United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2000 No. 117

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 27, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG OSE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Reverend Michael Caridi, Mary, Mother of the Church, Charleroi, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Father of our Lord, Jesus Christ, as this venerable assembly of representatives convenes this day to offer guidance and leadership to our Nation, we beseech Your divine presence among us and ask You to send Your blessings upon these men and women who so generously devote themselves to helping and serving others.

We ask that, prompted by Your Spirit, they will make decisions that further the ideals upon which this Nation was founded, decisions which respect the inherent dignity of every human being residing within our borders, irrespective of age, race, creed or social class.

May their work this day be pleasing in Your sight and may it bring about an increase of peace, justice and prosperity, not only in our own land, but throughout the whole world. 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. MASCARA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MASCARA 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 4700. An act to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact.

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution granting the consent of the Congress to the Red River Boundary Compact.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1658. An act to authorize the construction of a Reconciliation Place in Fort Pierre, South Dakota, and for other purposes.

S. 1865. An act to provide grants to establish demonstration mental health courts.

S. 1929. An act to amend the Native Hawaiian Health Care Improvement Act to revise and extend such Act.

S. 2272. An act to improve the administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts and for other purposes consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

WELCOME TO FATHER MICHAEL CARIDI, MARY, MOTHER OF THE CHURCH, CHARLEROI, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome Father Michael Caridi of Mary, Mother of the Church, in Charleroi, Pennsylvania, and his brothers, Gregory and Jamie Caridi, to our Nation's Capital.

Thank you, Father Michael, for your inspiring prayer. I am sure it will be comforting to all of us as we proceed with our legislative business today.

I would also like to extend a special greeting to Father David Dzermejko, pastor of Mary, Mother of the Church. Father David also served as a guest chaplain here several years ago.

I would also like to thank the House chaplain, Father Daniel Coughlin, for making the arrangements for Father Michael's visit.

Father David and Father Michael have been true spiritual leaders of our parish.

I wish to extend my best wishes to the parish family in Charleroi. Be assured, be assured, that I will take good care of Father Michael during his visit to Washington, DC.

VIGIL FOR CAPTAIN NATHAN PECHACEK, LAS VEGAS FIRE DEPARTMENT

(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, it is often known that in times of crisis, family and friends join together to support one another, and today that is exactly what is happening in Las Vegas, Nevada, for Captain Nathan Pechacek of the Las Vegas Fire Department.

Printed on recycled paper.

Earlier this week Captain Pechacek was seriously injured as his car was crushed and knocked on to its side by a drunk driver. Within minutes, fire fighters from Pechacek's own station arrived on the scene to rescue the injured driver from the wreck, not even knowing at first that the injured driver was their own captain.

Now, Captain Pechacek's fellow firefighters are keeping a vigil at the hospital, during which they have organized a blood drive to help him and others and volunteered to help Captain Pechecek's son with his homework in his father's absence.

We all wish Captain Pechacek a full and speedy recovery and his family strength during this difficult time. And to all those Las Vegas firefighters, we commend you on your heroism and loyalty.

Finally, I would like to end with a comment made by Las Vegas Fire Chief Mario Trevino. He said that they ''always treat an accident like it was our mother or father or sister or brother. This time it really was.''

JOHN LENNON MURDERER WANTS FREEDOM

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, John Lennon's murderer says he should be set free, and even John Lennon, who was a liberal, would agree he should be set free.

Think about it. Chapman said, ''My mental illness is over. I am eating, I am breathing, I am even singing and playing the guitar.''

Now, if that is not enough to throw up, let us remember Chapman's testimony. ''I asked Lennon for his autograph. He gave it to me. It was a ploy. I killed him. It was not his signature I wanted, I wanted his life.''

Beam me up. Mark Chapman deserves an electric chair, not an electric guitar.

I yield back the fact that America, that tolerates murderers like Mark Chapman, is an America that promotes and tolerates more murderers.

I yield back the life of John Lennon.

COMMENDING DR. CARLOTTA MORALES, PRINCIPAL OF SAINT AGATHA CATHOLIC SCHOOL, MIAMI, FLORIDA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to commend Dr. Carlotta Morales, the Principal of Saint Agatha Catholic School in my hometown of Miami.

Through her hard work and dedication, Dr. Morales has upgraded her school's facilities, advanced the education of her students, and improved the relationship between students, faculty and parents.

Dr. Morales has shown us what can be achieved with a positive attitude and a firm belief in self-reliance.

For her wonderful leadership in both her school and our community, Dr. Morales has been honored by both the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the Department of Education by being named one of this year's national distinguished principals.

Through her work, Dr. Morales demonstrates that our children are our Nation's most important assets, and her fine work on behalf of South Florida's youngsters is a shining example to be followed by educators everywhere.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Carlotta Morales as she continues her wonderful work at Saint Agatha Catholic school in Miami.

INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, today I continue in my effort to bring to this House's attention my deepest concern for American families destroyed by cases of international child abduction. Since February I have been coming to the floor to tell the stories of the over 10,000 American children who have been abducted abroad.

Today I will tell the story of Ms. Ildiko Gerbatsch and her two daughters, Naomi, who is 13, and her younger sister, Isabelle, who is now 10.

In the summer of 1977, Naomi and Isabelle visited their father in Germany. The parents had divorced in 1994, and Ms. Gerbatsch had complied with the California Superior Court's decision allowing the father visitation rights. At the end of the children's visiting time, the father failed to return the children to their mother in the United States.

To this date and after 3 years of legal disputes costing close to $100,000 in legal fees, the mother now has full custody of both children, but only on paper. Ms. Gerbatsch has only been allowed to visit with Naomi and Isabelle on three occasions. She has been mistreated by the German courts, who have failed to comply with the Hague Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, I come back to the floor for these daily one minutes because I care about families and reuniting children and parents. Let us make it our duty to place pressure on the countries that are the Hague signatories and who choose not to abide by the Hague Treaty.

I urge my colleagues to join me in spreading the message and taking a responsible role in bringing our children home.

VICE PRESIDENT AND MARRIAGE PENALTY TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, Vice President AL GORE, who once claimed he invented the Internet, now has an equally incredible claim, that he will get rid of the marriage penalty. The marriage penalty forces married couples to pay higher taxes than they would if they were single. Simply put, the marriage penalty is a tax on marriage.

The Vice President's proposal does not repeal the marriage penalty for all marriage penalty victims. The Vice President's plan only helps couples who take the standard deduction. That means that you would only get the marriage penalty reduction if you do not itemize your taxes.

In other words, under the Vice President's scheme, you will not get one penny of marriage penalty tax relief if you own a home and deduct your mortgage interest, if you donate to your church and other charities and deduct your contributions, if you own property and deduct your real estate or property taxes, if you deduct your State and local income taxes, if your spouse or child is ill and you deduct skyrocketing medical bills, or if you work at home and deduct the cost of your home office.

No one, Mr. Speaker, should be subjected to higher taxes simply because they are married. Taxing marriage is wrong. It is wrong whether a couple itemizes their taxes or not.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the American people, e-mail Vice President GORE, tell him to get it right. He did so well on the Internet, he should be able to do so well on the marriage penalty.

THE SURPLUS AND MEDICARE

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, this week we have had some interesting events. We were treated to a video coverage of Mr. Bush, Governor Bush, who is running for the Presidency, who was saying what a wonderful set of cuts were made in 1997 on Medicare, the Gingrich proposal to produce $270 billion that could be used for $270 billion worth of tax cuts.

Now we have the majority leader talking here about the marriage tax penalty. Why did they not do it in 1997? Well, they had some other rich folks they wanted to take care of before they got to the middle class folks in this country.

Tomorrow in the Committee on Ways and Means, for the third time, we are going to go back and shovel money back into the Medicare plan that was taken out in 1997. They are going to

throw $40 billion in there tomorrow to fill the hole they dug for themselves in 1997. If you think that is silly, where is something on prescription drugs?

Who is driving this bus, Mr. Speaker?

DEBT PAY DOWN AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of issues on our plate, but there are two in particular that the American people are demanding action on. The American people want us to take advantage of our current prosperity to pay off the multi-trillion dollar public debt that the Democrats racked up in their 30-year stranglehold on Congress, and they want to do something about prescription drugs. No senior should ever have to choose between putting food on the table and filling prescriptions when the doctor gives them.

Well, we are paying down the debt all right. By the end of the next year, we will have paid off a half a trillion dollars on the national debt, and done it while protecting 100 percent of Social Security and Medicare Trust Fund surpluses. But the Democrats and the President are blocking any progress on the prescription drug issue. You see, as long as they can keep us from implementing our plan, and it is a good one, they can keep accusing us of having done nothing.

Well, the American people need to know we have acted on the prescription drugs issue. We passed a plan that is effective, fair and comprehensive. We passed a plan that would give seniors solid coverage, even on catastrophic expenses, something AL GORE's plan would make them wait years for. But Democrats are blocking it because they do not want Republicans to get any credit for it.

HELPING SENIORS PAY FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are working to pay down the debt and help seniors get the prescription drugs they need. Republicans believe that in this time of plenty, it is critical that Congress reduce the public debt and enact a prescription drug benefit for our elderly.

As government surpluses pile up, we have a moral obligation to wipe out the public debt to provide our children with a brighter future. Reducing the public debt will strengthen the economy and result in lower interest rates for consumers. Our budget plan will pay down $240 billion of the public debt next year alone. America is the most prosperous nation on Earth, yet some seniors here are forced to choose between putting food on the table and the prescription drugs they need to lead healthy and productive lives.

1015

That is just not right. Republicans have passed a plan to make voluntary prescription drug coverage available and affordable to all.

Mr. Speaker, as the 106th Congress enters the final stretch, Republicans are working to pay off the public debt and help seniors pay for their prescription drugs they need to live happy, productive lives.

SLEEPOVERS AT THE WHITE HOUSE

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last week, the White House grudgingly released information showing that 404 people have been invited to sleep overnight in the White House since Hillary began her Senate campaign. Today a columnist in the Washington Post reports that 146 of the guests have contributed funds in this election cycle, 98 percent of it to Democrats. About 100 committed to supporting Hillary's campaign; others gave to the Gore campaign; others to the DNC.

Sleepovers have risen to 29 per month. That is almost every night. Mr. Speaker, this practice of turning the White House into a Motel 6 for soliciting campaign funds is improper and demeaning to the White House and to the office of the presidency. It is another disgusting example of the Clinton-Gore campaign finance practices, all while they call for campaign finance reform. That is nothing more than an attempt to get public attention away from their blatant ''no controlling legal authority'' violations. The American people deserve better.

CLINTON-GORE ENERGY POLICY IS DANGEROUS

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to energy prices and energy policy, the Clinton-Gore administration has failed the American people.

National gas and crude oil prices are at record highs. It is the American people who bear the brunt of the administration's failures on their policies.

The administration has prevented exploration of our largest domestic reserves along the coasts and in Alaska. They have strangled the capacity of American refineries with needless regulations to satisfy the goals of their extreme left wing. They have totally ignored and stifled the significant contributions of clean coal, hydroelectric and nuclear power.

The Vice President even cast a deciding vote to increase gasoline taxes on consumers, directly in line with his outrageous book, Earth in the Balance.

Now just a few weeks before the election, the Clinton-Gore administration reverses itself and risks the national energy security by releasing oil from our strategic petroleum reserves. I urge the administration to stop the politics and provide a real and effective energy policy for the American people.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MARTY NOTHSTEIN, OLYMPIC GOLD MEDAL WINNER

(Mr. TOOMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to offer hardy congratulations to Marty Nothstein. Last Wednesday, Marty won the gold medal in the cycling match sprint competition during the 2000 Summer Olympic Games in Sydney, Australia. I am proud to stand before all of my colleagues today to say ''job well done'' to this Trexlertown, Lehigh Valley, Pennsylvania native.

During the 1996 Atlanta games, Marty narrowly missed his chance at gold by placing second in the match sprint competition in one of the closest races from Olympic history. But instead of giving up on his Olympic dream for gold, Marty rededicated himself to his sport. He devoted more time, more energy, more patience to his training than he had at any other time during his long cycling career.

Marty's win last Wednesday is the culmination of a career that includes seven World Championship medals, including three World Championship titles.

Mr. Speaker, before all of my colleagues today, I want to recognize the efforts of this outstanding young man. By winning this gold medal on the world's biggest stage, Marty has proven that, with unparalleled effort, determination, and dedication, everything is possible. Marty is a true Olympic hero.

MEDIA BIASED AGAINST CHENEY

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, here is a recent Washington Post article describing vice presidential candidate Dick Cheney's speeches: ''Bash. Bash. Bash.''

The reporter quotes Cheney as saying that the country was ''weary of the Clinton-Gore routine,'' but then adds, ''even if no one else is'' but Cheney.

No, these sarcastic opinions are not from an editorial. They are from a news story that is supposed to be objective and impartial. What it reveals is the bias of a reporter who is trying to tell us what to think.

Why does the media display such a liberal bias? Simply because journalists are more liberal than the rest of us.

Peter Brown, an editor at the ''Orlando Sentinel'' conducted a study that discovered a profound cultural disconnect between journalists and readers. He found that reporters are far more likely than other Americans to approve of abortion on demand, to express disdainful attitudes towards the suburbs and rural areas, and to identify strongly with people who see themselves as victims of society. They are also less likely to go to church or do volunteer work in their communities.

But what is the answer? We need to tell the media, give us the facts, and let us make up our own mind.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT UNDER MEDICARE IS WHAT SENIORS WANT

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, as we speak right now, outside of this Chamber, our senior citizens who have come here begging us for some relief for the high cost of prescription drugs, they are telling us about how they are spending all of their money, rather than being able to buy the nutritious food or put a decent roof over their head, they are struggling to pay for the drugs that they need. We have only a few days left to provide real relief. A prescription drug benefit under Medicare is what they want.

Now we are talking about reimportation of lower-cost drugs from Canada. That is fine. Let us do that. Although, I have to tell my colleagues, it is pretty crazy that we have to rely on the Canadian Government who puts some controls on the cost of drugs, the cost they are willing to pay, and we as Americans have to go and buy those same American-made drugs from the Canadians because we do not do anything to control the cost.

Senior citizens need help. Let us get a prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE FOR AMERICA'S SENIORS IS IMPORTANT

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, prescription drug coverage for America's seniors is important. Our two parties differ, however.

Republicans believe in choice, not government control. Americans themselves can always make decisions that best meet their individuals needs. On the other hand, Democrats believe government, not individuals, make the best decisions for all people in every circumstance.

The Clinton-Gore administration's prescription drug proposals are total government control. Vice President GORE claims to have a recipe of hopes and promises. But when we get in the kitchen, we discover it is the same old concoction of government ingredients and bureaucratic spices. One can present it any way one wants to, but one knows it still tastes the same, it still smells the same. It is not good.

We need a prescription drug benefit under Medicare that offers seniors real choices without government control. Americans do not want, need, or deserve any more Hillary care.

SHAME ON THE CONGRESS FOR NOT TAKING ACTION ON PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to admonish this country, it is a shame that we are here talk, talk, talk, and not doing anything about prescription drugs.

My daughter recounted to me a story last Saturday night when she was in a pharmacy at midnight on Saturday night, to pick up some pain medicine. She told me that the people waiting in line there were limited English speaking, about eight families.

One of the gentlemen was pleading with the pharmacist to sell him at least two of the pills that were prescribed, he could not afford the whole package, because his infant daughter was sick and needed these prescription drugs. But the pharmacist would not sell the drugs to him because he could not buy the entire package, the entire dosage which the doctors recommend.

He said, ''I cannot afford it. Give me two now, and I will come back in a couple of days and buy the rest of them.'' It went on and on, and the pharmacist would not sell it because the process would not allow them to do it, and the person could not afford the drugs. He was in tears, as any parent would be.

Shame on America that we cannot take care of people; we cannot even disburse those drugs that have been prescribed because people cannot pay for them. Shame on the drug companies. Shame on the process. Shame on Congress for not correcting it.

THIS ADMINISTRATION NOT CONNECTED WHEN IT COMES TO EDUCATION

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, now we have from the Gore-Clinton administration the formula for turning around education. This was revealed on September 7, 2000, by the Secretary of Education, Richard Riley, and I quote: ''What we need are the three R's in education: relationships, resilience, and readiness.''

Now, is not that odd, because back home in Georgia, none of the parents or teachers have come to me and said, what we really need is resilience in education. Somehow their idea of the three R's is a little bit different. We need local control of education. We need parental involvement. We need the money going to the teacher in the classroom, not the bureaucrats in Washington. We need safe campuses.

No wonder the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), a Democrat Congressman, said January 10, 2000, and I quote directly: ''I sit on the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, and I have witnessed the failure of this administration and AL GORE to do enough to address our Nation's education needs.''

Well, I agree with the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), my Democrat colleague. It does not appear that this administration is connected when it comes to education.

UNITED STATES RANKS NEAR BOTTOM IN EDUCATION COMPARED TO INDUSTRIALIZED COUNTRIES AROUND THE WORLD

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have an obscenity to share with the Members of the House. For the 8 years that the Clinton-Gore administration has possessed the White House, they have squandered their opportunity to fix education in America.

The Third International Math and Science Study comparison compared 21 industrialized countries around the world in math and science. Let me read the list of countries that outperform the United States: Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, Iceland, Norway, France, New Zealand, Australia, Canada, Austria, Slovenia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Russia, Lithuania, the Czech Republic.

After the United States comes two countries: Cyprus and South Africa.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we rank near the bottom when compared to industrial countries around the world in education.

Republicans have a different message. Stop squandering opportunity in the White House. Get dollars to the classroom. Get money to the teachers, the administrators, the school board members who know the names of our children. Stop wasting billions on a huge bureaucracy here in Washington, D.C. that cannot teach.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH ACT OF 2000

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 594 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 594

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4365) to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to children's health, with Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 594 is a rule waiving all points of order against a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 4365, the Children's Health Act of the year 2000.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4365, the Children's Health Act of 2000, was passed in the House earlier this year on May 9 by a vote of 419 to two. Last week, our colleagues in the other body considered and passed this important legislation with an amendment by unanimous consent.

Adoption of this rule and passage of this legislation today is the last step in our work to sending this bill to the President for his signature and thus making this important package a reality.

I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for their renewed efforts and success on this important legislation and also to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), chairman of the Committee on Commerce and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), ranking member, for their hard work and leadership.

H.R. 4365, along with the decisions made by the other body, is a comprehensive package of several important children's health bills. Together it addresses a wide variety of critical issues, including day care safety, maternal and infant health, pediatric public health promotion, pediatric research, along with efforts to fight youth drug abuse and provide mental health services.

1030

The legislation includes two important divisions. Division A addresses issues regarding children's health; while Division B focuses on youth drug abuse. Together this package will form the foundation for efforts to address the unique needs of one of our most important constituencies: Our children.

The provisions contained in the second part of this legislation, Division D, include a number of provisions previously introduced and considered in the House of Representatives and will allow us to tackle the plague of drug abuse and addiction which are moving through many of our communities.

The 1999 National Household Survey on drug abuse reported that some 10.9 percent of our youths, between the ages of 12 and 17, use some form of illicit drug. Just as tragic are the report's findings that alcohol use is also on the rise with our Nation's youth, with some 10.4 million drinkers under the legal age of 21.

H.R. 4365 reauthorizes and improves the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, SAMSHA, by giving it greater focus on our youth and increased flexibility and accountability for the States. It will provide the needed funds for community-based programs, helping individuals with substance abuse and mental health disorders.

It includes the Drug Addiction Treatment Act, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), to permit qualified physicians to treat their addicted patients and speed up the drug approval process of narcotic drugs needed for additional treatment.

Finally, H.R. 4365 includes important provisions to reduce the proliferation of the drug methamphetamine, and tackle the devastating drug currently on the rise with our youth commonly known as Ecstasy.

Mr. Speaker, we all hope that the wealth of our Nation and the amazing technological advances that have been made in medicine will give us the necessary resources to protect our children from harm. We have made tremendous progress, but the sad fact is that there are still so many diseases that affect our children for which there is no cure or even an effective treatment.

Division A of the legislation before us will give child victims and their families hope by devoting more Federal resources to diseases such as autism, asthma, juvenile diabetes and arthritis. I am especially pleased that this new version of H.R. 4365 includes specific provisions on childhood cancer.

By awarding grants, expanding data collection, encouraging uniform reporting standards and urging the national coordination of activities, this bill will go a long way in the battle against this disease that takes the lives of so many of our Nation's children.

This legislation also focuses on a new pediatric research initiative at NIH, and reauthorizes money to train physicians at children's hospitals, in order to help us better understand the way in which diseases attack children and how to give them the most effective and appropriate care.

There are critical differences between medical care for adults and medical care for children that must be reflected in the training of physicians and treatments designed for a child's system, which is still developing. The children's hospitals across the Nation need funding to adequately train their physicians, and I am so very pleased that H.R. 4365 extends the authorization of appropriations for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals through fiscal year 2005.

This is an issue of fairness, and full authorization is necessary to provide children's hospitals support that is on par with that received by teaching hospitals that care for adults. This legislation recognizes and focuses on these many important differences.

Mr. Speaker, while we may never be able to make a child understand why he or she is sick or is made to suffer, we can invest in the research that will allow our best and brightest scientists to solve the mysteries of childhood disease so that more children can have the carefree youths to which they are entitled. What better way to invest our Nation's resources?

Mr. Speaker, this measure is straightforward and noncontroversial and its adoption will allow us to complete the work and the business of the House and pass this comprehensive package. I urge all my colleagues to support both the rule and this very important child health initiative.

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

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

As the gentlewoman has explained, this rule will take a Senate amendment from the Speaker's desk and agree to it. Under this procedure, there will be no opportunity to change the bill under consideration with a motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, 6 years after the Republican majority took control of this House, the Republican leadership has yet to find a way to effectively manage the business of the House. It is 3 days before the end of the fiscal year and 9 days before the Congress is scheduled to end, yet only 2 of the 13 appropriation bills have been sent to the President to be signed; we have yet to consider on this floor the funding bills we need to help people find housing or have safe transportation to get to work or plow their ground to produce food or learn the basic skills to be able to get and hold a job in the modern day workplace.

Last night, the members of the Committee on Rules were held hostage for hours past the last vote so that we might be available to bail out the Republican leadership so that the House might have some business to conduct today. Why should the Committee on Rules be held here until 9:30? For one very simple reason, Mr. Speaker. And that is because the majority party still has not figured out how to run this institution in an efficient manner and

could not find anything to do on the floor today.

However, sometime around 9 p.m. the Republican leadership came up with a solution. So what did they do? The Republican leadership has taken one of the bills that was supposed to be considered yesterday under procedures for noncontroversial bills, suspension of the rules, and moved it to today to be considered under a rule.

I do not mean to take anything away from the value of this bill. The Children's Health Act is vitally important to help find new ways to prevent or cure diseases which affect our children. But it should have been passed last night under suspension of the rules, as it was intended to be done. The health organizations, including the March of Dimes, the Spina Bifida Foundation, the Autism Society of America, the Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs, the Epilepsy Foundation, the Cereberal Palsy Association, and many, many others have worked hard to see the bill to completion and were counting on us to do our work. It is past time to get on with this business.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Children's Health Act of 2000. This bill now spans 400 pages and has two basic purposes. The first addresses a host of specific childhood health problems and prenatal risk factors, including many provisions which passed in the House earlier this year. The bill authorizes research and public health and health education services that respond to fragile X syndrome, epilepsy, asthma, childhood lead poisoning, pediatric cancers, childhood obesity prevention, traumatic brain injury, juvenile diabetes, hearing loss, oral health, autism, arthritis, muscular dystrophy, autoimmune conditions, child care safety and pediatric organ transplants.

It also provides block grants to the States for laboratory infrastructure and patient care services for those affected with or at risk for genetic conditions. The bill contains the first ever authorization of the very successful Healthy Start demonstration project, now in their ninth year of reducing infant mortality and improving pregnancy outcomes in underserved populations.

The second feature of this bill covers a wide range of youth drug and mental health service programs that will strengthen America's communities, including extending and reauthorizing programs administered by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. These programs provide critical safety net services for individuals and families with substance abuse problems and mental illness, and also exclusively target youth. It also supports public and professional education programs related to substance abuse and mental illness. The breadth of services provided here range from an underage drinking provision and a suicide prevention initiative, to services for youth offenders, the homeless, and adults with fetal alcohol syndrome.

This large and complex bill, however, is marked with a number of procedural irregularities. As worthy as the goals may be, no bill of this scope and magnitude should proceed to the floor without going through the committee process, yet this occurred in the majority's apparent rush to move this bill to the floor.

For example, the bill contains a provision that invokes charitable choice. This is a difficult issue for many Members, yet the Committee on the Judiciary was never given the opportunity for public debate on this issue. I know this is of particular concern to my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who is here to voice his concerns this morning.

The second example is marked with some irony. The fine provision promoting safe motherhood includes a public education initiative addressing the dangers of alcohol, tobacco and illicit drug use in pregnancy. Most women do not begin smoking during pregnancy, they begin as adolescents. Yet neither the House nor the Committee on Commerce had the opportunity to even debate the issue of FDA regulation of youth tobacco use during this Congress.

I will vote for this bill, however, I want America's children to know that while H.R. 4365 is a measurable step toward improving the quality of their collective health, we can and should do better. It is obvious that this Congress will fail to address many major health care issues that confront us. I am only grateful we have the opportunity to vote for this bill and do something constructive to improve the health care of our Nation's children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise to oppose the rule because, in its present form, good health care for children now includes a bad crime bill and a provision which waters down our fundamental civil rights. A good child health care bill should not come at such a price.

By adopting the rule, we will prohibit amendments to the bill that could fix the methamphetamine drug part of the bill. A similar bill was considered in the Committee on the Judiciary, and amendments could have conformed that 46-page bill to the formal deliberations of the committee. But the rule prohibits amendments, and so the bill now provides new Draconian mandatory minimums for violations of methamphetamines, mandatory minimums that everyone knows do not work. The same mandatory minimums as for crack cocaine.

Now, it is interesting that crack cocaine is prevalent in the black community; methamphetamine is more prevalent in the Hispanic community. They get the Draconian mandatory minimums. However, there is an exception to all of this. Ecstasy, which is prevalent in the middle class white community, does not suffer the same mandatory minimums. The Committee on the Judiciary at least had the common decency to make them all equal. But now we have a rule which prohibits any consideration for equalizing this penalty. We have this exemption and, because of the rule, we have to just do it.

The rule also protects another form of discrimination: Religious discrimination. Section 3305 has a provision that allows some sponsors of federally funded programs to discriminate on employment based on religion. That is they can tell otherwise qualified individuals that they do not hire their kind because of their religion. These are federally funded programs. We cannot address this discrimination because the rule protects that provision and does not allow any amendments.

So if we want good child health care, we have to accept the discrimination; we have to accept the mandatory minimums, with the exception for the middle class white kids. We should not be forced to accept ineffective counterproductive mandatory minimums and religious discrimination as a price for good child health care, and that is why I oppose this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled that the Children's Health Act of 2000 is on the floor today. I would like to thank the Chair of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), for their leadership and determination to see the bill through.

But I want to take special time to salute the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) for his work on behalf of children in America. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has worked tirelessly on behalf of millions of Americans suffering from traumatic brain injury. He has also assisted in my efforts to create the first national traumatic brain injury registry, which is critical.

I first became involved with this issue several years ago when a constituent of mine, Dennis Benigno, approached me to tell me about his son, who was struck by a car, hospitalized for months, leaving him with severe cognitive and physical damage.

1045

As a result of his son's accident, Mr. Benigno has been on the front lines researching the disease, informing others, reaching out to the medical research and scientific community, and lobbying elected officials like myself.

I am proud of the efforts and the progress my good friend has made on

behalf of traumatic brain injury, and I am pleased that the national registry will be included in the Children's Health Act.

These brain injury registries will also charge hospitals and local and State departments of health with the task of collecting data for up to a year following the injury.

A national registry will help all of us to better understand the injury, what types of treatment people have received, what services they use, and how we can best link people with services.

I also hope that we fight each day, like Dennis does, to raise awareness of this disease and to fight for the injured, like his son.

I urge all my colleagues to, when the bill comes up after we debate the rule, vote for the passage of this bill.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my opening remarks, this is a good bill. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) has some legitimate concerns about a particular matter that he was not able to address. The overall bill is an important piece of legislation.

We have concerns on this side that we seem to be treading water here in not being able to bring anything up on the floor on a regular basis. We do not know from day to day what is going to be considered.

This bill could have been done on suspension yesterday. That does not diminish the bill. This is an important piece of legislation. I support the bill and support the rule.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me just respond. This very well could have been considered under the suspension calendar last night. We would all have been considering this bill at about 11 p.m. if that were the case.

Instead, we chose to come back in the light of day and with everyone well rested and alert and consider this important piece of legislation and allow the American public to hear all the goods things that we are promoting and adopting.

In closing, let me remind my colleagues that the House has already passed this with a strong bipartisan support vote of 419–2. Our work today will allow us to dedicate important resources and focus Members on the very unique needs in the health and well-being of our children.

I urge adoption of this straightforward, noncontroversial rule and passage of the comprehensive legislation.

I applaud my colleagues, the gentleman from Florida (Chairman BILIRAKIS), and my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), on their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 594, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4365) to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to children's health, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BILIRAKIS

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. BILIRAKIS moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 4365, as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Children's Health Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.

DIVISION A—CHILDREN'S HEALTH

TITLE I—AUTISM

Sec. 101. Expansion, intensification, and coordination of activities of National Institutes of Health with respect to research on autism.
Sec. 102. Developmental disabilities surveillance and research programs.
Sec. 103. Information and education.
Sec. 104. Inter-agency Autism Coordinating Committee.
Sec. 105. Report to Congress.

TITLE II—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT REGARDING FRAGILE X

Sec. 201. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; research on fragile X.

TITLE III—JUVENILE ARTHRITIS AND RELATED CONDITIONS

Sec. 301. National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases; research on juvenile arthritis and related conditions.
Sec. 302. Information clearinghouse.

TITLE IV—REDUCING BURDEN OF DIABETES AMONG CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Sec. 401. Programs of Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
Sec. 402. Programs of National Institutes of Health.

TITLE V—ASTHMA SERVICES FOR CHILDREN

Subtitle A—Asthma Services

Sec. 501. Grants for children's asthma relief.
Sec. 502. Technical and conforming amendments.

Subtitle B—Prevention Activities

Sec. 511. Preventive health and health services block grant; systems for reducing asthma-related illnesses through integrated pest management.

Subtitle C—Coordination of Federal Activities

Sec. 521. Coordination through National Institutes of Health.

Subtitle D—Compilation of Data

Sec. 531. Compilation of data by Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

TITLE VI—BIRTH DEFECTS PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

Subtitle A—Folic Acid Promotion

Sec. 601. Program regarding effects of folic acid in prevention of birth defects.

Subtitle B—National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities

Sec. 611. National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities.

TITLE VII—EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND TREATMENT REGARDING HEARING LOSS IN INFANTS

Sec. 701. Purposes.
Sec. 702. Programs of Health Resources and Services Administration, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and National Institutes of Health.

TITLE VIII—CHILDREN AND EPILEPSY

Sec. 801. National public health campaign on epilepsy; seizure disorder demonstration projects in medically underserved areas.

TITLE IX—SAFE MOTHERHOOD; INFANT HEALTH PROMOTION

Subtitle A—Safe Motherhood Prevention Research

Sec. 901. Prevention research and other activities.

Subtitle B—Pregnant Women and Infants Health Promotion

Sec. 911. Programs regarding prenatal and postnatal health.

TITLE X—PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE

Sec. 1001. Establishment of pediatric research initiative.
Sec. 1002. Investment in tomorrow's pediatric researchers.
Sec. 1003. Review of regulations.
Sec. 1004. Long-term child development study.

TITLE XI—CHILDHOOD MALIGNANCIES

Sec. 1101. Programs of Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and National Institutes of Health.

TITLE XII—ADOPTION AWARENESS

Subtitle A—Infant Adoption Awareness

Sec. 1201. Grants regarding infant adoption awareness.

Subtitle B—Special Needs Adoption Awareness

Sec. 1211. Special needs adoption programs; public awareness campaign and other activities.

TITLE XIII—TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY

Sec. 1301. Programs of Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
Sec. 1302. Study and monitor incidence and prevalence.
Sec. 1303. Programs of National Institutes of Health.
Sec. 1304. Programs of Health Resources and Services Administration.
Sec. 1305. State grants for protection and advocacy services.
Sec. 1306. Authorization of appropriations for certain programs.

TITLE XIV—CHILD CARE SAFETY AND HEALTH GRANTS

Sec. 1401. Definitions.
Sec. 1402. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 1403. Programs.
Sec. 1404. Amounts reserved; allotments.
Sec. 1405. State applications.
Sec. 1406. Use of funds.
Sec. 1407. Reports.

TITLE XV—HEALTHY START INITIATIVE

Sec. 1501. Continuation of healthy start program.

TITLE XVI—ORAL HEALTH PROMOTION AND DISEASE PREVENTION

Sec. 1601. Identification of interventions that reduce the burden and transmission of oral, dental, and craniofacial diseases in high risk populations; development of approaches for pediatric oral and craniofacial assessment.

Sec. 1602. Oral health promotion and disease prevention.

Sec. 1603. Coordinated program to improve pediatric oral health.

TITLE XVII—VACCINE-RELATED PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—Vaccine Compensation Program

Sec. 1701. Content of petitions.

Subtitle B— Childhood Immunizations

Sec. 1711. Childhood immunizations.

TITLE XVIII—HEPATITIS C

Sec. 1801. Surveillance and education regarding hepatitis C.

TITLE XIX—NIH INITIATIVE ON AUTOIMMUNE DISEASES

Sec. 1901. Autoimmune diseases; initiative through Director of National Institutes of Health.

TITLE XX—GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS

Sec. 2001. Provisions to revise and extend program.

TITLE XXI—SPECIAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN REGARDING ORGAN TRANSPLANTATION

Sec. 2101. Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network; amendments regarding needs of children.

TITLE XXII—MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY RESEARCH

Sec. 2201. Muscular dystrophy research.

TITLE XXIII—CHILDREN AND TOURETTE SYNDROME AWARENESS

Sec. 2301. Grants regarding Tourette Syndrome.

TITLE XXIV—CHILDHOOD OBESITY PREVENTION

Sec. 2401. Programs operated through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

TITLE XXV—EARLY DETECTION AND TREATMENT REGARDING CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING

Sec. 2501. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention efforts to combat childhood lead poisoning.

Sec. 2502. Grants for lead poisoning related activities.

Sec. 2503. Training and reports by the Health Resources and Services Administration.

Sec. 2504. Screenings, referrals, and education regarding lead poisoning.

TITLE XXVI—SCREENING FOR HERITABLE DISORDERS

Sec. 2601. Program to improve the ability of States to provide newborn and child screening for heritable disorders.

TITLE XXVII—PEDIATRIC RESEARCH PROTECTIONS

Sec. 2701. Requirement for additional protections for children involved in research.

TITLE XXVIII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 2801. Report regarding research on rare diseases in children.

Sec. 2802. Study on metabolic disorders.

TITLE XXIX—EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 2901. Effective date.

DIVISION B—YOUTH DRUG AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Sec. 3001. Short title.

TITLE XXXI—PROVISIONS RELATING TO SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS

Sec. 3101. Children and violence.

Sec. 3102. Emergency response.

Sec. 3103. High risk youth reauthorization.

Sec. 3104. Substance abuse treatment services for children and adolescents.

Sec. 3105. Comprehensive community services for children with serious emotional disturbance.

Sec. 3106. Services for children of substance abusers.

Sec. 3107. Services for youth offenders.

Sec. 3108. Grants for strengthening families through community partnerships.

Sec. 3109. Programs to reduce underage drinking.

Sec. 3110. Services for individuals with fetal alcohol syndrome.

Sec. 3111. Suicide prevention.

Sec. 3112. General provisions.

TITLE XXXII—PROVISIONS RELATING TO MENTAL HEALTH

Sec. 3201. Priority mental health needs of regional and national significance.

Sec. 3202. Grants for the benefit of homeless individuals.

Sec. 3203. Projects for assistance in transition from homelessness.

Sec. 3204. Community mental health services performance partnership block grant.

Sec. 3205. Determination of allotment.

Sec. 3206. Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986.

Sec. 3207. Requirement relating to the rights of residents of certain facilities.

Sec. 3208. Requirement relating to the rights of residents of certain non-medical, community-based facilities for children and youth.

Sec. 3209. Emergency mental health centers.

Sec. 3210. Grants for jail diversion programs.

Sec. 3211. Improving outcomes for children and adolescents through services integration between child welfare and mental health services.

Sec. 3212. Grants for the integrated treatment of serious mental illness and co-occurring substance abuse.

Sec. 3213. Training grants.

TITLE XXXIII—PROVISIONS RELATING TO SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Sec. 3301. Priority substance abuse treatment needs of regional and national significance.

Sec. 3302. Priority substance abuse prevention needs of regional and national significance.

Sec. 3303. Substance abuse prevention and treatment performance partnership block grant.

Sec. 3304. Determination of allotments.

Sec. 3305. Nondiscrimination and institutional safeguards for religious providers.

Sec. 3306. Alcohol and drug prevention or treatment services for Indians and Native Alaskans.

Sec. 3307. Establishment of commission.

TITLE XXXIV—PROVISIONS RELATING TO FLEXIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Sec. 3401. General authorities and peer review.

Sec. 3402. Advisory councils.

Sec. 3403. General provisions for the performance partnership block grants.

Sec. 3404. Data infrastructure projects.

Sec. 3405. Repeal of obsolete addict referral provisions.

Sec. 3406. Individuals with co-occurring disorders.

Sec. 3407. Services for individuals with co-occurring disorders.

TITLE XXXV—WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR PHYSICIANS WHO DISPENSE OR PRESCRIBE CERTAIN NARCOTIC DRUGS FOR MAINTENANCE TREATMENT OR DETOXIFICATION TREATMENT

Sec. 3501. Short title.

Sec. 3502. Amendment to Controlled Substances Act.

TITLE XXXVI—METHAMPHETAMINE AND OTHER CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES

Sec. 3601. Short title.

Subtitle A—Methamphetamine Production, Trafficking, and Abuse

PART I—CRIMINAL PENALTIES

Sec. 3611. Enhanced punishment of amphetamine laboratory operators.

Sec. 3612. Enhanced punishment of amphetamine or methamphetamine laboratory operators.

Sec. 3613. Mandatory restitution for violations of Controlled Substances Act and Controlled Substances Import and Export Act relating to amphetamine and methamphetamine.

Sec. 3614. Methamphetamine paraphernalia.

PART II—ENHANCED LAW ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 3621. Environmental hazards associated with illegal manufacture of amphetamine and methamphetamine.

Sec. 3622. Reduction in retail sales transaction threshold for non-safe harbor products containing pseudoephedrine or phenylpropanolamine.

Sec. 3623. Training for Drug Enforcement Administration and State and local law enforcement personnel relating to clandestine laboratories.

Sec. 3624. Combating methamphetamine and amphetamine in high intensity drug trafficking areas.

Sec. 3625. Combating amphetamine and methamphetamine manufacturing and trafficking.

PART III—ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT

Sec. 3631. Expansion of methamphetamine research.

Sec. 3632. Methamphetamine and amphetamine treatment initiative by Center for Substance Abuse Treatment.

Sec. 3633. Study of methamphetamine treatment.

PART IV—REPORTS

Sec. 3641. Reports on consumption of methamphetamine and other illicit drugs in rural areas, metropolitan areas, and consolidated metropolitan areas.

Sec. 3642. Report on diversion of ordinary, over-the-counter pseudoephedrine and phenylpropanolamine products.

Subtitle B—Controlled Substances Generally

Sec. 3651. Enhanced punishment for trafficking in list I chemicals.

Sec. 3652. Mail order requirements.

Sec. 3653. Theft and transportation of anhydrous ammonia for purposes of illicit production of controlled substances.

Subtitle C—Ecstasy Anti-Proliferation Act of 2000

Sec. 3661. Short title.

Sec. 3662. Findings.

Sec. 3663. Enhanced punishment of Ecstasy traffickers.

Sec. 3664. Emergency authority to United States Sentencing Commission.

Sec. 3665. Expansion of Ecstasy and club drugs abuse prevention efforts.

Subtitle D—Miscellaneous

Sec. 3671. Antidrug messages on Federal Government Internet websites.

Sec. 3672. Reimbursement by Drug Enforcement Administration of expenses incurred to remediate methamphetamine laboratories.

Sec. 3673. Severability.

DIVISION A—CHILDREN'S HEALTH

TITLE I—AUTISM

SEC. 101. EXPANSION, INTENSIFICATION, AND COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH WITH RESPECT TO RESEARCH ON AUTISM.

Part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following section:

''EXPANSION, INTENSIFICATION, AND COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH WITH RESPECT TO RESEARCH ON AUTISM

''SEC. 409C. (a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) EXPANSION OF ACTIVITIES.—The Director of NIH (in this section referred to as the 'Director') shall expand, intensify, and coordinate the activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to research on autism.

''(2) ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM; COLLABORATION AMONG AGENCIES.—The Director shall carry out this section acting through the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health and in collaboration with any other agencies that the Director determines appropriate.

''(b) CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall under subsection (a)(1) make awards of grants and contracts to public or nonprofit private entities to pay all or part of the cost of planning, establishing, improving, and providing basic operating support for centers of excellence regarding research on autism.

''(2) RESEARCH.—Each center under paragraph (1) shall conduct basic and clinical research into autism. Such research should include investigations into the cause, diagnosis, early detection, prevention, control, and treatment of autism. The centers, as a group, shall conduct research including the fields of developmental neurobiology, genetics, and psychopharmacology.

''(3) SERVICES FOR PATIENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A center under paragraph (1) may expend amounts provided under such paragraph to carry out a program to make individuals aware of opportunities to participate as subjects in research conducted by the centers.

''(B) REFERRALS AND COSTS.—A program under subparagraph (A) may, in accordance with such criteria as the Director may establish, provide to the subjects described in such subparagraph, referrals for health and other services, and such patient care costs as are required for research.

''(C) AVAILABILITY AND ACCESS.—The extent to which a center can demonstrate availability and access to clinical services shall be considered by the Director in decisions about awarding grants to applicants which meet the scientific criteria for funding under this section.

''(4) COORDINATION OF CENTERS; REPORTS.—The Director shall, as appropriate, provide for the coordination of information among centers under paragraph (1) and ensure regular communication between such centers, and may require the periodic preparation of reports on the activities of the centers and the submission of the reports to the Director.

''(5) ORGANIZATION OF CENTERS.—Each center under paragraph (1) shall use the facilities of a single institution, or be formed from a consortium of cooperating institutions, meeting such requirements as may be prescribed by the Director.

''(6) NUMBER OF CENTERS; DURATION OF SUPPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall provide for the establishment of not less than 5 centers under paragraph (1).

''(B) DURATION.—Support for a center established under paragraph (1) may be provided under this section for a period of not to exceed 5 years. Such period may be extended for 1 or more additional periods not exceeding 5 years if the operations of such center have been reviewed by an appropriate technical and scientific peer review group established by the Director and if such group has recommended to the Director that such period should be extended.

''(c) FACILITATION OF RESEARCH.—The Director shall under subsection (a)(1) provide for a program under which samples of tissues and genetic materials that are of use in research on autism are donated, collected, preserved, and made available for such research. The program shall be carried out in accordance with accepted scientific and medical standards for the donation, collection, and preservation of such samples.

''(d) PUBLIC INPUT.—The Director shall under subsection (a)(1) provide for means through which the public can obtain information on the existing and planned programs and activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to autism and through which the Director can receive comments from the public regarding such programs and activities.

''(e) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section. Amounts appropriated under this subsection are in addition to any other amounts appropriated for such purpose.''.

SEC. 102. DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES SURVEILLANCE AND RESEARCH PROGRAMS.

(a) NATIONAL AUTISM AND PERVASIVE DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES SURVEILLANCE PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary''), acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, may make awards of grants and cooperative agreements for the collection, analysis, and reporting of data on autism and pervasive developmental disabilities. In making such awards, the Secretary may provide direct technical assistance in lieu of cash.

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive an award under paragraph (1) an entity shall be a public or nonprofit private entity (including health departments of States and political subdivisions of States, and including universities and other educational entities).

(b) CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE IN AUTISM AND PERVASIVE DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES EPIDEMIOLOGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall establish not less than 3 regional centers of excellence in autism and pervasive developmental disabilities epidemiology for the purpose of collecting and analyzing information on the number, incidence, correlates, and causes of autism and related developmental disabilities.

(2) RECIPIENTS OF AWARDS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTERS.—Centers under paragraph (1) shall be established and operated through the awarding of grants or cooperative agreements to public or nonprofit private entities that conduct research, including health departments of States and political subdivisions of States, and including universities and other educational entities.

(3) CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—An award for a center under paragraph (1) may be made only if the entity involved submits to the Secretary an application containing such agreements and information as the Secretary may require, including an agreement that the center involved will operate in accordance with the following:

(A) The center will collect, analyze, and report autism and pervasive developmental disabilities data according to guidelines prescribed by the Director, after consultation with relevant State and local public health officials, private sector developmental disability researchers, and advocates for those with developmental disabilities.

(B) The center will assist with the development and coordination of State autism and pervasive developmental disabilities surveillance efforts within a region.

(C) The center will identify eligible cases and controls through its surveillance systems and conduct research into factors which may cause autism and related developmental disabilities.

(D) The center will develop or extend an area of special research expertise (including genetics, environmental exposure to contaminants, immunology, and other relevant research specialty areas).

(c) CLEARINGHOUSE.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall carry out the following:

(1) The Secretary shall establish a clearinghouse within the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for the collection and storage of data generated from the monitoring programs established by this title. Through the clearinghouse, such Centers shall serve as the coordinating agency for autism and pervasive developmental disabilities surveillance activities. The functions of such a clearinghouse shall include facilitating the coordination of research and policy development relating to the epidemiology of autism and other pervasive developmental disabilities.

(2) The Secretary shall coordinate the Federal response to requests for assistance from State health department officials regarding potential or alleged autism or developmental disability clusters.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this title, the term ''State'' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 103. INFORMATION AND EDUCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and implement a program to provide information and education on autism to health professionals and the general public, including information and education on advances in the diagnosis and treatment of autism and training and continuing education through programs for scientists, physicians, and other health professionals who provide care for patients with autism.

(b) STIPENDS.—The Secretary may use amounts made available under this section to provide stipends for health professionals who are enrolled in training programs under this section.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 104. INTER-AGENCY AUTISM COORDINATING COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a committee to be known as the ''Autism Coordinating Committee'' (in this section referred to as the ''Committee'') to coordinate all efforts within the Department of Health and Human Services concerning autism, including activities carried out through the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention under this title (and the amendment made by this title).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall be composed of the Directors of such national research institutes, of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and of such other agencies and such other officials as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(2) ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—If determined appropriate by the Secretary, the Secretary may appoint to the Committee—

(A) parents or legal guardians of individuals with autism or other pervasive developmental disorders; and

(B) representatives of other governmental agencies that serve children with autism such as the Department of Education.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT; TERMS OF SERVICE; OTHER PROVISIONS.—The following shall apply with respect to the Committee:

(1) The Committee shall receive necessary and appropriate administrative support from the Department of Health and Human Services.

(2) Members of the Committee appointed under subsection (b)(2)(A) shall serve for a term of 3 years, and may serve for an unlimited number of terms if reappointed.

(3) The Committee shall meet not less than 2 times each year.

SEC. 105. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than January 1, 2001, and each January 1 thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, a report concerning the implementation of this title and the amendments made by this title.

TITLE II—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT REGARDING FRAGILE X

SEC. 201. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT; RESEARCH ON FRAGILE X.

Subpart 7 of part C of title IV of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end the following section:

''FRAGILE X

''SEC. 452E. (a) EXPANSION AND COORDINATION OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—The Director of the Institute, after consultation with the advisory council for the Institute, shall expand, intensify, and coordinate the activities of the Institute with respect to research on the disease known as fragile X.

''(b) RESEARCH CENTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Institute shall make grants or enter into contracts for the development and operation of centers to conduct research for the purposes of improving the diagnosis and treatment of, and finding the cure for, fragile X.

''(2) NUMBER OF CENTERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Director of the Institute shall, to the extent that amounts are appropriated, and subject to subparagraph (B), provide for the establishment of at least three fragile X research centers.

''(B) PEER REVIEW REQUIREMENT.—The Director of the Institute shall make a grant to, or enter into a contract with, an entity for purposes of establishing a center under paragraph (1) only if the grant or contract has been recommended after technical and scientific peer review required by regulations under section 492.

''(3) ACTIVITIES.—The Director of the Institute, with the assistance of centers established under paragraph (1), shall conduct and support basic and biomedical research into the detection and treatment of fragile X.

''(4) COORDINATION AMONG CENTERS.—The Director of the Institute shall, as appropriate, provide for the coordination of the activities of the centers assisted under this section, including providing for the exchange of information among the centers.

''(5) CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS.—Each center assisted under paragraph (1) shall use the facilities of a single institution, or be formed from a consortium of cooperating institutions, meeting such requirements as may be prescribed by the Director of the Institute.

''(6) DURATION OF SUPPORT.—Support may be provided to a center under paragraph (1) for a period not exceeding 5 years. Such period may be extended for one or more additional periods, each of which may not exceed 5 years, if the operations of such center have been reviewed by an appropriate technical and scientific peer review group established by the Director and if such group has recommended to the Director that such period be extended.

''(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this subsection, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

TITLE III—JUVENILE ARTHRITIS AND RELATED CONDITIONS

SEC. 301. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND MUSCULOSKELETAL AND SKIN DISEASES; RESEARCH ON JUVENILE ARTHRITIS AND RELATED CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart 4 of part C of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285d et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 442 the following section:

''JUVENILE ARTHRITIS AND RELATED CONDITIONS

''SEC. 442A. (a) EXPANSION AND COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—The Director of the Institute, in coordination with the Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, shall expand and intensify the programs of such Institutes with respect to research and related activities concerning juvenile arthritis and related conditions.

''(b) COORDINATION.—The Directors referred to in subsection (a) shall jointly coordinate the programs referred to in such subsection and consult with the Arthritis and Musculoskeletal Diseases Interagency Coordinating Committee.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

(b) PEDIATRIC RHEUMATOLOGY.—Subpart 1 of part E of title VII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 294n et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 763. PEDIATRIC RHEUMATOLOGY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the appropriate agencies, shall evaluate whether the number of pediatric rheumatologists is sufficient to address the health care needs of children with arthritis and related conditions, and if the Secretary determines that the number is not sufficient, shall develop strategies to help address the shortfall.

''(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than October 1, 2001, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report describing the results of the evaluation under subsection (a), and as applicable, the strategies developed under such subsection.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

SEC. 302. INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE.

Section 438(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285d–3(b)) is amended by inserting '', including juvenile arthritis and related conditions,'' after ''diseases''.

TITLE IV—REDUCING BURDEN OF DIABETES AMONG CHILDREN AND YOUTH

SEC. 401. PROGRAMS OF CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.

Part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 243 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 317G the following section:

''DIABETES IN CHILDREN AND YOUTH

''SEC. 317H. (a) SURVEILLANCE ON JUVENILE DIABETES.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall develop a sentinel system to collect data on juvenile diabetes, including with respect to incidence and prevalence, and shall establish a national database for such data.

''(b) TYPE 2 DIABETES IN YOUTH.—The Secretary shall implement a national public health effort to address type 2 diabetes in youth, including—

''(1) enhancing surveillance systems and expanding research to better assess the prevalence and incidence of type 2 diabetes in youth and determine the extent to which type 2 diabetes is incorrectly diagnosed as type 1 diabetes among children; and

''(2) developing and improving laboratory methods to assist in diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of diabetes including, but not limited to, developing noninvasive ways to monitor blood glucose to prevent hypoglycemia and improving existing glucometers that measure blood glucose.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

SEC. 402. PROGRAMS OF NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

Subpart 3 of part C of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285c et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 434 the following section:

''JUVENILE DIABETES

''SEC. 434A. (a) LONG-TERM EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES.—The Director of the Institute shall conduct or support long-term epidemiology studies in which individuals with or at risk for type 1, or juvenile, diabetes are followed for 10 years or more. Such studies shall investigate the causes and characteristics of the disease and its complications.

''(b) CLINICAL TRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE/INNOVATIVE TREATMENTS FOR JUVENILE DIABETES.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall support regional clinical research centers for the prevention, detection, treatment, and cure of juvenile diabetes.

''(c) PREVENTION OF TYPE 1 DIABETES.—The Secretary, acting through the appropriate agencies, shall provide for a national effort to prevent type 1 diabetes. Such effort shall provide for a combination of increased efforts in research and development of prevention strategies, including consideration of vaccine development, coupled with appropriate ability to test the effectiveness of such strategies in large clinical trials of children and young adults.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

TITLE V—ASTHMA SERVICES FOR CHILDREN

Subtitle A—Asthma Services

SEC. 501. GRANTS FOR CHILDREN'S ASTHMA RELIEF.

Title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following part:

''PART P—ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS

''SEC. 399L. CHILDREN'S ASTHMA TREATMENT GRANTS PROGRAM.

''(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other payments made under this Act or title V of the Social Security Act, the Secretary shall award grants to eligible entities to carry out the following purposes:

''(A) To provide access to quality medical care for children who live in areas that have a high prevalence of asthma and who lack access to medical care.

''(B) To provide on-site education to parents, children, health care providers, and medical teams to recognize the signs and symptoms of asthma, and to train them in the use of medications to treat asthma and prevent its exacerbations.

''(C) To decrease preventable trips to the emergency room by making medication available to individuals who have not previously had access to treatment or education in the management of asthma.

''(D) To provide other services, such as smoking cessation programs, home modification, and other direct and support services that ameliorate conditions that exacerbate or induce asthma.

''(2) CERTAIN PROJECTS.—In making grants under paragraph (1), the Secretary may make

grants designed to develop and expand the following projects:

''(A) Projects to provide comprehensive asthma services to children in accordance with the guidelines of the National Asthma Education and Prevention Program (through the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute), including access to care and treatment for asthma in a community-based setting.

''(B) Projects to fully equip mobile health care clinics that provide preventive asthma care including diagnosis, physical examinations, pharmacological therapy, skin testing, peak flow meter testing, and other asthma-related health care services.

''(C) Projects to conduct validated asthma management education programs for patients with asthma and their families, including patient education regarding asthma management, family education on asthma management, and the distribution of materials, including displays and videos, to reinforce concepts presented by medical teams.

''(2) AWARD OF GRANTS.—

''(A) APPLICATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall submit an application to the Secretary for a grant under this section in such form and manner as the Secretary may require.

''(ii) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An application submitted under this subparagraph shall include a plan for the use of funds awarded under the grant and such other information as the Secretary may require.

''(B) REQUIREMENT.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give preference to eligible entities that demonstrate that the activities to be carried out under this section shall be in localities within areas of known or suspected high prevalence of childhood asthma or high asthma-related mortality or high rate of hospitalization or emergency room visits for asthma (relative to the average asthma prevalence rates and associated mortality rates in the United States). Acceptable data sets to demonstrate a high prevalence of childhood asthma or high asthma-related mortality may include data from Federal, State, or local vital statistics, claims data under title XIX or XXI of the Social Security Act, other public health statistics or surveys, or other data that the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, deems appropriate.

''(3) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible entity' means a public or nonprofit private entity (including a State or political subdivision of a State), or a consortium of any of such entities.

''(b) COORDINATION WITH OTHER CHILDREN'S PROGRAMS.—An eligible entity shall identify in the plan submitted as part of an application for a grant under this section how the entity will coordinate operations and activities under the grant with—

''(1) other programs operated in the State that serve children with asthma, including any such programs operated under titles V, XIX, or XXI of the Social Security Act; and

''(2) one or more of the following—

''(A) the child welfare and foster care and adoption assistance programs under parts B and E of title IV of such Act;

''(B) the head start program established under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.);

''(C) the program of assistance under the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants and children (WIC) under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786);

''(D) local public and private elementary or secondary schools; or

''(E) public housing agencies, as defined in section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a).

''(c) EVALUATION.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary an evaluation of the operations and activities carried out under the grant that includes—

''(1) a description of the health status outcomes of children assisted under the grant;

''(2) an assessment of the utilization of asthma-related health care services as a result of activities carried out under the grant;

''(3) the collection, analysis, and reporting of asthma data according to guidelines prescribed by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and

''(4) such other information as the Secretary may require.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

SEC. 502. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in part L, by redesignating section 399D as section 399A;

(2) in part M—

(A) by redesignating sections 399H through 399L as sections 399B through 399F, respectively;

(B) in section 399B (as so redesignated), in subsection (e)—

(i) by striking ''section 399K(b)'' and inserting ''subsection (b) of section 399E''; and

(ii) by striking ''section 399C'' and inserting ''such section'';

(C) in section 399E (as so redesignated), in subsection (c), by striking ''section 399H(a)'' and inserting ''section 399B(a)''; and

(D) in section 399F (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking ''section 399I'' and inserting ''section 399C'';

(ii) in subsection (a), by striking ''subsection 399J'' and inserting ''section 399D''; and

(iii) in subsection (b), by striking ''subsection 399K'' and inserting ''section 399E'';

(3) in part N, by redesignating section 399F as section 399G; and

(4) in part O—

(A) by redesignating sections 399G through 399J as sections 399H through 399K, respectively;

(B) in section 399H (as so redesignated), in subsection (b), by striking ''section 399H'' and inserting ''section 399I'';

(C) in section 399J (as so redesignated), in subsection (b), by striking ''section 399G(d)'' and inserting ''section 399H(d)''; and

(D) in section 399K (as so redesignated), by striking ''section 399G(d)(1)'' and inserting ''section 399H(d)(1)''.

Subtitle B—Prevention Activities

SEC. 511. PREVENTIVE HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES BLOCK GRANT; SYSTEMS FOR REDUCING ASTHMA-RELATED ILLNESSES THROUGH INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT.

Section 1904(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300w–3(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (F) and (G), respectively;

(2) by adding a period at the end of subparagraph (G) (as so redesignated);

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (D), the following:

''(E) The establishment, operation, and coordination of effective and cost-efficient systems to reduce the prevalence of illness due to asthma and asthma-related illnesses, especially among children, by reducing the level of exposure to cockroach allergen or other known asthma triggers through the use of integrated pest management, as applied to cockroaches or other known allergens. Amounts expended for such systems may include the costs of building maintenance and the costs of programs to promote community participation in the carrying out at such sites of integrated pest management, as applied to cockroaches or other known allergens. For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'integrated pest management' means an approach to the management of pests in public facilities that combines biological, cultural, physical, and chemical tools in a way that minimizes economic, health, and environmental risks.'';

(4) in subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated), by striking ''subparagraphs (A) through (D)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (A) through (E)''; and

(5) in subparagraph (G) (as so redesignated), by striking ''subparagraphs (A) through (E)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (A) through (F)''.

Subtitle C—Coordination of Federal Activities

SEC. 521. COORDINATION THROUGH NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

Subpart 2 of part C of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285b et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 424A the following section:

''COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ASTHMA ACTIVITIES

''SEC. 424B (a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of Institute shall, through the National Asthma Education Prevention Program Coordinating Committee—

''(1) identify all Federal programs that carry out asthma-related activities;

''(2) develop, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies and professional and voluntary health organizations, a Federal plan for responding to asthma; and

''(3) not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of the Children's Health Act of 2000, submit recommendations to the appropriate committees of the Congress on ways to strengthen and improve the coordination of asthma-related activities of the Federal Government.

''(b) REPRESENTATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.—A representative of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be included on the National Asthma Education Prevention Program Coordinating Committee for the purpose of performing the tasks described in subsection (a).

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

Subtitle D—Compilation of Data

SEC. 531. COMPILATION OF DATA BY CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.

Part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 401 of this Act, is amended by inserting after section 317H the following section:

''COMPILATION OF DATA ON ASTHMA

''SEC. 317I. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall—

''(1) conduct local asthma surveillance activities to collect data on the prevalence and severity of asthma and the quality of asthma management;

''(2) compile and annually publish data on the prevalence of children suffering from asthma in each State; and

''(3) to the extent practicable, compile and publish data on the childhood mortality rate associated with asthma nationally.

''(b) SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, acting through the representative of the Director on the National Asthma Education Prevention Program Coordinating Committee, shall, in carrying out subsection (a), provide an update on surveillance activities at each Committee meeting.

''(c) COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS.—The activities described in subsection (a)(1) may be conducted in collaboration with eligible entities awarded a grant under section 399L.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

TITLE VI—BIRTH DEFECTS PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

Subtitle A—Folic Acid Promotion

SEC. 601. PROGRAM REGARDING EFFECTS OF FOLIC ACID IN PREVENTION OF BIRTH DEFECTS.

Part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 531 of this Act, is amended by inserting after section 317I the following section:

''EFFECTS OF FOLIC ACID IN PREVENTION OF BIRTH DEFECTS

''SEC. 317J. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall expand and intensify programs (directly or through grants or contracts) for the following purposes:

''(1) To provide education and training for health professionals and the general public for purposes of explaining the effects of folic acid in preventing birth defects and for purposes of encouraging each woman of reproductive capacity (whether or not planning a pregnancy) to consume on a daily basis a dietary supplement that provides an appropriate level of folic acid.

''(2) To conduct research with respect to such education and training, including identifying effective strategies for increasing the rate of consumption of folic acid by women of reproductive capacity.

''(3) To conduct research to increase the understanding of the effects of folic acid in preventing birth defects, including understanding with respect to cleft lip, cleft palate, and heart defects.

''(4) To provide for appropriate epidemiological activities regarding folic acid and birth defects, including epidemiological activities regarding neural tube defects.

''(b) CONSULTATIONS WITH STATES AND PRIVATE ENTITIES.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with the States and with other appropriate public or private entities, including national nonprofit private organizations, health professionals, and providers of health insurance and health plans.

''(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may (directly or through grants or contracts) provide technical assistance to public and nonprofit private entities in carrying out the activities described in subsection (a).

''(d) EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary shall (directly or through grants or contracts) provide for the evaluation of activities under subsection (a) in order to determine the extent to which such activities have been effective in carrying out the purposes of the program under such subsection, including the effects on various demographic populations. Methods of evaluation under the preceding sentence may include surveys of knowledge and attitudes on the consumption of folic acid and on blood folate levels. Such methods may include complete and timely monitoring of infants who are born with neural tube defects.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

Subtitle B—National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities

SEC. 611. NATIONAL CENTER ON BIRTH DEFECTS AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES.

Section 317C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247b–4) is amended—

(1) by striking the heading for the section and inserting the following:

''NATIONAL CENTER ON BIRTH DEFECTS AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES'';

(2) by striking ''SEC. 317C. (a)'' and all that follows through the end of subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 317C. (a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) NATIONAL CENTER.—There is established within the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention a center to be known as the National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities (referred to in this section as the 'Center'), which shall be headed by a director appointed by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

''(2) GENERAL DUTIES.—The Secretary shall carry out programs—

(A) to collect, analyze, and make available data on birth defects and developmental disabilities (in a manner that facilitates compliance with subsection (d)(2)), including data on the causes of such defects and disabilities and on the incidence and prevalence of such defects and disabilities;

(B) to operate regional centers for the conduct of applied epidemiological research on the prevention of such defects and disabilities; and

(C) to provide information and education to the public on the prevention of such defects and disabilities.

''(3) FOLIC ACID.—The Secretary shall carry out section 317J through the Center.

''(4) CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—

''(A) TRANSFERS.—All programs and functions described in subparagraph (B) are transferred to the Center, effective upon the expiration of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Children's Health Act of 2000.

''(B) RELEVANT PROGRAMS.—The programs and functions described in this subparagraph are all programs and functions that—

''(i) relate to birth defects; folic acid; cerebral palsy; mental retardation; child development; newborn screening; autism; fragile X syndrome; fetal alcohol syndrome; pediatric genetic disorders; disability prevention; or other relevant diseases, disorders, or conditions as determined the Secretary; and

''(ii) were carried out through the National Center for Environmental Health as of the day before the date of the enactment of the Act referred to in subparagraph (A).

''(C) RELATED TRANSFERS.—Personnel employed in connection with the programs and functions specified in subparagraph (B), and amounts available for carrying out the programs and functions, are transferred to the Center, effective upon the expiration of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Act referred to in subparagraph (A). Such transfer of amounts does not affect the period of availability of the amounts, or the availability of the amounts with respect to the purposes for which the amounts may be expended.''; and

(3) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''(a)(1)'' and inserting ''(a)(2)(A)''.

TITLE VII—EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND TREATMENT REGARDING HEARING LOSS IN INFANTS

SEC. 701. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are to clarify the authority within the Public Health Service Act to authorize statewide newborn and infant hearing screening, evaluation and intervention programs and systems, technical assistance, a national applied research program, and interagency and private sector collaboration for policy development, in order to assist the States in making progress toward the following goals:

(1) All babies born in hospitals in the United States and its territories should have a hearing screening before leaving the birthing facility. Babies born in other countries and residing in the United States via immigration or adoption should have a hearing screening as early as possible.

(2) All babies who are not born in hospitals in the United States and its territories should have a hearing screening within the first 3 months of life.

(3) Appropriate audiologic and medical evaluations should be conducted by 3 months for all newborns and infants suspected of having hearing loss to allow appropriate referral and provisions for audiologic rehabilitation, medical and early intervention before the age of 6 months.

(4) All newborn and infant hearing screening programs and systems should include a component for audiologic rehabilitation, medical and early intervention options that ensures linkage to any new and existing state-wide systems of intervention and rehabilitative services for newborns and infants with hearing loss.

(5) Public policy in regard to newborn and infant hearing screening and intervention should be based on applied research and the recognition that newborns, infants, toddlers, and children who are deaf or hard-of-hearing have unique language, learning, and communication needs, and should be the result of consultation with pertinent public and private sectors.

SEC. 702. PROGRAMS OF HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION, AND NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as added by section 501 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following section:

"SEC. 399M. EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND TREATMENT REGARDING HEARING LOSS IN INFANTS.

''(a) STATEWIDE NEWBORN AND INFANT HEARING SCREENING, EVALUATION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS AND SYSTEMS.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall make awards of grants or cooperative agreements to develop statewide newborn and infant hearing screening, evaluation and intervention programs and systems for the following purposes:

''(1) To develop and monitor the efficacy of state-wide newborn and infant hearing screening, evaluation and intervention programs and systems. Early intervention includes referral to schools and agencies, including community, consumer, and parent-based agencies and organizations and other programs mandated by part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, which offer programs specifically designed to meet the unique language and communication needs of deaf and hard of hearing newborns, infants, toddlers, and children.

''(2) To collect data on statewide newborn and infant hearing screening, evaluation and intervention programs and systems that can be used for applied research, program evaluation and policy development.

''(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, DATA MANAGEMENT, AND APPLIED RESEARCH.—

''(1) CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall make awards of grants or cooperative agreements to provide technical assistance to State agencies to complement an intramural program and to conduct applied research related to newborn and infant hearing screening, evaluation and intervention programs and systems. The program shall develop standardized procedures for data management and program effectiveness and costs, such as—

''(A) to ensure quality monitoring of newborn and infant hearing loss screening, evaluation, and intervention programs and systems;

''(B) to provide technical assistance on data collection and management;

''(C) to study the costs and effectiveness of newborn and infant hearing screening, evaluation and intervention programs and systems conducted by State-based programs in order to answer issues of importance to state and national policymakers;

''(D) to identify the causes and risk factors for congenital hearing loss;

''(E) to study the effectiveness of newborn and infant hearing screening, audiologic and medical evaluations and intervention programs and systems by assessing the health, intellectual and social developmental, cognitive, and language status of these children at school age; and

''(F) to promote the sharing of data regarding early hearing loss with State-based birth defects

and developmental disabilities monitoring programs for the purpose of identifying previously unknown causes of hearing loss.

''(2) NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.—The Director of the National Institutes of Health, acting through the Director of the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders, shall for purposes of this section, continue a program of research and development on the efficacy of new screening techniques and technology, including clinical studies of screening methods, studies on efficacy of intervention, and related research.

''(c) COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out programs under this section, the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall collaborate and consult with other Federal agencies; State and local agencies, including those responsible for early intervention services pursuant to title XIX of the Social Security Act (Medicaid Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment Program); title XXI of the Social Security Act (State Children's Health Insurance Program); title V of the Social Security Act (Maternal and Child Health Block Grant Program); and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; consumer groups of and that serve individuals who are deaf and hard-of-hearing and their families; appropriate national medical and other health and education specialty organizations; persons who are deaf and hard-of-hearing and their families; other qualified professional personnel who are proficient in deaf or hard-of-hearing children's language and who possess the specialized knowledge, skills, and attributes needed to serve deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, toddlers, children, and their families; third-party payers and managed care organizations; and related commercial industries.

''(2) POLICY DEVELOPMENT.—The Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall coordinate and collaborate on recommendations for policy development at the Federal and State levels and with the private sector, including consumer, medical and other health and education professional-based organizations, with respect to newborn and infant hearing screening, evaluation and intervention programs and systems.

''(3) STATE EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS AND SYSTEMS; DATA COLLECTION.—The Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall coordinate and collaborate in assisting States to establish newborn and infant hearing screening, evaluation and intervention programs and systems under subsection (a) and to develop a data collection system under subsection (b).

''(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION; RELIGIOUS ACCOMMODATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt or prohibit any State law, including State laws which do not require the screening for hearing loss of newborn infants or young children of parents who object to the screening on the grounds that such screening conflicts with the parents' religious beliefs.

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

''(1) The term 'audiologic evaluation' refers to procedures to assess the status of the auditory system; to establish the site of the auditory disorder; the type and degree of hearing loss, and the potential effects of hearing loss on communication; and to identify appropriate treatment and referral options. Referral options should include linkage to State coordinating agencies under part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or other appropriate agencies, medical evaluation, hearing aid/sensory aid assessment, audiologic rehabilitation treatment, national and local consumer, self-help, parent, and education organizations, and other family-centered services.

''(2) The terms 'audiologic rehabilitation' and 'audiologic intervention' refer to procedures, techniques, and technologies to facilitate the receptive and expressive communication abilities of a child with hearing loss.

''(3) The term 'early intervention' refers to providing appropriate services for the child with hearing loss, including nonmedical services, and ensuring that families of the child are provided comprehensive, consumer-oriented information about the full range of family support, training, information services, communication options and are given the opportunity to consider the full range of educational and program placements and options for their child.

''(4) The term 'medical evaluation by a physician' refers to key components including history, examination, and medical decision making focused on symptomatic and related body systems for the purpose of diagnosing the etiology of hearing loss and related physical conditions, and for identifying appropriate treatment and referral options.

''(5) The term 'medical intervention' refers to the process by which a physician provides medical diagnosis and direction for medical and/or surgical treatment options of hearing loss and/or related medical disorder associated with hearing loss.

''(6) The term 'newborn and infant hearing screening' refers to objective physiologic procedures to detect possible hearing loss and to identify newborns and infants who, after rescreening, require further audiologic and medical evaluations.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) STATEWIDE NEWBORN AND INFANT HEARING SCREENING, EVALUATION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS AND SYSTEMS.—For the purpose of carrying out subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Health Resources and Services Administration such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2002.

''(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, DATA MANAGEMENT, AND APPLIED RESEARCH; CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.—For the purpose of carrying out subsection (b)(1), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2002.

''(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, DATA MANAGEMENT, AND APPLIED RESEARCH; NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DEAFNESS AND OTHER COMMUNICATION DISORDERS.—For the purpose of carrying out subsection (b)(2), there are authorized to be appropriated to the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2002.''.

TITLE VIII—CHILDREN AND EPILEPSY

SEC. 801. NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH CAMPAIGN ON EPILEPSY; SEIZURE DISORDER DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS IN MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED AREAS.

Subpart I of part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b) is amended by adding at the end the following section:

''SEC. 330E. EPILEPSY; SEIZURE DISORDER.

''(a) NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH CAMPAIGN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop and implement public health surveillance, education, research, and intervention strategies to improve the lives of persons with epilepsy, with a particular emphasis on children. Such projects may be carried out by the Secretary directly and through awards of grants or contracts to public or nonprofit private entities. The Secretary may directly or through such awards provide technical assistance with respect to the planning, development, and operation of such projects.

''(2) CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.—Activities under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) expanding current surveillance activities through existing monitoring systems and improving registries that maintain data on individuals with epilepsy, including children;

''(B) enhancing research activities on the diagnosis, treatment, and management of epilepsy;

''(C) implementing public and professional information and education programs regarding epilepsy, including initiatives which promote effective management of the disease through children's programs which are targeted to parents, schools, daycare providers, patients;

''(D) undertaking educational efforts with the media, providers of health care, schools and others regarding stigmas and secondary disabilities related to epilepsy and seizures, and its effects on youth;

''(E) utilizing and expanding partnerships with organizations with experience addressing the health and related needs of people with disabilities; and

''(F) other activities the Secretary deems appropriate.

''(3) COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall ensure that activities under this subsection are coordinated as appropriate with other agencies of the Public Health Service that carry out activities regarding epilepsy and seizure.

''(b) SEIZURE DISORDER; DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS IN MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED AREAS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, may make grants for the purpose of carrying out demonstration projects to improve access to health and other services regarding seizures to encourage early detection and treatment in children and others residing in medically underserved areas.

''(2) APPLICATION FOR GRANT.—A grant may not be awarded under paragraph (1) unless an application therefore is submitted to the Secretary and the Secretary approves such application. Such application shall be submitted in such form and manner and shall contain such information as the Secretary may prescribe.

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

''(1) The term ''epilepsy'' refers to a chronic and serious neurological condition characterized by excessive electrical discharges in the brain causing recurring seizures affecting all life activities. The Secretary may revise the definition of such term to the extent the Secretary determines necessary.

''(2) The term ''medically underserved'' has the meaning applicable under section 799B(6).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

TITLE IX—SAFE MOTHERHOOD; INFANT HEALTH PROMOTION

Subtitle A—Safe Motherhood Prevention Research

SEC. 901. PREVENTION RESEARCH AND OTHER ACTIVITIES.

Part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 601 of this Act, is amended by inserting after section 317J the following section:

''SAFE MOTHERHOOD

''SEC. 317K. (a) SURVEILLANCE.—

''(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subsection is to develop surveillance systems at the local, State, and national level to better understand the burden of maternal complications and mortality and to decrease the disparities among population at risk of death and complications from pregnancy.

''(2) ACTIVITIES.—For the purpose described in paragraph (1), the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, may carry out the following activities:

''(A) The Secretary may establish and implement a national surveillance program to identify

and promote the investigation of deaths and severe complications that occur during pregnancy.

''(B) The Secretary may expand the Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring System to provide surveillance and collect data in each State.

''(C) The Secretary may expand the Maternal and Child Health Epidemiology Program to provide technical support, financial assistance, or the time-limited assignment of senior epidemiologists to maternal and child health programs in each State.

''(b) PREVENTION RESEARCH.—

''(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subsection is to provide the Secretary with the authority to further expand research concerning risk factors, prevention strategies, and the roles of the family, health care providers and the community in safe motherhood.

''(2) RESEARCH.—The Secretary may carry out activities to expand research relating to—

''(A) encouraging preconception counseling, especially for at risk populations such as diabetics;

''(B) the identification of critical components of prenatal delivery and postpartum care;

''(C) the identification of outreach and support services, such as folic acid education, that are available for pregnant women;

''(D) the identification of women who are at high risk for complications;

''(E) preventing preterm delivery;

''(F) preventing urinary tract infections;

''(G) preventing unnecessary caesarean sections;

''(H) an examination of the higher rates of maternal mortality among African American women;

''(I) an examination of the relationship between domestic violence and maternal complications and mortality;

''(J) preventing and reducing adverse health consequences that may result from smoking, alcohol and illegal drug use before, during and after pregnancy;

''(K) preventing infections that cause maternal and infant complications; and

''(L) other areas determined appropriate by the Secretary.

''(c) PREVENTION PROGRAMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out activities to promote safe motherhood, including—

''(A) public education campaigns on healthy pregnancies and the building of partnerships with outside organizations concerned about safe motherhood;

''(B) education programs for physicians, nurses and other health care providers; and

''(C) activities to promote community support services for pregnant women.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

Subtitle B—Pregnant Women and Infants Health Promotion

SEC. 911. PROGRAMS REGARDING PRENATAL AND POSTNATAL HEALTH.

Part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 901 of this Act, is amended by inserting after section 317K the following section:

''PRENATAL AND POSTNATAL HEALTH

''SEC. 317L. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall carry out programs—

''(1) to collect, analyze, and make available data on prenatal smoking, alcohol and illegal drug use, including data on the implications of such activities and on the incidence and prevalence of such activities and their implications;

''(2) to conduct applied epidemiological research on the prevention of prenatal and postnatal smoking, alcohol and illegal drug use;

''(3) to support, conduct, and evaluate the effectiveness of educational and cessation programs; and

''(4) to provide information and education to the public on the prevention and implications of prenatal and postnatal smoking, alcohol and illegal drug use.

''(b) GRANTS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary may award grants to and enter into contracts with States, local governments, scientific and academic institutions, Federally qualified health centers, and other public and nonprofit entities, and may provide technical and consultative assistance to such entities.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

TITLE X— PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE

SEC. 1001. ESTABLISHMENT OF PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

Part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 101 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE

''SEC. 409D. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish within the Office of the Director of NIH a Pediatric Research Initiative (referred to in this section as the 'Initiative') to conduct and support research that is directly related to diseases, disorders, and other conditions in children. The Initiative shall be headed by the Director of NIH.

''(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Initiative is to provide funds to enable the Director of NIH—

''(1) to increase support for pediatric biomedical research within the National Institutes of Health to realize the expanding opportunities for advancement in scientific investigations and care for children;

''(2) to enhance collaborative efforts among the Institutes to conduct and support multidisciplinary research in the areas that the Director deems most promising; and

''(3) in coordination with the Food and Drug Administration, to increase the development of adequate pediatric clinical trials and pediatric use information to promote the safer and more effective use of prescription drugs in the pediatric population.

''(c) DUTIES.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Director of NIH shall—

''(1) consult with the Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the other national research institutes, in considering their requests for new or expanded pediatric research efforts, and consult with the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration and other advisors as the Director determines to be appropriate;

''(2) have broad discretion in the allocation of any Initiative assistance among the Institutes, among types of grants, and between basic and clinical research so long as the assistance is directly related to the illnesses and conditions of children; and

''(3) be responsible for the oversight of any newly appropriated Initiative funds and annually report to Congress and the public on the extent of the total funds obligated to conduct or support pediatric research across the National Institutes of Health, including the specific support and research awards allocated through the Initiative.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

''(e) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—The Director of NIH may transfer amounts appropriated under this section to any of the Institutes for a fiscal year to carry out the purposes of the Initiative under this section.''.

SEC. 1002. INVESTMENT IN TOMORROW'S PEDIATRIC RESEARCHERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart 7 of part C of title IV of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 921 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''INVESTMENT IN TOMORROW'S PEDIATRIC RESEARCHERS

''SEC. 452G. (a) ENHANCED SUPPORT.—In order to ensure the future supply of researchers dedicated to the care and research needs of children, the Director of the Institute, after consultation with the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall support activities to provide for—

''(1) an increase in the number and size of institutional training grants to institutions supporting pediatric training; and

''(2) an increase in the number of career development awards for health professionals who intend to build careers in pediatric basic and clinical research.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION.—For the purpose of carrying out subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

(b) PEDIATRIC RESEARCH LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM.—Part G of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 288 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 487E the following section:

''PEDIATRIC RESEARCH LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM

''SEC. 487F. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Director of NIH, may establish a pediatric research loan repayment program. Through such program—

''(1) the Secretary shall enter into contracts with qualified health professionals under which such professionals will agree to conduct pediatric research, in consideration of the Federal government agreeing to repay, for each year of such service, not more than $35,000 of the principal and interest of the educational loans of such professionals; and

''(2) the Secretary shall, for the purpose of providing reimbursements for tax liability resulting from payments made under paragraph (1) on behalf of an individual, make payments, in addition to payments under such paragraph, to the individual in an amount equal to 39 percent of the total amount of loan repayments made for the taxable year involved.

''(b) APPLICATION OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—The provisions of sections 338B, 338C, and 338E shall, except as inconsistent with paragraph (1), apply to the program established under such paragraph to the same extent and in the same manner as such provisions apply to the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program established under subpart III of part D of title III.

''(c) FUNDING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of carrying out this section with respect to a national research institute the Secretary may reserve, from amounts appropriated for such institute for the fiscal year involved, such amounts as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available to carry out this section shall remain available until the expiration of the second fiscal year beginning after the fiscal year for which such amounts were made available.''.

SEC. 1003. REVIEW OF REGULATIONS.

(a) REVIEW.—By not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a review of the regulations under subpart D of part 46 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, consider any modifications necessary to ensure the adequate and appropriate protection of children participating in research, and report the findings of the Secretary to Congress.

(b) AREAS OF REVIEW.—In conducting the review under subsection (a), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall consider—

(1) the appropriateness of the regulations for children of differing ages and maturity levels, including legal status;

(2) the definition of ''minimal risk'' for a healthy child or for a child with an illness;

(3) the definitions of ''assent'' and ''permission'' for child clinical research participants and their parents or guardians and of ''adequate provisions'' for soliciting assent or permission in research as such definitions relate to the process of obtaining the agreement of children participating in research and the parents or guardians of such children;

(4) the definitions of ''direct benefit to the individual subjects'' and ''generalizable knowledge about the subject's disorder or condition'';

(5) whether payment (financial or otherwise) may be provided to a child or his or her parent or guardian for the participation of the child in research, and if so, the amount and type given;

(6) the expectations of child research participants and their parent or guardian for the direct benefits of the child's research involvement;

(7) safeguards for research involving children conducted in emergency situations with a waiver of informed assent;

(8) parent and child notification in instances in which the regulations have not been complied with;

(9) compliance with the regulations in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, the monitoring of such compliance, and enforcement actions for violations of such regulations; and

(10) the appropriateness of current practices for recruiting children for participation in research.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the review under subsection (a), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall consult broadly with experts in the field, including pediatric pharmacologists, pediatricians, pediatric professional societies, bioethics experts, clinical investigators, institutional review boards, industry experts, appropriate Federal agencies, and children who have participated in research studies and the parents, guardians, or families of such children.

(d) CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.—In conducting the review under subsection (a), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall consider and, not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, report to Congress concerning—

(1) whether the Secretary should establish data and safety monitoring boards or other mechanisms to review adverse events associated with research involving children; and

(2) whether the institutional review board oversight of clinical trials involving children is adequate to protect children.

SEC. 1004. LONG-TERM CHILD DEVELOPMENT STUDY.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to authorize the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development to conduct a national longitudinal study of environmental influences (including physical, chemical, biological, and psychosocial) on children's health and development.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development shall establish a consortium of representatives from appropriate Federal agencies (including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Environmental Protection Agency) to—

(1) plan, develop, and implement a prospective cohort study, from birth to adulthood, to evaluate the effects of both chronic and intermittent exposures on child health and human development; and

(2) investigate basic mechanisms of developmental disorders and environmental factors, both risk and protective, that influence health and developmental processes.

(c) REQUIREMENT.—The study under subsection (b) shall—

(1) incorporate behavioral, emotional, educational, and contextual consequences to enable a complete assessment of the physical, chemical, biological and psychosocial environmental influences on children's well-being;

(2) gather data on environmental influences and outcomes on diverse populations of children, which may include the consideration of prenatal exposures;

(3) consider health disparities among children which may include the consideration of prenatal exposures.

(d) REPORT.—Beginning not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and periodically thereafter for the duration of the study under this section, the Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the implementation and findings made under the planning and feasibility study conducted under this section.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $18,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each the fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

TITLE XI—CHILDHOOD MALIGNANCIES

SEC. 1101. PROGRAMS OF CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION AND NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 702 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following section:

''SEC. 399N. CHILDHOOD MALIGNANCIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting as appropriate through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall study environmental and other risk factors for childhood cancers (including skeletal malignancies, leukemias, malignant tumors of the central nervous system, lymphomas, soft tissue sarcomas, and other malignant neoplasms) and carry out projects to improve outcomes among children with childhood cancers and resultant secondary conditions, including limb loss, anemia, rehabilitation, and palliative care. Such projects shall be carried out by the Secretary directly and through awards of grants or contracts.

''(b) CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.—Activities under subsection (a) include—

''(1) the expansion of current demographic data collection and population surveillance efforts to include childhood cancers nationally;

''(2) the development of a uniform reporting system under which treating physicians, hospitals, clinics, and states report the diagnosis of childhood cancers, including relevant associated epidemiological data; and

''(3) support for the National Limb Loss Information Center to address, in part, the primary and secondary needs of persons who experience childhood cancers in order to prevent or minimize the disabling nature of these cancers.

''(c) COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall assure that activities under this section are coordinated as appropriate with other agencies of the Public Health Service that carry out activities focused on childhood cancers and limb loss.

''(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'childhood cancer' refers to a spectrum of different malignancies that vary by histology, site of disease, origin, race, sex, and age. The Secretary may for purposes of this section revise the definition of such term to the extent determined by the Secretary to be appropriate.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

TITLE XII—ADOPTION AWARENESS

Subtitle A—Infant Adoption Awareness

SEC. 1201. GRANTS REGARDING INFANT ADOPTION AWARENESS.

Subpart I of part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 801 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following section:

''SEC. 330F. CERTAIN SERVICES FOR PREGNANT WOMEN.

''(a) INFANT ADOPTION AWARENESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make grants to national, regional, or local adoption organizations for the purpose of developing and implementing programs to train the designated staff of eligible health centers in providing adoption information and referrals to pregnant women on an equal basis with all other courses of action included in nondirective counseling to pregnant women.

''(2) BEST-PRACTICES GUIDELINES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A condition for the receipt of a grant under paragraph (1) is that the adoption organization involved agree that, in providing training under such paragraph, the organization will follow the guidelines developed under subparagraph (B).

''(B) PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and supervise a process described in clause (ii) in which the participants are—

''(I) an appropriate number and variety of adoption organizations that, as a group, have expertise in all models of adoption practice and that represent all members of the adoption triad (birth mother, infant, and adoptive parent); and

''(II) affected public health entities.

''(ii) DESCRIPTION OF PROCESS.—The process referred to in clause (i) is a process in which the participants described in such clause collaborate to develop best-practices guidelines on the provision of adoption information and referrals to pregnant women on an equal basis with all other courses of action included in nondirective counseling to pregnant women.

''(iii) DATE CERTAIN FOR DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall ensure that the guidelines described in clause (ii) are developed not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Children's Health Act of 2000.

''(C) RELATION TO AUTHORITY FOR GRANTS.—The Secretary may not make any grant under paragraph (1) before the date on which the guidelines under subparagraph (B) are developed.

''(3) USE OF GRANT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a grant under paragraph (1)—

''(i) an adoption organization may expend the grant to carry out the programs directly or through grants to or contracts with other adoption organizations;

''(ii) the purposes for which the adoption organization expends the grant may include the development of a training curriculum, consistent with the guidelines developed under paragraph (2)(B); and

''(iii) a condition for the receipt of the grant is that the adoption organization agree that, in providing training for the designated staff of eligible health centers, such organization will make reasonable efforts to ensure that the individuals who provide the training are individuals who are knowledgeable in all elements of the adoption process and are experienced in providing adoption information and referrals in the geographic areas in which the eligible health centers are located, and that the designated staff receive the training in such areas.

''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING TRAINING OF TRAINERS.—With respect to individuals who under a grant under paragraph (1) provide training for the designated staff of eligible health centers (referred to in this subparagraph as 'trainers'), subparagraph (A)(iii) may not be construed as establishing any limitation

regarding the geographic area in which the trainers receive instruction in being such trainers. A trainer may receive such instruction in a different geographic area than the area in which the trainer trains (or will train) the designated staff of eligible health centers.

''(4) ADOPTION ORGANIZATIONS; ELIGIBLE HEALTH CENTERS; OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

''(A) The term 'adoption organization' means a national, regional, or local organization—

''(i) among whose primary purposes are adoption;

''(ii) that is knowledgeable in all elements of the adoption process and on providing adoption information and referrals to pregnant women; and

''(iii) that is a nonprofit private entity.

''(B) The term 'designated staff', with respect to an eligible health center, means staff of the center who provide pregnancy or adoption information and referrals (or will provide such information and referrals after receiving training under a grant under paragraph (1)).

''(C) The term 'eligible health centers' means public and nonprofit private entities that provide health services to pregnant women.

''(5) TRAINING FOR CERTAIN ELIGIBLE HEALTH CENTERS.—A condition for the receipt of a grant under paragraph (1) is that the adoption organization involved agree to make reasonable efforts to ensure that the eligible health centers with respect to which training under the grant is provided include—

''(A) eligible health centers that receive grants under section 1001 (relating to voluntary family planning projects);

''(B) eligible health centers that receive grants under section 330 (relating to community health centers, migrant health centers, and centers regarding homeless individuals and residents of public housing); and

''(C) eligible health centers that receive grants under this Act for the provision of services in schools.

''(6) PARTICIPATION OF CERTAIN ELIGIBLE HEALTH CLINICS.—In the case of eligible health centers that receive grants under section 330 or 1001:

''(A) Within a reasonable period after the Secretary begins making grants under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide eligible health centers with complete information about the training available from organizations receiving grants under such paragraph. The Secretary shall make reasonable efforts to encourage eligible health centers to arrange for designated staff to participate in such training. Such efforts shall affirm Federal requirements, if any, that the eligible health center provide nondirective counseling to pregnant women.

''(B) All costs of such centers in obtaining the training shall be reimbursed by the organization that provides the training, using grants under paragraph (1).

''(C) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Children's Health Act of 2000, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report evaluating the extent to which adoption information and referral, upon request, are provided by eligible health centers. Within a reasonable time after training under this section is initiated, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report evaluating the extent to which adoption information and referral, upon request, are provided by eligible health centers in order to determine the effectiveness of such training and the extent to which such training complies with subsection (a)(1). In preparing the reports required by this subparagraph, the Secretary shall in no respect interpret the provisions of this section to allow any interference in the provider-patient relationship, any breach of patient confidentiality, or any monitoring or auditing of the counseling process or patient records which breaches patient confidentiality or reveals patient identity. The reports required by this subparagraph shall be conducted by the Secretary acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration and in collaboration with the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

''(b) APPLICATION FOR GRANT.—The Secretary may make a grant under subsection (a) only if an application for the grant is submitted to the Secretary and the application is in such form, is made in such manner, and contains such agreements, assurances, and information as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out this section.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

Subtitle B—Special Needs Adoption Awareness

SEC. 1211. SPECIAL NEEDS ADOPTION PROGRAMS; PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN AND OTHER ACTIVITIES.

Subpart I of part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 1201 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following section:

''SEC. 330G. SPECIAL NEEDS ADOPTION PROGRAMS; PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN AND OTHER ACTIVITIES.

''(a) SPECIAL NEEDS ADOPTION AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, through making grants to nonprofit private entities, provide for the planning, development, and carrying out of a national campaign to provide information to the public regarding the adoption of children with special needs.

''(2) INPUT ON PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT.—In providing for the planning and development of the national campaign under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide for input from a number and variety of adoption organizations throughout the States in order that the full national diversity of interests among adoption organizations is represented in the planning and development of the campaign.

''(3) CERTAIN FEATURES.—With respect to the national campaign under paragraph (1):

''(A) The campaign shall be directed at various populations, taking into account as appropriate differences among geographic regions, and shall be carried out in the language and cultural context that is most appropriate to the population involved.

''(B) The means through which the campaign may be carried out include—

''(i) placing public service announcements on television, radio, and billboards; and

''(ii) providing information through means that the Secretary determines will reach individuals who are most likely to adopt children with special needs.

''(C) The campaign shall provide information on the subsidies and supports that are available to individuals regarding the adoption of children with special needs.

''(D) The Secretary may provide that the placement of public service announcements, and the dissemination of brochures and other materials, is subject to review by the Secretary.

''(4) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the costs of the activities to be carried out by an entity pursuant to paragraph (1), a condition for the receipt of a grant under such paragraph is that the entity agree to make available (directly or through donations from public or private entities) non-Federal contributions toward such costs in an amount that is not less than 25 percent of such costs.

''(B) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED.—Non-Federal contributions under subparagraph (A) may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services. Amounts provided by the Federal Government, or services assisted or subsidized to any significant extent by the Federal Government, may not be included in determining the amount of such contributions.

''(b) NATIONAL RESOURCES PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall (directly or through grant or contract) carry out a program that, through toll-free telecommunications, makes available to the public information regarding the adoption of children with special needs. Such information shall include the following:

''(1) A list of national, State, and regional organizations that provide services regarding such adoptions, including exchanges and other information on communicating with the organizations. The list shall represent the full national diversity of adoption organizations.

''(2) Information beneficial to individuals who adopt such children, including lists of support groups for adoptive parents and other postadoptive services.

''(c) OTHER PROGRAMS.—With respect to the adoption of children with special needs, the Secretary shall make grants—

''(1) to provide assistance to support groups for adoptive parents, adopted children, and siblings of adopted children; and

''(2) to carry out studies to identify—

''(A) the barriers to completion of the adoption process; and

''(B) those components that lead to favorable long-term outcomes for families that adopt children with special needs.

''(d) APPLICATION FOR GRANT.—The Secretary may make an award of a grant or contract under this section only if an application for the award is submitted to the Secretary and the application is in such form, is made in such manner, and contains such agreements, assurances, and information as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out this section.

''(e) FUNDING.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

TITLE XIII—TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY

SEC. 1301. PROGRAMS OF CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 393A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) the implementation of a national education and awareness campaign regarding such injury (in conjunction with the program of the Secretary regarding health-status goals for 2010, commonly referred to as Healthy People 2010), including—

''(A) the national dissemination of information on—

''(i) incidence and prevalence; and

''(ii) information relating to traumatic brain injury and the sequelae of secondary conditions arising from traumatic brain injury upon discharge from hospitals and trauma centers; and

''(B) the provision of information in primary care settings, including emergency rooms and trauma centers, concerning the availability of State level services and resources.'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the second sentence, by striking ''anoxia due to near drowning.'' and inserting ''anoxia due to trauma.''; and

(B) in the third sentence, by inserting before the period the following: '', after consultation with States and other appropriate public or nonprofit private entities''.

(b) NATIONAL REGISTRY.—Part J of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 393A the following section:

''NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY REGISTRIES

''SEC. 393B. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for

Disease Control and Prevention, may make grants to States or their designees to operate the State's traumatic brain injury registry, and to academic institutions to conduct applied research that will support the development of such registries, to collect data concerning—

''(1) demographic information about each traumatic brain injury;

''(2) information about the circumstances surrounding the injury event associated with each traumatic brain injury;

''(3) administrative information about the source of the collected information, dates of hospitalization and treatment, and the date of injury; and

''(4) information characterizing the clinical aspects of the traumatic brain injury, including the severity of the injury, outcomes of the injury, the types of treatments received, and the types of services utilized.''.

SEC. 1302. STUDY AND MONITOR INCIDENCE AND PREVALENCE.

Section 4 of Public Law 104–166 (42 U.S.C. 300d–61 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A)—

(A) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i)(I) determine the incidence and prevalence of traumatic brain injury in all age groups in the general population of the United States, including institutional settings; and

''(II) determine appropriate methodological strategies to obtain data on the incidence and prevalence of mild traumatic brain injury and report to Congress concerning such within 18 months of the date of enactment of the Children's Health Act of 2000; and''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking '', if the Secretary determines that such a system is appropriate'';

(2) in subsection (a)(1)(B)(i), by inserting '', including return to work or school and community participation,'' after ''functioning''; and

(3) in subsection (d), to read as follows:

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

SEC. 1303. PROGRAMS OF NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

(a) INTERAGENCY PROGRAM.—Section 1261(d)(4) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–61(d)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''degree of injury'' and inserting ''degree of brain injury'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''acute injury'' and inserting ''acute brain injury''; and

(3) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''injury treatment'' and inserting ''brain injury treatment''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 1261(h)(4) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–61(h)(4)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking ''anoxia due to near drowning.'' and inserting ''anoxia due to trauma.''; and

(2) in the third sentence, by inserting before the period the following: '', after consultation with States and other appropriate public or nonprofit private entities''.

(c) RESEARCH ON COGNITIVE AND NEUROBEHAVIORAL DISORDERS ARISING FROM TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.—Section 1261(d)(4) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–61(d)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) carrying out subparagraphs (A) through (D) with respect to cognitive disorders and neurobehavioral consequences arising from traumatic brain injury, including the development, modification, and evaluation of therapies and programs of rehabilitation toward reaching or restoring normal capabilities in areas such as reading, comprehension, speech, reasoning, and deduction.''.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1261 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–61) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

SEC. 1304. PROGRAMS OF HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.

Section 1252 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–51) is amended—

*(1) in the section heading by striking ''**DEMONSTRATION**'';*

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''demonstration'';

(3) in subsection (b)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iv), by striking ''representing traumatic brain injury survivors'' and inserting ''representing individuals with traumatic brain injury''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''who are survivors of'' and inserting ''with'';

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking '', in cash,''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by amending the paragraph to read as follows:

''(2) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED.—Non-Federal contributions under paragraph (1) may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services. Amounts provided by the Federal Government, or services assisted or subsidized to any significant extent by the Federal Government, may not be included in determining the amount of such contributions.'';

(5) by redesignating subsections (e) through (h) as subsections (g) through (j), respectively; and

(6) by inserting after subsection (d) the following subsections:

''(e) CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUSLY AWARDED DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—A State that received a grant under this section prior to the date of the enactment of the Children's Health Act of 2000 may compete for new project grants under this section after such date of enactment.

''(f) USE OF STATE GRANTS.—

''(1) COMMUNITY SERVICES AND SUPPORTS.—A State shall (directly or through awards of contracts to nonprofit private entities) use amounts received under a grant under this section for the following:

''(A) To develop, change, or enhance community-based service delivery systems that include timely access to comprehensive appropriate services and supports. Such service and supports—

''(i) shall promote full participation by individuals with brain injury and their families in decision making regarding the services and supports; and

''(ii) shall be designed for children and other individuals with traumatic brain injury.

''(B) To focus on outreach to underserved and inappropriately served individuals, such as individuals in institutional settings, individuals with low socioeconomic resources, individuals in rural communities, and individuals in culturally and linguistically diverse communities.

''(C) To award contracts to nonprofit entities for consumer or family service access training, consumer support, peer mentoring, and parent to parent programs.

''(D) To develop individual and family service coordination or case management systems.

''(E) To support other needs identified by the advisory board under subsection (b) for the State involved.

''(2) BEST PRACTICES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—State services and supports provided under a grant under this section shall reflect the best practices in the field of traumatic brain injury, shall be in compliance with title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and shall be supported by quality assurance measures as well as state-of-the-art health care and integrated community supports, regardless of the severity of injury.

''(B) DEMONSTRATION BY STATE AGENCY.—The State agency responsible for administering amounts received under a grant under this section shall demonstrate that it has obtained knowledge and expertise of traumatic brain injury and the unique needs associated with traumatic brain injury.

''(3) STATE CAPACITY BUILDING.—A State may use amounts received under a grant under this section to—

''(A) educate consumers and families;

''(B) train professionals in public and private sector financing (such as third party payers, State agencies, community-based providers, schools, and educators);

''(C) develop or improve case management or service coordination systems;

''(D) develop best practices in areas such as family or consumer support, return to work, housing or supportive living personal assistance services, assistive technology and devices, behavioral health services, substance abuse services, and traumatic brain injury treatment and rehabilitation;

''(E) tailor existing State systems to provide accommodations to the needs of individuals with brain injury (including systems administered by the State departments responsible for health, mental health, labor/employment, education, mental retardation/developmental disorders, transportation, and correctional systems);

''(F) improve data sets coordinated across systems and other needs identified by a State plan supported by its advisory council; and

''(G) develop capacity within targeted communities.'';

(5) in subsection (g) (as so redesignated), by striking ''agencies of the Public Health Service'' and inserting ''Federal agencies'';

(6) in subsection (i) (as redesignated by paragraph (3))—

(A) in the second sentence, by striking ''anoxia due to near drowning.'' and inserting ''anoxia due to trauma.''; and

(B) in the third sentence, by inserting before the period the following: '', after consultation with States and other appropriate public or nonprofit private entities''; and

(7) in subsection (j) (as so redesignated), by amending the subsection to read as follows:

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

SEC. 1305. STATE GRANTS FOR PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY SERVICES.

Part E of title XII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–51 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1253. STATE GRANTS FOR PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY SERVICES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration (referred to in this section as the 'Administrator'), shall make grants to protection and advocacy systems for the purpose of enabling such systems to provide services to individuals with traumatic brain injury.

''(b) SERVICES PROVIDED.—Services provided under this section may include the provision of—

''(1) information, referrals, and advice;

''(2) individual and family advocacy;

''(3) legal representation; and

''(4) specific assistance in self-advocacy.

''(c) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a protection and advocacy system shall submit an application to the Administrator at such time, in such form and manner, and accompanied by such information

and assurances as the Administrator may require.

''(d) APPROPRIATIONS LESS THAN $2,700,000.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any fiscal year in which the amount appropriated under subsection (i) to carry out this section is less than $2,700,000, the Administrator shall make grants from such amount to individual protection and advocacy systems within States to enable such systems to plan for, develop outreach strategies for, and carry out services authorized under this section for individuals with traumatic brain injury.

''(2) AMOUNT.—The amount of each grant provided under paragraph (1) shall be determined as set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (e).

''(e) APPROPRIATIONS OF $2,700,000 OR MORE.—

''(1) POPULATION BASIS.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), with respect to each fiscal year in which the amount appropriated under subsection (i) to carry out this section is $2,700,000 or more, the Administrator shall make a grant to a protection and advocacy system within each State.

''(2) AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant provided to a system under paragraph (1) shall be equal to an amount bearing the same ratio to the total amount appropriated for the fiscal year involved under subsection (i) as the population of the State in which the grantee is located bears to the population of all States.

''(3) MINIMUMS.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the amount of a grant a protection and advocacy system under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year shall—

''(A) in the case of a protection and advocacy system located in American Samoa, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the protection and advocacy system serving the American Indian consortium, not be less than $20,000; and

''(B) in the case of a protection and advocacy system in a State not described in subparagraph (A), not be less than $50,000.

''(4) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—For each fiscal year in which the total amount appropriated under subsection (i) to carry out this section is $5,000,000 or more, and such appropriated amount exceeds the total amount appropriated to carry out this section in the preceding fiscal year, the Administrator shall increase each of the minimum grants amount described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3) by a percentage equal to the percentage increase in the total amount appropriated under subsection (i) to carry out this section between the preceding fiscal year and the fiscal year involved.

''(f) CARRYOVER.—Any amount paid to a protection and advocacy system that serves a State or the American Indian consortium for a fiscal year under this section that remains unobligated at the end of such fiscal year shall remain available to such system for obligation during the next fiscal year for the purposes for which such amount was originally provided.

''(g) DIRECT PAYMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator shall pay directly to any protection and advocacy system that complies with the provisions of this section, the total amount of the grant for such system, unless the system provides otherwise for such payment.

''(h) ANNUAL REPORT.—Each protection and advocacy system that receives a payment under this section shall submit an annual report to the Administrator concerning the services provided to individuals with traumatic brain injury by such system.

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each the fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

''(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) AMERICAN INDIAN CONSORTIUM.—The term 'American Indian consortium' means a consortium established under part C of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance Bill of Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 6042 et seq.).

''(2) PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY SYSTEM.—The term 'protection and advocacy system' means a protection and advocacy system established under part C of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 6042 et seq.).

''(3) STATE.—The term 'State', unless otherwise specified, means the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.''.

SEC. 1306. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN PROGRAMS.

Section 394A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–3) is amended by striking ''and'' after ''1994'' and by inserting before the period the following: '', and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

TITLE XIV—CHILD CARE SAFETY AND HEALTH GRANTS

SEC. 1401. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CHILD WITH A DISABILITY; INFANT OR TODDLER WITH A DISABILITY.—The terms ''child with a disability'' and ''infant or toddler with a disability'' have the meanings given the terms in sections 602 and 632 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401 and 1431).

(2) ELIGIBLE CHILD CARE PROVIDER.—The term ''eligible child care provider'' means a provider of child care services for compensation, including a provider of care for a school-age child during non-school hours, that—

(A) is licensed, regulated, registered, or otherwise legally operating, under State and local law; and

(B) satisfies the State and local requirements, applicable to the child care services the provider provides.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(4) STATE.—The term ''State'' means any of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 1402. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $200,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each subsequent fiscal year.

SEC. 1403. PROGRAMS.

The Secretary shall make allotments to eligible States under section 1404. The Secretary shall make the allotments to enable the States to establish programs to improve the health and safety of children receiving child care outside the home, by preventing illnesses and injuries associated with that care and promoting the health and well-being of children receiving that care.

SEC. 1404. AMOUNTS RESERVED; ALLOTMENTS.

(a) AMOUNTS RESERVED.—The Secretary shall reserve not more than ½ of 1 percent of the amount appropriated under section 1402 for each fiscal year to make allotments to Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to be allotted in accordance with their respective needs.

(b) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—From the amounts appropriated under section 1402 for each fiscal year and remaining after reservations are made under subsection (a), the Secretary shall allot to each State an amount equal to the sum of—

(A) an amount that bears the same ratio to 50 percent of such remainder as the product of the young child factor of the State and the allotment percentage of the State bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all States; and

(B) an amount that bears the same ratio to 50 percent of such remainder as the product of the school lunch factor of the State and the allotment percentage of the State bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all States.

(2) YOUNG CHILD FACTOR.—In this subsection, the term ''young child factor'' means the ratio of the number of children under 5 years of age in a State to the number of such children in all States, as provided by the most recent annual estimates of population in the States by the Census Bureau of the Department of Commerce.

(3) SCHOOL LUNCH FACTOR.—In this subsection, the term ''school lunch factor'' means the ratio of the number of children who are receiving free or reduced price lunches under the school lunch program established under the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) in the State to the number of such children in all States, as determined annually by the Department of Agriculture.

(4) ALLOTMENT PERCENTAGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the allotment percentage for a State shall be determined by dividing the per capita income of all individuals in the United States, by the per capita income of all individuals in the State.

(B) LIMITATIONS.—If an allotment percentage determined under subparagraph (A) for a State—

(i) is more than 1.2 percent, the allotment percentage of the State shall be considered to be 1.2 percent; and

(ii) is less than 0.8 percent, the allotment percentage of the State shall be considered to be 0.8 percent.

(C) PER CAPITA INCOME.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), per capita income shall be—

(i) determined at 2-year intervals;

(ii) applied for the 2-year period beginning on October 1 of the first fiscal year beginning after the date such determination is made; and

(iii) equal to the average of the annual per capita incomes for the most recent period of 3 consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce on the date such determination is made.

(c) DATA AND INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall obtain from each appropriate Federal agency, the most recent data and information necessary to determine the allotments provided for in subsection (b).

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''State'' includes only the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 1405. STATE APPLICATIONS.

To be eligible to receive an allotment under section 1404, a State shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. The application shall contain information assessing the needs of the State with regard to child care health and safety, the goals to be achieved through the program carried out by the State under this title, and the measures to be used to assess the progress made by the State toward achieving the goals.

SEC. 1406. USE OF FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives an allotment under section 1404 shall use the funds made available through the allotment to carry out 2 or more activities consisting of—

(1) providing training and education to eligible child care providers on preventing injuries and illnesses in children, and promoting health-related practices;

(2) strengthening licensing, regulation, or registration standards for eligible child care providers;

(3) assisting eligible child care providers in meeting licensing, regulation, or registration standards, including rehabilitating the facilities of the providers, in order to bring the facilities into compliance with the standards;

(4) enforcing licensing, regulation, or registration standards for eligible child care providers, including holding increased unannounced inspections of the facilities of those providers;

(5) providing health consultants to provide advice to eligible child care providers;

(6) assisting eligible child care providers in enhancing the ability of the providers to serve children with disabilities and infants and toddlers with disabilities;

(7) conducting criminal background checks for eligible child care providers and other individuals who have contact with children in the facilities of the providers;

(8) providing information to parents on what factors to consider in choosing a safe and healthy child care setting; or

(9) assisting in improving the safety of transportation practices for children enrolled in child care programs with eligible child care providers.

(b) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Funds appropriated pursuant to the authority of this title shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local public funds expended to provide services for eligible individuals.

SEC. 1407. REPORTS.

Each State that receives an allotment under section 1404 shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report that describes—

(1) the activities carried out with funds made available through the allotment; and

(2) the progress made by the State toward achieving the goals described in the application submitted by the State under section 1405.

TITLE XV—HEALTHY START INITIATIVE

SEC. 1501. CONTINUATION OF HEALTHY START PROGRAM.

Subpart I of part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 1211 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following section:

"SEC. 330H. HEALTHY START FOR INFANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) CONTINUATION AND EXPANSION OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, Maternal and Child Health Bureau, shall under authority of this section continue in effect the Healthy Start Initiative and may, during fiscal year 2001 and subsequent years, carry out such program on a national basis.

''(2) DEFINITION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'Healthy Start Initiative' is a reference to the program that, as an initiative to reduce the rate of infant mortality and improve perinatal outcomes, makes grants for project areas with high annual rates of infant mortality and that, prior to the effective date of this section, was a demonstration program carried out under section 301.

''(3) ADDITIONAL GRANTS.— Effective upon increased funding beyond fiscal year 1999 for such Initiative, additional grants may be made to States to assist communities with technical assistance, replication of successful projects, and State policy formation to reduce infant and maternal mortality and morbidity.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR MAKING GRANTS.—In making grants under subsection (a), the Secretary shall require that applicants (in addition to meeting all eligibility criteria established by the Secretary) establish, for project areas under such subsection, community-based consortia of individuals and organizations (including agencies responsible for administering block grant programs under title V of the Social Security Act, consumers of project services, public health departments, hospitals, health centers under section 330, and other significant sources of health care services) that are appropriate for participation in projects under subsection (a).

''(c) COORDINATION.—Recipients of grants under subsection (a) shall coordinate their services and activities with the State agency or agencies that administer block grant programs under title V of the Social Security Act in order to promote cooperation, integration, and dissemination of information with Statewide systems and with other community services funded under the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant.

''(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Except to the extent inconsistent with this section, this section may not be construed as affecting the authority of the Secretary to make modifications in the program carried out under subsection (a).

''(e) ADDITIONAL SERVICES FOR AT-RISK PREGNANT WOMEN AND INFANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to conduct and support research and to provide additional health care services for pregnant women and infants, including grants to increase access to prenatal care, genetic counseling, ultrasound services, and fetal or other surgery.

''(2) ELIGIBLE PROJECT AREA.—The Secretary may make a grant under paragraph (1) only if the geographic area in which services under the grant will be provided is a geographic area in which a project under subsection (a) is being carried out, and if the Secretary determines that the grant will add to or expand the level of health services available in such area to pregnant women and infants.

''(3) EVALUATION BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—During fiscal year 2004, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an evaluation of activities under grants under paragraph (1) in order to determine whether the activities have been effective in serving the needs of pregnant women with respect to services described in such paragraph. The evaluation shall include an analysis of whether such activities have been effective in reducing the disparity in health status between the general population and individuals who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups. Not later than January 10, 2004, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Commerce in the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions in the Senate, a report describing the findings of the evaluation.

''(B) RELATION TO GRANTS REGARDING ADDITIONAL SERVICES FOR AT-RISK PREGNANT WOMEN AND INFANTS.—Before the date on which the evaluation under subparagraph (A) is submitted in accordance with such subparagraph—

''(i) the Secretary shall ensure that there are not more than five grantees under paragraph (1); and

''(ii) an entity is not eligible to receive grants under such paragraph unless the entity has substantial experience in providing the health services described in such paragraph.

''(f) FUNDING.—

''(1) GENERAL PROGRAM.—

''(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section (other than subsection (e)), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

''(B) ALLOCATIONS.—

''(i) PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.—Of the amounts appropriated under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year, the Secretary may reserve up to 5 percent for coordination, dissemination, technical assistance, and data activities that are determined by the Secretary to be appropriate for carrying out the program under this section.

''(ii) EVALUATION.—Of the amounts appropriated under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year, the Secretary may reserve up to 1 percent for evaluations of projects carried out under subsection (a). Each such evaluation shall include a determination of whether such projects have been effective in reducing the disparity in health status between the general population and individuals who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups.

''(2) ADDITIONAL SERVICES FOR AT-RISK PREGNANT WOMEN AND INFANTS.—

''(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out subsection (e), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

''(B) ALLOCATION FOR COMMUNITY-BASED MOBILE HEALTH UNITS.—Of the amounts appropriated under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall make available not less than 10 percent for providing services under subsection (e) (including ultrasound services) through visits by mobile units to communities that are eligible for services under subsection (a).''.

TITLE XVI—ORAL HEALTH PROMOTION AND DISEASE PREVENTION

SEC. 1601. IDENTIFICATION OF INTERVENTIONS THAT REDUCE THE BURDEN AND TRANSMISSION OF ORAL, DENTAL, AND CRANIOFACIAL DISEASES IN HIGH RISK POPULATIONS; DEVELOPMENT OF APPROACHES FOR PEDIATRIC ORAL AND CRANIOFACIAL ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, through the Maternal and Child Health Bureau, the Indian Health Service, and in consultation with the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall—

(1) support community-based research that is designed to improve understanding of the etiology, pathogenesis, diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of pediatric oral, dental, craniofacial diseases and conditions and their sequelae in high risk populations;

(2) support demonstrations of preventive interventions in high risk populations including nutrition, parenting, and feeding techniques; and

(3) develop clinical approaches to assess individual patients for the risk of pediatric dental disease.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE PRACTICE LAWS.—Treatment and other services shall be provided pursuant to this section by licensed dental health professionals in accordance with State practice and licensing laws.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section for each the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 1602. ORAL HEALTH PROMOTION AND DISEASE PREVENTION.

Part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 911 of this Act, is amended by inserting after section 317L the following section:

''ORAL HEALTH PROMOTION AND DISEASE PREVENTION

''SEC. 317M. (a) GRANTS TO INCREASE RESOURCES FOR COMMUNITY WATER FLUORIDATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, may make grants to States and Indian tribes for the purpose of increasing the resources available for community water fluoridation.

''(2) USE OF FUNDS.—A State shall use amounts provided under a grant under paragraph (1)—

''(A) to purchase fluoridation equipment;

''(B) to train fluoridation engineers;

''(C) to develop educational materials on the benefits of fluoridation; or

''(D) to support the infrastructure necessary to monitor and maintain the quality of water fluoridation.

''(b) COMMUNITY WATER FLUORIDATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and in collaboration with the Director of the Indian Health Service, shall establish a demonstration project that is designed to assist rural water systems in successfully implementing the water fluoridation guidelines of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention that are entitled ''Engineering

and Administrative Recommendations for Water Fluoridation, 1995'' (referred to in this subsection as the 'EARWF').

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) COLLABORATION.—In collaborating under paragraph (1), the Directors referred to in such paragraph shall ensure that technical assistance and training are provided to tribal programs located in each of the 12 areas of the Indian Health Service. The Director of the Indian Health Service shall provide coordination and administrative support to tribes under this section.

''(B) GENERAL USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available under paragraph (1) shall be used to assist small water systems in improving the effectiveness of water fluoridation and to meet the recommendations of the EARWF.

''(C) FLUORIDATION SPECIALISTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall provide for the establishment of fluoridation specialist engineering positions in each of the Dental Clinical and Preventive Support Centers through which technical assistance and training will be provided to tribal water operators, tribal utility operators and other Indian Health Service personnel working directly with fluoridation projects.

''(ii) LIAISON.—A fluoridation specialist shall serve as the principal technical liaison between the Indian Health Service and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with respect to engineering and fluoridation issues.

''(iii) CDC.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall appoint individuals to serve as the fluoridation specialists.

''(D) IMPLEMENTATION.—The project established under this subsection shall be planned, implemented and evaluated over the 5-year period beginning on the date on which funds are appropriated under this section and shall be designed to serve as a model for improving the effectiveness of water fluoridation systems of small rural communities.

''(3) EVALUATION.—In conducting the ongoing evaluation as provided for in paragraph (2)(D), the Secretary shall ensure that such evaluation includes—

''(A) the measurement of changes in water fluoridation compliance levels resulting from assistance provided under this section;

''(B) the identification of the administrative, technical and operational challenges that are unique to the fluoridation of small water systems;

''(C) the development of a practical model that may be easily utilized by other tribal, state, county or local governments in improving the quality of water fluoridation with emphasis on small water systems; and

''(D) the measurement of any increased percentage of Native Americans or Alaskan Natives who receive the benefits of optimally fluoridated water.

''(c) SCHOOL-BASED DENTAL SEALANT PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and in collaboration with the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, may award grants to States and Indian tribes to provide for the development of school-based dental sealant programs to improve the access of children to sealants.

''(2) USE OF FUNDS.—A State shall use amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) to provide funds to eligible school-based entities or to public elementary or secondary schools to enable such entities or schools to provide children with access to dental care and dental sealant services. Such services shall be provided by licensed dental health professionals in accordance with State practice licensing laws.

''(3) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive funds under paragraph (1), an entity shall—

''(A) prepare and submit to the State an application at such time, in such manner and containing such information as the state may require; and

''(B) be a public elementary or secondary school—

''(i) that is located in an urban area in which and more than 50 percent of the student population is participating in federal or state free or reduced meal programs; or

''(ii) that is located in a rural area and, with respect to the school district in which the school is located, the district involved has a median income that is at or below 235 percent of the poverty line, as defined in section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)).

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the term 'Indian tribe' means an Indian tribe or tribal organization as defined in section 4(b) and section 4(c) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

SEC. 1603. COORDINATED PROGRAM TO IMPROVE PEDIATRIC ORAL HEALTH.

Part B of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 243 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''COORDINATED PROGRAM TO IMPROVE PEDIATRIC ORAL HEALTH

''SEC. 320A. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall establish a program to fund innovative oral health activities that improve the oral health of children under 6 years of age who are eligible for services provided under a Federal health program, to increase the utilization of dental services by such children, and to decrease the incidence of early childhood and baby bottle tooth decay.

''(b) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants to or enter into contracts with public or private nonprofit schools of dentistry or accredited dental training institutions or programs, community dental programs, and programs operated by the Indian Health Service (including federally recognized Indian tribes that receive medical services from the Indian Health Service, urban Indian health programs funded under title V of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and tribes that contract with the Indian Health Service pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act) to enable such schools, institutions, and programs to develop programs of oral health promotion, to increase training of oral health services providers in accordance with State practice laws, or to increase the utilization of dental services by eligible children.

''(c) DISTRIBUTION.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, ensure an equitable national geographic distribution of the grants, including areas of the United States where the incidence of early childhood caries is highest.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

TITLE XVII—VACCINE-RELATED PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—Vaccine Compensation Program

SEC. 1701. CONTENT OF PETITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2111(c)(1)(D) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300aa–11(c)(1)(D)) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end and inserting ''or (iii) suffered such illness, disability, injury, or condition from the vaccine which resulted in inpatient hospitalization and surgical intervention, and''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) takes effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act, including with respect to petitions under section 2111 of the Public Health Service Act that are pending on such date.

Subtitle B—Childhood Immunizations

SEC. 1711. CHILDHOOD IMMUNIZATIONS.

Section 317(j)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247b(j)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''1998'' and all that follows and inserting ''1998 through 2005.''.

TITLE XVIII—HEPATITIS C

SEC. 1801. SURVEILLANCE AND EDUCATION REGARDING HEPATITIS C.

Part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 1602 of this Act, is amended by inserting after section 317M the following section:

''SURVEILLANCE AND EDUCATION REGARDING HEPATITIS C VIRUS

''SEC. 317N. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, may (directly and through grants to public and nonprofit private entities) provide for programs to carry out the following:

''(1) To cooperate with the States in implementing a national system to determine the incidence of hepatitis C virus infection (in this section referred to as 'HCV infection') and to assist the States in determining the prevalence of such infection, including the reporting of chronic HCV cases.

''(2) To identify, counsel, and offer testing to individuals who are at risk of HCV infection as a result of receiving blood transfusions prior to July 1992, or as a result of other risk factors.

''(3) To provide appropriate referrals for counseling, testing, and medical treatment of individuals identified under paragraph (2) and to ensure, to the extent practicable, the provision of appropriate follow-up services.

''(4) To develop and disseminate public information and education programs for the detection and control of HCV infection, with priority given to high risk populations as determined by the Secretary.

''(5) To improve the education, training, and skills of health professionals in the detection and control of HCV infection, with priority given to pediatricians and other primary care physicians, and obstetricians and gynecologists.

''(b) LABORATORY PROCEDURES.—The Secretary may (directly and through grants to public and nonprofit private entities) carry out programs to provide for improvements in the quality of clinical-laboratory procedures regarding hepatitis C, including reducing variability in laboratory results on hepatitis C antibody and PCR testing.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

TITLE XIX—NIH INITIATIVE ON AUTOIMMUNE DISEASES

SEC. 1901. AUTOIMMUNE DISEASES; INITIATIVE THROUGH DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

Part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284 et seq.), as amended by section 1001 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 409E. AUTOIMMUNE DISEASES.

''(a) EXPANSION, INTENSIFICATION, AND COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH shall expand, intensify, and coordinate research and other activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to autoimmune diseases.

''(2) ALLOCATIONS BY DIRECTOR OF NIH.—With respect to amounts appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the Director of NIH shall allocate the amounts among the national research institutes that are carrying out paragraph (1).

''(3) DEFINITION.—The term 'autoimmune disease' includes, for purposes of this section such diseases or disorders with evidence of autoimmune pathogensis as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(b) COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that the Autoimmune Diseases Coordinating Committee (referred to in this section as the 'Coordinating Committee') coordinates activities across the National Institutes and with other Federal health programs and activities relating to such diseases.

''(2) COMPOSITION.—The Coordinating Committee shall be composed of the directors or their designees of each of the national research institutes involved in research with respect to autoimmune diseases and representatives of all other Federal departments and agencies whose programs involve health functions or responsibilities relevant to such diseases, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Food and Drug Administration.

''(3) CHAIR.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to autoimmune diseases, the Chair of the Committee shall serve as the principal advisor to the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary for Health, and the Director of NIH, and shall provide advice to the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, and other relevant agencies.

''(B) DIRECTOR OF NIH.—The Chair of the Committee shall be directly responsible to the Director of NIH.

''(c) PLAN FOR NIH ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Coordinating Committee shall develop a plan for conducting and supporting research and education on autoimmune diseases through the national research institutes and shall periodically review and revise the plan. The plan shall—

''(A) provide for a broad range of research and education activities relating to biomedical, psychosocial, and rehabilitative issues, including studies of the disproportionate impact of such diseases on women;

''(B) identify priorities among the programs and activities of the National Institutes of Health regarding such diseases; and

''(C) reflect input from a broad range of scientists, patients, and advocacy groups.

''(2) CERTAIN ELEMENTS OF PLAN.—The plan under paragraph (1) shall, with respect to autoimmune diseases, provide for the following as appropriate:

''(A) Research to determine the reasons underlying the incidence and prevalence of the diseases.

''(B) Basic research concerning the etiology and causes of the diseases.

''(C) Epidemiological studies to address the frequency and natural history of the diseases, including any differences among the sexes and among racial and ethnic groups.

''(D) The development of improved screening techniques.

''(E) Clinical research for the development and evaluation of new treatments, including new biological agents.

''(F) Information and education programs for health care professionals and the public.

''(3) IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN.—The Director of NIH shall ensure that programs and activities of the National Institutes of Health regarding autoimmune diseases are implemented in accordance with the plan under paragraph (1).

''(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Coordinating Committee under subsection (b)(1) shall biennially submit to the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate, a report that describes the research, education, and other activities on autoimmune diseases being conducted or supported through the national research institutes, and that in addition includes the following:

''(1) The plan under subsection (c)(1) (or revisions to the plan, as the case may be).

''(2) Provisions specifying the amounts expended by the National Institutes of Health with respect to each of the autoimmune diseases included in the plan.

''(3) Provisions identifying particular projects or types of projects that should in the future be considered by the national research institutes or other entities in the field of research on autoimmune diseases.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005. The authorization of appropriations established in the preceding sentence is in addition to any other authorization of appropriations that is available for conducting or supporting through the National Institutes of Health research and other activities with respect to autoimmune diseases.''.

TITLE XX—GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS

SEC. 2001. PROVISIONS TO REVISE AND EXTEND PROGRAM.

(a) PAYMENTS.—Section 340E(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and 2001'' and inserting ''through 2005''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''The Secretary shall promulgate regulations pursuant to the rulemaking requirements of title 5, United States Code, which shall govern payments made under this subpart.''.

(b) UPDATING RATES.—Section 340E(c)(2)(F) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e(c)(2)(F)) is amended by striking ''hospital's cost reporting period that begins during fiscal year 2000'' and inserting ''Federal fiscal year for which payments are made''.

(c) RESIDENT COUNT FOR INTERIM PAYMENTS.—Section 340E(e)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e(e)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Such interim payments to each individual hospital shall be based on the number of residents reported in the hospital's most recently filed medicare cost report prior to the application date for the Federal fiscal year for which the interim payment amounts are established. In the case of a hospital that does not report residents on a medicare cost report, such interim payments shall be based on the number of residents trained during the hospital's most recently completed medicare cost report filing period.''.

(d) WITHHOLDING.—Section 340E(e)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) by adding ''and indirect'' after ''direct'';

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''The Secretary shall withhold up to 25 percent from each interim installment for direct and indirect graduate medical education paid under paragraph (1) as necessary to ensure a hospital will not be overpaid on an interim basis.''.

(e) RECONCILIATION.—Section 340E(e)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e(e)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) RECONCILIATION.—Prior to the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall determine any changes to the number of residents reported by a hospital in the application of the hospital for the current fiscal year to determine the final amount payable to the hospital for the current fiscal year for both direct expense and indirect expense amounts. Based on such determination, the Secretary shall recoup any overpayments made to pay any balance due to the extent possible. The final amount so determined shall be considered a final intermediary determination for the purposes of section 1878 of the Social Security Act and shall be subject to administrative and judicial review under that section in the same manner as the amount of payment under section 1186(d) of such Act is subject to review under such section.''.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 340E(f) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2005, such sums as may be necessary.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2005, such sums as may be necessary.''.

(g) DEFINITION OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL.—Section 340E(g)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e(g)(2)) is amended by striking ''described in'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''with a medicare payment agreement and which is excluded from the medicare inpatient prospective payment system pursuant to section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act and its accompanying regulations.''.

TITLE XXI—SPECIAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN REGARDING ORGAN TRANSPLANTATION

SEC. 2101. ORGAN PROCUREMENT AND TRANSPLANTATION NETWORK; AMENDMENTS REGARDING NEEDS OF CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 372(b)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 274(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (J), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in each of subparagraphs (K) and (L), by striking the period and inserting a comma; and

(3) by adding at the end the following subparagraphs:

''(M) recognize the differences in health and in organ transplantation issues between children and adults throughout the system and adopt criteria, polices, and procedures that address the unique health care needs of children,

''(N) carry out studies and demonstration projects for the purpose of improving procedures for organ donation procurement and allocation, including but not limited to projects to examine and attempt to increase transplantation among populations with special needs, including children and individuals who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups, and among populations with limited access to transportation, and

''(O) provide that for purposes of this paragraph, the term 'children' refers to individuals who are under the age of 18.''.

(b) STUDY REGARDING IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE DRUGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this subsection as the ''Secretary'') shall provide for a study to determine the costs of immunosuppressive drugs that are provided to children pursuant to organ transplants and to determine the extent to which health plans and health insurance cover such costs. The Secretary may carry out the study directly or through a grant to the Institute of Medicine (or other public or nonprofit private entity).

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING CERTAIN ISSUES.—The Secretary shall ensure that, in addition to making determinations under paragraph (1), the study under such paragraph makes recommendations regarding the following issues:

(A) The costs of immunosuppressive drugs that are provided to children pursuant to organ transplants and to determine the extent to which health plans, health insurance and government programs cover such costs.

(B) The extent of denial of organs to be released for transplant by coroners and medical examiners.

(C) The special growth and developmental issues that children have pre- and post- organ transplantation.

(D) Other issues that are particular to the special health and transplantation needs of children.

(3) REPORT.—The Secretary shall ensure that, not later than December 31, 2001, the study under paragraph (1) is completed and a report describing the findings of the study is submitted to the Congress.

TITLE XXII—MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY RESEARCH

SEC. 2201. MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY RESEARCH.

Part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 1901 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY RESEARCH

''SEC. 409F. (a) COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—The Director of NIH shall expand and increase coordination in the activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to research on muscular dystrophies, including Duchenne muscular dystrophy.

''(b) ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM; COLLABORATION AMONG AGENCIES.—The Director of NIH shall carry out this section through the appropriate institutes, including the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke and in collaboration with any other agencies that the Director determines appropriate.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005. Amounts appropriated under this subsection shall be in addition to any other amounts appropriated for such purpose.''.

TITLE XXIII—CHILDREN AND TOURETTE SYNDROME AWARENESS

SEC. 2301. GRANTS REGARDING TOURETTE SYNDROME.

Part A of title XI of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end the following section:

''TOURETTE SYNDROME

''SEC. 1108. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop and implement outreach programs to educate the public, health care providers, educators and community based organizations about the etiology, symptoms, diagnosis and treatment of Tourette Syndrome, with a particular emphasis on children with Tourette Syndrome. Such programs may be carried out by the Secretary directly and through awards of grants or contracts to public or nonprofit private entities.

''(b) CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.—Activities under subsection (a) shall include—

''(1) the production and translation of educational materials, including public service announcements;

''(2) the development of training material for health care providers, educators and community based organizations; and

''(3) outreach efforts directed at the misdiagnosis and underdiagnosis of Tourette Syndrome in children and in minority groups.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

TITLE XXIV—CHILDHOOD OBESITY PREVENTION

SEC. 2401. PROGRAMS OPERATED THROUGH THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.

Title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.), as amended by section 1101 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following part:

''PART Q—PROGRAMS TO IMPROVE THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN

''SEC. 399W. GRANTS TO PROMOTE CHILDHOOD NUTRITION AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting though the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall award competitive grants to States and political subdivisions of States for the development and implementation of State and community-based intervention programs to promote good nutrition and physical activity in children and adolescents.

''(b) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section a State or political subdivision of a State shall prepare and submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including a plan that describes—

''(1) how the applicant proposes to develop a comprehensive program of school- and community-based approaches to encourage and promote good nutrition and appropriate levels of physical activity with respect to children or adolescents in local communities;

''(2) the manner in which the applicant shall coordinate with appropriate State and local authorities, such as State and local school departments, State departments of health, chronic disease directors, State directors of programs under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, 5-a-day coordinators, governors councils for physical activity and good nutrition, and State and local parks and recreation departments; and

''(3) the manner in which the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of the program carried out under this section.

''(c) USE OF FUNDS.—A State or political subdivision of a State shall use amount received under a grant under this section to—

''(1) develop, implement, disseminate, and evaluate school- and community-based strategies in States to reduce inactivity and improve dietary choices among children and adolescents;

''(2) expand opportunities for physical activity programs in school- and community-based settings; and

''(3) develop, implement, and evaluate programs that promote good eating habits and physical activity including opportunities for children with cognitive and physical disabilities.

''(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may set-aside an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the amount appropriated for a fiscal year under subsection (h) to permit the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to—

''(1) provide States and political subdivisions of States with technical support in the development and implementation of programs under this section; and

''(2) disseminate information about effective strategies and interventions in preventing and treating obesity through the promotion of good nutrition and physical activity.

''(e) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not to exceed 10 percent of the amount of a grant awarded to the State or political subdivision under subsection (a) for a fiscal year may be used by the State or political subdivision for administrative expenses.

''(f) TERM.—A grant awarded under subsection (a) shall be for a term of 3 years.

''(g) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'children and adolescents' means individuals who do not exceed 18 years of age.

''(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

''SEC. 399X. APPLIED RESEARCH PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and in consultation with the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall—

''(1) conduct research to better understand the relationship between physical activity, diet, and health and factors that influence health-related behaviors;

''(2) develop and evaluate strategies for the prevention and treatment of obesity to be used in community-based interventions and by health professionals;

''(3) develop and evaluate strategies for the prevention and treatment of eating disorders, such as anorexia and bulimia;

''(4) conduct research to establish the prevalence, consequences, and costs of childhood obesity and its effects in adulthood;

''(5) identify behaviors and risk factors that contribute to obesity;

''(6) evaluate materials and programs to provide nutrition education to parents and teachers of children in child care or pre-school and the food service staff of such child care and pre-school entities; and

''(7) evaluate materials and programs that are designed to educate and encourage physical activity in child care and pre-school facilities.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

''SEC. 399Y. EDUCATION CAMPAIGN.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and in collaboration with national, State, and local partners, physical activity organizations, nutrition experts, and health professional organizations, shall develop a national public campaign to promote and educate children and their parents concerning—

''(1) the health risks associated with obesity, inactivity, and poor nutrition;

''(2) ways in which to incorporate physical activity into daily living; and

''(3) the benefits of good nutrition and strategies to improve eating habits.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

''SEC. 399Z. HEALTH PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in collaboration with the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration and the heads of other agencies, and in consultation with appropriate health professional associations, shall develop and carry out a program to educate and train health professionals in effective strategies to—

''(1) better identify and assess patients with obesity or an eating disorder or patients at-risk of becoming obese or developing an eating disorder;

''(2) counsel, refer, or treat patients with obesity or an eating disorder; and

''(3) educate patients and their families about effective strategies to improve dietary habits and establish appropriate levels of physical activity.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

TITLE XXV—EARLY DETECTION AND TREATMENT REGARDING CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING

SEC. 2501. CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION EFFORTS TO COMBAT CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAD POISONING PREVENTION GRANTEES.—Section 317A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247b–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) Assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the applicant will ensure complete and consistent reporting of all blood lead test results

from laboratories and health care providers to State and local health departments in accordance with guidelines of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for standardized reporting as described in subsection (m).''; and

(2) in subsection (j)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (F) by striking ''(E)'' and inserting ''(F)'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

''(F) The number of grantees that have established systems to ensure mandatory reporting of all blood lead tests from laboratories and health care providers to State and local health departments.''.

(b) GUIDELINES FOR STANDARDIZED REPORTING.—Section 317A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247b–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) GUIDELINES FOR STANDARDIZED REPORTING.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall develop national guidelines for the uniform reporting of all blood lead test results to State and local health departments.''.

(c) DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EFFECTIVE DATA MANAGEMENT BY THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall—

(A) assist with the improvement of data linkages between State and local health departments and between State health departments and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

(B) assist States with the development of flexible, comprehensive State-based data management systems for the surveillance of children with lead poisoning that have the capacity to contribute to a national data set;

(C) assist with the improvement of the ability of State-based data management systems and federally-funded means-tested public benefit programs (including the special supplemental food program for women, infants and children (WIC) under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786) and the early head start program under section 645A of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9840a(h)) to respond to ad hoc inquiries and generate progress reports regarding the lead blood level screening of children enrolled in those programs;

(D) assist States with the establishment of a capacity for assessing how many children enrolled in the medicaid, WIC, early head start, and other federally-funded means-tested public benefit programs are being screened for lead poisoning at age-appropriate intervals;

(E) use data obtained as result of activities under this section to formulate or revise existing lead blood screening and case management policies; and

(F) establish performance measures for evaluating State and local implementation of the requirements and improvements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E).

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection such sums as may be necessary for each the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection takes effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2502. GRANTS FOR LEAD POISONING RELATED ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 243 et seq.), as amended by section 1801 of this Act, is amended by inserting after section 317N the following section:

''GRANTS FOR LEAD POISONING RELATED ACTIVITIES

''SEC. 317O. (a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make grants to States to support public health activities in States and localities where data suggests that at least 5 percent of preschool-age children have an elevated blood lead level through—

''(A) effective, ongoing outreach and community education targeted to families most likely to be at risk for lead poisoning;

''(B) individual family education activities that are designed to reduce ongoing exposures to lead for children with elevated blood lead levels, including through home visits and coordination with other programs designed to identify and treat children at risk for lead poisoning; and

''(C) the development, coordination and implementation of community-based approaches for comprehensive lead poisoning prevention from surveillance to lead hazard control.

''(2) STATE MATCH.—A State is not eligible for a grant under this section unless the State agrees to expend (through State or local funds) $1 for every $2 provided under the grant to carry out the activities described in paragraph (1).

''(3) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a State shall submit an application to the Secretary in such form and manner and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(b) COORDINATION WITH OTHER CHILDREN'S PROGRAMS.—A State shall identify in the application for a grant under this section how the State will coordinate operations and activities under the grant with—

''(1) other programs operated in the State that serve children with elevated blood lead levels, including any such programs operated under titles V, XIX, or XXI of the Social Security Act; and

''(2) one or more of the following—

''(A) the child welfare and foster care and adoption assistance programs under parts B and E of title IV of such Act;

''(B) the head start program established under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.);

''(C) the program of assistance under the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants and children (WIC) under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786);

''(D) local public and private elementary or secondary schools; or

''(E) public housing agencies, as defined in section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a).

''(c) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—The Secretary shall establish needs indicators and performance measures to evaluate the activities carried out under grants awarded under this section. Such indicators shall be commensurate with national measures of maternal and child health programs and shall be developed in consultation with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 340D(c)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256d(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''317E'' and inserting ''317F''.

SEC. 2503. TRAINING AND REPORTS BY THE HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.

(a) TRAINING.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration and in collaboration with the Administrator of the Health Care Financing Administration and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall conduct education and training programs for physicians and other health care providers regarding childhood lead poisoning, current screening and treatment recommendations and requirements, and the scientific, medical, and public health basis for those policies.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, annually shall report to Congress on the number of children who received services through health centers established under section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b) and received a blood lead screening test during the prior fiscal year, noting the percentage that such children represent as compared to all children who received services through such health centers.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 2504. SCREENINGS, REFERRALS, AND EDUCATION REGARDING LEAD POISONING.

Section 317A(l)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247b–1(l)(1)) is amended by striking ''1994'' and all that follows and inserting ''1994 through 2005.''.

TITLE XXVI—SCREENING FOR HERITABLE DISORDERS

SEC. 2601. PROGRAM TO IMPROVE THE ABILITY OF STATES TO PROVIDE NEWBORN AND CHILD SCREENING FOR HERITABLE DISORDERS.

Part A of title XI of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 2301 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1109. IMPROVED NEWBORN AND CHILD SCREENING FOR HERITABLE DISORDERS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants to eligible entities to enhance, improve or expand the ability of State and local public health agencies to provide screening, counseling or health care services to newborns and children having or at risk for heritable disorders.

''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts provided under a grant awarded under subsection (a) shall be used to—

''(1) establish, expand, or improve systems or programs to provide screening, counseling, testing or specialty services for newborns and children at risk for heritable disorders;

''(2) establish, expand, or improve programs or services to reduce mortality or morbidity from heritable disorders;

''(3) establish, expand, or improve systems or programs to provide information and counseling on available therapies for newborns and children with heritable disorders;

''(4) improve the access of medically underserved populations to screening, counseling, testing and specialty services for newborns and children having or at risk for heritable disorders; or

''(5) conduct such other activities as may be necessary to enable newborns and children having or at risk for heritable disorders to receive screening, counseling, testing or specialty services, regardless of income, race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability.

''(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a) an entity shall—

''(1) be a State or political subdivision of a State, or a consortium of 2 or more States or political subdivisions of States; and

''(2) prepare and submit to the Secretary an application that includes—

''(A) a plan to use amounts awarded under the grant to meet specific health status goals and objectives relative to heritable disorders, including attention to needs of medically underserved populations;

''(B) a plan for the collection of outcome data or other methods of evaluating the degree to which amounts awarded under this grant will be used to achieve the goals and objectives identified under subparagraph (A);

''(C) a plan for monitoring and ensuring the quality of services provided under the grant;

''(D) an assurance that amounts awarded under the grant will be used only to implement the approved plan for the State;

''(E) an assurance that the provision of services under the plan is coordinated with services

provided under programs implemented in the State under titles V, XVIII, XIX, XX, or XXI of the Social Security Act (subject to Federal regulations applicable to such programs) so that the coverage of services under such titles is not substantially diminished by the use of granted funds; and

''(F) such other information determined by the Secretary to be necessary.

''(d) LIMITATION.—An eligible entity may not use amounts received under this section to—

''(1) provide cash payments to or on behalf of affected individuals;

''(2) provide inpatient services;

''(3) purchase land or make capital improvements to property; or

''(4) provide for proprietary research or training.

''(e) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—The participation by any individual in any program or portion thereof established or operated with funds received under this section shall be wholly voluntary and shall not be a prerequisite to eligibility for or receipt of any other service or assistance from, or to participation in, another Federal or State program.

''(f) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Funds appropriated under this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local public funds provided for activities of the type described in this section.

''(g) PUBLICATION.

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An application submitted under subsection (c)(2) shall be made public by the State in such a manner as to facilitate comment from any person, including through hearings and other methods used to facilitate comments from the public.

''(2) COMMENTS.—Comments received by the State after the publication described in paragraph (1) shall be addressed in the application submitted under subsection (c)(2).

''(h) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide to entities receiving grants under subsection (a) such technical assistance as may be necessary to ensure the quality of programs conducted under this section.

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

''SEC. 1110. EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF NEWBORN AND CHILD SCREENING PROGRAMS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants to eligible entities to provide for the conduct of demonstration programs to evaluate the effectiveness of screening, counseling or health care services in reducing the morbidity and mortality caused by heritable disorders in newborns and children.

''(b) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—A demonstration program conducted under a grant under this section shall be designed to evaluate and assess, within the jurisdiction of the entity receiving such grant—

''(1) the effectiveness of screening, counseling, testing or specialty services for newborns and children at risk for heritable disorders in reducing the morbidity and mortality associated with such disorders;

''(2) the effectiveness of screening, counseling, testing or specialty services in accurately and reliably diagnosing heritable disorders in newborns and children; or

''(3) the availability of screening, counseling, testing or specialty services for newborns and children at risk for heritable disorders.

''(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a) an entity shall be a State or political subdivision of a State, or a consortium of 2 or more States or political subdivisions of States.

''SEC. 1111. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HERITABLE DISORDERS IN NEWBORNS AND CHILDREN.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee to be known as the 'Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children' (referred to in this section as the 'Advisory Committee').

''(b) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee shall—

''(1) provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary concerning grants and projects awarded or funded under section 1109;

''(2) provide technical information to the Secretary for the development of policies and priorities for the administration of grants under section 1109; and

''(3) provide such recommendations, advice or information as may be necessary to enhance, expand or improve the ability of the Secretary to reduce the mortality or morbidity from heritable disorders.

''(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall appoint not to exceed 15 members to the Advisory Committee. In appointing such members, the Secretary shall ensure that the total membership of the Advisory Committee is an odd number.

''(2) REQUIRED MEMBERS.—The Secretary shall appoint to the Advisory Committee under paragraph (1)—

''(A) the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration;

''(B) the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

''(C) the Director of the National Institutes of Health;

''(D) the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality;

''(E) medical, technical, or scientific professionals with special expertise in heritable disorders, or in providing screening, counseling, testing or specialty services for newborns and children at risk for heritable disorders;

''(F) members of the public having special expertise about or concern with heritable disorders; and

''(G) representatives from such Federal agencies, public health constituencies, and medical professional societies as determined to be necessary by the Secretary, to fulfill the duties of the Advisory Committee, as established under subsection (b).''.

TITLE XXVII—PEDIATRIC RESEARCH PROTECTIONS

SEC. 2701. REQUIREMENT FOR ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS FOR CHILDREN INVOLVED IN RESEARCH.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall require that all research involving children that is conducted, supported, or regulated by the Department of Health and Human Services be in compliance with subpart D of part 45 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations.

TITLE XXVIII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 2801. REPORT REGARDING RESEARCH ON RARE DISEASES IN CHILDREN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall submit to the Congress a report on—

(1) the activities that, during fiscal year 2000, were conducted and supported by such Institutes with respect to rare diseases in children, including Friedreich's ataxia and Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome; and

(2) the activities that are planned to be conducted and supported by such Institutes with respect to such diseases during the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 2802. STUDY ON METABOLIC DISORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall, in consultation with relevant experts or through the Institute of Medicine, study issues related to treatment of PKU and other metabolic disorders for children, adolescents, and adults, and mechanisms to assure access to effective treatment, including special diets, for children and others with PKU and other metabolic disorders. Such mechanisms shall be evidence-based and reflect the best scientific knowledge regarding effective treatment and prevention of disease progression.

(b) DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS.—Upon completion of the study referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary shall disseminate and otherwise make available the results of the study to interested groups and organizations, including insurance commissioners, employers, private insurers, health care professionals, State and local public health agencies, and State agencies that carry out the medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act or the State children's health insurance program under title XXI of such Act.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2003.

TITLE XXIX—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 2901. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This division and the amendments made by this division take effect October 1, 2000, or upon the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs later.

DIVISION B—YOUTH DRUG AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

SEC. 3001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act''.

TITLE XXXI—PROVISIONS RELATING TO SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS

SEC. 3101. CHILDREN AND VIOLENCE.

Title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART G—PROJECTS FOR CHILDREN AND VIOLENCE

''SEC. 581. CHILDREN AND VIOLENCE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the Attorney General, shall carry out directly or through grants, contracts or cooperative agreements with public entities a program to assist local communities in developing ways to assist children in dealing with violence.

''(b) ACTIVITIES.—Under the program under subsection (a), the Secretary may—

''(1) provide financial support to enable local communities to implement programs to foster the health and development of children;

''(2) provide technical assistance to local communities with respect to the development of programs described in paragraph (1);

''(3) provide assistance to local communities in the development of policies to address violence when and if it occurs;

''(4) assist in the creation of community partnerships among law enforcement, education systems and mental health and substance abuse service systems; and

''(5) establish mechanisms for children and adolescents to report incidents of violence or plans by other children or adolescents to commit violence.

''(c) REQUIREMENTS.—An application for a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall demonstrate that—

''(1) the applicant will use amounts received to create a partnership described in subsection (b)(4) to address issues of violence in schools;

''(2) the activities carried out by the applicant will provide a comprehensive method for addressing violence, that will include—

''(A) security;

''(B) educational reform;

''(C) the review and updating of school policies;

''(D) alcohol and drug abuse prevention and early intervention services;

''(E) mental health prevention and treatment services; and

''(F) early childhood development and psychosocial services; and

''(3) the applicant will use amounts received only for the services described in subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F) of paragraph (2).

''(d) GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall ensure that grants, contracts or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) will be distributed equitably among the regions of the country and among urban and rural areas.

''(e) DURATION OF AWARDS.—With respect to a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (a), the period during which payments under such an award will be made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years.

''(f) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of each project carried out under this section and shall disseminate the results of such evaluations to appropriate public and private entities.

''(g) INFORMATION AND EDUCATION.—The Secretary shall establish comprehensive information and education programs to disseminate the findings of the knowledge development and application under this section to the general public and to health care professionals.

''(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $100,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

''SEC. 582. GRANTS TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEMS OF PERSONS WHO EXPERIENCE VIOLENCE RELATED STRESS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts or cooperative agreements to public and nonprofit private entities, as well as to Indian tribes and tribal organizations, for the purpose of developing programs focusing on the behavioral and biological aspects of psychological trauma response and for developing knowledge with regard to evidence-based practices for treating psychiatric disorders of children and youth resulting from witnessing or experiencing a traumatic event.

''(b) PRIORITIES.—In awarding grants, contracts or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) related to the development of knowledge on evidence-based practices for treating disorders associated with psychological trauma, the Secretary shall give priority to mental health agencies and programs that have established clinical and basic research experience in the field of trauma-related mental disorders.

''(c) GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall ensure that grants, contracts or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) with respect to centers of excellence are distributed equitably among the regions of the country and among urban and rural areas.

''(d) EVALUATION.—The Secretary, as part of the application process, shall require that each applicant for a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) submit a plan for the rigorous evaluation of the activities funded under the grant, contract or agreement, including both process and outcomes evaluation, and the submission of an evaluation at the end of the project period.

''(e) DURATION OF AWARDS.—With respect to a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (a), the period during which payments under such an award will be made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years. Such grants, contracts or agreements may be renewed.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

SEC. 3102. EMERGENCY RESPONSE.

Section 501 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (o);

(2) by inserting after subsection (l) the following:

''(m) EMERGENCY RESPONSE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 504 and except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary may use not to exceed 2.5 percent of all amounts appropriated under this title for a fiscal year to make noncompetitive grants, contracts or cooperative agreements to public entities to enable such entities to address emergency substance abuse or mental health needs in local communities.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Amounts appropriated under part C shall not be subject to paragraph (1).

''(3) EMERGENCIES.—The Secretary shall establish criteria for determining that a substance abuse or mental health emergency exists and publish such criteria in the Federal Register prior to providing funds under this subsection.

''(n) LIMITATION ON THE USE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—No information, if an establishment or person supplying the information or described in it is identifiable, obtained in the course of activities undertaken or supported under section 505 may be used for any purpose other than the purpose for which it was supplied unless such establishment or person has consented (as determined under regulations of the Secretary) to its use for such other purpose. Such information may not be published or released in other form if the person who supplied the information or who is described in it is identifiable unless such person has consented (as determined under regulations of the Secretary) to its publication or release in other form.''; and

(3) in subsection (o) (as so redesignated), by striking ''1993'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

SEC. 3103. HIGH RISK YOUTH REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 517(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–23(h)) is amended by striking ''$70,000,000'' and all that follows through ''1994'' and inserting ''such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2003''.

SEC. 3104. SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS.

(a) SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES.—Subpart 1 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 514. SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to public and private nonprofit entities, including Native Alaskan entities and Indian tribes and tribal organizations, for the purpose of providing substance abuse treatment services for children and adolescents.

''(b) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to applicants who propose to—

''(1) apply evidenced-based and cost effective methods for the treatment of substance abuse among children and adolescents;

''(2) coordinate the provision of treatment services with other social service agencies in the community, including educational, juvenile justice, child welfare, and mental health agencies;

''(3) provide a continuum of integrated treatment services, including case management, for children and adolescents with substance abuse disorders and their families;

''(4) provide treatment that is gender-specific and culturally appropriate;

''(5) involve and work with families of children and adolescents receiving treatment;

''(6) provide aftercare services for children and adolescents and their families after completion of substance abuse treatment; and

''(7) address the relationship between substance abuse and violence.

''(c) DURATION OF GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) for periods not to exceed 5 fiscal years.

''(d) APPLICATION.—An entity desiring a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

''(e) EVALUATION.—An entity that receives a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall submit, in the application for such grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, a plan for the evaluation of any project undertaken with funds provided under this section. Such entity shall provide the Secretary with periodic evaluations of the progress of such project and such evaluation at the completion of such project as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

''SEC. 514A. EARLY INTERVENTION SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to public and private nonprofit entities, including local educational agencies (as defined in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801)), for the purpose of providing early intervention substance abuse services for children and adolescents.

''(b) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to applicants who demonstrate an ability to—

''(1) screen for and assess substance use and abuse by children and adolescents;

''(2) make appropriate referrals for children and adolescents who are in need of treatment for substance abuse;

''(3) provide early intervention services, including counseling and ancillary services, that are designed to meet the developmental needs of children and adolescents who are at risk for substance abuse; and

''(4) develop networks with the educational, juvenile justice, social services, and other agencies and organizations in the State or local community involved that will work to identify children and adolescents who are in need of substance abuse treatment services.

''(c) CONDITION.—In awarding grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that such grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements are allocated, subject to the availability of qualified applicants, among the principal geographic regions of the United States, to Indian tribes and tribal organizations, and to urban and rural areas.

''(d) DURATION OF GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) for periods not to exceed 5 fiscal years.

''(e) APPLICATION.—An entity desiring a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

''(f) EVALUATION.—An entity that receives a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall submit, in the application for such grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, a plan for the evaluation of any project undertaken with funds provided under this section. Such entity shall provide the Secretary with periodic evaluations of the progress of such project and such evaluation at the completion of such project as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry

out this section, $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

(b) YOUTH INTERAGENCY CENTERS.—Subpart 3 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–31 et seq.) is amended by adding the following:

''SEC. 520C. YOUTH INTERAGENCY RESEARCH, TRAINING, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS.

''(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and in consultation with the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall award grants or contracts to public or nonprofit private entities to establish not more than 4 research, training, and technical assistance centers to carry out the activities described in subsection (c).

''(b) APPLICATION.—A public or private nonprofit entity desiring a grant or contract under subsection (a) shall prepare and submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—A center established under a grant or contract under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) provide training with respect to state-of-the-art mental health and justice-related services and successful mental health and substance abuse-justice collaborations that focus on children and adolescents, to public policymakers, law enforcement administrators, public defenders, police, probation officers, judges, parole officials, jail administrators and mental health and substance abuse providers and administrators;

''(2) engage in research and evaluations concerning State and local justice and mental health systems, including system redesign initiatives, and disseminate information concerning the results of such evaluations;

''(3) provide direct technical assistance, including assistance provided through toll-free telephone numbers, concerning issues such as how to accommodate individuals who are being processed through the courts under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), what types of mental health or substance abuse service approaches are effective within the judicial system, and how community-based mental health or substance abuse services can be more effective, including relevant regional, ethnic, and gender-related considerations; and

''(4) provide information, training, and technical assistance to State and local governmental officials to enhance the capacity of such officials to provide appropriate services relating to mental health or substance abuse.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

(c) PREVENTION OF ABUSE AND ADDICTION.—Subpart 2 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–21 et seq.) is amended by adding the following:

''SEC. 519E. PREVENTION OF METHAMPHETAMINE AND INHALANT ABUSE AND ADDICTION.

''(a) GRANTS.—The Director of the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (referred to in this section as the 'Director') may make grants to and enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with public and nonprofit private entities to enable such entities—

''(1) to carry out school-based programs concerning the dangers of methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction, using methods that are effective and evidence-based, including initiatives that give students the responsibility to create their own anti-drug abuse education programs for their schools; and

''(2) to carry out community-based methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction prevention programs that are effective and evidence-based.

''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available under a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall be used for planning, establishing, or administering methamphetamine or inhalant prevention programs in accordance with subsection (c).

''(c) PREVENTION PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts provided under this section may be used—

''(A) to carry out school-based programs that are focused on those districts with high or increasing rates of methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction and targeted at populations which are most at risk to start methamphetamine or inhalant abuse;

''(B) to carry out community-based prevention programs that are focused on those populations within the community that are most at-risk for methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction;

''(C) to assist local government entities to conduct appropriate methamphetamine or inhalant prevention activities;

''(D) to train and educate State and local law enforcement officials, prevention and education officials, members of community anti-drug coalitions and parents on the signs of methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction and the options for treatment and prevention;

''(E) for planning, administration, and educational activities related to the prevention of methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction;

''(F) for the monitoring and evaluation of methamphetamine or inhalant prevention activities, and reporting and disseminating resulting information to the public; and

''(G) for targeted pilot programs with evaluation components to encourage innovation and experimentation with new methodologies.

''(2) PRIORITY.—The Director shall give priority in making grants under this section to rural and urban areas that are experiencing a high rate or rapid increases in methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction.

''(d) ANALYSES AND EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Up to $500,000 of the amount available in each fiscal year to carry out this section shall be made available to the Director, acting in consultation with other Federal agencies, to support and conduct periodic analyses and evaluations of effective prevention programs for methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction and the development of appropriate strategies for disseminating information about and implementing these programs.

''(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Director shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Commerce and Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual report with the results of the analyses and evaluation under paragraph (1).

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (a), $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

SEC. 3105. COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY SERVICES FOR CHILDREN WITH SERIOUS EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE.

(a) MATCHING FUNDS.—Section 561(c)(1)(D) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290ff(c)(1)(D)) is amended by striking ''fifth'' and inserting ''fifth and sixth''.

(b) FLEXIBILITY FOR INDIAN TRIBES AND TERRITORIES.—Section 562 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290ff–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) WAIVERS.—The Secretary may waive 1 or more of the requirements of subsection (c) for a public entity that is an Indian Tribe or tribal organization, or American Samoa, Guam, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of Palau, or the United States Virgin Islands if the Secretary determines, after peer review, that the system of care is family-centered and uses the least restrictive environment that is clinically appropriate.''.

(c) DURATION OF GRANTS.—Section 565(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290ff–4(a)) is amended by striking ''5 fiscal'' and inserting ''6 fiscal''.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 565(f)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290ff–4(f)(1)) is amended by striking ''1993'' and all that follows and inserting ''2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

(e) CURRENT GRANTEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Entities with active grants under section 561 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290ff) on the date of enactment of this Act shall be eligible to receive a 6th year of funding under the grant in an amount not to exceed the amount that such grantee received in the 5th year of funding under such grant. Such 6th year may be funded without requiring peer and Advisory Council review as required under section 504 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa–3).

(2) LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to a grantee only if the grantee agrees to comply with the provisions of section 561 as amended by subsection (a).

SEC. 3106. SERVICES FOR CHILDREN OF SUBSTANCE ABUSERS.

(a) ADMINISTRATION AND ACTIVITIES.—

(1) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 399D(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Administrator'' and all that follows through ''Administration'' and insert ''Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration'' and inserting ''Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration''.

(2) ACTIVITIES.—Section 399D(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting the following: ''through youth service agencies, family social services, child care providers, Head Start, schools and after-school programs, early childhood development programs, community-based family resource and support centers, the criminal justice system, health, substance abuse and mental health providers through screenings conducted during regular childhood examinations and other examinations, self and family member referrals, substance abuse treatment services, and other providers of services to children and families; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) to provide education and training to health, substance abuse and mental health professionals, and other providers of services to children and families through youth service agencies, family social services, child care, Head Start, schools and after-school programs, early childhood development programs, community-based family resource and support centers, the criminal justice system, and other providers of services to children and families.''.

(3) IDENTIFICATION OF CERTAIN CHILDREN.—Section 399D(a)(3)(A) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(a)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''(i) the entity'' and inserting ''(i)(I) the entity'';

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) by striking ''(ii) the entity'' and inserting ''(II) the entity''; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) the entity will identify children who may be eligible for medical assistance under a State program under title XIX or XXI of the Social Security Act.''.

(b) SERVICES FOR CHILDREN.—Section 399D(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''alcohol and drug,'' after ''psychological,'';

(2) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

''(5) Developmentally and age-appropriate drug and alcohol early intervention, treatment and prevention services.''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8), the following:

''Services shall be provided under paragraphs (2) through (8) by a public health nurse, social worker, or similar professional, or by a trained worker from the community who is supervised by a professional, or by an entity, where the professional or entity provides assurances that the professional or entity is licensed or certified by the State if required and is complying with applicable licensure or certification requirements.''.

(c) SERVICES FOR AFFECTED FAMILIES.—Section 399D(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting before the colon the following: '', or by an entity, where the professional or entity provides assurances that the professional or entity is licensed or certified by the State if required and is complying with applicable licensure or certification requirements''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) Aggressive outreach to family members with substance abuse problems.

''(E) Inclusion of consumer in the development, implementation, and monitoring of Family Services Plan.'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) Alcohol and drug treatment services, including screening and assessment, diagnosis, detoxification, individual, group and family counseling, relapse prevention, pharmacotherapy treatment, after-care services, and case management.'';

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking '', including educational and career planning'' and inserting ''and counseling on the human immunodeficiency virus and acquired immune deficiency syndrome'';

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''conflict and''; and

(D) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''Remedial'' and inserting ''Career planning and''; and

(3) in paragraph (3)(D), by inserting ''which include child abuse and neglect prevention techniques'' before the period.

(d) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Section 399D(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting:

''(d) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The Secretary shall distribute the grants through the following types of entities:'';

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking ''drug treatment'' and inserting ''drug early intervention, prevention or treatment; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''; and'' and inserting ''; or''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''or pediatric health or mental health providers and family mental health providers'' before the period.

(e) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION.—Section 399D(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''including maternal and child health'' before ''mental'';

(B) by striking ''treatment programs''; and

(C) by striking ''and the State agency responsible for administering public maternal and child health services'' and inserting '', the State agency responsible for administering alcohol and drug programs, the State lead agency, and the State Interagency Coordinating Council under part H of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; and''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(f) REPORTS TO THE SECRETARY.—Section 399D(i)(6) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(i)(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(2) by striking subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) and inserting the following:

''(C) the number of case workers or other professionals trained to identify and address substance abuse issues.''.

(g) EVALUATIONS.—Section 399D(l) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(l)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the semicolon and inserting the following: '', including increased participation in work or employment-related activities and decreased participation in welfare programs.''; and

(3) by striking paragraphs (5) and (6).

(h) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 399D(m) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(m)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the semicolon and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E); and

(3) by striking paragraphs (4) and (5).

(i) DATA COLLECTION.—Section 399D(n) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(n)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The periodic report shall include a quantitative estimate of the prevalence of alcohol and drug problems in families involved in the child welfare system, the barriers to treatment and prevention services facing these families, and policy recommendations for removing the identified barriers, including training for child welfare workers.''.

(j) DEFINITION.—Section 399D(o)(2)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(o)(2)(B)) is amended by striking ''dangerous''.

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 399D(p) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(p)) is amended to read as follows:

''(p) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

(l) GRANTS FOR TRAINING AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 399D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (f);

(2) by striking subsection (k);

(3) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (l), (m), (n), (o), and (p) as subsections (e) through (o), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (c), the following:

''(d) TRAINING FOR PROVIDERS OF SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.—The Secretary may make a grant under subsection (a) for the training of health, substance abuse and mental health professionals and other providers of services to children and families through youth service agencies, family social services, child care providers, Head Start, schools and after-school programs, early childhood development programs, community-based family resource centers, the criminal justice system, and other providers of services to children and families. Such training shall be to assist professionals in recognizing the drug and alcohol problems of their clients and to enhance their skills in identifying and understanding the nature of substance abuse, and obtaining substance abuse early intervention, prevention and treatment resources.'';

(5) in subsection (k)(2) (as so redesignated), by striking ''(h)'' and inserting ''(i)''; and

(6) in paragraphs (3)(E) and (5) of subsection (m) (as so redesignated), by striking ''(d)'' and inserting ''(e)''.

(m) TRANSFER AND REDESIGNATION.—Section 399D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d), as amended by this section—

(1) is transferred to title V;

(2) is redesignated as section 519; and

(3) is inserted after section 518.

(n) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.) is amended by striking the heading of part L.

SEC. 3107. SERVICES FOR YOUTH OFFENDERS.

Subpart 3 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–31 et seq.), as amended by section 3104(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 520D. SERVICES FOR YOUTH OFFENDERS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Center for Mental Health Services, and in consultation with the Director of the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Director of the Special Education Programs, shall award grants on a competitive basis to State or local juvenile justice agencies to enable such agencies to provide aftercare services for youth offenders who have been discharged from facilities in the juvenile or criminal justice system and have serious emotional disturbances or are at risk of developing such disturbances.

''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—A State or local juvenile justice agency receiving a grant under subsection (a) shall use the amounts provided under the grant—

''(1) to develop a plan describing the manner in which the agency will provide services for each youth offender who has a serious emotional disturbance and has been detained or incarcerated in facilities within the juvenile or criminal justice system;

''(2) to provide a network of core or aftercare services or access to such services for each youth offender, including diagnostic and evaluation services, substance abuse treatment services, outpatient mental health care services, medication management services, intensive home-based therapy, intensive day treatment services, respite care, and therapeutic foster care;

''(3) to establish a program that coordinates with other State and local agencies providing recreational, social, educational, vocational, or operational services for youth, to enable the agency receiving a grant under this section to provide community-based system of care services for each youth offender that addresses the special needs of the youth and helps the youth access all of the aforementioned services; and

''(4) using not more than 20 percent of funds received, to provide planning and transition services as described in paragraph (3) for youth offenders while such youth are incarcerated or detained.

''(c) APPLICATION.—A State or local juvenile justice agency that desires a grant under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

''(d) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section and annually

thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare and submit, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives, a report that describes the services provided pursuant to this section.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) SERIOUS EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE.—The term 'serious emotional disturbance' with respect to a youth offender means an offender who currently, or at any time within the 1-year period ending on the day on which services are sought under this section, has a diagnosable mental, behavioral, or emotional disorder that functionally impairs the offender's life by substantially limiting the offender's role in family, school, or community activities, and interfering with the offender's ability to achieve or maintain 1 or more developmentally-appropriate social, behavior, cognitive, communicative, or adaptive skills.

''(2) COMMUNITY-BASED SYSTEM OF CARE.—The term 'community-based system of care' means the provision of services for the youth offender by various State or local agencies that in an interagency fashion or operating as a network addresses the recreational, social, educational, vocational, mental health, substance abuse, and operational needs of the youth offender.

''(3) YOUTH OFFENDER.—The term 'youth offender' means an individual who is 21 years of age or younger who has been discharged from a State or local juvenile or criminal justice system, except that if the individual is between the ages of 18 and 21 years, such individual has had contact with the State or local juvenile or criminal justice system prior to attaining 18 years of age and is under the jurisdiction of such a system at the time services are sought.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

SEC. 3108. GRANTS FOR STRENGTHENING FAMILIES THROUGH COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS.

Subpart 2 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–21 et seq) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 519A. GRANTS FOR STRENGTHENING FAMILIES.

''(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Prevention Center, may make grants to public and nonprofit private entities to develop and implement model substance abuse prevention programs to provide early intervention and substance abuse prevention services for individuals of high-risk families and the communities in which such individuals reside.

''(b) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to applicants that—

''(1) have proven experience in preventing substance abuse by individuals of high-risk families and reducing substance abuse in communities of such individuals;

''(2) have demonstrated the capacity to implement community-based partnership initiatives that are sensitive to the diverse backgrounds of individuals of high-risk families and the communities of such individuals;

''(3) have experience in providing technical assistance to support substance abuse prevention programs that are community-based;

''(4) have demonstrated the capacity to implement research-based substance abuse prevention strategies; and

''(5) have implemented programs that involve families, residents, community agencies, and institutions in the implementation and design of such programs.

''(c) DURATION OF GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants under subsection (a) for a period not to exceed 5 years.

''(d) USE OF FUNDS.—An applicant that is awarded a grant under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) in the first fiscal year that such funds are received under the grant, use such funds to develop a model substance abuse prevention program; and

''(2) in the fiscal year following the first fiscal year that such funds are received, use such funds to implement the program developed under paragraph (1) to provide early intervention and substance abuse prevention services to—

''(A) strengthen the environment of children of high risk families by targeting interventions at the families of such children and the communities in which such children reside;

''(B) strengthen protective factors, such as—

''(i) positive adult role models;

''(ii) messages that oppose substance abuse;

''(iii) community actions designed to reduce accessibility to and use of illegal substances; and

''(iv) willingness of individuals of families in which substance abuse occurs to seek treatment for substance abuse;

''(C) reduce family and community risks, such as family violence, alcohol or drug abuse, crime, and other behaviors that may effect healthy child development and increase the likelihood of substance abuse; and

''(D) build collaborative and formal partnerships between community agencies, institutions, and businesses to ensure that comprehensive high quality services are provided, such as early childhood education, health care, family support programs, parent education programs, and home visits for infants.

''(e) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), an applicant shall prepare and submit to the Secretary an application that—

''(1) describes a model substance abuse prevention program that such applicant will establish;

''(2) describes the manner in which the services described in subsection (d)(2) will be provided; and

''(3) describe in as much detail as possible the results that the entity expects to achieve in implementing such a program.

''(f) MATCHING FUNDING.—The Secretary may not make a grant to a entity under subsection (a) unless that entity agrees that, with respect to the costs to be incurred by the entity in carrying out the program for which the grant was awarded, the entity will make available non-Federal contributions in an amount that is not less than 40 percent of the amount provided under the grant.

''(g) REPORT TO SECRETARY.—An applicant that is awarded a grant under subsection (a) shall prepare and submit to the Secretary a report in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including an assessment of the efficacy of the model substance abuse prevention program implemented by the applicant and the short, intermediate, and long term results of such program.

''(h) EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary shall conduct evaluations, based in part on the reports submitted under subsection (g), to determine the effectiveness of the programs funded under subsection (a) in reducing substance use in high-risk families and in making communities in which such families reside in stronger. The Secretary shall submit such evaluations to the appropriate committees of Congress.

''(i) HIGH-RISK FAMILIES.—In this section, the term 'high-risk family' means a family in which the individuals of such family are at a significant risk of using or abusing alcohol or any illegal substance.

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $3,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

SEC. 3109. PROGRAMS TO REDUCE UNDERAGE DRINKING.

Subpart 2 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–21 et seq), as amended by section 3108, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 519B. PROGRAMS TO REDUCE UNDERAGE DRINKING.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make awards of grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts to public and nonprofit private entities, including Indian tribes and tribal organizations, to enable such entities to develop plans for and to carry out school-based (including institutions of higher education) and community-based programs for the prevention of alcoholic-beverage consumption by individuals who have not attained the legal drinking age.

''(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to receive an award under subsection (a), an entity shall provide any assurances to the Secretary which the Secretary may require, including that the entity will—

''(1) annually report to the Secretary on the effectiveness of the prevention approaches implemented by the entity;

''(2) use science based and age appropriate approaches; and

''(3) involve local public health officials and community prevention program staff in the planning and implementation of the program.

''(c) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate each project under subsection (a) and shall disseminate the findings with respect to each such evaluation to appropriate public and private entities.

''(d) GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall ensure that awards will be distributed equitably among the regions of the country and among urban and rural areas.

''(e) DURATION OF AWARD.—With respect to an award under subsection (a), the period during which payments under such award are made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years. The preceding sentence may not be construed as establishing a limitation on the number of awards under such subsection that may be made to the recipient.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

SEC. 3110. SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH FETAL ALCOHOL SYNDROME.

Subpart 2 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–21 et seq), as amended by sections 3108 and 3109, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 519C. SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH FETAL ALCOHOL SYNDROME.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make awards of grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts to public and nonprofit private entities, including Indian tribes and tribal organizations, to provide services to individuals diagnosed with fetal alcohol syndrome or alcohol-related birth defects.

''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—An award under subsection (a) may, subject to subsection (d), be used to—

''(1) screen and test individuals to determine the type and level of services needed;

''(2) develop a comprehensive plan for providing services to the individual;

''(3) provide mental health counseling;

''(4) provide substance abuse prevention services and treatment, if needed;

''(5) coordinate services with other social programs including social services, justice system, educational services, health services, mental health and substance abuse services, financial assistance programs, vocational services and housing assistance programs;

''(6) provide vocational services;

''(7) provide health counseling;

''(8) provide housing assistance;

''(9) parenting skills training;

''(10) overall case management;

''(11) supportive services for families of individuals with Fetal Alcohol Syndrome; and

''(12) provide other services and programs, to the extent authorized by the Secretary after consideration of recommendations made by the National Task Force on Fetal Alcohol Syndrome.

''(c) REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to receive an award under subsection (a), an applicant shall—

''(1) demonstrate that the program will be part of a coordinated, comprehensive system of care for such individuals;

''(2) demonstrate an established communication with other social programs in the community including social services, justice system, financial assistance programs, health services, educational services, mental health and substance abuse services, vocational services and housing assistance services;

''(3) show a history of working with individuals with fetal alcohol syndrome or alcohol-related birth defects;

''(4) provide assurance that the services will be provided in a culturally and linguistically appropriate manner; and

''(5) provide assurance that at the end of the 5-year award period, other mechanisms will be identified to meet the needs of the individuals and families served under such award.

''(d) RELATIONSHIP TO PAYMENTS UNDER OTHER PROGRAMS.—An award may be made under subsection (a) only if the applicant involved agrees that the award will not be expended to pay the expenses of providing any service under this section to an individual to the extent that payment has been made, or can reasonably be expected to be made, with respect to such expenses—

''(1) under any State compensation program, under an insurance policy, or under any Federal or State health benefits program; or

''(2) by an entity that provides health services on a prepaid basis.

''(e) DURATION OF AWARDS.—With respect to an award under subsection (a), the period during which payments under such award are made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years.

''(f) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate each project carried out under subsection (a) and shall disseminate the findings with respect to each such evaluation to appropriate public and private entities.

''(g) FUNDING.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

''(2) ALLOCATION.—Of the amounts appropriated under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, not less than $300,000 shall, for purposes relating to fetal alcohol syndrome and alcohol-related birth defects, be made available for collaborative, coordinated interagency efforts with the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, the National Institute on Child Health and Human Development, the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Department of Education, and the Department of Justice.

''SEC. 519D. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE ON SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH FETAL ALCOHOL SYNDROME AND ALCOHOL-RELATED BIRTH DEFECTS AND TREATMENT FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH SUCH CONDITIONS AND THEIR FAMILIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make awards of grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts to public or nonprofit private entities for the purposes of establishing not more than 4 centers of excellence to study techniques for the prevention of fetal alcohol syndrome and alcohol-related birth defects and adaptations of innovative clinical interventions and service delivery improvements for the provision of comprehensive services to individuals with fetal alcohol syndrome or alcohol-related birth defects and their families and for providing training on such conditions.

''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—An award under subsection (a) may be used to—

''(1) study adaptations of innovative clinical interventions and service delivery improvements strategies for children and adults with fetal alcohol syndrome or alcohol-related birth defects and their families;

''(2) identify communities which have an exemplary comprehensive system of care for such individuals so that they can provide technical assistance to other communities attempting to set up such a system of care;

''(3) provide technical assistance to communities who do not have a comprehensive system of care for such individuals and their families;

''(4) train community leaders, mental health and substance abuse professionals, families, law enforcement personnel, judges, health professionals, persons working in financial assistance programs, social service personnel, child welfare professionals, and other service providers on the implications of fetal alcohol syndrome and alcohol-related birth defects, the early identification of and referral for such conditions;

''(5) develop innovative techniques for preventing alcohol use by women in child bearing years;

''(6) perform other functions, to the extent authorized by the Secretary after consideration of recommendations made by the National Task Force on Fetal Alcohol Syndrome.

''(c) REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A recipient of an award under subsection (a) shall at the end of the period of funding report to the Secretary on any innovative techniques that have been discovered for preventing alcohol use among women of child bearing years.

''(2) DISSEMINATION OF FINDINGS.—The Secretary shall upon receiving a report under paragraph (1) disseminate the findings to appropriate public and private entities.

''(d) DURATION OF AWARDS.—With respect to an award under subsection (a), the period during which payments under such award are made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years.

''(e) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate each project carried out under subsection (a) and shall disseminate the findings with respect to each such evaluation to appropriate public and private entities.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

SEC. 3111. SUICIDE PREVENTION.

Subpart 3 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–31 et seq), as amended by section 3107, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 520E. SUICIDE PREVENTION FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes, tribal organizations, public organizations, or private nonprofit organizations to establish programs to reduce suicide deaths in the United States among children and adolescents.

''(b) COLLABORATION.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that activities under this section are coordinated among the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, the relevant institutes at the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Health Resources and Services Administration, and the Administration on Children and Families.

''(c) REQUIREMENTS.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, tribal organization, public organization, or private nonprofit organization desiring a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section shall demonstrate that the suicide prevention program such entity proposes will—

''(1) provide for the timely assessment, treatment, or referral for mental health or substance abuse services of children and adolescents at risk for suicide;

''(2) be based on best evidence-based, suicide prevention practices and strategies that are adapted to the local community;

''(3) integrate its suicide prevention program into the existing health care system in the community including primary health care, mental health services, and substance abuse services;

''(4) be integrated into other systems in the community that address the needs of children and adolescents including the educational system, juvenile justice system, welfare and child protection systems, and community youth support organizations;

''(5) use primary prevention methods to educate and raise awareness in the local community by disseminating evidence-based information about suicide prevention;

''(6) include suicide prevention, mental health, and related information and services for the families and friends of those who completed suicide, as needed;

''(7) provide linguistically appropriate and culturally competent services, as needed;

''(8) provide a plan for the evaluation of outcomes and activities at the local level, according to standards established by the Secretary, and agree to participate in a national evaluation; and

''(9) ensure that staff used in the program are trained in suicide prevention and that professionals involved in the system of care have received training in identifying persons at risk of suicide.

''(d) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts provided under grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local public funds that are expended to provide services for eligible individuals.

''(e) CONDITION.—An applicant for a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall demonstrate to the Secretary that the applicant has the support of the local community and relevant public health officials.

''(f) SPECIAL POPULATIONS.—In awarding grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that such awards are made in a manner that will focus on the needs of communities or groups that experience high or rapidly rising rates of suicide.

''(g) APPLICATION.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, tribal organization, public organization, or private nonprofit organization receiving a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall prepare and submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require. Such application shall include a plan for the rigorous evaluation of activities funded under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, including a process and outcome evaluation.

''(h) DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS.—In awarding grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that such awards are distributed among the geographical regions of the United States and between urban and rural settings.

''(i) EVALUATION.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, tribal organization, public organization, or private nonprofit organization receiving a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall prepare and submit to the Secretary at the end of the program period, an evaluation of all activities funded under this section.

''(j) DISSEMINATION AND EDUCATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that findings derived

from activities carried out under this section are disseminated to State, county and local governmental agencies and public and private nonprofit organizations active in promoting suicide prevention and family support activities.

''(k) DURATION OF PROJECTS.—With respect to a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded under this section, the period during which payments under such award may be made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years.

''(l) STUDY.—Within 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall, directly or by grant or contract, initiate a study to assemble and analyze data to identify—

''(1) unique profiles of children under 13 who attempt or complete suicide;

''(2) unique profiles of youths between ages 13 and 21 who attempt or complete suicide; and

''(3) a profile of services which might have been available to these groups and the use of these services by children and youths from paragraphs (1) and (2).

''(m) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $75,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2003.

''(2) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall use 1 percent of the amount appropriated under paragraph (1) for each fiscal year for managing programs under this section.''.

SEC. 3112. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) DUTIES OF THE CENTER FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT.—Section 507(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (12) as paragraphs (4) through (14), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1), the following:

''(2) ensure that emphasis is placed on children and adolescents in the development of treatment programs;

''(3) collaborate with the Attorney General to develop programs to provide substance abuse treatment services to individuals who have had contact with the Justice system, especially adolescents;'';

(3) in paragraph (7) (as so redesignated), by striking ''services, and monitor'' and all that follows through ''1925'' and inserting ''services'';

(4) in paragraph (13) (as so redesignated), by striking ''treatment, including'' and all that follows through ''which shall'' and inserting ''treatment, which shall''; and

(5) in paragraph 14 (as so redesignated), by striking ''paragraph (11)'' and inserting ''paragraph (13)''.

(b) OFFICE FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION.—Section 515(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–21(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (9) and (10) as (10) and (11);

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8), the following:

''(9) collaborate with the Attorney General of the Department of Justice to develop programs to prevent drug abuse among high risk youth;''; and

(3) in paragraph (10) (as so redesignated), by striking ''public concerning'' and inserting ''public, especially adolescent audiences, concerning''.

(c) DUTIES OF THE CENTER FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.—Section 520(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–3(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (14) as paragraphs (4) through (15), respectively;

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

''(3) collaborate with the Department of Education and the Department of Justice to develop programs to assist local communities in addressing violence among children and adolescents;'';

(3) in paragraph (8) (as so redesignated), by striking ''programs authorized'' and all that follows through ''Programs'' and inserting ''programs under part C''; and

(4) in paragraph (9) (as so redesignated), by striking ''program and programs'' and all that follows through ''303'' and inserting ''programs''.

TITLE XXXII—PROVISIONS RELATING TO MENTAL HEALTH

SEC. 3201. PRIORITY MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 520A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–32) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 520A. PRIORITY MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

''(a) PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall address priority mental health needs of regional and national significance (as determined under subsection (b)) through the provision of or through assistance for—

''(1) knowledge development and application projects for prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation, and the conduct or support of evaluations of such projects;

''(2) training and technical assistance programs;

''(3) targeted capacity response programs; and

''(4) systems change grants including statewide family network grants and client-oriented and consumer run self-help activities.

The Secretary may carry out the activities described in this subsection directly or through grants or cooperative agreements with States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes and tribal organizations, other public or private nonprofit entities.

''(b) PRIORITY MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.—

''(1) DETERMINATION OF NEEDS.—Priority mental health needs of regional and national significance shall be determined by the Secretary in consultation with States and other interested groups. The Secretary shall meet with the States and interested groups on an annual basis to discuss program priorities.

''(2) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—In developing program priorities described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give special consideration to promoting the integration of mental health services into primary health care systems.

''(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Recipients of grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under this section shall comply with information and application requirements determined appropriate by the Secretary.

''(2) DURATION OF AWARD.—With respect to a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded under this section, the period during which payments under such award are made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years.

''(3) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Secretary may, for projects carried out under subsection (a), require that entities that apply for grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this section provide non-Federal matching funds, as determined appropriate by the Secretary, to ensure the institutional commitment of the entity to the projects funded under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement. Such non-Federal matching funds may be provided directly or through donations from public or private entities and may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services.

''(4) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—With respect to activities for which a grant, contract or cooperative agreement is awarded under this section, the Secretary may require that recipients for specific projects under subsection (a) agree to maintain expenditures of non-Federal amounts for such activities at a level that is not less than the level of such expenditures maintained by the entity for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the entity receives such a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.

''(d) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate each project carried out under subsection (a)(1) and shall disseminate the findings with respect to each such evaluation to appropriate public and private entities.

''(e) INFORMATION AND EDUCATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish information and education programs to disseminate and apply the findings of the knowledge development and application, training, and technical assistance programs, and targeted capacity response programs, under this section to the general public, to health care professionals, and to interested groups. The Secretary shall make every effort to provide linkages between the findings of supported projects and State agencies responsible for carrying out mental health services.

''(2) RURAL AND UNDERSERVED AREAS.—In disseminating information on evidence-based practices in the provision of children's mental health services under this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure that such information is distributed to rural and medically underserved areas.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $300,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

''(2) DATA INFRASTRUCTURE.—If amounts are not appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out section 1971 with respect to mental health, then the Secretary shall make available, from the amounts appropriated for such fiscal year under paragraph (1), an amount equal to the sum of $6,000,000 and 10 percent of all amounts appropriated for such fiscal year under such paragraph in excess of $100,000,000, to carry out such section 1971.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 303 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242a) is repealed.

(2) Section 520B of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–33) is repealed.

(3) Section 612 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa–3 note) is repealed.

SEC. 3202. GRANTS FOR THE BENEFIT OF HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS.

Section 506 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa–5) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 506. GRANTS FOR THE BENEFIT OF HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts and cooperative agreements to community-based public and private nonprofit entities for the purposes of providing mental health and substance abuse services for homeless individuals. In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall consult with the Interagency Council on the Homeless, established under section 201 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11311).

''(b) PREFERENCES.—In awarding grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give a preference to—

''(1) entities that provide integrated primary health, substance abuse, and mental health services to homeless individuals;

''(2) entities that demonstrate effectiveness in serving runaway, homeless, and street youth;

''(3) entities that have experience in providing substance abuse and mental health services to homeless individuals;

''(4) entities that demonstrate experience in providing housing for individuals in treatment for or in recovery from mental illness or substance abuse; and

''(5) entities that demonstrate effectiveness in serving homeless veterans.

''(c) SERVICES FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—In awarding grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall not—

''(1) prohibit the provision of services under such subsection to homeless individuals who are suffering from a substance abuse disorder and are not suffering from a mental health disorder; and

''(2) make payments under subsection (a) to any entity that has a policy of—

''(A) excluding individuals from mental health services due to the existence or suspicion of substance abuse; or

''(B) has a policy of excluding individuals from substance abuse services due to the existence or suspicion of mental illness.

''(d) TERM OF THE AWARDS.—No entity may receive a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) for more than 5 years.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

SEC. 3203. PROJECTS FOR ASSISTANCE IN TRANSITION FROM HOMELESSNESS.

(a) WAIVERS FOR TERRITORIES.—Section 522 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290cc–22) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) WAIVER FOR TERRITORIES.—With respect to the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, Palau, the Marshall Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Secretary may waive the provisions of this part that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—Section 535(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290cc–35(a)) is amended by striking ''1991 through 1994'' and inserting ''2001 through 2003''.

SEC. 3204. COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIP BLOCK GRANT.

(a) CRITERIA FOR PLAN.—Section 1912(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–2(b)) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (12) and inserting the following:

''(1) COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY-BASED MENTAL HEALTH SYSTEMS.—The plan provides for an organized community-based system of care for individuals with mental illness and describes available services and resources in a comprehensive system of care, including services for dually diagnosed individuals. The description of the system of care shall include health and mental health services, rehabilitation services, employment services, housing services, educational services, substance abuse services, medical and dental care, and other support services to be provided to individuals with Federal, State and local public and private resources to enable such individuals to function outside of inpatient or residential institutions to the maximum extent of their capabilities, including services to be provided by local school systems under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The plan shall include a separate description of case management services and provide for activities leading to reduction of hospitalization.

''(2) MENTAL HEALTH SYSTEM DATA AND EPIDEMIOLOGY.—The plan contains an estimate of the incidence and prevalence in the State of serious mental illness among adults and serious emotional disturbance among children and presents quantitative targets to be achieved in the implementation of the system described in paragraph (1).

''(3) CHILDREN'S SERVICES.—In the case of children with serious emotional disturbance, the plan—

''(A) subject to subparagraph (B), provides for a system of integrated social services, educational services, juvenile services, and substance abuse services that, together with health and mental health services, will be provided in order for such children to receive care appropriate for their multiple needs (such system to include services provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act);

''(B) provides that the grant under section 1911 for the fiscal year involved will not be expended to provide any service under such system other than comprehensive community mental health services; and

''(C) provides for the establishment of a defined geographic area for the provision of the services of such system.

''(4) TARGETED SERVICES TO RURAL AND HOMELESS POPULATIONS.—The plan describes the State's outreach to and services for individuals who are homeless and how community-based services will be provided to individuals residing in rural areas.

''(5) MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.—The plan describes the financial resources, staffing and training for mental health providers that is necessary to implement the plan, and provides for the training of providers of emergency health services regarding mental health. The plan further describes the manner in which the State intends to expend the grant under section 1911 for the fiscal year involved.

Except as provided for in paragraph (3), the State plan shall contain the information required under this subsection with respect to both adults with serious mental illness and children with serious emotional disturbance.''.

(b) REVIEW OF PLANNING COUNCIL OF STATE'S REPORT.—Section 1915(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–4(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and the report of the State under section 1942(a) concerning the preceding fiscal year'' after ''to the grant''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period ''and any comments concerning the annual report''.

(c) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—Section 1915(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–4(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1), the following:

''(2) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FUNDS.—The Secretary may exclude from the aggregate State expenditures under subsection (a), funds appropriated to the principle agency for authorized activities which are of a non-recurring nature and for a specific purpose.''.

(d) APPLICATION FOR GRANTS.—Section 1917(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–6(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) the plan is received by the Secretary not later than September 1 of the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year for which a State is seeking funds, and the report from the previous fiscal year as required under section 1941 is received by December 1 of the fiscal year of the grant;''.

(e) WAIVERS FOR TERRITORIES.—Section 1917(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–6(b)) is amended by striking ''whose allotment under section 1911 for the fiscal year is the amount specified in section 1918(c)(2)(B)'' and inserting in its place ''except Puerto Rico''.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—Section 1920 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–9) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''$450,000,000'' and all that follows through the end and inserting ''$450,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''section 505'' and inserting ''sections 505 and 1971''.

SEC. 3205. DETERMINATION OF ALLOTMENT.

Section 1918(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–7(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) MINIMUM ALLOTMENTS FOR STATES.—With respect to fiscal year 2000, and subsequent fiscal years, the amount of the allotment of a State under section 1911 shall not be less than the amount the State received under such section for fiscal year 1998.''.

SEC. 3206. PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY FOR MENTALLY ILL INDIVIDUALS ACT OF 1986.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—The first section of the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–319) is amended to read as follows:

''SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

''This Act may be cited as the 'Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act'.''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 102 of the Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act (as amended by subsection (a)) (42 U.S.C. 10802) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', except as provided in section 104(d),'' after ''means'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''(i)'' who'' and inserting ''(i)(I) who'';

(ii) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as subclauses (II) and (III);

(iii) in subclause (III) (as so redesignated), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) who satisfies the requirements of subparagraph (A) and lives in a community setting, including their own home.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) The term 'American Indian consortium' means a consortium established under part C of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 6042 et seq.).''.

(c) USE OF ALLOTMENTS.—Section 104 of the Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act (as amended by subsection (a)) (42 U.S.C. 10804) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) The definition of 'individual with a mental illness' contained in section 102(4)(B)(iii) shall apply, and thus an eligible system may use its allotment under this title to provide representation to such individuals, only if the total allotment under this title for any fiscal year is $30,000,000 or more, and in such case, an eligible system must give priority to representing persons with mental illness as defined in subparagraphs (A) and (B)(i) of section 102(4).''.

(d) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Paragraph (2) of section 112(a) of the Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act (as amended by subsection (a)) (42 U.S.C. 10822(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2)(A) The minimum amount of the allotment of an eligible system shall be the product (rounded to the nearest $100) of the appropriate base amount determined under subparagraph (B) and the factor specified in subparagraph (C).

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the appropriate base amount—

''(i) for American Samoa, Guam, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of Palau, and the Virgin Islands, is $139,300; and

''(ii) for any other State, is $260,000.

''(C) The factor specified in this subparagraph is the ratio of the amount appropriated under section 117 for the fiscal year for which the allotment is being made to the amount appropriated under such section for fiscal year 1995.

''(D) If the total amount appropriated for a fiscal year is at least $25,000,000, the Secretary shall make an allotment in accordance with subparagraph (A) to the eligible system serving the American Indian consortium.''.

(e) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 112(a) of the Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act (as amended by subsection (a)) (42 U.S.C. 10822(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands'' and inserting ''Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of Palau''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3).

(f) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 117 of the Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act (as amended by subsection (a)) (42 U.S.C. 10827) is amended by striking ''1995'' and inserting ''2003''.

SEC. 3207. REQUIREMENT RELATING TO THE RIGHTS OF RESIDENTS OF CERTAIN FACILITIES.

Title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART H—REQUIREMENT RELATING TO THE RIGHTS OF RESIDENTS OF CERTAIN FACILITIES

''SEC. 591. REQUIREMENT RELATING TO THE RIGHTS OF RESIDENTS OF CERTAIN FACILITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A public or private general hospital, nursing facility, intermediate care facility, or other health care facility, that receives support in any form from any program supported in whole or in part with funds appropriated to any Federal department or agency shall protect and promote the rights of each resident of the facility, including the right to be free from physical or mental abuse, corporal punishment, and any restraints or involuntary seclusions imposed for purposes of discipline or convenience.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Restraints and seclusion may only be imposed on a resident of a facility described in subsection (a) if—

''(1) the restraints or seclusion are imposed to ensure the physical safety of the resident, a staff member, or others; and

''(2) the restraints or seclusion are imposed only upon the written order of a physician, or other licensed practitioner permitted by the State and the facility to order such restraint or seclusion, that specifies the duration and circumstances under which the restraints are to be used (except in emergency circumstances specified by the Secretary until such an order could reasonably be obtained).

''(c) CURRENT LAW.—This part shall not be construed to affect or impede any Federal or State law or regulations that provide greater protections than this part regarding seclusion and restraint.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) RESTRAINTS.—The term 'restraints' means—

''(A) any physical restraint that is a mechanical or personal restriction that immobilizes or reduces the ability of an individual to move his or her arms, legs, or head freely, not including devices, such as orthopedically prescribed devices, surgical dressings or bandages, protective helmets, or any other methods that involves the physical holding of a resident for the purpose of conducting routine physical examinations or tests or to protect the resident from falling out of bed or to permit the resident to participate in activities without the risk of physical harm to the resident (such term does not include a physical escort); and

''(B) a drug or medication that is used as a restraint to control behavior or restrict the resident's freedom of movement that is not a standard treatment for the resident's medical or psychiatric condition.

''(2) SECLUSION.—The term 'seclusion' means a behavior control technique involving locked isolation. Such term does not include a time out.

''(3) PHYSICAL ESCORT.—The term 'physical escort' means the temporary touching or holding of the hand, wrist, arm, shoulder or back for the purpose of inducing a resident who is acting out to walk to a safe location.

''(4) TIME OUT.—The term 'time out' means a behavior management technique that is part of an approved treatment program and may involve the separation of the resident from the group, in a non-locked setting, for the purpose of calming. Time out is not seclusion.

''SEC. 592. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.— Each facility to which the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986 applies shall notify the appropriate agency, as determined by the Secretary, of each death that occurs at each such facility while a patient is restrained or in seclusion, of each death occurring within 24 hours after the patient has been removed from restraints and seclusion, or where it is reasonable to assume that a patient's death is a result of such seclusion or restraint. A notification under this section shall include the name of the resident and shall be provided not later than 7 days after the date of the death of the individual involved.

''(b) FACILITY.—In this section, the term 'facility' has the meaning given the term 'facilities' in section 102(3) of the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 10802(3)).''.

''SEC. 593. REGULATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.

''(a) TRAINING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this part, the Secretary, after consultation with appropriate State and local protection and advocacy organizations, physicians, facilities, and other health care professionals and patients, shall promulgate regulations that require facilities to which the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 10801 et seq.) applies, to meet the requirements of subsection (b).

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations promulgated under subsection (a) shall require that—

''(1) facilities described in subsection (a) ensure that there is an adequate number of qualified professional and supportive staff to evaluate patients, formulate written individualized, comprehensive treatment plans, and to provide active treatment measures;

''(2) appropriate training be provided for the staff of such facilities in the use of restraints and any alternatives to the use of restraints; and

''(3) such facilities provide complete and accurate notification of deaths, as required under section 592(a).

''(c) ENFORCEMENT.—A facility to which this part applies that fails to comply with any requirement of this part, including a failure to provide appropriate training, shall not be eligible for participation in any program supported in whole or in part by funds appropriated to any Federal department or agency.''.

SEC. 3208. REQUIREMENT RELATING TO THE RIGHTS OF RESIDENTS OF CERTAIN NON-MEDICAL, COMMUNITY-BASED FACILITIES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

Title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa et seq.), as amended by section 3207, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART I—REQUIREMENT RELATING TO THE RIGHTS OF RESIDENTS OF CERTAIN NON-MEDICAL, COMMUNITY-BASED FACILITIES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

''SEC. 595. REQUIREMENT RELATING TO THE RIGHTS OF RESIDENTS OF CERTAIN NON-MEDICAL, COMMUNITY-BASED FACILITIES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

''(a) PROTECTION OF RIGHTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A public or private non-medical, community-based facility for children and youth (as defined in regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary) that receives support in any form from any program supported in whole or in part with funds appropriated under this Act shall protect and promote the rights of each resident of the facility, including the right to be free from physical or mental abuse, corporal punishment, and any restraints or involuntary seclusions imposed for purposes of discipline or convenience.

''(2) NONAPPLICABILITY.—Notwithstanding this part, a facility that provides inpatient psychiatric treatment services for individuals under the age of 21, as authorized and defined in subsections (a)(16) and (h) of section 1905 of the Social Security Act, shall comply with the requirements of part H.

''(3) APPLICABILITY OF MEDICAID PROVISIONS.—A non-medical, community-based facility for children and youth funded under the medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act shall continue to meet all existing requirements for participation in such program that are not affected by this part.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Physical restraints and seclusion may only be imposed on a resident of a facility described in subsection (a) if—

''(A) the restraints or seclusion are imposed only in emergency circumstances and only to ensure the immediate physical safety of the resident, a staff member, or others and less restrictive interventions have been determined to be ineffective; and

''(B) the restraints or seclusion are imposed only by an individual trained and certified, by a State-recognized body (as defined in regulation promulgated by the Secretary) and pursuant to a process determined appropriate by the State and approved by the Secretary, in the prevention and use of physical restraint and seclusion, including the needs and behaviors of the population served, relationship building, alternatives to restraint and seclusion, de-escalation methods, avoiding power struggles, thresholds for restraints and seclusion, the physiological and psychological impact of restraint and seclusion, monitoring physical signs of distress and obtaining medical assistance, legal issues, position asphyxia, escape and evasion techniques, time limits, the process for obtaining approval for continued restraints, procedures to address problematic restraints, documentation, processing with children, and follow-up with staff, and investigation of injuries and complaints.

''(2) INTERIM PROCEDURES RELATING TO TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Until such time as the State develops a process to assure the proper training and certification of facility personnel in the skills and competencies referred in paragraph (1)(B), the facility involved shall develop and implement an interim procedure that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—A procedure developed under subparagraph (A) shall—

''(i) ensure that a supervisory or senior staff person with training in restraint and seclusion who is competent to conduct a face-to-face assessment (as defined in regulations promulgated by the Secretary), will assess the mental and physical well-being of the child or youth being restrained or secluded and assure that the restraint or seclusion is being done in a safe manner;

''(ii) ensure that the assessment required under clause (i) take place as soon as practicable, but in no case later than 1 hour after the initiation of the restraint or seclusion; and

''(iii) ensure that the supervisory or senior staff person continues to monitor the situation for the duration of the restraint and seclusion.

''(3) LIMITATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The use of a drug or medication that is used as a restraint to control behavior or restrict the resident's freedom of movement that is not a standard treatment for the resident's medical or psychiatric condition in nonmedical community-based facilities for children and youth described in subsection (a)(1) is prohibited.

''(B) PROHIBITION.—The use of mechanical restraints in non-medical, community-based facilities for children and youth described in subsection (a)(1) is prohibited.

''(C) LIMITATION.—A non-medical, community-based facility for children and youth described in subsection (a)(1) may only use seclusion when a staff member is continuously face-to-face monitoring the resident and when strong licensing or accreditation and internal controls are in place.

''(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting the use of restraints for medical immobilization, adaptive support, or medical protection.

''(2) CURRENT LAW.—This part shall not be construed to affect or impede any Federal or State law or regulations that provide greater protections than this part regarding seclusion and restraint.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) MECHANICAL RESTRAINT.—The term 'mechanical restraint' means the use of devices as a means of restricting a resident's freedom of movement.

''(2) PHYSICAL ESCORT.—The term 'physical escort' means the temporary touching or holding of the hand, wrist, arm, shoulder or back for the purpose of inducing a resident who is acting out to walk to a safe location.

''(3) PHYSICAL RESTRAINT.—The term 'physical restraint' means a personal restriction that immobilizes or reduces the ability of an individual to move his or her arms, legs, or head freely. Such term does not include a physical escort.

''(4) SECLUSION.—The term 'seclusion' means a behavior control technique involving locked isolation. Such term does not include a time out.

''(5) TIME OUT.—The term 'time out' means a behavior management technique that is part of an approved treatment program and may involve the separation of the resident from the group, in a non-locked setting, for the purpose of calming. Time out is not seclusion.

''SEC. 595A. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

''Each facility to which this part applies shall notify the appropriate State licensing or regulatory agency, as determined by the Secretary—

''(1) of each death that occurs at each such facility. A notification under this section shall include the name of the resident and shall be provided not later than 24 hours after the time of the individuals death; and

''(2) of the use of seclusion or restraints in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary, in consultation with the States.

''SEC. 595B. REGULATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.

''(a) TRAINING.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this part, the Secretary, after consultation with appropriate State, local, public and private protection and advocacy organizations, health care professionals, social workers, facilities, and patients, shall promulgate regulations that—

''(1) require States that license non-medical, community-based residential facilities for children and youth to develop licensing rules and monitoring requirements concerning behavior management practice that will ensure compliance with Federal regulations and to meet the requirements of subsection (b);

''(2) require States to develop and implement such licensing rules and monitoring requirements within 1 year after the promulgation of the regulations referred to in the matter preceding paragraph (1); and

''(3) support the development of national guidelines and standards on the quality, quantity, orientation and training, required under this part, as well as the certification or licensure of those staff responsible for the implementation of behavioral intervention concepts and techniques.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations promulgated under subsection (a) shall require—

''(1) that facilities described in subsection (a) ensure that there is an adequate number of qualified professional and supportive staff to evaluate residents, formulate written individualized, comprehensive treatment plans, and to provide active treatment measures;

''(2) the provision of appropriate training and certification of the staff of such facilities in the prevention and use of physical restraint and seclusion, including the needs and behaviors of the population served, relationship building, alternatives to restraint, de-escalation methods, avoiding power struggles, thresholds for restraints, the physiological impact of restraint and seclusion, monitoring physical signs of distress and obtaining medical assistance, legal issues, position asphyxia, escape and evasion techniques, time limits for the use of restraint and seclusion, the process for obtaining approval for continued restraints and seclusion, procedures to address problematic restraints, documentation, processing with children, and follow-up with staff, and investigation of injuries and complaints; and

''(3) that such facilities provide complete and accurate notification of deaths, as required under section 595A(1).

''(c) ENFORCEMENT.—A State to which this part applies that fails to comply with any requirement of this part, including a failure to provide appropriate training and certification, shall not be eligible for participation in any program supported in whole or in part by funds appropriated under this Act.''.

SEC. 3209. EMERGENCY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS.

Subpart 3 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–31 et seq.), as amended by section 3111, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 520F. GRANTS FOR EMERGENCY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS.

''(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall award grants to States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes, and tribal organizations to support the designation of hospitals and health centers as Emergency Mental Health Centers.

''(b) HEALTH CENTER.—In this section, the term 'health center' has the meaning given such term in section 330, and includes community health centers and community mental health centers.

''(c) DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS.—The Secretary shall ensure that such grants awarded under subsection (a) are equitably distributed among the geographical regions of the United States, between urban and rural populations, and between different settings of care including health centers, mental health centers, hospitals, and other psychiatric units or facilities.

''(d) APPLICATION.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization that desires a grant under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including a plan for the rigorous evaluation of activities carried out with funds received under this section.

''(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization receiving a grant under subsection (a) shall use funds from such grant to establish or designate hospitals and health centers as Emergency Mental Health Centers.

''(2) EMERGENCY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS.—Such Emergency Mental Health Centers described in paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall—

''(i) serve as a central receiving point in the community for individuals who may be in need of emergency mental health services;

''(ii) purchase, if needed, any equipment necessary to evaluate, diagnose and stabilize an individual with a mental illness;

''(iii) provide training, if needed, to the medical personnel staffing the Emergency Mental Health Center to evaluate, diagnose, stabilize, and treat an individual with a mental illness; and

''(iv) provide any treatment that is necessary for an individual with a mental illness or a referral for such individual to another facility where such treatment may be received; and

''(B) may establish and train a mobile crisis intervention team to respond to mental health emergencies within the community.

''(f) EVALUATION.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization that receives a grant under subsection (a) shall prepare and submit an evaluation to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require, including an evaluation of activities carried out with funds received under this section and a process and outcomes evaluation.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2003.''.

SEC. 3210. GRANTS FOR JAIL DIVERSION PROGRAMS.

Subpart 3 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–31 et seq.), as amended by section 3209, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 520G. GRANTS FOR JAIL DIVERSION PROGRAMS.

''(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall make up to 125 grants to States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes, and tribal organizations, acting directly or through agreements with other public or nonprofit entities, to develop and implement programs to divert individuals with a mental illness from the criminal justice system to community-based services.

''(b) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the Attorney General and any other appropriate officials in carrying out this section.

''(2) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall issue regulations and guidelines necessary to carry out this section, including methodologies and outcome measures for evaluating programs carried out by States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes, and tribal organizations receiving grants under subsection (a).

''(c) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To receive a grant under subsection (a), the chief executive of a State, chief executive of a subdivision of a State, Indian tribe or tribal organization shall prepare and submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary shall reasonably require.

''(2) CONTENT.—Such application shall—

''(A) contain an assurance that—

''(i) community-based mental health services will be available for the individuals who are diverted from the criminal justice system, and that such services are based on the best known practices, reflect current research findings, include case management, assertive community treatment, medication management and access, integrated mental health and co-occurring substance abuse treatment, and psychiatric rehabilitation, and will be coordinated with social services, including life skills training, housing placement, vocational training, education job placement, and health care;

''(ii) there has been relevant interagency collaboration between the appropriate criminal justice, mental health, and substance abuse systems; and

''(iii) the Federal support provided will be used to supplement, and not supplant, State, local, Indian tribe, or tribal organization sources of funding that would otherwise be available;

''(B) demonstrate that the diversion program will be integrated with an existing system of care for those with mental illness;

''(C) explain the applicant's inability to fund the program adequately without Federal assistance;

''(D) specify plans for obtaining necessary support and continuing the proposed program following the conclusion of Federal support; and

''(E) describe methodology and outcome measures that will be used in evaluating the program.

''(d) USE OF FUNDS.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization that receives a grant under subsection (a) may use funds received under such grant to—

''(1) integrate the diversion program into the existing system of care;

''(2) create or expand community-based mental health and co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse services to accommodate the diversion program;

''(3) train professionals involved in the system of care, and law enforcement officers, attorneys, and judges; and

''(4) provide community outreach and crisis intervention.

''(e) FEDERAL SHARE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall pay to a State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization receiving a grant under subsection (a) the Federal share of the cost of activities described in the application.

''(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of a grant made under this section shall not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of the program carried out by the State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization. Such share shall be used for new expenses of the program carried out by such State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization.

''(3) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of payments made under this section may be made in cash or in kind fairly evaluated, including planned equipment or services. The Secretary may waive the requirement of matching contributions.

''(f) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall ensure that such grants awarded under subsection (a) are equitably distributed among the geographical regions of the United States and between urban and rural populations.

''(g) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Training and technical assistance may be provided by the Secretary to assist a State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization receiving a grant under subsection (a) in establishing and operating a diversion program.

''(h) EVALUATIONS.—The programs described in subsection (a) shall be evaluated not less than 1 time in every 12-month period using the methodology and outcome measures identified in the grant application.

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2002 through 2003.''.

SEC. 3211. IMPROVING OUTCOMES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS THROUGH SERVICES INTEGRATION BETWEEN CHILD WELFARE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.

Subpart 3 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–31 et seq.), as amended by section 3210, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 520H. IMPROVING OUTCOMES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS THROUGH SERVICES INTEGRATION BETWEEN CHILD WELFARE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts or cooperative agreements to States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes, and tribal organizations to provide integrated child welfare and mental health services for children and adolescents under 19 years of age in the child welfare system or at risk for becoming part of the system, and parents or caregivers with a mental illness or a mental illness and a co-occurring substance abuse disorder.

''(b) DURATION.—With respect to a grant, contract or cooperative agreement awarded under this section, the period during which payments under such award are made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years.

''(c) APPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive an award under subsection (a), a State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

''(2) CONTENT.—An application submitted under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) describe the program to be funded under the grant, contract or cooperative agreement;

''(B) explain how such program reflects best practices in the provision of child welfare and mental health services; and

''(C) provide assurances that—

''(i) persons providing services under the grant, contract or cooperative agreement are adequately trained to provide such services; and

''(ii) the services will be provided in accordance with subsection (d).

''(d) USE OF FUNDS.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization that receives a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall use amounts made available through such grant, contract or cooperative agreement to—

''(1) provide family-centered, comprehensive, and coordinated child welfare and mental health services, including prevention, early intervention and treatment services for children and adolescents, and for their parents or caregivers;

''(2) ensure a single point of access for such coordinated services;

''(3) provide integrated mental health and substance abuse treatment for children, adolescents, and parents or caregivers with a mental illness and a co-occurring substance abuse disorder;

''(4) provide training for the child welfare, mental health and substance abuse professionals who will participate in the program carried out under this section;

''(5) provide technical assistance to child welfare and mental health agencies;

''(6) develop cooperative efforts with other service entities in the community, including education, social services, juvenile justice, and primary health care agencies;

''(7) coordinate services with services provided under the medicaid program and the State Children's Health Insurance Program under titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act;

''(8) provide linguistically appropriate and culturally competent services; and

''(9) evaluate the effectiveness and cost-efficiency of the integrated services that measure the level of coordination, outcome measures for parents or caregivers with a mental illness or a mental illness and a co-occurring substance abuse disorder, and outcome measures for children.

''(e) DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS.—The Secretary shall ensure that grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements awarded under subsection (a) are equitably distributed among the geographical regions of the United States and between urban and rural populations.

''(f) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate each program carried out by a State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization under subsection (a) and shall disseminate the findings with respect to each such evaluation to appropriate public and private entities.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

SEC. 3212. GRANTS FOR THE INTEGRATED TREATMENT OF SERIOUS MENTAL ILLNESS AND CO-OCCURRING SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

Subpart 3 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–31 et seq.), as amended by section 3211, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 520I. GRANTS FOR THE INTEGRATED TREATMENT OF SERIOUS MENTAL ILLNESS AND CO-OCCURRING SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and private nonprofit organizations for the development or expansion of programs to provide integrated treatment services for individuals with a serious mental illness and a co-occurring substance abuse disorder.

''(b) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to applicants that emphasize the provision of services for individuals with a serious mental illness and a co-occurring substance abuse disorder who—

''(1) have a history of interactions with law enforcement or the criminal justice system;

''(2) have recently been released from incarceration;

''(3) have a history of unsuccessful treatment in either an inpatient or outpatient setting;

''(4) have never followed through with outpatient services despite repeated referrals; or

''(5) are homeless.

''(c) USE OF FUNDS.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, tribal organization, or private nonprofit organization that receives a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall use funds received under such grant—

''(1) to provide fully integrated services rather than serial or parallel services;

''(2) to employ staff that are cross-trained in the diagnosis and treatment of both serious mental illness and substance abuse;

''(3) to provide integrated mental health and substance abuse services at the same location;

''(4) to provide services that are linguistically appropriate and culturally competent;

''(5) to provide at least 10 programs for integrated treatment of both mental illness and substance abuse at sites that previously provided only mental health services or only substance abuse services; and

''(6) to provide services in coordination with other existing public and private community programs.

''(d) CONDITION.—The Secretary shall ensure that a State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, tribal organization, or private nonprofit organization that receives a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) maintains the level of effort necessary to sustain existing mental health and substance abuse programs for other populations served by mental health systems in the community.

''(e) DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS.—The Secretary shall ensure that grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements awarded under subsection (a) are equitably distributed among the geographical regions of the United States and between urban and rural populations.

''(f) DURATION.—The Secretary shall award grants, contract, or cooperative agreements under this subsection for a period of not more than 5 years.

''(g) APPLICATION.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, tribal organization, or private nonprofit organization that desires a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this subsection shall prepare and submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. Such application shall include a plan for the rigorous evaluation of activities funded with an award under such subsection, including a process and outcomes evaluation.

''(h) EVALUATION.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, tribal organization, or private nonprofit organization that receives a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this subsection shall prepare and submit a plan

for the rigorous evaluation of the program funded under such grant, contract, or agreement, including both process and outcomes evaluation, and the submission of an evaluation at the end of the project period.

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2002 through 2003.''.

SEC. 3213. TRAINING GRANTS.

Subpart 3 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–31 et seq.), as amended by section 3212, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 520J. TRAINING GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants in accordance with the provisions of this section.

''(b) MENTAL ILLNESS AWARENESS TRAINING GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants to States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and nonprofit private entities to train teachers and other relevant school personnel to recognize symptoms of childhood and adolescent mental disorders, to refer family members to the appropriate mental health services if necessary, to train emergency services personnel to identify and appropriately respond to persons with a mental illness, and to provide education to such teachers and personnel regarding resources that are available in the community for individuals with a mental illness.

''(2) EMERGENCY SERVICES PERSONNEL.—In this subsection, the term 'emergency services personnel' includes paramedics, firefighters, and emergency medical technicians.

''(3) DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS.—The Secretary shall ensure that such grants awarded under this subsection are equitably distributed among the geographical regions of the United States and between urban and rural populations.

''(4) APPLICATION.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, tribal organization, or nonprofit private entity that desires a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including a plan for the rigorous evaluation of activities that are carried out with funds received under a grant under this subsection.

''(5) USE OF FUNDS.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, tribal organization, or nonprofit private entity receiving a grant under this subsection shall use funds from such grant to—

''(A) train teachers and other relevant school personnel to recognize symptoms of childhood and adolescent mental disorders and appropriately respond;

''(B) train emergency services personnel to identify and appropriately respond to persons with a mental illness; and

''(C) provide education to such teachers and personnel regarding resources that are available in the community for individuals with a mental illness.

''(6) EVALUATION.—A State, political subdivision of a State, Indian tribe, tribal organization, or nonprofit private entity that receives a grant under this subsection shall prepare and submit an evaluation to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require, including an evaluation of activities carried out with funds received under the grant under this subsection and a process and outcome evaluation.

''(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection, $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2003.''.

TITLE XXXIII—PROVISIONS RELATING TO SUBSTANCE ABUSE

SEC. 3301. PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT NEEDS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

(a) RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT PROGRAMS FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—Section 508(r) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–1(r)) is amended to read as follows:

''(r) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to fiscal years 2001 through 2003.''.

(b) PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT.—Section 509 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–1) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 509. PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT NEEDS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

''(a) PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall address priority substance abuse treatment needs of regional and national significance (as determined under subsection (b)) through the provision of or through assistance for—

''(1) knowledge development and application projects for treatment and rehabilitation and the conduct or support of evaluations of such projects;

''(2) training and technical assistance; and

''(3) targeted capacity response programs.

The Secretary may carry out the activities described in this section directly or through grants or cooperative agreements with States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes and tribal organizations, other public or nonprofit private entities.

''(b) PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT NEEDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Priority substance abuse treatment needs of regional and national significance shall be determined by the Secretary after consultation with States and other interested groups. The Secretary shall meet with the States and interested groups on an annual basis to discuss program priorities.

''(2) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—In developing program priorities under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give special consideration to promoting the integration of substance abuse treatment services into primary health care systems.

''(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Recipients of grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this section shall comply with information and application requirements determined appropriate by the Secretary.

''(2) DURATION OF AWARD.—With respect to a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded under this section, the period during which payments under such award are made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years.

''(3) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Secretary may, for projects carried out under subsection (a), require that entities that apply for grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under that project provide non-Federal matching funds, as determined appropriate by the Secretary, to ensure the institutional commitment of the entity to the projects funded under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement. Such non-Federal matching funds may be provided directly or through donations from public or private entities and may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services.

''(4) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—With respect to activities for which a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement is awarded under this section, the Secretary may require that recipients for specific projects under subsection (a) agree to maintain expenditures of non-Federal amounts for such activities at a level that is not less than the level of such expenditures maintained by the entity for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the entity receives such a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.

''(d) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate each project carried out under subsection (a)(1) and shall disseminate the findings with respect to each such evaluation to appropriate public and private entities.

''(e) INFORMATION AND EDUCATION.—The Secretary shall establish comprehensive information and education programs to disseminate and apply the findings of the knowledge development and application, training and technical assistance programs, and targeted capacity response programs under this section to the general public, to health professionals and other interested groups. The Secretary shall make every effort to provide linkages between the findings of supported projects and State agencies responsible for carrying out substance abuse prevention and treatment programs.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $300,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The following sections of the Public Health Service Act are repealed:

(1) Section 510 (42 U.S.C. 290bb–3).
(2) Section 511 (42 U.S.C. 290bb–4).
(3) Section 512 (42 U.S.C. 290bb–5).
(4) Section 571 (42 U.S.C. 290gg).

SEC. 3302. PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION NEEDS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 516 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–1) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 516. PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION NEEDS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

''(a) PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall address priority substance abuse prevention needs of regional and national significance (as determined under subsection (b)) through the provision of or through assistance for—

''(1) knowledge development and application projects for prevention and the conduct or support of evaluations of such projects;

''(2) training and technical assistance; and

''(3) targeted capacity response programs.

The Secretary may carry out the activities described in this section directly or through grants or cooperative agreements with States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes and tribal organizations, or other public or nonprofit private entities.

''(b) PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION NEEDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Priority substance abuse prevention needs of regional and national significance shall be determined by the Secretary in consultation with the States and other interested groups. The Secretary shall meet with the States and interested groups on an annual basis to discuss program priorities.

''(2) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—In developing program priorities under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give special consideration to—

''(A) applying the most promising strategies and research-based primary prevention approaches; and

''(B) promoting the integration of substance abuse prevention information and activities into primary health care systems.

''(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Recipients of grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under this section shall comply with information and application requirements determined appropriate by the Secretary.

''(2) DURATION OF AWARD.—With respect to a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded under this section, the period during which payments under such award are made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years.

''(3) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Secretary may, for projects carried out under subsection (a), require that entities that apply for grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under that project provide non-Federal matching funds, as determined appropriate by the Secretary, to ensure the institutional commitment of the entity

to the projects funded under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement. Such non-Federal matching funds may be provided directly or through donations from public or private entities and may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services.

''(4) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—With respect to activities for which a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement is awarded under this section, the Secretary may require that recipients for specific projects under subsection (a) agree to maintain expenditures of non-Federal amounts for such activities at a level that is not less than the level of such expenditures maintained by the entity for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the entity receives such a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.

''(d) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate each project carried out under subsection (a)(1) and shall disseminate the findings with respect to each such evaluation to appropriate public and private entities.

''(e) INFORMATION AND EDUCATION.—The Secretary shall establish comprehensive information and education programs to disseminate the findings of the knowledge development and application, training and technical assistance programs, and targeted capacity response programs under this section to the general public and to health professionals. The Secretary shall make every effort to provide linkages between the findings of supported projects and State agencies responsible for carrying out substance abuse prevention and treatment programs.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $300,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 518 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–24) is repealed.

SEC. 3303. SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIP BLOCK GRANT.

(a) ALLOCATION REGARDING ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS.—Section 1922 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–22) is amended by—

(1) striking subsection (a); and

(2) redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (a) and (b).

(b) GROUP HOMES FOR RECOVERING SUBSTANCE ABUSERS.—Section 1925(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–25(a)) is amended by striking ''For fiscal year 1993'' and all that follows through the colon and inserting the following: ''A State, using funds available under section 1921, may establish and maintain the ongoing operation of a revolving fund in accordance with this section to support group homes for recovering substance abusers as follows:''.

(c) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—Section 1930 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–30) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d) respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a), the following:

''(b) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FUNDS.—The Secretary may exclude from the aggregate State expenditures under subsection (a), funds appropriated to the principle agency for authorized activities which are of a non-recurring nature and for a specific purpose.''.

(d) APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS.—Section 1932(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–32(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) the application is received by the Secretary not later than October 1 of the fiscal year for which the State is seeking funds;''.

(e) WAIVER FOR TERRITORIES.—Section 1932(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–32(c)) is amended by striking ''whose allotment under section 1921 for the fiscal year is the amount specified in section 1933(c)(2)(B)'' and inserting ''except Puerto Rico''.

(f) WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1932 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–32) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of a State, the Secretary may waive the requirements of all or part of the sections described in paragraph (2) using objective criteria established by the Secretary by regulation after consultation with the States and other interested parties including consumers and providers.

''(2) SECTIONS.—The sections described in paragraph (1) are sections 1922(c), 1923, 1924 and 1928.

''(3) DATE CERTAIN FOR ACTING UPON REQUEST.—The Secretary shall approve or deny a request for a waiver under paragraph (1) and inform the State of that decision not later than 120 days after the date on which the request and all the information needed to support the request are submitted.

''(4) ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall annually report to the general public on the States that receive a waiver under this subsection.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Effective upon the publication of the regulations developed in accordance with section 1932(e)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–32(d))—

(A) section 1922(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–22(c)) is amended by—

(i) striking paragraph (2); and

(ii) redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(B) section 1928(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–28(d)) is repealed.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—Section 1935 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–35) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''$1,500,000,000'' and all that follows through the end and inserting ''$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''section 505'' and inserting ''sections 505 and 1971'';

(3) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''1949(a)'' and inserting ''1948(a)''; and

(4) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

''(3) CORE DATA SET.—A State that receives a new grant, contract, or cooperative agreement from amounts available to the Secretary under paragraph (1), for the purposes of improving the data collection, analysis and reporting capabilities of the State, shall be required, as a condition of receipt of funds, to collect, analyze, and report to the Secretary for each fiscal year subsequent to receiving such funds a core data set to be determined by the Secretary in conjunction with the States.''.

SEC. 3304. DETERMINATION OF ALLOTMENTS.

Section 1933(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–33(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) MINIMUM ALLOTMENTS FOR STATES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to fiscal year 2000, and each subsequent fiscal year, the amount of the allotment of a State under section 1921 shall not be less than the amount the State received under such section for the previous fiscal year increased by an amount equal to 30.65 percent of the percentage by which the aggregate amount allotted to all States for such fiscal year exceeds the aggregate amount allotted to all States for the previous fiscal year.

''(2) LIMITATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a State shall not receive an allotment under section 1921 for a fiscal year in an amount that is less than an amount equal to 0.375 percent of the amount appropriated under section 1935(a) for such fiscal year.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—In applying subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall ensure that no State receives an increase in its allotment under section 1921 for a fiscal year (as compared to the amount allotted to the State in the prior fiscal year) that is in excess of an amount equal to 300 percent of the percentage by which the amount appropriated under section 1935(a) for such fiscal year exceeds the amount appropriated for the prior fiscal year.

''(3) DECREASE IN OR EQUAL APPROPRIATIONS.—If the amount appropriated under section 1935(a) for a fiscal year is equal to or less than the amount appropriated under such section for the prior fiscal year, the amount of the State allotment under section 1921 shall be equal to the amount that the State received under section 1921 in the prior fiscal year decreased by the percentage by which the amount appropriated for such fiscal year is less than the amount appropriated or such section for the prior fiscal year.''.

SEC. 3305. NONDISCRIMINATION AND INSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS FOR RELIGIOUS PROVIDERS.

Subpart III of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–51 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1955. SERVICES PROVIDED BY NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.

''(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

''(1) to prohibit discrimination against nongovernmental organizations and certain individuals on the basis of religion in the distribution of government funds to provide substance abuse services under this title and title V, and the receipt of services under such titles; and

''(2) to allow the organizations to accept the funds to provide the services to the individuals without impairing the religious character of the organizations or the religious freedom of the individuals.

''(b) RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS INCLUDED AS NONGOVERNMENTAL PROVIDERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State may administer and provide substance abuse services under any program under this title or title V through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to provide assistance to beneficiaries under such titles with nongovernmental organizations.

''(2) REQUIREMENT.—A State that elects to utilize nongovernmental organizations as provided for under paragraph (1) shall consider, on the same basis as other nongovernmental organizations, religious organizations to provide services under substance abuse programs under this title or title V, so long as the programs under such titles are implemented in a manner consistent with the Establishment Clause of the first amendment to the Constitution. Neither the Federal Government nor a State or local government receiving funds under such programs shall discriminate against an organization that provides services under, or applies to provide services under, such programs, on the basis that the organization has a religious character.

''(c) RELIGIOUS CHARACTER AND INDEPENDENCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A religious organization that provides services under any substance abuse program under this title or title V shall retain its independence from Federal, State, and local governments, including such organization's control over the definition, development, practice, and expression of its religious beliefs.

''(2) ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDS.—Neither the Federal Government nor a State or local government shall require a religious organization—

''(A) to alter its form of internal governance; or

''(B) to remove religious art, icons, scripture, or other symbols;

in order to be eligible to provide services under any substance abuse program under this title or title V.

''(d) EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—

''(1) SUBSTANCE ABUSE.—A religious organization that provides services under any substance

abuse program under this title or title V may require that its employees providing services under such program adhere to rules forbidding the use of drugs or alcohol.

''(2) TITLE VII EXEMPTION.—The exemption of a religious organization provided under section 702 or 703(e)(2) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–1, 2000e–2(e)(2)) regarding employment practices shall not be affected by the religious organization's provision of services under, or receipt of funds from, any substance abuse program under this title or title V.

''(e) RIGHTS OF BENEFICIARIES OF ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If an individual described in paragraph (3) has an objection to the religious character of the organization from which the individual receives, or would receive, services funded under any substance abuse program under this title or title V, the appropriate Federal, State, or local governmental entity shall provide to such individual (if otherwise eligible for such services) within a reasonable period of time after the date of such objection, services that—

''(A) are from an alternative provider that is accessible to the individual; and

''(B) have a value that is not less than the value of the services that the individual would have received from such organization.

''(2) NOTICE.—The appropriate Federal, State, or local governmental entity shall ensure that notice is provided to individuals described in paragraph (3) of the rights of such individuals under this section.

''(3) INDIVIDUAL DESCRIBED.—An individual described in this paragraph is an individual who receives or applies for services under any substance abuse program under this title or title V.

''(f) NONDISCRIMINATION AGAINST BENEFICIARIES.—A religious organization providing services through a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under any substance abuse program under this title or title V shall not discriminate, in carrying out such program, against an individual described in subsection (e)(3) on the basis of religion, a religious belief, a refusal to hold a religious belief, or a refusal to actively participate in a religious practice.

''(g) FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any religious organization providing services under any substance abuse program under this title or title V shall be subject to the same regulations as other nongovernmental organizations to account in accord with generally accepted accounting principles for the use of such funds provided under such program.

''(2) LIMITED AUDIT.—Such organization shall segregate government funds provided under such substance abuse program into a separate account. Only the government funds shall be subject to audit by the government.

''(h) COMPLIANCE.—Any party that seeks to enforce such party's rights under this section may assert a civil action for injunctive relief exclusively in an appropriate Federal or State court against the entity, agency or official that allegedly commits such violation.

''(i) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—No funds provided through a grant or contract to a religious organization to provide services under any substance abuse program under this title or title V shall be expended for sectarian worship, instruction, or proselytization.

''(j) EFFECT ON STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS.—If a State or local government contributes State or local funds to carry out any substance abuse program under this title or title V, the State or local government may segregate the State or local funds from the Federal funds provided to carry out the program or may commingle the State or local funds with the Federal funds. If the State or local government commingles the State or local funds, the provisions of this section shall apply to the commingled funds in the same manner, and to the same extent, as the provisions apply to the Federal funds.

''(k) TREATMENT OF INTERMEDIATE CONTRACTORS.—If a nongovernmental organization (referred to in this subsection as an 'intermediate organization'), acting under a contract or other agreement with the Federal Government or a State or local government, is given the authority under the contract or agreement to select nongovernmental organizations to provide services under any substance abuse program under this title or title V, the intermediate organization shall have the same duties under this section as the government but shall retain all other rights of a nongovernmental organization under this section.''.

SEC. 3306. ALCOHOL AND DRUG PREVENTION OR TREATMENT SERVICES FOR INDIANS AND NATIVE ALASKANS.

Part A of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 506A. ALCOHOL AND DRUG PREVENTION OR TREATMENT SERVICES FOR INDIANS AND NATIVE ALASKANS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to public and private nonprofit entities, including Native Alaskan entities and Indian tribes and tribal organizations, for the purpose of providing alcohol and drug prevention or treatment services for Indians and Native Alaskans.

''(b) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to applicants that—

''(1) propose to provide alcohol and drug prevention or treatment services on reservations;

''(2) propose to employ culturally-appropriate approaches, as determined by the Secretary, in providing such services; and

''(3) have provided prevention or treatment services to Native Alaskan entities and Indian tribes and tribal organizations for at least 1 year prior to applying for a grant under this section.

''(c) DURATION.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) for a period not to exceed 5 years.

''(d) APPLICATION.—An entity desiring a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

''(e) EVALUATION.—An entity that receives a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall submit, in the application for such grant, a plan for the evaluation of any project undertaken with funds provided under this section. Such entity shall provide the Secretary with periodic evaluations of the progress of such project and such evaluation at the completion of such project as the Secretary determines to be appropriate. The final evaluation submitted by such entity shall include a recommendation as to whether such project shall continue.

''(f) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare and submit, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, a report describing the services provided pursuant to this section.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

SEC. 3307. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established a commission to be known as the Commission on Indian and Native Alaskan Health Care that shall examine the health concerns of Indians and Native Alaskans who reside on reservations and tribal lands (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Commission').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission established under subsection (a) shall consist of—

(A) the Secretary;

(B) 15 members who are experts in the health care field and issues that the Commission is established to examine; and

(C) the Director of the Indian Health Service and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who shall be nonvoting members.

(2) APPOINTING AUTHORITY.—Of the 15 members of the Commission described in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) 2 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(B) 2 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives;

(C) 2 shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate;

(D) 2 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate; and

(E) 7 shall be appointed by the Secretary.

(3) LIMITATION.—Not fewer than 10 of the members appointed to the Commission shall be Indians or Native Alaskans.

(4) CHAIRPERSON.—The Secretary shall serve as the Chairperson of the Commission.

(5) EXPERTS.—The Commission may seek the expertise of any expert in the health care field to carry out its duties.

(c) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filed in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.—The Commission shall—

(1) study the health concerns of Indians and Native Alaskans; and

(2) prepare the reports described in subsection (i).

(e) POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.—

(1) HEARINGS.—The Commission may hold such hearings, including hearings on reservations, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such information as the Commission considers advisable to carry out the purpose for which the Commission was established.

(2) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out the purpose for which the Commission was established. Upon request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(f) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), each member of the Commission may be compensated at a rate not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time), during which that member is engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission.

(2) LIMITATION.—Members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additional pay on account of their service on the Commission.

(g) TRAVEL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(h) COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in accordance with rules established by the Commission, may select and appoint a staff director and other personnel necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its duties.

(2) COMPENSATION OF PERSONNEL.—The Secretary, in accordance with rules established by

the Commission, may set the amount of compensation to be paid to the staff director and any other personnel that serve the Commission.

(3) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and the detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(4) CONSULTANT SERVICES.—The Chairperson of the Commission is authorized to procure the temporary and intermittent services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title.

(i) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, a report that shall—

(A) detail the health problems faced by Indians and Native Alaskans who reside on reservations;

(B) examine and explain the causes of such problems;

(C) describe the health care services available to Indians and Native Alaskans who reside on reservations and the adequacy of such services;

(D) identify the reasons for the provision of inadequate health care services for Indians and Native Alaskans who reside on reservations, including the availability of resources;

(E) develop measures for tracking the health status of Indians and Native Americans who reside on reservations; and

(F) make recommendations for improvements in the health care services provided for Indians and Native Alaskans who reside on reservations, including recommendations for legislative change.

(2) EXCEPTION.—In addition to the report required under paragraph (1), not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, a report that describes any alcohol and drug abuse among Indians and Native Alaskans who reside on reservations.

(j) PERMANENT COMMISSION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Commission.

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

TITLE XXXIV—PROVISIONS RELATING TO FLEXIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 3401. GENERAL AUTHORITIES AND PEER REVIEW.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITIES.—Paragraph (1) of section 501(e) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There may be in the Administration an Associate Administrator for Alcohol Prevention and Treatment Policy to whom the Administrator may delegate the functions of promoting, monitoring, and evaluating service programs for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism and alcohol abuse within the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment and the Center for Mental Health Services, and coordinating such programs among the Centers, and among the Centers and other public and private entities. The Associate Administrator also may ensure that alcohol prevention, education, and policy strategies are integrated into all programs of the Centers that address substance abuse prevention, education, and policy, and that the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention addresses the Healthy People 2010 goals and the National Dietary Guidelines of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Agriculture related to alcohol consumption.''.

(b) PEER REVIEW.—Section 504 of the Public Health Service (42 U.S.C. 290aa–3) is amended as follows:

''SEC. 504. PEER REVIEW.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, after consultation with the Administrator, shall require appropriate peer review of grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts to be administered through the agency which exceed the simple acquisition threshold as defined in section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act.

''(b) MEMBERS.—The members of any peer review group established under subsection (a) shall be individuals who by virtue of their training or experience are eminently qualified to perform the review functions of the group. Not more than ¼ of the members of any such peer review group shall be officers or employees of the United States.

''(c) ADVISORY COUNCIL REVIEW.—If the direct cost of a grant or cooperative agreement (described in subsection (a)) exceeds the simple acquisition threshold as defined by section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, the Secretary may make such a grant or cooperative agreement only if such grant or cooperative agreement is recommended—

''(1) after peer review required under subsection (a); and

''(2) by the appropriate advisory council.

''(d) CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may establish limited exceptions to the limitations contained in this section regarding participation of Federal employees and advisory council approval. The circumstances under which the Secretary may make such an exception shall be made public.''.

SEC. 3402. ADVISORY COUNCILS.

Section 502(e) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa–1(e)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''3 times'' and inserting ''2 times''.

SEC. 3403. GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR THE PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIP BLOCK GRANTS.

(a) PLANS FOR PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIPS.—Section 1949 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–59) is amended as follows:

''SEC. 1949. PLANS FOR PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIPS.

''(a) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary in conjunction with States and other interested groups shall develop separate plans for the programs authorized under subparts I and II for creating more flexibility for States and accountability based on outcome and other performance measures. The plans shall each include—

''(1) a description of the flexibility that would be given to the States under the plan;

''(2) the common set of performance measures that would be used for accountability, including measures that would be used for the program under subpart II for pregnant addicts, HIV transmission, tuberculosis, and those with a co-occurring substance abuse and mental disorders, and for programs under subpart I for children with serious emotional disturbance and adults with serious mental illness and for individuals with co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders;

''(3) the definitions for the data elements to be used under the plan;

''(4) the obstacles to implementation of the plan and the manner in which such obstacles would be resolved;

''(5) the resources needed to implement the performance partnerships under the plan; and

''(6) an implementation strategy complete with recommendations for any necessary legislation.

''(b) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the plans developed under subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives.

''(c) INFORMATION.—As the elements of the plans described in subsection (a) are developed, States are encouraged to provide information to the Secretary on a voluntary basis.

''(d) PARTICIPANTS.—The Secretary shall include among those interested groups that participate in the development of the plan consumers of mental health or substance abuse services, providers, representatives of political divisions of States, and representatives of racial and ethnic groups including Native Americans.''.

(b) AVAILABILITY TO STATES OF GRANT PROGRAMS.—Section 1952 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–62) is amended as follows:

''SEC. 1952. AVAILABILITY TO STATES OF GRANT PAYMENTS.

''Any amounts paid to a State for a fiscal year under section 1911 or 1921 shall be available for obligation and expenditure until the end of the fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the amounts were paid.''.

SEC. 3404. DATA INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

Part C of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300y et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking the headings for part C and subpart I and inserting the following:

''PART C—CERTAIN PROGRAMS REGARDING MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE

''Subpart I—Data Infrastructure Development'';

(2) by striking section 1971 (42 U.S.C. 300y) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 1971. DATA INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to, and enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with States for the purpose of developing and operating mental health or substance abuse data collection, analysis, and reporting systems with regard to performance measures including capacity, process, and outcomes measures.

''(b) PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall establish criteria to ensure that services will be available under this section to States that have a fundamental basis for the collection, analysis, and reporting of mental health and substance abuse performance measures and States that do not have such basis. The Secretary will establish criteria for determining whether a State has a fundamental basis for the collection, analysis, and reporting of data.

''(c) CONDITION OF RECEIPT OF FUNDS.—As a condition of the receipt of an award under this section a State shall agree to collect, analyze, and report to the Secretary within 2 years of the date of the award on a core set of performance measures to be determined by the Secretary in conjunction with the States.

''(d) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the costs of the program to be carried out under subsection (a) by a State, the Secretary may make an award under such subsection only if the applicant agrees to make available (directly or through donations from public or private entities) non-Federal contributions toward such costs in an amount that is not less than 50 percent of such costs.

''(2) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED.—Non-Federal contributions under paragraph (1) may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services. Amounts provided by the Federal Government, or services assisted or subsidized to any significant extent by the Federal Government, may not be included in determining the amount of such contributions.

''(e) DURATION OF SUPPORT.—The period during which payments may be made for a project under subsection (a) may be not less than 3 years nor more than 5 years.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001, 2002 and 2003.

''(2) ALLOCATION.—Of the amounts appropriated under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, 50 percent shall be expended to support data infrastructure development for mental health and 50 percent shall be expended to support data infrastructure development for substance abuse.''.

SEC. 3405. REPEAL OF OBSOLETE ADDICT REFERRAL PROVISIONS.

(a) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT AUTHORITIES.—Part E of title III (42 U.S.C. 257 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE NARA AUTHORITIES.—Titles III and IV of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–793) are repealed.

(c) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE TITLE 28 AUTHORITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 175 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents to part VI of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking the items relating to chapter 175.

SEC. 3406. INDIVIDUALS WITH CO-OCCURRING DISORDERS.

The Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after section 503 (42 U.S.C. 290aa–2) the following:

''SEC. 503A. REPORT ON INDIVIDUALS WITH CO-OCCURRING MENTAL ILLNESS AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE DISORDERS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall, after consultation with organizations representing States, mental health and substance abuse treatment providers, prevention specialists, individuals receiving treatment services, and family members of such individuals, prepare and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives, a report on prevention and treatment services for individuals who have co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders.

''(b) REPORT CONTENT.—The report under subsection (a) shall be based on data collected from existing Federal and State surveys regarding the treatment of co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders and shall include—

''(1) a summary of the manner in which individuals with co-occurring disorders are receiving treatment, including the most up-to-date information available regarding the number of children and adults with co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders and the manner in which funds provided under sections 1911 and 1921 are being utilized, including the number of such children and adults served with such funds;

''(2) a summary of improvements necessary to ensure that individuals with co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders receive the services they need;

''(3) a summary of practices for preventing substance abuse among individuals who have a mental illness and are at risk of having or acquiring a substance abuse disorder; and

''(4) a summary of evidenced-based practices for treating individuals with co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders and recommendations for implementing such practices.

''(c) FUNDS FOR REPORT.—The Secretary may obligate funds to carry out this section with such appropriations as are available.''.

SEC. 3407. SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH CO-OCCURRING DISORDERS.

Subpart III of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–51 et seq.) (as amended by section 3305) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1956. SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH CO-OCCURRING DISORDERS.

''States may use funds available for treatment under sections 1911 and 1921 to treat persons with co-occurring substance abuse and mental disorders as long as funds available under such sections are used for the purposes for which they were authorized by law and can be tracked for accounting purposes.''.

TITLE XXXV—WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR PHYSICIANS WHO DISPENSE OR PRESCRIBE CERTAIN NARCOTIC DRUGS FOR MAINTENANCE TREATMENT OR DETOXIFICATION TREATMENT

SEC. 3501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Drug Addiction Treatment Act of 2000''.

SEC. 3502. AMENDMENT TO CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 303(g) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''(A) security'' and inserting ''(i) security'', and by striking ''(B) the maintenance'' and inserting ''(ii) the maintenance'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively;

(3) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(g)'';

(4) by striking ''Practitioners who dispense'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (2), practitioners who dispense''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following paragraph:

''(2)(A) Subject to subparagraphs (D) and (J), the requirements of paragraph (1) are waived in the case of the dispensing (including the prescribing), by a practitioner, of narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, or V or combinations of such drugs if the practitioner meets the conditions specified in subparagraph (B) and the narcotic drugs or combinations of such drugs meet the conditions specified in subparagraph (C).

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the conditions specified in this subparagraph with respect to a practitioner are that, before the initial dispensing of narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, or V or combinations of such drugs to patients for maintenance or detoxification treatment, the practitioner submit to the Secretary a notification of the intent of the practitioner to begin dispensing the drugs or combinations for such purpose, and that the notification contain the following certifications by the practitioner:

''(i) The practitioner is a qualifying physician (as defined in subparagraph (G)).

''(ii) With respect to patients to whom the practitioner will provide such drugs or combinations of drugs, the practitioner has the capacity to refer the patients for appropriate counseling and other appropriate ancillary services.

''(iii) In any case in which the practitioner is not in a group practice, the total number of such patients of the practitioner at any one time will not exceed the applicable number. For purposes of this clause, the applicable number is 30, except that the Secretary may by regulation change such total number.

''(iv) In any case in which the practitioner is in a group practice, the total number of such patients of the group practice at any one time will not exceed the applicable number. For purposes of this clause, the applicable number is 30, except that the Secretary may by regulation change such total number, and the Secretary for such purposes may by regulation establish different categories on the basis of the number of practitioners in a group practice and establish for the various categories different numerical limitations on the number of such patients that the group practice may have.

''(C) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the conditions specified in this subparagraph with respect to narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, or V or combinations of such drugs are as follows:

''(i) The drugs or combinations of drugs have, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act, been approved for use in maintenance or detoxification treatment.

''(ii) The drugs or combinations of drugs have not been the subject of an adverse determination. For purposes of this clause, an adverse determination is a determination published in the Federal Register and made by the Secretary, after consultation with the Attorney General, that the use of the drugs or combinations of drugs for maintenance or detoxification treatment requires additional standards respecting the qualifications of practitioners to provide such treatment, or requires standards respecting the quantities of the drugs that may be provided for unsupervised use.

''(D)(i) A waiver under subparagraph (A) with respect to a practitioner is not in effect unless (in addition to conditions under subparagraphs (B) and (C)) the following conditions are met:

''(I) The notification under subparagraph (B) is in writing and states the name of the practitioner.

''(II) The notification identifies the registration issued for the practitioner pursuant to subsection (f).

''(III) If the practitioner is a member of a group practice, the notification states the names of the other practitioners in the practice and identifies the registrations issued for the other practitioners pursuant to subsection (f).

''(ii) Upon receiving a notification under subparagraph (B), the Attorney General shall assign the practitioner involved an identification number under this paragraph for inclusion with the registration issued for the practitioner pursuant to subsection (f). The identification number so assigned shall be appropriate to preserve the confidentiality of patients for whom the practitioner has dispensed narcotic drugs under a waiver under subparagraph (A).

''(iii) Not later than 45 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a notification under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall make a determination of whether the practitioner involved meets all requirements for a waiver under subparagraph (B). If the Secretary fails to make such determination by the end of the such 45-day period, the Attorney General shall assign the physician an identification number described in clause (ii) at the end of such period.

''(E)(i) If a practitioner is not registered under paragraph (1) and, in violation of the conditions specified in subparagraphs (B) through (D), dispenses narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, or V or combinations of such drugs for maintenance treatment or detoxification treatment, the Attorney General may, for purposes of section 304(a)(4), consider the practitioner to have committed an act that renders the registration of the practitioner pursuant to subsection (f) to be inconsistent with the public interest.

''(ii)(I) Upon the expiration of 45 days from the date on which the Secretary receives a notification under subparagraph (B), a practitioner who in good faith submits a notification under subparagraph (B) and reasonably believes that the conditions specified in subparagraphs (B) through (D) have been met shall, in dispensing narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, or V or combinations of such drugs for maintenance treatment or detoxification treatment, be considered to have a waiver under subparagraph (A) until notified otherwise by the Secretary, except that such a practitioner may commence to prescribe or dispense such narcotic drugs for such purposes prior to the expiration of such 45-day period if it facilitates the treatment of an individual patient and both the Secretary and the Attorney General are notified by the practitioner of the intent to commence prescribing or dispensing such narcotic drugs.

''(II) For purposes of subclause (I), the publication in the Federal Register of an adverse determination by the Secretary pursuant to subparagraph (C)(ii) shall (with respect to the narcotic drug or combination involved) be considered to be a notification provided by the Secretary to practitioners, effective upon the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the adverse determination is so published.

''(F)(i) With respect to the dispensing of narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, or V or combinations of such drugs to patients for maintenance or detoxification treatment, a practitioner may, in his or her discretion, dispense such drugs or combinations for such treatment under a registration under paragraph (1) or a waiver under subparagraph (A) (subject to meeting the applicable conditions).

''(ii) This paragraph may not be construed as having any legal effect on the conditions for obtaining a registration under paragraph (1), including with respect to the number of patients who may be served under such a registration.

''(G) For purposes of this paragraph:

''(i) The term 'group practice' has the meaning given such term in section 1877(h)(4) of the Social Security Act.

''(ii) The term 'qualifying physician' means a physician who is licensed under State law and who meets one or more of the following conditions:

''(I) The physician holds a subspecialty board certification in addiction psychiatry from the American Board of Medical Specialties.

''(II) The physician holds an addiction certification from the American Society of Addiction Medicine.

''(III) The physician holds a subspecialty board certification in addiction medicine from the American Osteopathic Association.

''(IV) The physician has, with respect to the treatment and management of opiate-dependent patients, completed not less than eight hours of training (through classroom situations, seminars at professional society meetings, electronic communications, or otherwise) that is provided by the American Society of Addiction Medicine, the American Academy of Addiction Psychiatry, the American Medical Association, the American Osteopathic Association, the American Psychiatric Association, or any other organization that the Secretary determines is appropriate for purposes of this subclause.

''(V) The physician has participated as an investigator in one or more clinical trials leading to the approval of a narcotic drug in schedule III, IV, or V for maintenance or detoxification treatment, as demonstrated by a statement submitted to the Secretary by the sponsor of such approved drug.

''(VI) The physician has such other training or experience as the State medical licensing board (of the State in which the physician will provide maintenance or detoxification treatment) considers to demonstrate the ability of the physician to treat and manage opiate-dependent patients.

''(VII) The physician has such other training or experience as the Secretary considers to demonstrate the ability of the physician to treat and manage opiate-dependent patients. Any criteria of the Secretary under this subclause shall be established by regulation. Any such criteria are effective only for 3 years after the date on which the criteria are promulgated, but may be extended for such additional discrete 3-year periods as the Secretary considers appropriate for purposes of this subclause. Such an extension of criteria may only be effectuated through a statement published in the Federal Register by the Secretary during the 30-day period preceding the end of the 3-year period involved.

''(H)(i) In consultation with the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, the Director of the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, the Secretary shall issue regulations (through notice and comment rulemaking) or issue practice guidelines to address the following:

''(I) Approval of additional credentialing bodies and the responsibilities of additional credentialing bodies.

''(II) Additional exemptions from the requirements of this paragraph and any regulations under this paragraph.

Nothing in such regulations or practice guidelines may authorize any Federal official or employee to exercise supervision or control over the practice of medicine or the manner in which medical services are provided.

''(ii) Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Drug Addiction Treatment Act of 2000, the Secretary shall issue a treatment improvement protocol containing best practice guidelines for the treatment and maintenance of opiate-dependent patients. The Secretary shall develop the protocol in consultation with the Director of the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration and other substance abuse disorder professionals. The protocol shall be guided by science.

''(I) During the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Drug Addiction Treatment Act of 2000, a State may not preclude a practitioner from dispensing or prescribing drugs in schedule III, IV, or V, or combinations of such drugs, to patients for maintenance or detoxification treatment in accordance with this paragraph unless, before the expiration of that 3-year period, the State enacts a law prohibiting a practitioner from dispensing such drugs or combinations of drug.

''(J)(i) This paragraph takes effect on the date of the enactment of the Drug Addiction Treatment Act of 2000, and remains in effect thereafter except as provided in clause (iii) (relating to a decision by the Secretary or the Attorney General that this paragraph should not remain in effect).

''(ii) For purposes relating to clause (iii), the Secretary and the Attorney General may, during the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Drug Addiction Treatment Act of 2000, make determinations in accordance with the following:

''(I) The Secretary may make a determination of whether treatments provided under waivers under subparagraph (A) have been effective forms of maintenance treatment and detoxification treatment in clinical settings; may make a determination of whether such waivers have significantly increased (relative to the beginning of such period) the availability of maintenance treatment and detoxification treatment; and may make a determination of whether such waivers have adverse consequences for the public health.

''(II) The Attorney General may make a determination of the extent to which there have been violations of the numerical limitations established under subparagraph (B) for the number of individuals to whom a practitioner may provide treatment; may make a determination of whether waivers under subparagraph (A) have increased (relative to the beginning of such period) the extent to which narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, or V or combinations of such drugs are being dispensed or possessed in violation of this Act; and may make a determination of whether such waivers have adverse consequences for the public health.

''(iii) If, before the expiration of the period specified in clause (ii), the Secretary or the Attorney General publishes in the Federal Register a decision, made on the basis of determinations under such clause, that this paragraph should not remain in effect, this paragraph ceases to be in effect 60 days after the date on which the decision is so published. The Secretary shall in making any such decision consult with the Attorney General, and shall in publishing the decision in the Federal Register include any comments received from the Attorney General for inclusion in the publication. The Attorney General shall in making any such decision consult with the Secretary, and shall in publishing the decision in the Federal Register include any comments received from the Secretary for inclusion in the publication.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 304 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 824) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter after and below paragraph (5), by striking ''section 303(g)'' each place such term appears and inserting ''section 303(g)(1)''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''section 303(g)'' and inserting ''section 303(g)(1)''.

(c) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of assisting the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the additional duties established for the Secretary pursuant to the amendments made by this section, there are authorized to be appropriated, in addition to other authorizations of appropriations that are available for such purpose, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2003.

TITLE XXXVI—METHAMPHETAMINE AND OTHER CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES

SEC. 3601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Methamphetamine Anti-Proliferation Act of 2000''.

Subtitle A—Methamphetamine Production, Trafficking, and Abuse

PART I—CRIMINAL PENALTIES

SEC. 3611. ENHANCED PUNISHMENT OF AMPHETAMINE LABORATORY OPERATORS.

(a) AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall amend the Federal sentencing guidelines in accordance with this section with respect to any offense relating to the manufacture, importation, exportation, or trafficking in amphetamine (including an attempt or conspiracy to do any of the foregoing) in violation of—

(1) the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.);

(2) the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.); or

(3) the Maritime Drug Law Enforcement Act (46 U.S.C. App. 1901 et seq.).

(b) GENERAL REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out this section, the United States Sentencing Commission shall, with respect to each offense described in subsection (a) relating to amphetamine—

(1) review and amend its guidelines to provide for increased penalties such that those penalties are comparable to the base offense level for methamphetamine; and

(2) take any other action the Commission considers necessary to carry out this subsection.

(c) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the United States Sentencing Commission shall ensure that the sentencing guidelines for offenders convicted of offenses described in subsection (a) reflect the heinous nature of such offenses, the need for aggressive law enforcement action to fight such offenses, and the extreme dangers associated with unlawful activity involving amphetamines, including—

(1) the rapidly growing incidence of amphetamine abuse and the threat to public safety that such abuse poses;

(2) the high risk of amphetamine addiction;

(3) the increased risk of violence associated with amphetamine trafficking and abuse; and

(4) the recent increase in the illegal importation of amphetamine and precursor chemicals.

(d) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY TO SENTENCING COMMISSION.—The United States Sentencing Commission shall promulgate amendments pursuant to this section as soon as practicable after

the date of enactment of this Act in accordance with the procedure set forth in section 21(a) of the Sentencing Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–182), as though the authority under that Act had not expired.

SEC. 3612. ENHANCED PUNISHMENT OF AMPHETAMINE OR METHAMPHETAMINE LABORATORY OPERATORS.

(a) FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall amend the Federal sentencing guidelines in accordance with paragraph (2) with respect to any offense relating to the manufacture, attempt to manufacture, or conspiracy to manufacture amphetamine or methamphetamine in violation of—

(A) the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.);

(B) the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.); or

(C) the Maritime Drug Law Enforcement Act (46 U.S.C. App. 1901 et seq.).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this paragraph, the United States Sentencing Commission shall—

(A) if the offense created a substantial risk of harm to human life (other than a life described in subparagraph (B)) or the environment, increase the base offense level for the offense—

(i) by not less than 3 offense levels above the applicable level in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) if the resulting base offense level after an increase under clause (i) would be less than level 27, to not less than level 27; or

(B) if the offense created a substantial risk of harm to the life of a minor or incompetent, increase the base offense level for the offense—

(i) by not less than 6 offense levels above the applicable level in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) if the resulting base offense level after an increase under clause (i) would be less than level 30, to not less than level 30.

(3) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY TO SENTENCING COMMISSION.—The United States Sentencing Commission shall promulgate amendments pursuant to this subsection as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act in accordance with the procedure set forth in section 21(a) of the Sentencing Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–182), as though the authority under that Act had not expired.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made pursuant to this section shall apply with respect to any offense occurring on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3613. MANDATORY RESTITUTION FOR VIOLATIONS OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT AND CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES IMPORT AND EXPORT ACT RELATING TO AMPHETAMINE AND METHAMPHETAMINE.

(a) MANDATORY RESTITUTION.—Section 413(q) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 853(q)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall'';

(2) by inserting ''amphetamine or'' before ''methamphetamine'' each place it appears;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting '', the State or local government concerned, or both the United States and the State or local government concerned'' after ''United States'' the first place it appears; and

(B) by inserting ''or the State or local government concerned, as the case may be,'' after ''United States'' the second place it appears; and

(4) in paragraph (3), by striking ''section 3663 of title 18, United States Code'' and inserting ''section 3663A of title 18, United States Code''.

(b) DEPOSIT OF AMOUNTS IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND.—Section 524(c)(4) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) all amounts collected—

''(i) by the United States pursuant to a reimbursement order under paragraph (2) of section 413(q) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 853(q)); and

''(ii) pursuant to a restitution order under paragraph (1) or (3) of section 413(q) of the Controlled Substances Act for injuries to the United States.''.

(c) CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN ORDERS OF RESTITUTION.—Section 3663(c)(2)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''which may be'' after ''the fine''.

(d) EXPANSION OF APPLICABILITY OF MANDATORY RESTITUTION.—Section 3663A(c)(1)(A)(ii) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or under section 416(a) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 856(a)),'' after ''under this title,''.

(e) TREATMENT OF ILLICIT SUBSTANCE MANUFACTURING OPERATIONS AS CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY.—Section 416 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 856) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) A violation of subsection (a) shall be considered an offense against property for purposes of section 3663A(c)(1)(A)(ii) of title 18, United States Code.''.

SEC. 3614. METHAMPHETAMINE PARAPHERNALIA.

Section 422(d) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 863(d)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting ''methamphetamine,'' after ''PCP,''.

PART II—ENHANCED LAW ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 3621. ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS ASSOCIATED WITH ILLEGAL MANUFACTURE OF AMPHETAMINE AND METHAMPHETAMINE.

(a) USE OF AMOUNTS OR DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND.—Section 524(c)(1)(E) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(i) for'' before ''disbursements'';

(2) by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) for payment for—

''(I) costs incurred by or on behalf of the Department of Justice in connection with the removal, for purposes of Federal forfeiture and disposition, of any hazardous substance or pollutant or contaminant associated with the illegal manufacture of amphetamine or methamphetamine; and

''(II) costs incurred by or on behalf of a State or local government in connection with such removal in any case in which such State or local government has assisted in a Federal prosecution relating to amphetamine or methamphetamine, to the extent such costs exceed equitable sharing payments made to such State or local government in such case;''.

(b) GRANTS UNDER DRUG CONTROL AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 501(b)(3) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3751(b)(3)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: ''and to remove any hazardous substance or pollutant or contaminant associated with the illegal manufacture of amphetamine or methamphetamine''.

(c) AMOUNTS SUPPLEMENT AND NOT SUPPLANT.—

(1) ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND.—Any amounts made available from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund in a fiscal year by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a) shall supplement, and not supplant, any other amounts made available to the Department of Justice in such fiscal year from other sources for payment of costs described in section 524(c)(1)(E)(ii) of title 28, United States Code, as so amended.

(2) GRANT PROGRAM.—Any amounts made available in a fiscal year under the grant program under section 501(b)(3) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3751(b)(3)) for the removal of hazardous substances or pollutants or contaminants associated with the illegal manufacture of amphetamine or methamphetamine by reason of the amendment made by subsection (b) shall supplement, and not supplant, any other amounts made available in such fiscal year from other sources for such removal.

SEC. 3622. REDUCTION IN RETAIL SALES TRANSACTION THRESHOLD FOR NON-SAFE HARBOR PRODUCTS CONTAINING PSEUDOEPHEDRINE OR PHENYLPROPANOLAMINE.

(a) REDUCTION IN TRANSACTION THRESHOLD.—Section 102(39)(A)(iv)(II) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(39)(A)(iv)(II)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''24 grams'' both places it appears and inserting ''9 grams''; and

(2) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ''and sold in package sizes of not more than 3 grams of pseudoephedrine base or 3 grams of phenylpropanolamine base''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3623. TRAINING FOR DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION AND STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL RELATING TO CLANDESTINE LABORATORIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration shall carry out the programs described in subsection (b) with respect to the law enforcement personnel of States and localities determined by the Administrator to have significant levels of methamphetamine-related or amphetamine-related crime or projected by the Administrator to have the potential for such levels of crime in the future.

(2) DURATION.—The duration of any program under that subsection may not exceed 3 years.

(b) COVERED PROGRAMS.—The programs described in this subsection are as follows:

(1) ADVANCED MOBILE CLANDESTINE LABORATORY TRAINING TEAMS.—A program of advanced mobile clandestine laboratory training teams, which shall provide information and training to State and local law enforcement personnel in techniques utilized in conducting undercover investigations and conspiracy cases, and other information designed to assist in the investigation of the illegal manufacturing and trafficking of amphetamine and methamphetamine.

(2) BASIC CLANDESTINE LABORATORY CERTIFICATION TRAINING.—A program of basic clandestine laboratory certification training, which shall provide information and training—

(A) to Drug Enforcement Administration personnel and State and local law enforcement personnel for purposes of enabling such personnel to meet any certification requirements under law with respect to the handling of wastes created by illegal amphetamine and methamphetamine laboratories; and

(B) to State and local law enforcement personnel for purposes of enabling such personnel to provide the information and training covered by subparagraph (A) to other State and local law enforcement personnel.

(3) CLANDESTINE LABORATORY RECERTIFICATION AND AWARENESS TRAINING.—A program of clandestine laboratory recertification and awareness training, which shall provide information and training to State and local law enforcement personnel for purposes of enabling such personnel to provide recertification and awareness training relating to clandestine laboratories to additional State and local law enforcement personnel.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for

each of fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002 amounts as follows:

(1) $1,500,000 to carry out the program described in subsection (b)(1).

(2) $3,000,000 to carry out the program described in subsection (b)(2).

(3) $1,000,000 to carry out the program described in subsection (b)(3).

SEC. 3624. COMBATING METHAMPHETAMINE AND AMPHETAMINE IN HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall use amounts available under this section to combat the trafficking of methamphetamine and amphetamine in areas designated by the Director as high intensity drug trafficking areas.

(2) ACTIVITIES.—In meeting the requirement in paragraph (1), the Director shall transfer funds to appropriate Federal, State, and local governmental agencies for employing additional Federal law enforcement personnel, or facilitating the employment of additional State and local law enforcement personnel, including agents, investigators, prosecutors, laboratory technicians, chemists, investigative assistants, and drug-prevention specialists.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

(1) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

(2) such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2004.

(c) APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS.—

(1) FACTORS IN APPORTIONMENT.—The Director shall apportion amounts appropriated for a fiscal year pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (b) for activities under subsection (a) among and within areas designated by the Director as high intensity drug trafficking areas based on the following factors:

(A) The number of methamphetamine manufacturing facilities and amphetamine manufacturing facilities discovered by Federal, State, or local law enforcement officials in the previous fiscal year.

(B) The number of methamphetamine prosecutions and amphetamine prosecutions in Federal, State, or local courts in the previous fiscal year.

(C) The number of methamphetamine arrests and amphetamine arrests by Federal, State, or local law enforcement officials in the previous fiscal year.

(D) The amounts of methamphetamine, amphetamine, or listed chemicals (as that term is defined in section 102(33) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(33)) seized by Federal, State, or local law enforcement officials in the previous fiscal year.

(E) Intelligence and predictive data from the Drug Enforcement Administration and the Department of Health and Human Services showing patterns and trends in abuse, trafficking, and transportation in methamphetamine, amphetamine, and listed chemicals (as that term is so defined).

(2) CERTIFICATION.—Before the Director apportions any funds under this subsection to a high intensity drug trafficking area, the Director shall certify that the law enforcement entities responsible for clandestine methamphetamine and amphetamine laboratory seizures in that area are providing laboratory seizure data to the national clandestine laboratory database at the El Paso Intelligence Center.

(d) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 5 percent of the amount appropriated in a fiscal year pursuant to the authorization of appropriations for that fiscal year in subsection (b) may be available in that fiscal year for administrative costs associated with activities under subsection (a).

SEC. 3625. COMBATING AMPHETAMINE AND METHAMPHETAMINE MANUFACTURING AND TRAFFICKING.

(a) ACTIVITIES.—In order to combat the illegal manufacturing and trafficking in amphetamine and methamphetamine, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration may—

(1) assist State and local law enforcement in small and mid-sized communities in all phases of investigations related to such manufacturing and trafficking, including assistance with foreign-language interpretation;

(2) staff additional regional enforcement and mobile enforcement teams related to such manufacturing and trafficking;

(3) establish additional resident offices and posts of duty to assist State and local law enforcement in rural areas in combating such manufacturing and trafficking;

(4) provide the Special Operations Division of the Administration with additional agents and staff to collect, evaluate, interpret, and disseminate critical intelligence targeting the command and control operations of major amphetamine and methamphetamine manufacturing and trafficking organizations;

(5) enhance the investigative and related functions of the Chemical Control Program of the Administration to implement more fully the provisions of the Comprehensive Methamphetamine Control Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–237);

(6) design an effective means of requiring an accurate accounting of the import and export of list I chemicals, and coordinate investigations relating to the diversion of such chemicals;

(7) develop a computer infrastructure sufficient to receive, process, analyze, and redistribute time-sensitive enforcement information from suspicious order reporting to field offices of the Administration and other law enforcement and regulatory agencies, including the continuing development of the Suspicious Order Reporting and Tracking System (SORTS) and the Chemical Transaction Database (CTRANS) of the Administration;

(8) establish an education, training, and communication process in order to alert the industry to current trends and emerging patterns in the illegal manufacturing of amphetamine and methamphetamine; and

(9) carry out such other activities as the Administrator considers appropriate.

(b) ADDITIONAL POSITIONS AND PERSONNEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out activities under subsection (a), the Administrator may establish in the Administration not more than 50 full-time positions, including not more than 31 special-agent positions, and may appoint personnel to such positions.

(2) PARTICULAR POSITIONS.—In carrying out activities under paragraphs (5) through (8) of subsection (a), the Administrator may establish in the Administration not more than 15 full-time positions, including not more than 10 diversion investigator positions, and may appoint personnel to such positions. Any positions established under this paragraph are in addition to any positions established under paragraph (1).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the Drug Enforcement Administration for each fiscal year after fiscal year 1999, $9,500,000 for purposes of carrying out the activities authorized by subsection (a) and employing personnel in positions established under subsection (b), of which $3,000,000 shall be available for activities under paragraphs (5) through (8) of subsection (a) and for employing personnel in positions established under subsection (b)(2).

PART III—ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT

SEC. 3631. EXPANSION OF METHAMPHETAMINE RESEARCH.

Section 464N of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285o–2) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) METHAMPHETAMINE RESEARCH.—

''(1) GRANTS OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Director of the Institute may make grants or enter into cooperative agreements to expand the current and on-going interdisciplinary research and clinical trials with treatment centers of the National Drug Abuse Treatment Clinical Trials Network relating to methamphetamine abuse and addiction and other biomedical, behavioral, and social issues related to methamphetamine abuse and addiction.

''(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available under a grant or cooperative agreement under paragraph (1) for methamphetamine abuse and addiction may be used for research and clinical trials relating to—

''(A) the effects of methamphetamine abuse on the human body, including the brain;

''(B) the addictive nature of methamphetamine and how such effects differ with respect to different individuals;

''(C) the connection between methamphetamine abuse and mental health;

''(D) the identification and evaluation of the most effective methods of prevention of methamphetamine abuse and addiction;

''(E) the identification and development of the most effective methods of treatment of methamphetamine addiction, including pharmacological treatments;

''(F) risk factors for methamphetamine abuse;

''(G) effects of methamphetamine abuse and addiction on pregnant women and their fetuses; and

''(H) cultural, social, behavioral, neurological and psychological reasons that individuals abuse methamphetamine, or refrain from abusing methamphetamine.

''(3) RESEARCH RESULTS.—The Director shall promptly disseminate research results under this subsection to Federal, State and local entities involved in combating methamphetamine abuse and addiction.

''(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out paragraph (1), such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year.

''(B) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year shall supplement and not supplant any other amounts appropriated in such fiscal year for research on methamphetamine abuse and addiction.''.

SEC. 3632. METHAMPHETAMINE AND AMPHETAMINE TREATMENT INITIATIVE BY CENTER FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT.

Subpart 1 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''METHAMPHETAMINE AND AMPHETAMINE TREATMENT INITIATIVE

''SEC. 514. (a) GRANTS.—

''(1) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.—The Director of the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment may make grants to States and Indian tribes recognized by the United States that have a high rate, or have had a rapid increase, in methamphetamine or amphetamine abuse or addiction in order to permit such States and Indian tribes to expand activities in connection with the treatment of methamphetamine or amphetamine abuser or addiction in the specific geographical areas of such States or Indian tribes, as the case may be, where there is such a rate or has been such an increase.

''(2) RECIPIENTS.—Any grants under paragraph (1) shall be directed to the substance abuse directors of the States, and of the appropriate tribal government authorities of the Indian tribes, selected by the Director to receive such grants.

''(3) NATURE OF ACTIVITIES.—Any activities under a grant under paragraph (1) shall be based on reliable scientific evidence of their efficacy in the treatment of methamphetamine or amphetamine abuse or addiction.

''(b) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—The Director shall ensure that grants under subsection (a) are distributed equitably among the various regions of the country and among rural, urban,

and suburban areas that are affected by methamphetamine or amphetamine abuse or addiction.

''(c) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—The Director shall—

''(1) evaluate the activities supported by grants under subsection (a);

''(2) disseminate widely such significant information derived from the evaluation as the Director considers appropriate to assist States, Indian tribes, and private providers of treatment services for methamphetamine or amphetamine abuser or addiction in the treatment of methamphetamine or amphetamine abuse or addiction; and

''(3) provide States, Indian tribes, and such providers with technical assistance in connection with the provision of such treatment.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

''(2) USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS.—Of the funds appropriated to carry out this section in any fiscal year, the lesser of 5 percent of such funds or $1,000,000 shall be available to the Director for purposes of carrying out subsection (c).''.

SEC. 3633. STUDY OF METHAMPHETAMINE TREATMENT.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, in consultation with the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, conduct a study on the development of medications for the treatment of addiction to amphetamine and methamphetamine.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Health and Human Services for fiscal year 2000 such sums as may be necessary to meet the requirements of subsection (a).

PART IV—REPORTS

SEC. 3641. REPORTS ON CONSUMPTION OF METHAMPHETAMINE AND OTHER ILLICIT DRUGS IN RURAL AREAS, METROPOLITAN AREAS, AND CONSOLIDATED METROPOLITAN AREAS.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall include in each National Household Survey on Drug Abuse appropriate prevalence data and information on the consumption of methamphetamine and other illicit drugs in rural areas, metropolitan areas, and consolidated metropolitan areas.

SEC. 3642. REPORT ON DIVERSION OF ORDINARY, OVER-THE-COUNTER PSEUDOEPHEDRINE AND PHENYLPROPANOLAMINE PRODUCTS.

(a) STUDY.—The Attorney General shall conduct a study of the use of ordinary, over-the-counter pseudoephedrine and phenylpropanolamine products in the clandestine production of illicit drugs. Sources of data for the study shall include the following:

(1) Information from Federal, State, and local clandestine laboratory seizures and related investigations identifying the source, type, or brand of drug products being utilized and how they were obtained for the illicit production of methamphetamine and amphetamine.

(2) Information submitted voluntarily from the pharmaceutical and retail industries involved in the manufacture, distribution, and sale of drug products containing ephedrine, pseudoephedrine, and phenylpropanolamine, including information on changes in the pattern, volume, or both, of sales of ordinary, over-the-counter pseudoephedrine and phenylpropanolamine products.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall include—

(A) the findings of the Attorney General as a result of the study; and

(B) such recommendations on the need to establish additional measures to prevent diversion of ordinary, over-the-counter pseudoephedrine and phenylpropanolamine (such as a threshold on ordinary, over-the-counter pseudoephedrine and phenylpropanolamine products) as the Attorney General considers appropriate.

(3) MATTERS CONSIDERED.—In preparing the report, the Attorney General shall consider the comments and recommendations including the comments on the Attorney General's proposed findings and recommendations, of State and local law enforcement and regulatory officials and of representatives of the industry described in subsection (a)(2).

(c) REGULATION OF RETAIL SALES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 401(d) of the Comprehensive Methamphetamine Control Act of 1996 (21 U.S.C. 802 note) and subject to paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall establish by regulation a single-transaction limit of not less than 24 grams of ordinary, over-the-counter pseudoephedrine or phenylpropanolamine (as the case may be) for retail distributors, if the Attorney General finds, in the report under subsection (b), that—

(A) there is a significant number of instances (as set forth in paragraph (3)(A) of such section 401(d) for purposes of such section) where ordinary, over-the-counter pseudoephedrine products, phenylpropanolamine products, or both such products that were purchased from retail distributors were widely used in the clandestine production of illicit drugs; and

(B) the best practical method of preventing such use is the establishment of single-transaction limits for retail distributors of either or both of such products.

(2) DUE PROCESS.—The Attorney General shall establish the single-transaction limit under paragraph (1) only after notice, comment, and an informal hearing.

Subtitle B—Controlled Substances Generally

SEC. 3651. ENHANCED PUNISHMENT FOR TRAFFICKING IN LIST I CHEMICALS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall amend the Federal sentencing guidelines in accordance with this section with respect to any violation of paragraph (1) or (2) of section 401(d) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(d)) involving a list I chemical and any violation of paragraph (1) or (3) of section 1010(d) of the Controlled Substance Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960(d)) involving a list I chemical.

(b) EPHEDRINE, PHENYLPROPANOLAMINE, AND PSEUDOEPHEDRINE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying this section, the United States Sentencing Commission shall, with respect to each offense described in subsection (a) involving ephedrine, phenylpropanolamine, or pseudoephedrine (including their salts, optical isomers, and salts of optical isomers), review and amend its guidelines to provide for increased penalties such that those penalties corresponded to the quantity of controlled substance that could reasonably have been manufactured using the quantity of ephedrine, phenylpropanolamine, or pseudoephedrine possessed or distributed.

(2) CONVERSION RATIOS.—For the purposes of the amendments made by this subsection, the quantity of controlled substance that could reasonably have been manufactured shall be determined by using a table of manufacturing conversion ratios for ephedrine, phenylpropanolamine, and pseudoephedrine, which table shall be established by the Sentencing Commission based on scientific, law enforcement, and other data the Sentencing Commission considers appropriate.

(c) OTHER LIST I CHEMICALS.—In carrying this section, the United States Sentencing Commission shall, with respect to each offense described in subsection (a) involving any list I chemical other than ephedrine, phenylpropanolamine, or pseudoephedrine, review and amend its guidelines to provide for increased penalties such that those penalties reflect the dangerous nature of such offenses, the need for aggressive law enforcement action to fight such offenses, and the extreme dangers associated with unlawful activity involving methamphetamine and amphetamine, including—

(1) the rapidly growing incidence of controlled substance manufacturing;

(2) the extreme danger inherent in manufacturing controlled substances;

(3) the threat to public safety posed by manufacturing controlled substances; and

(4) the recent increase in the importation, possession, and distribution of list I chemicals for the purpose of manufacturing controlled substances.

(d) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY TO SENTENCING COMMISSION.—The United States Sentencing Commission shall promulgate amendments pursuant to this section as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act in accordance with the procedure set forth in section 21(a) of the Sentencing Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–182), as though the authority under that Act had not expired.

SEC. 3652. MAIL ORDER REQUIREMENTS.

Section 310(b)(3) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 830(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively;

(2) by inserting before subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, the following new subparagraph (A):

''(A) As used in this paragraph:

''(i) The term 'drug product' means an active ingredient in dosage form that has been approved or otherwise may be lawfully marketed under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for distribution in the United States.

''(ii) The term 'valid prescription' means a prescription which is issued for a legitimate medical purpose by an individual practitioner licensed by law to administer and prescribe the drugs concerned and acting in the usual course of the practitioner's professional practice.'';

(3) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, by inserting ''or who engages in an export transaction'' after ''nonregulated person''; and

(4) adding at the end the following:

''(D) Except as provided in subparagraph (E), the following distributions to a nonregulated person, and the following export transactions, shall not be subject to the reporting requirement in subparagraph (B):

''(i) Distributions of sample packages of drug products when such packages contain not more than 2 solid dosage units or the equivalent of 2 dosage units in liquid form, not to exceed 10 milliliters of liquid per package, and not more than one package is distributed to an individual or residential address in any 30-day period.

''(ii) Distributions of drug products by retail distributors that may not include face-to-face transactions to the extent that such distributions are consistent with the activities authorized for a retail distributor as specified in section 102(46).

''(iii) Distributions of drug products to a resident of a long term care facility (as that term is defined in regulations prescribed by the Attorney General) or distributions of drug products to a long term care facility for dispensing to or for use by a resident of that facility.

''(iv) Distributions of drug products pursuant to a valid prescription.

''(v) Exports which have been reported to the Attorney General pursuant to section 1004 or

1018 or which are subject to a waiver granted under section 1018(e)(2).

''(vi) Any quantity, method, or type of distribution or any quantity, method, or type of distribution of a specific listed chemical (including specific formulations or drug products) or of a group of listed chemicals (including specific formulations or drug products) which the Attorney General has excluded by regulation from such reporting requirement on the basis that such reporting is not necessary for the enforcement of this title or title III.

''(E) The Attorney General may revoke any or all of the exemptions listed in subparagraph (D) for an individual regulated person if he finds that drug products distributed by the regulated person are being used in violation of this title or title III. The regulated person shall be notified of the revocation, which will be effective upon receipt by the person of such notice, as provided in section 1018(c)(1), and shall have the right to an expedited hearing as provided in section 1018(c)(2).''.

SEC. 3653. THEFT AND TRANSPORTATION OF ANHYDROUS AMMONIA FOR PURPOSES OF ILLICIT PRODUCTION OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part D of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''ANHYDROUS AMMONIA

''SEC. 423. (a) It is unlawful for any person—

''(1) to steal anhydrous ammonia, or

''(2) to transport stolen anhydrous ammonia across State lines,

knowing, intending, or having reasonable cause to believe that such anhydrous ammonia will be used to manufacture a controlled substance in violation of this part.

''(b) Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be imprisoned or fined, or both, in accordance with section 403(d) as if such violation were a violation of a provision of section 403.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for that Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 421 the following new items:

''Sec. 422. Drug paraphernalia.
''Sec. 423. Anhydrous ammonia.''.

(c) ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN RESEARCH.—

(1) AGREEMENT.—The Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration shall seek to enter into an agreement with Iowa State University in order to permit the University to continue and expand its current research into the development of inert agents that, when added to anhydrous ammonia, eliminate the usefulness of anhydrous ammonia as an ingredient in the production of methamphetamine.

(2) REIMBURSABLE PROVISION OF FUNDS.—The agreement under paragraph (1) may provide for the provision to Iowa State University, on a reimbursable basis, of $500,000 for purposes the activities specified in that paragraph.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Drug Enforcement Administration for fiscal year 2000, $500,000 for purposes of carrying out the agreement under this subsection.

Subtitle C—Ecstasy Anti-Proliferation Act of 2000

SEC. 3661. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Ecstasy Anti-Proliferation Act of 2000''.

SEC. 3662. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The illegal importation of 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine, commonly referred to as ''MDMA'' or ''Ecstasy'' (referred to in this subtitle as ''Ecstasy''), has increased in recent years, as evidenced by the fact that Ecstasy seizures by the United States Customs Service have increased from less than 500,000 tablets during fiscal year 1997 to more than 9,000,000 tablets during the first 9 months of fiscal year 2000.

(2) Use of Ecstasy can cause long-lasting, and perhaps permanent, damage to the serotonin system of the brain, which is fundamental to the integration of information and emotion, and this damage can cause long-term problems with learning and memory.

(3) Due to the popularity and marketability of Ecstasy, there are numerous Internet websites with information on the effects of Ecstasy, the production of Ecstasy, and the locations of Ecstasy use (often referred to as ''raves''). The availability of this information targets the primary users of Ecstasy, who are most often college students, young professionals, and other young people from middle- to high-income families.

(4) Greater emphasis needs to be placed on—

(A) penalties associated with the manufacture, distribution, and use of Ecstasy;

(B) the education of young people on the negative health effects of Ecstasy, since the reputation of Ecstasy as a ''safe'' drug is the most dangerous component of Ecstasy;

(C) the education of State and local law enforcement agencies regarding the growing problem of Ecstasy trafficking across the United States;

(D) reducing the number of deaths caused by Ecstasy use and the combined use of Ecstasy with other ''club'' drugs and alcohol; and

(E) adequate funding for research by the National Institute on Drug Abuse to—

(i) identify those most vulnerable to using Ecstasy and develop science-based prevention approaches tailored to the specific needs of individuals at high risk;

(ii) understand how Ecstasy produces its toxic effects and how to reverse neurotoxic damage;

(iii) develop treatments, including new medications and behavioral treatment approaches;

(iv) better understand the effects that Ecstasy has on the developing children and adolescents; and

(v) translate research findings into useful tools and ensure their effective dissemination.

SEC. 3663. ENHANCED PUNISHMENT OF ECSTASY TRAFFICKERS.

(a) AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission (referred to in this section as the ''Commission'') shall amend the Federal sentencing guidelines regarding any offense relating to the manufacture, importation, or exportation of, or trafficking in—

(1) 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine;

(2) 3,4-methylenedioxy amphetamine;

(3) 3,4-methylenedioxy-N-ethylamphetamine;

(4) paramethoxymethamphetamine (PMA); or

(5) any other controlled substance, as determined by the Commission in consultation with the Attorney General, that is marketed as Ecstasy and that has either a chemical structure substantially similar to that of 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine or an effect on the central nervous system substantially similar to or greater than that of 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine;

including an attempt or conspiracy to commit an offense described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) in violation of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), or the Maritime Drug Law Enforcement Act (46 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.).

(b) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the Commission shall, with respect to each offense described in subsection (a)—

(1) review and amend the Federal sentencing guidelines to provide for increased penalties such that those penalties reflect the seriousness of these offenses and the need to deter them; and

(2) take any other action the Commission considers to be necessary to carry out this section.

(c) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the Commission shall ensure that the Federal sentencing guidelines for offenders convicted of offenses described in subsection (a) reflect—

(1) the need for aggressive law enforcement action with respect to offenses involving the controlled substances described in subsection (a); and

(2) the dangers associated with unlawful activity involving such substances, including—

(A) the rapidly growing incidence of abuse of the controlled substances described in subsection (a) and the threat to public safety that such abuse poses;

(B) the recent increase in the illegal importation of the controlled substances described in subsection (a);

(C) the young age at which children are beginning to use the controlled substances described in subsection (a);

(D) the fact that the controlled substances described in subsection (a) are frequently marketed to youth;

(E) the large number of doses per gram of the controlled substances described in subsection (a); and

(F) any other factor that the Commission determines to be appropriate.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the base offense levels for Ecstasy are too low, particularly for high-level traffickers, and should be increased, such that they are comparable to penalties for other drugs of abuse; and

(2) based on the fact that importation of Ecstasy has surged in the past few years, the traffickers are targeting the Nation's youth, and the use of Ecstasy among youth in the United States is increasing even as other drug use among this population appears to be leveling off, the base offense levels for importing and trafficking the controlled substances described in subsection (a) should be increased.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the amendments pursuant to this section have been promulgated, the Commission shall—

(1) prepare a report describing the factors and information considered by the Commission in promulgating amendments pursuant to this section; and

(2) submit the report to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Commerce, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3664. EMERGENCY AUTHORITY TO UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION.

The United States Sentencing Commission shall promulgate amendments under this subtitle as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act in accordance with the procedure set forth in section 21(a) of the Sentencing Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–182), as though the authority under that Act had not expired.

SEC. 3665. EXPANSION OF ECSTASY AND CLUB DRUGS ABUSE PREVENTION EFFORTS.

(a) PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT.—Part A of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa et seq.), as amended by section 3306, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 506B. GRANTS FOR ECSTASY AND OTHER CLUB DRUGS ABUSE PREVENTION.

''(a) AUTHORITY.—The Administrator may make grants to, and enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with, public and nonprofit private entities to enable such entities—

''(1) to carry out school-based programs concerning the dangers of the abuse of and addiction to 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine, related drugs, and other drugs commonly referred to as 'club drugs' using methods that are effective and science-based, including initiatives

that give students the responsibility to create their own anti-drug abuse education programs for their schools; and

''(2) to carry out community-based abuse and addiction prevention programs relating to 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine, related drugs, and other club drugs that are effective and science-based.

''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available under a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall be used for planning, establishing, or administering prevention programs relating to 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine, related drugs, and other club drugs.

''(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(1) DISCRETIONARY FUNCTIONS.—Amounts provided to an entity under this section may be used—

''(A) to carry out school-based programs that are focused on those districts with high or increasing rates of abuse and addiction to 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine, related drugs, and other club drugs and targeted at populations that are most at risk to start abusing these drugs;

''(B) to carry out community-based prevention programs that are focused on those populations within the community that are most at-risk for abuse of and addiction to 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine, related drugs, and other club drugs;

''(C) to assist local government entities to conduct appropriate prevention activities relating to 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine, related drugs, and other club drugs;

''(D) to train and educate State and local law enforcement officials, prevention and education officials, health professionals, members of community anti-drug coalitions and parents on the signs of abuse of and addiction to 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine, related drugs, and other club drugs and the options for treatment and prevention;

''(E) for planning, administration, and educational activities related to the prevention of abuse of and addiction to 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine, related drugs, and other club drugs;

''(F) for the monitoring and evaluation of prevention activities relating to 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine, related drugs, and other club drugs and reporting and disseminating resulting information to the public; and

''(G) for targeted pilot programs with evaluation components to encourage innovation and experimentation with new methodologies.

''(2) PRIORITY.—The Administrator shall give priority in awarding grants under this section to rural and urban areas that are experiencing a high rate or rapid increases in abuse and addiction to 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine, related drugs, and other club drugs.

''(d) ALLOCATION AND REPORT.—

''(1) PREVENTION PROGRAM ALLOCATION.—Not less than $500,000 of the amount appropriated in each fiscal year to carry out this section shall be made available to the Administrator, acting in consultation with other Federal agencies, to support and conduct periodic analyses and evaluations of effective prevention programs for abuse of and addiction to 3,4-methylenedioxy methamphetamine, related drugs, and other club drugs and the development of appropriate strategies for disseminating information about and implementing such programs.

''(2) REPORT.—The Administrator shall annually prepare and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, a report containing the results of the analyses and evaluations conducted under paragraph (1).

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

''(2) such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding fiscal year.''.

Subtitle D—Miscellaneous

SEC. 3671. ANTIDRUG MESSAGES ON FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INTERNET WEBSITES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each department, agency, and establishment of the Federal Government shall, in consultation with the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, place antidrug messages on appropriate Internet websites controlled by such department, agency, or establishment which messages shall, where appropriate, contain an electronic hyperlink to the Internet website, if any, of the Office.

SEC. 3672. REIMBURSEMENT BY DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION OF EXPENSES INCURRED TO REMEDIATE METHAMPHETAMINE LABORATORIES.

(a) REIMBURSEMENT AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General, acting through the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, may reimburse States, units of local government, Indian tribal governments, other public entities, and multi-jurisdictional or regional consortia thereof for expenses incurred to clean up and safely dispose of substances associated with clandestine methamphetamine laboratories which may present a danger to public health or the environment.

(b) ADDITIONAL DEA PERSONNEL.—From amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to carry out this section, the Attorney General may hire not more than 5 additional Drug Enforcement Administration personnel to administer this section.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General to carry out this section $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 3673. SEVERABILITY.

Any provision of this title held to be invalid or unenforceable by its terms, or as applied to any person or circumstance, shall be construed as to give the maximum effect permitted by law, unless such provision is held to be utterly invalid or unenforceable, in which event such provision shall be severed from this title and shall not affect the applicability of the remainder of this title, or of such provision, to other persons not similarly situated or to other, dissimilar circumstances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4365.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to bring H.R. 4365, the Children's Health Act of 2000, to the floor of the House today. This measure is a result of strong bipartisan, and I underline strong bipartisan, bicameral cooperation and extensive negotiations.

The bill before us today includes the original children's health bill passed by the House in May, as well as provisions to reauthorize the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. The Senate passed the revised bill last Friday. Since then, more than a dozen children's health advocacy groups have issued statements publicly applauding the bill and praising this effort.

In developing this legislation, my Committee on Commerce colleagues and I examined many of the difficult barriers we face in working to improve children's health and well-being. Witnesses testified about a variety of serious childhood afflictions, including autism, Fragile X, childhood asthma, and juvenile diabetes.

The bill before us authorizes and reauthorizes children's disease research and prevention activities conducted under the Public Health Service Act. Among its key provisions, the bill establishes a new Pediatric Research Initiative within the National Institutes of Health to enhance opportunities for research and improve coordination of efforts to prevent or cure diseases affecting children.

The bill also addresses a number of specific concerns, including autism, Fragile X, birth defects, early hearing loss, epilepsy, asthma, juvenile arthritis, childhood malignancies, juvenile diabetes, safe motherhood and infant health promotion, adoption awareness, traumatic brain injury, Healthy Start, oral health, vaccine injury compensation, Hepatitis C, autoimmune diseases, graduate medical education in children's hospitals, muscular dystrophy, and rare pediatric diseases.

Equally important, Mr. Speaker, it does not include specific funding earmarks or other controversial provisions.

This legislation incorporates a number of separate legislative proposals, and I would like to acknowledge the efforts of those Members who worked to develop provisions that were included in the bill.

I also want to acknowledge all of the patient advocates, there were many, as there were many Members and also cosponsors of the original children's health bill, who lent us strong support for this initiative. Their dedication helped keep this legislation alive.

We can never estimate the human toll of childhood diseases. However, they also have an enormous financial impact through billions of dollars in increased health care costs. Every dollar spent by the Federal Government on disease research and prevention is an extremely wise investment.

Any parent can tell us that nothing is more heart-wrenching than watching their own child suffer with an illness. As a father and grandfather myself, I know how terrible that can be. Today, however, we have a rare opportunity to do something that will give hope to families devastated by childhood disease.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, also takes great steps to reauthorize and refine

the mission of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. It gives States more flexibility in the use of their block grant funds and follows the trend in other Federal programs to require more accountability based on performance.

The bill authorizes funding for many important services for youths and adolescents. These include youth drug treatment, early intervention for juvenile substance abuse, prevention of methamphetamine and inhalant use, follow-up services for youth offenders released from juvenile justice facilities, comprehensive community services for children with serious emotional disturbances, services for individuals with fetal alcohol syndrome, and prevention of underage drinking and suicide prevention.

The bill also addresses the needs of adults by authorizing grants for emergency mental health centers, programs to divert individuals with mental illness from the criminal justice system, and programs to expand mental health and substance abuse treatment services for the homeless.

In addition, this bill facilitates some physicians' ability to prescribe certain narcotics, such at buprenorpine, that are used in treating narcotics addiction. It also provides a comprehensive strategy to combat methamphetamine use. These provisions were approved by my subcommittee as H.R. 2634, the Drug Addiction Treatment Act of 2000, and this language was carefully worked out with the Committee on the Judiciary.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation in addition to reauthorizing the Federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services programs. The bill before us will provide vital resources targeted at ending the scourge of childhood diseases.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), a member of the subcommittee, for his tireless efforts. Together, we did put kids ahead of politicians, and I am truly grateful for his commitment to improve the health of our Nation's children.

I also want to recognize the staff who worked to advance this legislation, and first and foremost, to thank my health policy advisor, Anne Esposito, for her hard work and dedication through long hours and extensive negotiations.

I am also grateful to her partner in that effort, Ellie Dehoney from the staff of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN). Together they demonstrated the patience and determination necessary to keep this process on track and moving forward.

Additionally, I would like to thank Mr. Jeremy Allen, who was with me for a short time as, I guess, a presidential fellow. He worked to pass the bill through the House and helped with the Senate negotiations; Michael Reilly, who was also with us in that capacity at one time; and, of course, my chief of staff, Todd Tuten, because it was his consent based on our success with the women's health initiative that led to doing this; and, additionally, Dr. Carolyn Sporn, who is a third-year resident at George Washington University in the Emergency room who chose to spend a month in my office to gain the knowledge that I think all medical doctors should have regarding this process.

Together we are doing something good for kids. I urge every Member to support passage of H.R. 4365.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is moving forward today to pass legislation seeking to improve the health care of our Nation's children.

While much of the health focus in the 106th Congress has been in the area of Medicare programs and other areas of health care policy, Congress has largely neglected the area of children's health and development until my colleagues, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), spearheaded this important initiative.

I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work in this area and really forcing this issue before the end of the 106th Congress.

I, too, want to add my thanks to the staff, particularly John Ford, Judith Bankendorf, and Eleanor Dehoney of the Committee on Commerce and Bruce Lesley from my staff for their outstanding work on this legislation, as it has been improved through every step of the process due to their hard work and diligence.

As the chairman knows, nothing could be more important to our Nation's future than our children. Numerous indicators of the well-being of our children paint a mixed picture. Both in terms of success and shortcomings, they give us a mixed view of what our Nation's future holds.

Reports of both gains and continued unmet needs are also apparent with regard to a variety of other pediatric health care needs including infant mortality, immunization rates, pediatric asthma care, youth violence, and the critically important fact that over 11 million children in this country still remain uninsured.

It is on this latter point, the issue of uninsured children and adolescents, that I hope this Congress will choose to address through legislative action in the near future. We cannot fully address the health care needs of children without addressing the fact that 11 million children still continue to have limited, sporadic, if any, access to health care.

H.R. 4365 takes very important strides to expand pediatric research efforts and increase coordination in Federal resources for a variety of childhood diseases or health problems. While some have questioned such a focus on the needs of children, the Federal Government commitment related to child and adolescent health and development is completely inadequate and desperately needs greater focus and attention to the unique health care problems facing children.

According to a report issued by the President's National Science and Technology Council entitled ''Investing in Our Future: A National Research Initiative for America's Children for the 21st Century,'' the combined research spending for children and adolescents through the Federal Government represents ''less than three percent of the total Federal research enterprise''.

Thus, the Federal Government commits less than 3 percent of its research focus to improve the lives of children despite the fact that they represent over 30 percent of our Nation's population and our future.

1100

As such, pediatric research and prevention efforts must be at the forefront. As the President's National Science and Technology Council concluded:

''Our Nation has a clear stake in ensuring that all of America's children grow up to be healthy, educated, productive and contributing adults. Scientific research is and will continue to be a catalyst for achieving that goal.''

I would like to highlight those provisions in this bill that come from legislation that I introduced in this Congress, including:

H.R. 4008, the Pediatric Organ Transplantation Improvement Act of 2000. This legislation, introduced with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), will require that our Nation's organ transplant system recognizes children's unique health care needs and increases research into improving pediatric organ transplantation. For some of our Nation's most vulnerable citizens, children awaiting lifesaving organ transplants, this language should improve their care and even save lives.

H.R. 4594, the Pediatric Diabetes Research and Prevention Act. This initiative, introduced with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) as well as in the Senate by Senator COLLINS improves our Nation's research and prevention efforts into pediatric diabetes. The language increases the necessary tools to expand clinical trials on children with diabetes to move some of the remarkable research that we are seeing on diabetes from the laboratory bench to the patient's bedside.

H.R. 5198, the Children's Research Protection Act. This legislation, introduced with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and Senators DODD and DEWINE, promotes the improvement of pediatric research and protections for children involved in medical

research. The provision requires that all HHS-funded and regulated research comply with pediatric-specific human subject protections and has many other important provisions.

Finally, H.R. 1313, the Patient Freedom from Restraint Act of 1999. This initiative, which was introduced as companion legislation to bills by Senators LIEBERMAN and DODD, would take important steps to protect both children and adults with mental illness or mental retardation from being inappropriately placed in endangering restraints or seclusion, which has caused personal harm and even death.

There are many other fine provisions of this bill. Several I would like to talk about is the reauthorization of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, or SAMHSA, Act which improves mental health and substance abuse services for children and adolescents. There are several provisions that have become known as the Columbine provisions because they deal with children and adolescents who are at great risk. One, grants to public entities, seeks to develop ways to assist children in dealing with violence. Another allows the Secretary to use up to 2.5 percent of the funds appropriated for discretionary grants for responding to emergencies. Yet another reauthorizes the high-risk youth program which provides funds to public and nonprofit private entities to establish programs for the prevention of drug abuse among high-risk youths. There are many other fine provisions of SAMHSA which are in this bill and which we will hear about from my colleagues.

In addition, the bill has numerous other important children's health provisions, including fragile X research, pediatric asthma, birth defects, hearing loss and newborn screening, childhood cancer, traumatic brain injury, child care safety, graduate medical education for our Nation's children's hospitals and lead poisoning.

I am proud of this legislation. I know we are all proud of this legislation. Again I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their courageous leadership on this broad bill.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BRYANT), a member of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment and a very conscientious and active Member.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I thank him for bringing this bill to the floor and for his leadership on all health care issues.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of the Children's Health Act and would like to alert my colleagues to two issues which specifically are addressed in this bill and which are of concern to me and interest to me: Duchenne muscular dystrophy and day care safety. Duchenne muscular dystrophy is the most common and most catastrophic form of genetic childhood disease, occurring in one of every 3,500 live births and generally killing its victims in their late teens or early twenties.

My first experience with a family suffering from this devastating disease was in 1998 when my constituents Roy and Carol Henderson from Memphis first contacted my office. Their son had been diagnosed with Duchenne muscular dystrophy. I remember the pain and frustration that that strong family expressed to me as they began to search for answers to the difficult questions of why their child was afflicted with this awful, debilitating disease. Why were there so few treatment options for their son? And, most importantly, why had the government failed to prioritize more Federal resources toward finding a cure to this terrible disease?

Despite the 1987 discovery of the dystrophin gene, the survivability of this childhood disease has not been extended in any significant way. For decades, the only treatment known to somewhat alter the course of this disease was the use of steroids whose serious side effects are well known.

For these reasons it is imperative that the National Institutes of Health, NIH, begin to focus some of its Federal resources toward muscular dystrophy research. Today we will be voting on comprehensive children's health legislation which directs NIH to provide a more coordinated emphasis on muscular dystrophy research and assigns the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke with the responsibility of leading NIH's efforts in this promising field.

The bill also includes legislation authored by Senator BILL FRIST and introduced in the House by myself and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY). This section will provide the States with over $200 million to improve the safety of its day care centers throughout the United States. The bill would allow States the flexibility to use the funding for a number of purposes, including training child care providers, rehabilitating child care facilities, improving the safety of transporting children and conducting criminal background checks for child care providers. With the all too frequent reports of abuse and neglect in child care facilities, there was a need to give States additional resources to provide quality child care. Under the bill's formula, my State, Tennessee, would receive $4.2 million to give child care providers the tools needed to offer safe, affordable, quality child care to the children of Tennessee.

In conclusion, too many of our children needlessly suffer and even die from abuse, birth defects and diseases which can be prevented given the proper investment of our time and resources. With the passage of this bill, Congress will renew its commitment to America's children. I am pleased that the sponsors of this legislation recognized the seriousness of these issues by including them in this legislation. I encourage my colleagues to support its passage.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for her leadership along with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), who is the ranking member, and as well the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for their leadership.

This is an important issue. I know there are many legislative initiatives that are found in this legislation dealing with children's health. I applaud the reauthorization of SAMHSA dealing specifically with the important issues of substance abuse and also the provisions that assist children in dealing with violence as well as the $2.5 million in grants to assist local communities in reauthorizing high-risk programs dealing with children susceptible to drug use. That is clearly still a viable concern in our communities. My 15-year-old son acknowledges that we have a problem, and I imagine that he may be representative of many of our children around the Nation.

I would hope, however, that as we look at the question of children's health as we will be hearing from many members of the Democratic Caucus discussing specifically this question of children's health and this poor state of children's health in the Nation that we will continue to do this in a more deliberative fashion, that we will be able to give more time to addressing the needs of children, particularly the concerns I have and the legislation I filed, H.R. 3455, the Give a Kid a Chance omnibus mental health bill that is a comprehensive assessment of providing resources to parents, immediate resources so that children who are in need of access to mental health care are not channeled to the juvenile justice system. That is what happens now.

Along with the 11 million children that are uninsured, can you imagine the children that do not have access to mental health services? And even though I know that there are provisions in this bill, there is still much to be accomplished.

Might I also take note of the charitable choice provisions that raises much concern. I wish we would explore this question. We are for these issues, but we want to have them in a nondiscriminatory fashion. I would have hoped the Committee on the Judiciary would have been allowed to address this question in a fair manner. Certainly I think we are moving forward on children's health, but we still have a long way to go on the needs of children's mental health.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), my 98th Congress colleague.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and the honored chairman of this subcommittee the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for bringing forward a really extremely important bill that will provide many good services for children throughout America.

There are two specific provisions intended to protect children in therapeutic group homes, patients in psychiatric hospitals, old folks in nursing homes and youths in juvenile detention centers from hurting themselves and others. The intent behind these provisions is to ensure that vulnerable populations who live behind closed doors are safe and treated with respect and dignity. This bill establishes standards for the clinical use of restraints to physically stabilize a patient and protocols for time-out situations that require the patient to be separated from others. This is the first time that Congress has attempted to legislate clinical practices in health care facilities as well as nonmedical community-based facilities. For this reason it is very important that this legislation be clear and unambiguous about the kinds of practices that will be prohibited and the kinds that will be encouraged.

Unfortunately, the legislation is not exactly clear. A distinction is made in the legislation between health care facilities and nonmedical community-based facilities, but there is no definition of either. Where does a residential treatment center fit in? What rules will apply?

A standard practice in treatment facilities is the use of therapeutic holding to calm a patient who is out of control through proximity and physical touch. Therapeutic holds are used to protect children. They are used to express affection. They are used to calm children. I worked as an aide on the children's ward of a major psychiatric hospital and I know the power of therapeutic holds. I chaired the community child guidance clinic in my hometown for many years and as a State senator visited residential facilities for children with serious psychiatric problems throughout Connecticut. We must not deny these critical facilities the ability to provide loving help for our kids.

My reading of section 591(d)(1) in part H where restraint is defined as excluding ''any method that involves the physical holding of a resident'' would allow the practice of therapeutic holding to be used when appropriate to allow residents to resume their activities as soon as possible. It is my expectation that the HHS regulations will reflect this reading and that the Committee on Commerce agrees that therapeutic holds are indeed excluded from any definition of restraint.

While the legislation calls for training and staff development in the use of restraint and seclusion methods, two things are unclear: Who will provide this training and who will pay for it? I would hope, and it would be very helpful, if HHS would promulgate all regulations, both those for health care facilities and those for nonmedical community-based facilities, at the same time to avoid confusion and to ensure seamless delivery of services to the most vulnerable populations in our country.

In summary, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I stand to speak not against the underlying bill but specifically in regard to the so-called charitable choice language in the bill. Let me make five points about that language:

First what it says is Federal tax dollars can go directly to churches, synagogues and houses of worship. I believe that is clearly unconstitutional and for good reason. Federal subsidies of our churches and houses of worship is something we have not done for 200 years in our country.

The second point. It mentions this language under the guise of not wanting to have discrimination against religious organizations. That might be cute marketing but it is faulty logic and it is unconstitutional logic. What that says in effect is that the Bill of Rights and the first amendment thereof discriminates against religion. The reason Mr. Madison, Mr. Jefferson and our Founding Fathers set up a distance between government and religion and church and state was to protect religion, not to discriminate against it. Their argument is that I guess the Bill of Rights is discriminating against religion.

The third point is it talks about stopping discrimination. Charitable choice language in this bill actually subsidizes religious discrimination.

1115

Very clearly it says you can take my Federal tax dollars, your Federal tax dollars, and put out a government paid for sign that says ''No Catholics, no Jews, no Protestants need apply here for this federally subsidized job.'' That is wrong. It is wrong to have Federal taxpayers paying for religious job discrimination.

The fourth point is that charitable choice language in the name of helping religion is actually going to bring government auditing on our churches. According to the language of the bill itself, the churches and houses of worship are going to have to face the same auditing requirements as non-religious entities. I am not sure our religious entities are helped in America by having Uncle Sam come in and audit.

This language is unnecessary, it is harmful, it is unconstitutional, and it should not be in this bill.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), who has been quite a leader in diabetes in this House.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida and the gentlewoman from Colorado, both great friends of mine, with respect to their commitment to curing the disease of diabetes that affects so many people around this world, especially in the United States of America.

This bill is a great bill with respect to its attention to diabetes. It creates a national registry to track the incidence of juvenile diabetes; it establishes long-term epidemiology studies, in which persons with type 1 diabetes will be followed for 10 years; it addresses type 2 diabetes in youth; it creates a critical trial infrastructure for juvenile diabetes; it provides a look at animal studies, which will provide hope and promise that a true vaccine can be developed to prevent type 1 diabetes in humans; and it also contains a loan repayment program to encourage research.

Overall, this bill is a very good effort as it relates to diabetes, and I am very much supportive of it. I hope that all the 270 members of the House Diabetes Caucus will get on board and support it as well.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this legislation. H.R. 4365 reflects consensus around issues that are of deep importance to all of us, keeping our children healthy and free of substance abuse and mental illness.

This bill addresses major challenges in childhood disease and reauthorizes the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. As a school nurse, a mother, and now a grandmother, children's health is an issue that has been of great concern to me throughout my entire life.

This bill would dedicate more Federal spending and intensify efforts on childhood diseases, including fragile X, autism, early hearing loss, juvenile diabetes and other child-specific conditions and diseases. This legislation does much to help young victims of childhood disease.

Mr. Speaker, parents and families with children who suffer from these childhood diseases have put their heart and soul into passing this legislation, and we must thank them for their tireless efforts. They have come forward with personal, often very painful stories, illustrating the need for this bill. I commend them, and I urge support for this important legislation.

This bill also includes reauthorization of SAMSHA, based on a version of legislation that I introduced earlier this year. This reauthorization will address substance abuse as it relates to children, in addition to adults, with regard to under-age drinking, children

and violence, and fetal alcohol syndrome, to name a few.

To the extent that we can protect our children from alcohol and substance abuse, we reduce their chances of addiction or abuse as adults. Drug addiction is often an intergenerational family problem, with future use by children of addicts a very common occurrence. Sadly, this is a pattern I saw regularly as a school nurse.

This legislation also includes a bill I authored, the Youth Drinking Elimination Act. This legislation, which has the support of the American Academy of Pediatrics, will provide competitive grants to private organizations and governmental agencies through SAMSHA to develop and implement programs and services to reduce underage drinking.

I have seen the success of SAMSHA prevention programs in my own district, particularly with Santa Barbara's Fighting Back and also with Life Steps in San Luis Obispo. They provide highly successful public awareness initiatives, mentoring, criminal justice partnerships and health care intervention programs.

Mr. Speaker, SAMSHA reauthorization is the best way we can comprehensively address the problems of substance abuse and mental health confronting our communities. These problems are just too great for us to treat in a piecemeal fashion.

I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed legislation.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a provision in this legislation that I have authored that will help us address the growing problem of so-called ''club drugs,'' such as Ecstasy.

Five months ago, three young adults in the Chicago area, including two in my Congressional District, died after ingesting what they thought was the club drug Ecstasy, but was in fact a much more powerful cousin called PMA.

These club drugs are flooding our country, and it is not hard to see why. Ecstasy costs just pennies to make, but it is sold here in the United States for as much as $40 per tablet, and the penalties for trafficking are a joke. While the youth of this country believe that Ecstasy is harmless, the problems they face range from paranoia to brain damage, and even to death.

Under this bill, the penalties for Ecstasy trafficking will be increased and we will authorize $10 million to teach our children that these club drugs are dangerous. I believe that this will get the attention of traffickers and the users of Ecstasy, and I urge passage of this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank all of those who have been in the leadership role in bringing this important legislation to the floor.

I support this legislation and any legislation that will help and protect America's children. I do want to bring attention though to one provision that is very dear to my heart and truly affects the inner-city communities in my district. That provision authorizes funding for important life-enhancing and life-saving asthma initiatives.

As author of the Asthma Awareness Education and Treatment Act and founder of the Congressional Asthma Task Force with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and Senators DURBIN and DEWINE, I have been a vocal and unyielding advocate for America's right to breathe.

Countless children and families in my district, which includes Watts, Compton and other low-income inner cities, are literally struggling to breathe, primarily because they lack information and access to effective long-term asthma management medical care.

While the rate of asthma prevalence has grown throughout the country, including rural and suburban areas, it has devastated our inner cities minorities and low-income families. The asthma death rate is twice as high among African Americans, and a staggering four times higher for African-American children. African Americans are also five times more likely to seek emergency room care for asthma, which does not provide long-term management for this disease.

Asthma is also more prevalent among all age groups in lower-income families. In families with an income average of less than $10,000, 80 out of 1,000 individuals have asthma, while in families with an average income of $20,000 to $34,000, 54 out of 1,000 individuals have asthma. That means close to 400,000 more people with extremely limited earnings have asthma.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. This bill provides that type of funding, and I welcome and appreciate this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today we will pass historic legislation which will help and protect America's children. The Children's Health Act is the result of bipartisan dedication to ensuring that we address critical problems facing our youth today. From drug abuse to youth violence to prenatal care, this legislation is comprised of critical programs that will impact the lives of children most in need.

While I embrace all the initiatives included in the Children's Health Act, today I would like to address one provision in particular, which is dear to my heart and will truly affect the inner-city communities in my district. That provision authorizes funding for important, life-enhancing and life-saving asthma initiatives.

As author of the Asthma Awareness, Education and Treatment Act and founder of the Congressional Asthma Task Force with Congressman BARTON and Senators DURBIN and DEWINE, I have been a vocal and unyielding advocate for America's right to breathe. Countless children and families in my district which includes Watts, Compton and other low-income inner-city communities are literally struggling to breathe primarily because they lack information and access to effective, long-term asthma management medical care. While the rate of asthma prevalence has grown throughout the country, including rural and suburban areas, it has devastated our inner-cities, minorities and low income families. The asthma death rate is twice as high among African Americans and a staggering four times higher for African American children. African Americans are also five times more likely to seek emergency room care for asthma, which does not provide long-term management of this disease. Asthma is also more prevalent among all age groups in lower income families. In families with an annual income of less than $10,000, 80 out of 1,000 individuals have asthma while in families with an annual income of $20,000 to $34,999, 54 out of 1,000 individuals have asthma—that means close to 400,000 more people with extremely limited earnings have asthma.

Whatever your income, we are all paying the price for the 160% increase in asthma among preschool children over the past decade. The total cost of asthma to Americans was close to $12 billion in 1998. Parents miss work, children miss school, and too many cases are treated in emergency rooms that could have been treated, or in some situations prevented, by education, medication and ongoing management by a physician.

Today with the passage of the Children's Health Act, we are taking meaningful steps to curb this staggering growth in asthma cases, its high cost to society, and its disproportionate effect on minorities and low income families. This bill provides comprehensive asthma services to children, mobile health care clinics, patient and family education on managing asthma, and identification of children eligible for Medicaid, and other children's health programs.

In representing some of the poorest areas of the country in South Central Los Angeles, I have seen the dire need for community assistance, and that is why I applaud the efforts of Senator DURBIN to ensure this legislative language was included in the Senate-passed bill. Furthermore, I urge my colleagues to not only vote for the Children's Health Act but to ensure that you inform your constituents of the asthma services this bill creates. As Members of Congress, it is our job to educate our constituents on the policies we enact and empower them to use the programs we create to improve their lives.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight one of the specific provisions of this child health package, the Infant Adoption Awareness Act.

It is truly my privilege to stand here and thank my colleagues in the House and Senate and on many different sides of the family planning issue for their ability to come together and pass adoption provisions which allow us to celebrate life by celebrating adoption.

I would like to thank the leaders in sponsoring and negotiating this legislation, the gentleman from Virginia

(Chairman BLILEY); the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL); Senator FRIST; Senator KENNEDY.

In particular, I would like to thank and honor the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), for his tireless efforts on behalf of adoption. As an adoptive father and co-chairman of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption, as well as the chairman of the House Committee on Commerce, he has championed the adoption issue to help build happy, loving homes across America.

I would also like to thank Marc Wheat of the Committee on Commerce staff for his excellent work and dedication and persistence on this project.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the infant adoption awareness provisions in this bill are a step in the right direction to bring complete and accurate adoption information to women facing unplanned pregnancies. These women in difficult circumstances deserve to hear about the options from a well-trained counselor who can provide accurate, up-to-date information on adoption.

This act provides professional development for pregnancy counselors in adoption counseling. The training will enable pregnancy counselors to feel confident in their knowledge of the adoption process, relevant State and local laws, and the legal, medical and financial resources which can be provided to women with unplanned pregnancies.

Mr. Speaker, I know that it is not easy to get a diverse group of organizations representing a wide variety of interests to agree on anything. I am therefore particularly delighted to be on the floor today praising the infant adoption awareness component of this bill, which reflects the input of a broad range of organizations. I want to thank everyone for their support.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time, and I especially thank her and the manager on the other side for the hard work that succeeded in bringing this bill that we have waited so long to get to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I must say we had no right to subject such an important bill to the constitutional attack it is going to get in the courts almost immediately. We have marred this bill by incorporating two provisions that involve deliberate discrimination. At least one of them puts the bill at constitutional peril. That is the constitutional choice provision.

I am a former Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Title VII gives the broadest deference to religious institutions. They can discriminate in employment involving religion, and even in secular activities that they carry out, and even if conduct as they see it is against their religion.

But once you give a religious organization the right to administer Federal funds, our law and our Constitution require equal treatment. Title VI and title VII both make that clear, and certainly the Constitution does.

We are funding churches, synagogues, other religious entities, as if they were Federal agencies. That in itself raises the most serious constitutional questions, because these are pervasively religious institutions, and that is exactly what the Supreme Court says you cannot fund.

Then we go one unconstitutional step further. We allow these religious institutions to discriminate as to whom they hire to administer Federal funds. That is where the line surely must be drawn.

We go further in discriminating in this bill. We carry into this bill discredited, discriminatory, mandatory sentencing minimums, and we carry it to new legislation, turning a deaf ear to the Federal courts and to all our experience. Worse, we effectively exempt white defendants from mandatory minimums, while assuring black and Hispanic defendants will get them. That is deliberate discrimination. That is the very definition of racism.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), who, as has already been said, has spent an awful lot of time particularly on the autism portion of this legislation, and so many other children's issues.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and for his hard work. He has really been the leader on this.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the happiest days for me in the House in 8 years here, because of the importance of this bill for America's children. It does so much that none of us can do it justification in a few minutes so I just want to just focus on the autism part.

Autism is not a rare disease. It is the third most common developmental disorder to affect children, following mental retardation and cerebral palsy. Autism currently affects over 400,000 individuals in the United States. One of every 500 children born today will be faced with autism.

The third most common developmental disorder, autism is more prevalent than Down syndrome, childhood cancer or cystic fibrosis. It is a lifelong, severe neurological disorder that usually manifests itself in children during their first two years of life and causes severe impairment in language, cognition and communication.

1130

Mr. Speaker, I have a friend. His name is John. He lives in California. He has a little boy named Dov. He told me about how this young son of his was coming along, developmentally meeting all of the milestones. And as a father, I can relate to that. I think the greatest joy of childhood is watching your children move along the developmental milestones.

John said that at a certain stage his son just sort of drifted off, and it was like watching him on an ice flow drifting away, because he could no longer communicate. He could not say ''Mommy,'' could not say ''Daddy,'' and he has been impossible to really reach ever since then.

John and his friends, other parents of autistic children, formed an organization. Theirs is called Curing Autism Now, CAN. In my district, we have mothers and fathers who created Caring and Sharing. They are committed to doing something about these children. They are committed to trying to find a cure, to find a way to identify this disorder early.

Mr. Speaker, what this bill will do for these parents who have struggled, because for many, many years doctors actually did not understand what autism was, did not recognize the symptoms and blamed the parents. Blamed usually the mothers and said that they were cold and dispassionate and that is why their children were regressing. What a cruel thing to do to a parent struggling with this awful malady. Doctors still are lacking in their ability to recognize childhood autism early.

What this bill will do is create five research centers geographically dispersed around the country, so that parents who know that there is something wrong with their child can go to get diagnosis, to get their child in an early clinical program to find out what the state of the art is in treatment, and what the state of the art is in curing this disease.

I am delighted and proud today that the House of Representatives is going to answer the prayers of these parents.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 15 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, although I support the children's health part of the Children's Health Act, I rise to oppose the bill for several reasons.

First, I must object to the process by which we merge an anti-drug bill and attacks on religious liberty into legislation dealing with children's health. Mr. Speaker, the anti-drug part of the bill provides for more mandatory minimum sentences, making penalties for amphetamine abuses comparable to those for abusing methamphetamine and crack cocaine, which is 5 years for 5 grams of possession.

It is interesting to note that the majority has taken out the mandatory minimums for penalties for Ecstasy, a methamphetamine-based drug which is prevalent in the middle-class white community. This is curious, because crack cocaine, prevalent in the African-American community, Draconian

mandatory minimums. Methamphetamine, prevalent in the Hispanic community, mandatory minimums. And for Ecstasy and powder cocaine, prevalent in the white community, no mandatory minimums.

Now, I oppose mandatory minimums for the same reason the Judicial Conference of the United States recently wrote to Chairman HYDE. They said that mandatory minimums are a bad idea because they treat dissimilar offenders in a similar manner, offenders who can be quite different with respect to the seriousness of their conduct or a danger to society. Mandatories require the sentencing court to impose the same sentence on offenders, when sound policy and common sense call for reasonable differences in punishment. But this bill requires no exception except for those drugs used in the middle-class white community.

Additionally, I oppose the bill because it attacks our civil rights laws. It contains the charitable choice, as has already been mentioned on the floor. Let me mention that if this bill passes, some sponsors of federally sponsored programs, not church-run programs, federally funded programs will be able to say for the first time in 30 years that ''we do not hire your kind because of your religion.''

Mr. Speaker, if this bill passes, it contains counterproductive mandatory minimums applied in a racially discriminatory manner and allows religious bigotry to be practiced with Federal funds. There seems to be a suggestion that if the dollar amount is high enough and the programs are good enough, that civil rights can be bought and sold.

Mr. Speaker, I will not vote for this bill, even though it includes a good Children's Health Care Act.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill includes provisions for substance abuse and mental health reauthorization, which allows us to think about our Latino adolescents, ages 9 to 14, leading the Nation in attempted suicide, depression, self-reported gun handling, asthma, diabetes, besides an increase in HIV/AIDS cases and teen pregnancy.

I am sorry to have to recognize the need to pay special attention to this segment of the population who are facing great challenges, and I am thankful for the funding. It will help our communities, schools, community-based organizations work together with families to combat this phenomenon in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the violence, the drugs, the cultural assimilation, peer pressure, dysfunctional families, environment, media are all some of the causes we must help our adolescents deal with. Our youngsters are our future; and we must neither neglect, ignore, nor turn our backs on them. They do not vote, but let us give them a voice for the future.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of this bill, especially in support of the bill's provision dealing with the growing nationwide threat of methamphetamine. The legislation is substantially similar to the Methamphetamine Antiproliferation Act that we considered on the House side in Committee on the Judiciary. It was introduced by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

The bill was brought up in committee after the Subcommittee on Crime traveled across the country and held hearings on the growing problem of methamphetamine. The subcommittee in these hearings heard from law enforcement officials, treatment and prevention organizations, State crime laboratories and concerned community leaders.

Some of the most compelling testimony came from the meth addicts themselves. One recovering addict said that meth is so consuming, that everything from family to employment, from self-dignity to self-restraint is sacrificed for meth.

Mr. Speaker, this threat is real and immediate. My own State of Arkansas was recently declared to have the highest number of meth lab seizures per capita in the Nation. A similar story is repeated across the country. The number of labs cleaned up by the DEA has almost doubled each year since 1995. Last year, more than 5,500 labs were seized by the DEA and other enforcement officials.

This resulted in millions of dollars spent on cleaning up pollutants and toxins left behind by the operators of these labs, which can run as much as $10,000 per lab. But let me emphasize that the legislation, the provisions in the bill concerning meth are balanced in its approach.

First of all, the bill provides additional resources to fight the production and use of methamphetamine. It provides training for State and local agencies in handling the toxic waste created by meth labs, and it provides for stiff penalties for the manufacturing and trafficking of meth.

But in addition, besides the enforcement side, it authorizes significant funding for drug prevention and treatment efforts. $10 million is allocated for State grants for addiction treatment, and $15 million for education programs. So it is a balanced approach to dealing with the problem of meth.

If we look at some of the specifics of the legislation, it makes the penalties for manufacturing and trafficking amphetamine, a lesser-known but no less dangerous drug than meth, the same as methamphetamine. But it increases the penalties when there is a substantial risk of harm to human life or the environment, which is many times the case with meth labs.

It also criminalizes the interstate transportation of anhydrous ammonia, which is used by farmers in the production of fertilizer, but is also used in the production of methamphetamine. And so to help the farmers, though, the legislation authorizes funds to research alternative substances for farming and other uses that cannot be used in making meth.

It requires meth lab operators to reimburse society for the environmental and physical damage they cause through their activity. And it authorizes $5.5 million for DEA training of State and local law enforcement in meth lab detection and investigation techniques.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on about some of the specific provisions of the bill, but it helps us deal with the problem. There are some of the objections raised by the methamphetamine legislation that were deleted from this bill. For example, provisions allowing for delayed notice of a search warrant have been deleted. Penalties for the advertisement of illegal drugs and drug paraphernalia have been deleted. So some of those questionable parts are not in this legislation.

I commend the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), who has done an excellent job of dealing with the problem of Ecstasy and the club drugs. Those provisions she has described are also in the legislation.

Let me just make some personal comments about the drug problem. When I grew up in northwest Arkansas on the farm, I became aware of the drug problems on the nightly news, thinking it did not affect us in the rural areas. But the National Center for Addiction and Substance Abuse announced recently that the drug use among young teens in rural America is now higher than in the Nation's large urban centers. In fact, eighth graders living in rural America are 100 percent more likely to use amphetamines, 34 percent of rural eighth graders are more likely to smoke marijuana than kids in urban areas.

Mr. Speaker, this should be a wakeup call to parents and community leaders in our country. As a former Federal prosecutor, as a legislator, but most importantly as a father of teenagers, my heart aches over the lives that are ruined by the gripping terror of meth that overpowers so many, from the curious teenager to the innocent victim of its violence.

Recent surveys show that in 1999, 54 percent of high school seniors had used an illicit substance. The number has risen for the past 6 of 7 years. These statistics show that drug-induced deaths now exceed the national murder

rate. These statistics are a call to action. But the cost does not stop with physical violence. The social consequences are equally devastating. Just last August, police raided a heavily armed meth lab in Conway, Arkansas, after discovering that a baby living in the drug trailer had been left alone and had eaten the drugs left strewn around the trailer. Clearly, additional resources are needed to thwart the damage threatening the next generation. That is what is provided in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the objection raised by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). He has indicated that this creates new mandatory minimums. I understand that he now agrees that new mandatory minimums are not provided in this legislation. There are no new mandatory minimums.

Secondly, there was a question raised about the discriminatory impact of sentences between amphetamine, crack cocaine, and some of the club drugs. First of all, we tried and I think we had a preferable House bill, but this is the Senate bill and I think we probably can improve upon that. I am willing to work with the gentleman from Virginia to make sure that we have equal treatment.

We are giving direction to the Sentencing Commission, and I hope they come up with recommendations that are fair and nondiscriminatory. But we will be happy to look at that in the next Congress as well.

So I am pleased to support this legislation. I ask my colleagues to support it as well. It is fair, and it is what addresses the problems that faces our young people today.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Children's Health Act, legislation that would reauthorize children's health research and prevention programs, graduate medical education programs for children's hospitals, substance abuse and drug abuse prevention and treatment programs, and safety of child care programs.

As an original cosponsor of many of the initiatives that are included in this comprehensive bill, I am pleased that Congress will be acting to protect children's health.

One of the most important provisions is the reauthorization for 5 years of the Graduate Medical Education Program for independent children's hospitals. As one who represents the largest independent children's hospital in the United States, I strongly support the role that pediatric hospitals play in advancing pediatric medicine in the training of physicians dedicated to children's health care needs.

1145

Under the current law, Medicare, which is the main funder of graduate medical education in the United States, does not provide funding for pediatric residencies for freestanding children's hospitals such as Texas Children's Hospital in my district because these hospitals, of course, treat a very small number of Medicare patients who are under the disability program.

Last year, Congress enacted a law that provided a one-time capped entitlement for pediatric Medicare education programs. This legislation would rightly extend this valuable program for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am also working with my colleagues to ensure that the pediatric graduate medical education program receives sufficient funding through the annual appropriations process. Earlier this year, the House of Representatives approved for the fiscal year 2001 Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bills $80 billion for pediatric graduate medical education, an increase of $40 million, over this year's program. I am committed to maintaining this funding level as the budget is finalized.

Another important issue in this bill is the pediatric research initiative that would require the National Institutes of Health to conduct pediatric biomedical research at the NIH. In particular, this initiative will ensure that more research is done on how diseases affected children as compared to adults. In most cases, clinical trials are conducted on adults without any consideration of how these drugs would affect children.

This initiative would also encourage the development of pediatric clinical trials to ensure that safe and effective drug treatments are available. When children face life-threatening diseases, it is very difficult to determine how much and what type of treatments should be given to them because there is insufficient information about how these treatments would affect them.

With more data in clinical trials, there will be more options for children who are fighting for their lives. The bill also directs the National Institutes of Health to conduct more research on diseases which directly affect children such as hearing loss, autism, asthma and juvenile diabetes.

I think this is a step in the right direction. I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the ranking members of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment, and I encourage my colleagues to adopt this bill.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the comments made by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) who has been a tremendous leader on the issue of combatting methamphetamine production, sale and distribution in our country and from my perspective especially in rural America.

I am here today to speak on behalf of this legislation and, particularly, the meth section, that in large part mirrors H.R. 2987, a bill which I am a sponsor.

Kansas was one of those locations, certainly Kansas, a rural State, was one of those locations in which the Committee on the Judiciary came to on location to hear about the problems we face in our part of the country. And the stories that were told, the testimony that was taken was very compelling.

I brought with me today comments made by the sheriff of one of the counties in Kansas who testified before the subcommittee on the Judiciary on the impact of methamphetamines on his rural county, and I think it can be said across the State of Kansas and rural places around the country.

Sheriff Sherrer's testimony before the subcommittee in part is this, ''the adverse effect of meth on rural America is destroying our way of life. We are now combatting narcotics problems on fertile farm ground; problems that previously existed only in large cities with large police forces having large narcotics and violent crime units. The idea that we are living in Mayberry is a myth.

''We are living in a war zone. My office is totally unprepared to combat the rapidly expanding problem of the manufacture of meth in rural Kansas. The money and manpower necessary to combat the problem is destroying my annual budget and exhausting my personnel.

''There were 25 labs seized in Pawnee County in 1999.'' And I might add, as an aside, indicate that Pawnee County's population is 7,470. We have had more than 500 meth busts in 1999 in our State alone, and we are going to, unfortunately, exceed that record this year.

Sheriff Sherrer's testimony continues, ''my personnel are physically exhausted and perhaps even worse is that they are mentally exhausted, 80- and 90-hour workweeks are not uncommon in our attempt to combat the meth problem and still attend to our normal duties. I don't have the budget or the manpower necessary to fight the current meth problem. I have exhausted all manpower and financial efforts to address this problem to no avail. As a law enforcement agency, we are exhausted.

''On behalf of all western Kansas law enforcement administrators, concerning the problem of methamphetamine, we are understaffed, underfunded, outgunned and out of our league.''

I thought originally when I got involved in this issue that it was somewhat beyond the scope of the duties that I normally face as a rural Member of Congress, but this is a problem that

is real in rural America. I am glad this Congress is addressing this issue in this legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise and express my strong support for the Children'S Health Act. This important legislation includes the Children's Day Care Health and Safety Improvement Act, a bill that I introduced with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BRYANT).

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take this opportunity to also thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman BLILEY) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BRYANT) and certainly my colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), for the leadership and hard work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing a national child care crisis. In 1997, 31,000 children ages 4 and younger were treated in hospital emergency rooms for injuries sustained in child care facilities.

In 1999, in my home district of Nassau County, there were 55 cases of suspected child abuse incidents in child care facilities. Our bill gives $200 million in State grants to improve programs, to improve the health and safety of our children in child care.

These grants can be used for a number of reasons, train and educate child care providers to prevent injuries and illnesses and to promote health-related practices; strengthen and enforce child care provider licensing, regulation and registration; rehabilitate, which is probably one of the most important parts of this bill, child care facilities to meet health and safety standards; provide health consultants to give health and safety advice to child care providers; enhance child care providers' ability to serve children with disabilities; conduct criminal background checks on child care providers, what I think is really important, especially to give our parents the peace of mind of where they are going to send their child is offering the best services possible, and I think to provide information to parents on choosing a safe and healthy setting for their children or to or improve the safety of transportation of children in child care.

Mr. Speaker, being a new grandmother, I have to say watching my daughter-in-law looking for day care is an experience that is happening around this Nation, so the more that we can do to provide certainly our children, the future leaders of this country, with a safe environment and the best environment, we, in Congress, are doing a great job. I appreciate the work of this committee for letting this to go forward and hoping we can do more in the future.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just close by saying we can sense the breadth of this bill by listening to the debate on the floor today, everything from child care to imaging, to medical research, vital, vital issues for our children. Again, I am proud to be a part of this debate and of this bill. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the chairman, and also the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the ranking member.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I endorse the remarks of the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and thank her for her role, the role that she has played, not only in this legislation, but all matters involving particularly children. I want to emphasize that this legislation came about as the result of an awful lot of hard work on a bipartisan basis. The minority was involved in every case, and I ask that everyone support.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4365, the Children's Health Act of 2000. This comprehensive measure will make a significant difference in the lives of millions of children and families by boosting biomedical and clinical research on a range of conditions and diseases that afflict children with particular severity and by improving access to treatment. As a member of the Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, I was fortunate to have the opportunity to work closely with our chairman, MIKE BILIRAKIS, who has shown great leadership on this legislation.

I am especially pleased and grateful that the final version of this bill includes provisions strengthening the National Institutes of Health's focus on Duchenne muscular dystrophy research. This will be the first time that Duchenne muscular dystrophy is mentioned in the Public Health Service Act.

I have seen the human face of this disease and the toll that it takes on children and families. Some time ago, I had the opportunity to visit with Don and Joyce Carpenter of Kalamazoo, MI, and their young and courageous son, Ben. Ben suffers from Duchenne muscular dystrophy. From them I learned that Duchenne muscular dystrophy is the most common and the most catastrophic form of genetic childhood disease. Sadly, it generally kills its victims in their late teens or early 20's.

For decades, the only drug treatment known to somewhat alter the course of the disease in the use of steroids—whose serious side effects are well-known. We've simply got to do better. We have to find a way to prevent this devastating disorder in the first place—perhaps through the promise of gene therapy. And until we learn how to prevent it, we've got to learn how to treat it more effectively.

I urge every Member of Congress to join me in voting for this bill and giving hope to Don and Joyce and Ben Carpenter and the many like them across this Nation and world. We can work miracles when we really try.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4365, the Children's Health Act of 2000. This legislation renews America's commitment to children and ensuring that their physical and mental health are cared for.

This comprehensive bill contains a number of provisions that will revise and establish programs with respect to children's health research and prevention activities performed by Federal public health agencies. Of these provisions there are five which I would like to highlight. H.R. 4365 will:

(1) Improve autism research by directing the Director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to expand and diversify the NIH's activities with respect to autism, as well as requiring the Director to award grants and contracts to public or nonprofit entities for research on autism and creating the National Autism Developmental Disabilities Surveillance Program, which uses a number of mechanisms to improve the collection, analysis, and reporting of case data on autism and other pervasive developmental disabilities.

(2) Direct the HHS Secretary to develop a system to collect data on juvenile diabetes through the CDC, and establish a national data base for this data and conduct and support long-term studies through the NIH that follow individuals with juvenile, or type 1, diabetes for 10 years or more and establish through the CDC a national health effort to address type 2 diabetes in youth.

(3) Require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to distribute to States sufficient funding to enable them to establish programs to improve the health and safety of children receiving child care outside the home by preventing illnesses and injuries.

(4) Provide funding to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) to assistance to State and local law enforcement officials in methamphetamine investigations and establishing additional DEA offices. This legislation provides law enforcement officials with tools and training to combat the methamphetamine and club drug epidemics in America today, and authorize comprehensive prevention and treatment programs to combat abuse and addiction as well.

(5) Modify the vaccine injury compensation program which currently only provides compensation to someone injured from routinely administered vaccines where the injury lasts more than 6 months. Certain vaccines, like rotavirus, often require immediate surgery, which would not be eligible for compensation. The modified program makes compensation available if the injury requires a hospital stay or surgery.

The programs I have mentioned, as well as the other important provisions of this bill, will make significant changes in the lives of children throughout this country. I applaud our colleague from Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for his leadership on this issue and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4365, the Children's Health Act of 2000.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4365, the Children's Health Act of 2000. In particular, I am pleased the legislation includes S. 976 which reauthorizes the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA).

S. 976 includes comprehensive standards for the use of restraint and seclusion in all facilities receiving Federal funding. The regulations, authored primarily by my colleague from Connecticut, Senator CHRISTOPHER DODD, will go a long way toward ensuring those receiving treatment in federally funded facilities are not subject to potentially life threatening inappropriate restraint and seclusion.

I became deeply concerned about the inappropriate use of restraint and seclusion following a series of articles published by the

Hartford Courant in October 1998, entitled ''Deadly Restraint.'' The series reported patient deaths related to the use of restraint or seclusion in 142 cases over 10 years, and chronicled the deaths of 23 patients who had died within 11 months—all apparent victims of overuse of seclusion or restraint.

Among the deaths the Courant investigated was Andrew McClain's. Andrew was an 11 year old foster child from Bridgeport, CT—in my district—who was a patient at Elmcrest Hospital, a State psychiatric institution, in Portland, CT.

On March 22, 1998, Andrew was told to move to a different table than the one where he was seated during breakfast. When he disobeyed, an aide at the hospital forcibly restrained Andrew and placed him in a face-down restraint hold.

Andrew's arms were drawn across his chest. The full weight of an adult on his back pinned this 11-year-old child to the ground, making it impossible for him to breathe, and eventually causing his death.

Andrew's horrifying death and others like it in the Courant series raised serious questions surrounding the use of restraints in mental health facilities nationwide, and more importantly, it raised public awareness of a very serious issue.

It also caused significant concern among members of the Connecticut delegation, who asked the General Accounting Office to study the use of restraint and seclusion among our most vulnerable populations—those with mental illness or mental retardation—who depend on care from others for their well-being.

The study, published last September, revealed a number of disturbing facts including at least 24 deaths associated with restraint or seclusion in 1998 alone. The GAO study also found the lack of a comprehensive reporting system to track injuries to both patients and staff resulting from restraint and seclusion, and an inconsistency among Federal and State regulations regarding restraint and seclusion for the mentally ill and disabled.

The GAO recommended an improved reporting system and led to conclusions that having regulatory protections and reporting requirements in place would reduce the use of restraint and seclusion and improve safety for patients and staff. The report also highlighted the urgent need to regulate the use of restraint and seclusion in federally funded facilities.

As a result of the GAO findings, both Senators DODD and LIEBERMAN introduced comprehensive legislation to regulate the use of restraint and seclusion in mental health facilities.

With the support of other members of the Connecticut delegation, on November 1, I introduced H.R. 3010, the Restraint Safety Act—the House companion to legislation introduced by Senator LIEBERMAN.

Provisions from Senator DODD's bill were included in the Senate-passed SAMHSA reauthorization bill which we are considering today.

Mr. Speaker, only strong Federal guidelines will ensure those in all facilities which receive federal funding will be free from unnecessary restraint and seclusion and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support these life-saving provisions by voting for the underlying bill.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letters re H.R. 4365 to be printed in the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, September 26, 2000.

Hon. BILL MCCOLLUM,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Crime, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed letter dated March 15, 2000, from Mr. Robert Raben, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, to Chairman Henry J. Hyde, House Judiciary Committee, contains the views of the Drug Enforcement Administration on provisions previously contained in 486, now included in HR 4365, ''An Act to Amend the Public Health Act of 2000'' as placed on the Senate calendar on September 25, 2000.

We continue to support the objectives behind relaxing the restrictions governing practitioners who dispense replacement pharmacotherapies to make drug addiction treatment available in greater numbers. The March 15 letter did state concerns, however, regarding what is now Title XXXV which amends Section 303(g) of the Controlled Substances Act. Specifically, we are concerned about the (g)(2)(B)(II) subparagraph which this amendment adds. As we stated, these concerns would be resolved if the following language were added to the report accompanying the bill to clarify congressional intent regarding this section:

''Nothing in this section is intended to affect either the long standing authority of the Attorney General to enforce the standard that a controlled substance is legally dispensed by a practitioner only when it is dispensed for a legitimate medical purpose by the practitioner acting in the usual course of his/her professional practice or the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services under 42 U.S.C. 257a, after consultation with the Attorney General, to determine appropriate methods of professional practice in the medical treatment of narcotic addiction. See, U.S. v. Moore, 423 U.S. 122 (1975). The standard applies to the dispensing of all controlled substances, including the dispensing in the course of maintenance or detoxification of an individual.''

Thank you for the opportunity to reaffirm our views on the bill. Please do not hesitate to call if we may be of additional assistance.

Sincerely,

DONNIE R. MARSHALL,
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, March 15, 2000.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter presents the views of the Department of Justice on S. 486, the ''Methamphetamine Anti-Proliferation Act of 1999,'' as passed by the Senate on November 19, 1999. The Department supports many of the provisions in S. 486, because they provide important and necessary tools for deterring the spread of methamphetamine manufacturing and abuse in our Nation.

We are pleased that several suggested changes to the bill were made to accommodate the Department's concerns. We, however, continue to be troubled by section 211 (''Waiver Authority for Physicians Who Dispense or Prescribe Certain Narcotic Drugs for Maintenance Treatment or Detoxification Treatment''). While we support the objectives behind relaxing the restrictions governing practitioners who dispense replacement pharmacotherapies to make drug addition treatment available to greater numbers, we believe that federal law enforcement must maintain the ability to prosecute unauthorized dispensing of controlled substances.

Our major concern is with section 211(a)(5), adding section 303(g)(2)(B)(ii)(II) of the Controlled Substances Act [page 55, line 7–11, engrossed Senate bill]. That provision states that ''[n]othing in the regulations or practice guidelines under this clause may authorize any Federal official or employee to exercise supervision or control over the practice of medicine or the manner in which the medicinal services are provided.'' As written, section 211 could be interpreted in a way that would narrow the DEA's current authority under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) to prosecute physicians who dispense controlled substances, but do so without a legitimate medical purpose in the usual course of their professional practice. It is well-settled law that a physician's license is not an automatic and absolute shield to prosecution under the CSA, since the CSA was designed by Congress in part ''to confine authorized medical practice within accepted limits,'' *See United States* v. *Moore*, 423 U.S. 122, 143 (1975). In *Moore*, for example, a defendant/doctor was authorized to dispense methadone for detoxification purposes only. A jury found that he exceeded the bounds of his professional practice by prescribing large quantities of methadone for patients without giving them adequate physical examinations or specific instructions for its use and charged fees according to the quantity of methadone prescribed rather than fees for medical services rendered. The Supreme Court concluded that the doctor was using his medical license as an excuse to facilitate the sale of controlled substances to addicts and, therefore, was in violation of the CSA.

Our concerns would be resolved if the following language were added to the report accompanying the bill to clarify congressional intent regarding this section:

''Nothing in this section is intended to affect neither the long standing authority of the Attorney General to enforce the standard that a controlled substance is legally dispensed by a practitioner only when it is dispensed for a legitimate medical purpose by the practitioner acting in the usual course of his/her professional practice nor the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services under 42 U.S.C. §257a, after consultation with the Attorney General, to determine appropriate methods of professional practice in the medical treatment of narcotic addiction. *See, U.S.* v. *Moore*, 423 U.S. 122 (1975). The standard applies to the dispensing of all controlled substances, including the dispensing in the course of maintenance or detoxification of an individual.''

On an unrelated matter, we recommend that section 123(a) of the bill (''Expansion of Methamphetamine Abuse Prevention Reports'') (enacting new section 515(e) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. §290bb(e)(1))) be amended by adding after ''the Administrator'' ''of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the Attorney General.'' Although we do not object to this provision as it is currently drafted, we believe that the language we are suggesting would help to ensure coordination among related and ongoing federal initiatives.

Finally, section 114(c) of the bill would require the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) to ''apportion'' funds appropriated for combating methamphetamine in High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA's). Technically, this is an inaccurate use of the word ''apportion.'' Only the Office of Management and Budget is authorized to ''apportion'' funds. We recommend that the word ''allocate'' be substituted for ''apportion.''

Thank you for the opportunity to present our views. Please do not hesitate to call

upon us if we may be of additional assistance. The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely,

ROBERT RABEN,
Assistant Attorney General.

Identical letter to be sent to the ranking minority member, Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank those who have spent so many hours working on developing a comprehensive children's health bill to present to this House today. While this bill makes great strides on many childhood diseases and health issues, I will focus my remarks on the devastating affects that Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy has on the children with the disease and their families.

Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy is the most common genetic illness, crossing all cultures. Although Duchenne MD is an inherited disease and is present from the initial stages of fetal development, there is generally no indication at birth that the child has abnormal muscle function. In the first year of life, it is rare for parents to detect any delay in development. Typically a child is diagnosed between the age of 2–5 years. As a child grows and his muscle cells deteriorate, and he becomes noticeably weak. The child usually loses his ability to walk around 10 years of age. As time progresses, the chest muscles deteriorate, causing respiratory problems. Death often occurs in the late teens unless mechanical breathing is instituted.

This is painful not only for the child but also for the mothers and fathers who care for and love their child. To date there are efforts in finding a cure for this disease and the Children's Health Bill will allow these efforts to come to fruition. In addition, this bill will begin to provide the resources needed to expand research efforts in finding treatment and a cure for this disease.

As a member of the Labor-Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, I have supported doubling the NIH's budget over a five year period. I am pleased that this legislation's Muscular Dystrophy title tracks with report language from both the House and Senate Labor/HHS Appropriations bills, calling for increased research and coordination among the institutes of NIH. One of the problems that has confronted this disease community is that MD does not have a natural ''home'' among the institutes. I am confident that the National Institute for Neurological Disorders and Stroke, under the exemplary leadership of Dr. Gerald Fischbach, will increase the pace of research and provide a crucial coordination role.

An essential and logical portion of this heightened research would be the creation of a muscle biology study section, which could easily be accomplished in the context on an ongoing review of the study sections and their scientific peer review processes of NIH. I am troubled that out of the current 105 NIH study sections, there is no study section for muscle, the largest organ of the body.

Mr. Speaker, not only are there no cures for this, the world's number-one genetic killer of children, but there are no real therapies for Duchenne and Becker Muscular Dystrophy. Astonishingly, the pace of research, in real dollars, actually declined after the dystrophin gene was discovered in 1986. Passage of the Children's Health Act is a clear indication from Congress that this is unacceptable. I urge all Members of this House to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, as the original sponsor of H.R. 2511, the Adoption Awareness Act, along with the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman BLILEY, a champion of adoption issues, I am pleased to endorse the Infant Adoption Awareness Act included in the child health bill, H.R. 4365.

Adoption is a wonderful option because it brings a positive, life-giving end to what could be difficult circumstances. The mother can place her child in a loving family, the child receives a warm and welcoming home, and an adoptive couple gets to wear one of the greatest titles in America—parent. Additionally, pro-life individuals, groups, and communities should encourage adoption as one of the life-giving choices of women with unplanned pregnancies. With the love and care provided at crisis pregnancy centers and in homes, community and faith-based organizations across the country, more women will hear about the resources available to help them through this difficult time and to encourage them to bring this newly-formed life into the world.

While this language is not as broad as the original legislation, it does reflect significant efforts to advance the purpose of the Adoption Awareness Act. This language was drafted with input from a wide variety of organizations, including those in the adoption and public health communities.

Women facing unplanned pregnancies deserve to hear about their options from a well-trained counselor who can provide accurate, up-to-date information on adoption. This Act provides professional development for pregnancy counselors in adoption counseling. The training will enable pregnancy counselors to feel confident in their knowledge of the adoption process, relevant State and local laws, and the legal, medical, and financial resources which can be provided to women with unplanned pregnancies.

I am pleased to support the Infant Adoption Awareness Act as a step in the right direction to bring complete and accurate adoption information to women facing unplanned pregnancies. I hope that this step significantly advances our Nation in the direction of eliminating a perceived anti-adoption bias in pregnancy counseling in providing lasting answers to difficult circumstances.

I truly believe that in our great Nation, while there may be unwanted pregnancies, there are no unwanted children.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4365, the Childrens' Health Act of 2000, as amended by the other body. This important legislation is the result of long, hard negotiations on the part of members of my staff and their counterparts on the staff of Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DINGELL, and members of the other body that made this possible.

As members of the House will recall, after we passed H.R. 4365 the first time, the other body moved forward on legislation that would have left many health problems facing children unaddressed. I am pleased to report that were able to restore the House provisions that were omitted in the other body's legislation, and have added authorizations that strengthen the bill.

Though too numerous to mention each provision individually, I want to comment on three provisions that I believe are particularly important. As a proud adoptive father of two, I am pleased that this bill advances adoption policy in this country. The bill ensures that family planning counselors have access to training on presenting complete and accurate adoption information to women facing unplanned pregnancies. In the interest of time, I will extend my remarks for a more full discussion of this aspect of the legislation.

Moreover, this bill contains several initiatives that will foster the adoption of special needs children. The bill also authorizes the Healthy Start program for the first time. For at-risk pregnant women served by this program, it authorizes mobile health clinics equipped with ultra-sound screening technology and also expands access to prenatal and other surgical services to the unborn child, mother, and infant during the first year after birth.

I am also pleased that this bill directs NIH to expand and increase coordination in activities with respect to research on muscular dystrophies. It also makes important strides in the fight against autism, which affects 1 in every 500 children born today. More prevalent than Down syndrome, childhood cancer or cystic fibrosis, autism hits children during the first two years of life and causes severe impairment in language, cognition and communication. Since so many of America's children suffer from so many disorders, it is right that work to ensure that researchers are looking for the cures they need.

Although this bill addresses many tragic disorders among children, among the most tragic is that of drug abuse—and this bill extends a powerful helping hand to help parents to secure their children's future. This bill further extends the war on drugs to those who push methamphetamine, ''ecstasy,'' and heroin onto our young people. Under these provisions, criminal penalties are increased for individuals who manufacture and traffic in methamphetamine and ''ecstasy.'' The provisions also increase funding for law enforcement training and targets high intensity methamphetamine trafficking areas.

Perhaps most importantly, we are attacking heroin abuse by reducing the demand for this deadly drug. Let me relate some of the testimony Mr. Odis Rivers of Detroit, Michigan shared with the Commerce Subcommittee on Health and Environment last year. He has been addicted to heroin for 30 years, and is undergoing treatment with a drug that this bill will help more physicians prescribe to their patients. He told the Subcommittee that he was back with his wife and family and was enjoying their support. He had won their respect, and could again assume his rightful place in their family. As the Detroit Free Press stated on October 3rd of last year, ''this seems like the kind of legislation that should be passed, especially in light of new University of Michigan research showing that heroin use among teens doubled from 1991 to 1998.'' These provisions will make new heroin-blocking medications available to physicians treating patients struggling to be free from heroin addiction.

Not only do we use innovative strategies to address the problems of meth, ecstasy, and heroin, we also ensure that there is a Federal agency that is focused on reducing the incidence of substance abuse and mental illness throughout society. H.R. 4365 reauthorizes the

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, which was created in 1992 to assist States develop effective prevention and treatment programs to protect America's children from the scourges of mental illness and drug abuse. The important ''charitable choice'' provision in this legislation permits Federal assistance for religious organizations providing substance abuse services, which is similar to language that has been enacted into law several times with broad support in the House.

It is important that the Members of this House vote for passage of this critically important bill to secure a better future for America's children by helping to reduce the incidence of disease and illness. We know we can lessen the incidence of these diseases through heightened research activities, and through the use of successful interventions that still remain out of reach by many in our society.

Again, I thank my colleagues and many other Members who have contributed to making this bill possible, and I would like to recognize the hard work of the House staff who brought this bill together: Marc Wheat, Jason Lee, Brent Del Monte, Patrick Morrisey, Anne Esposito, Carolyn Sporn, John Ford, Judith Benkendorf, Ellie Dehoney, and Katie Porter.

Last year, Congressman JIM DEMINT of South Carolina and I introduced H.R. 2511, the Adoption Awareness Act. After negotiations with all interested parties, including adoption advocates, foster care advocates, and representatives from the pro-life community as well as the abortion industry, the language of H.R. 2511 changed but the central purpose remained the same: the Infant Adoption Awareness Act ensures that counselors in health clinics and other settings provide women who have unplanned pregnancies complete and accurate information on adoption.

The Infant Adoption Awareness Act passed the House as part of H.R. 4365 by a vote of 419–2 and passed the Senate by unanimous consent. As Chairman of the Commerce Committee, I have been responsible for the negotiations leading to the final form of the Infant Adoption Awareness Act for these many months, and I want to take this opportunity to explain the bill at length to my colleagues in case there is any confusion with the text of the original Adoption Awareness Act, H.R. 2511.

What struck Congressman DEMINT and me was that the studies and statistics available in this field show a lack of activity which may well reflect an anti-adoption bias in pregnancy counseling. According to a University of Illinois study by Professor Edmund Mech, Orientations of Pregnancy Counselors Toward Adoption, 40 percent of self-identified ''pregnancy counselors'' in settings such as health, family planning, and social service agencies do not even raise the issue of adoption with their pregnant clients. Of the 60 percent who raise the issue of adoption in some form, 40 percent provide inaccurate or incomplete information. Furthermore, while pregnancy counselors themselves may not have a negative bias towards adoption, they presuppose that their client is not interested and therefore do not present adoption as a true option for women facing unplanned pregnancies (Source: Mech, Pregnant Adolescents: Communicating the Adoption Option). The Infant Adoption Awareness Act would set up a training program by which clinic workers and others could receive professional in-service training in educational adoption counseling. If properly trained, these counselors would be equipped to provide valuable information on adoption to their clients.

While many societal factors have changed in the last twenty years, including the acceptance of non-marital teen parenting, the availability of welfare, and increased availability of abortion services, there has been a dramatic drop in the number of adoptions among live births to unwed mothers. Prior to 1973, an adoption placement occurred for almost one of every ten premarital births. By the 1990s, the number had dropped to an adoption placement for one of less than every hundred premarital births. A long-term study of the Adolescent Family Life (AFL) pregnancy programs which included an adoption counseling component showed that—given necessary adjustments for client and community characteristics—more women chose to place their child for adoption when enrolled in an AFL Care project which provided adoption counseling as a part of pregnancy resolution decision-making (Source: McLaughlin and Johnson, Battelle Human Affairs Research Centers, The Relationship of Client and Project Characteristics to the Relinquishment Rates of the AFL Care Demonstration Projects). Thus, this Act intends to ensure that the public health and other professionals coming in contact with a high percentage of women facing unplanned pregnancies—often unwed adolescents—are properly prepared to have a complete and accurate discussion of adoption.

The Act allows for a six month period in which representatives of the adoption community come together to adopt or develop best-practices guidelines for counseling on adoption to women facing unplanned pregnancies. Specifically, the Secretary should include representatives of diverse viewpoints in the adoption community, including organizations representing agencies arranging infant adoptions, adoption attorneys, adoptive parents, social services, and appropriate groups representing the adoption triad (birth parents, infant, and adoptive parents). Organizations with significant expertise and history in this arena include the National Council For Adoption, Loving and Caring, Bethany Christian Services, the American Academy of Adoption Attorneys, and the American Bar Association Family Law Section's Adoption Committee. These organizations should be represented on the panel. While recognizing the sensitivity of making an adoption decision, the organizations represented should be those which promote adoption in a realistic, positive manner as beneficial to the birth parents, child, and adoptive parents. The best-practices guidelines should focus on the essential components of adoption information and counseling to be presented during a pregnancy counseling session. Furthermore, the guidelines should include important variables to be presented, such as state laws on adoption, and available medical, legal, and financial resources. Previous curricula developed for these purposes should be the starting point and, as an interim set of guidelines, be determinative.

The role of the public health clinics on the panel developing the best practices guidelines (and organizations representing their interests, such as the Family Planning Councils of America) is to ensure the guidelines are relevant to the health clinic setting. The experts in adoption counseling, including those who have a history of developing and delivering training or tools to teach adoption counseling, should shape the best-practices guidelines to provide an excellent model for presenting adoption to women facing unplanned pregnancies. Since different attitudes towards adoption exist throughout the country which can be attributed to racial, ethnic, religious, social, and geographic differences, the best-practices guidelines should act as a blueprint or model while still allowing localities the flexibility to address their local situation. Therefore, the best-practices guidelines would be a model which could be tailored to address the individual needs of the pregnant woman.

After the best-practices guidelines are developed, the Secretary shall make grants to adoption organizations to carry out training, which will often be training trainers, to teach pregnancy counselors how to present complete and accurate information on adoption. The guidelines are meant to be the basis for the adoption, improvement, or development of a training curriculum by grantees. Furthermore, the grantees can carry out the training programs directly or through grants or contracts with other adoption organizations. For instance, a national office could subgrant or contract with local affiliates throughout the nation or a region thereof. The Secretary should use discretion in ensuring that all regions of the nation will have adequate access to the training without having duplicate services in an area with a small number of eligible health clinics. There are no geographic limitations on where the trainers should be trained. The intent is to provide for training of trainers, often on a statewide or regional basis, so truly expert trainers can teach others.

The trainers should be highly qualified individuals with an expertise in adoption counseling. ''Adoption counseling'' in the adoption community implies an in-depth discussion of adoption which includes knowledge of various types of adoption and familiarity with the viewpoint and challenges of birth mothers, putative fathers, adoptive parents, and the best interest of the child. Trainers should have experience in providing adoption information and referrals in the geographic area of the eligible health centers. With a knowledge of state laws and access to local support networks, a trainer will be able to provide a more extensive review of local information and resources to the pregnancy counselors. The most essential component of the training, however, is to teach pregnancy counselors how to accurately and completely present adoption as an option to their clients and to ensure counselors are able to answer the frequently asked questions clients have regarding adoption.

The Infant Adoption Awareness Act refers to pregnancy counselors providing adoption information and referrals as a part of pregnancy counseling. It is important to note that handing a client a piece of paper or booklet explaining the adoption process and providing phone numbers of agencies or attorneys for adoption referrals does not constitute adoption information and referrals. Adoption information means a counselor is able to fully explore the option of adoption with a client. This includes answering relevant questions such as the types of adoptions, financial and medical resources for birth mothers, and state laws regarding relinquishment procedures and putative father involvement. Referral upon request includes following the procedures of the health clinic to make an appointment for the client and follow-

up as necessary. Referral may be made to an in-house adoption provider, such as a staff member of a licensed adoption agency. Since adoption is explored in the context of pregnancy counseling sessions in which counselors and clients have a limited amount of time, it is essential that the counselors provide complete and accurate summary information to their clients at that time.

The intent of this Act is to ensure that pregnancy counselors are well-trained, knowledgeable and comfortable presenting adoption to their clients. While adoption may not be the right choice for every women facing an unplanned pregnancy, each woman should be presented adoption information to make a well-informed decision. Many women have not thought of the possibility of adoption, do not know how to explore the details of adoption, or have misconceptions of the adoption process which hinder their consideration of the alternative of adoption. Since pregnancy counselors act as an important resource for these women, they must be equipped to fully address the option of adoption with their clients.

The adoption organizations eligible to receive grants for training (or subgrants or contracts) are those national, regional, or local private, non-profit institutions among whose primary purposes is adoption, and are knowledgeable in all elements of the adoption process and on providing adoption information and referrals to pregnant women. These adoption organizations must work in collaboration with existing Health Resources Services Administration (HRSA) funded ''training centers.'' Of particular importance is the organization's experience in explaining the process involved to the birth mother placing the child for adoption. It is essential that adoption is among the primary of the entity, as it should be organizations with true experts in adoption counseling who are training pregnancy counselors.

Health centers which are eligible to have staff receive training are public and nonprofit private entities that provide health-related services to pregnant women. The designated staff of the health centers means the counselors who will interact and provide counseling to women with unplanned pregnancies. The designated staff members are those who provide pregnancy or adoption information and referrals (or will provide such information and referrals after receiving training). Furthermore, while the Act sets out those health centers which should receive priority is being trained, nothing should be construed to prohibit those who provide counseling in other settings, such as on military bases and corrections facilities, to be eligible to participate in the adoption counseling training sessions.

The grant is conditioned on the agreement of the adoption organization to make reasonable efforts to ensure that the eligible health centers which may receive training under this grant include, but are not limited to, those that receive federal family planning funding, community health centers, migrant health centers, centers for homeless individuals and residents of public housing and school-based clinics.

The Secretary has the duty to provide eligible health centers (which receive funding under Section 330 and 1001) with complete information about the training available from the adoption organizations receiving the training grants. Furthermore, the Secretary has the duty to encourage eligible health centers to have their designated staff participate in the training. The Secretary must make reasonable efforts to encourage staff to undergo training within a reasonable period after the Secretary begins making grants for such training. The grantees will cover the costs of training the designated staff and reimbursing the health center for costs associated with receiving the training. Adoption counseling training is a type of professional development for pregnancy counselors and should be reimbursed on a similar basis as other professional development activities which staff receive in the local area.

Within one year, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate Committees of Congress a report prepared by an independent evaluator, paid for by funds set aside under this Act evaluating the extent to which adoption information, and referral upon request, is provided by eligible health centers. The bill directs the reports to be conducted by the Secretary acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration and in collaboration with the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. The study should be scientifically-based and sufficiently broad so as to gain an understanding of the current practices of providing adoption information in Federally funded health clinics throughout the country. This should include the attention given to adoption relative to other options discussed in pregnancy counseling. Further, the study should indicate how often and in what form (written, verbal) adoption information is offered, the completeness and accuracy of the adoption information provided, and non-identifying information about the options ultimately chosen by clients.

Within a reasonable period of time, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate Committees of Congress a report evaluating the extent to which adoption information, and referral upon request, is provided by eligible health centers to determine the effectiveness of the training. The bill directs the reports to be conducted by the Secretary acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration and in collaboration with the Director of the Agency for Health Care Research and Quality. Moreover, it is important that the study is scientifically-based, that is, more than a checklist asserting that adoption counseling, information, or referral has been provided, and focus on those health centers in which designated staff have been provided training through this Act. In conducting these studies, the Secretary shall ensure that the research does not allow any interference in the provider-patient relationship, any breach of patient confidentiality, or any monitoring or auditing of the counseling process which breaches patient confidentiality or reveals patient identity.

Funding for research in adoption counseling practices has been sporadic at best. Despite the acknowledged need to ensure pregnancy counselors can present adoption in a positive, accurate manner, funding for such studies has not materialized in proportion to the need. The Adolescent Family Life Program in the Office of Population Affairs provided for limited studies in the 1980s and follow-up studies on the effectiveness of the AFL Demonstration Programs into the early 1990s. The Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs in the 1990s proposed an objective of increasing to 90 percent the number of pregnancy counselors who are able to counsel on adoption in a complete, accurate manner. With a change of Administration, this goal never materialized as one of the priorities of the Public Health Service. Furthermore, plans for follow-up study by the Department of Health and Human Services to determine if the orientations of pregnancy counselors toward adoption had changed were dropped in 1995. Thus, research in this area is of critical importance.

Additionally, while the intention was to include ''charitable choice'' language allowing faith-based organizations to compete for grants on the same basis as any other non-governmental provider without impairing the religious character of such institution, this language is not in the final bill due to opposition from the minority. I hope faith-based institutions will be able to compete for these grants in the future. To clarify, under charitable choice, the Federal Government cannot discriminate against an organization that applies to receive such a grant on the bias that the organization has a religious character and programs must be implemented consistent with the Establishment and Free Exercise Clauses of the United States Constitution. While following the agreed upon charitable choice model, future charitable choice language must be crafted to conform it to the purpose and structure of this Act.

As an adoptive father, Co-Chairman of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption, and Chairman of the House Commerce Committee, I am proud to have worked to make complete and accurate information on adoption a reality for women across the country. I look forward to the implementation of this important legislation as one my legacies to this great country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I submit this statement on my behalf and the behalf of Congressman BILL MCCOLLUM, Chairman, Subcommittee on Crime.

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE TOM BLILEY AND THE HONORABLE BILL MCCOLLUM

We write to clarify our intent with respect to Title XXXV of H.R. 4653, the Child Health Act of 2000. We support the objectives of this provision, to amend current law governing practitioners in order to make certain addiction treatment available in appropriate circumstances.

However, subsection within Title XXXV stating that ''Nothing in such regulations or practice guidelines may authorize any Federal official or employee to exercise supervision or control over the practice of medicine or the manner in which medical services are provided'' requires further clarification. Nothing in this subsection is intended to affect either the long standing authority of the Attorney General to enforce the standard governing the dispensing of controlled substances, nor the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, after consultation with the Attorney General, to determine the appropriate methods professional practice in the medical treatment of narcotic addiction. This authority applies to the dispensing of all controlled substances, including that which is authorized by this provision.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in this town, it's difficult to take action in any direction without creating controversy.

Consensus is a rarity.

This legislation bucks the trend. It reflects consensus around a common-sense principle.

If we can protect children from needless surgery, preventable disability, premature death—we should do it.

That's what this bill is all about.

We are placing our hope and trust in the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, HRSA, and other federal agencies that have responsibility for improving our nation's health.

We are asking them to intensify their efforts in areas of children's health including juvenile arthritis, muscular dystrophy, asthma, and Fragile X syndrome.

This bill provides screening and health care services for infants and children at risk for heritable disorders, and it implements organ donation policies that recognize the unique needs of children.

We have done a lot in this bill to help young victims of childhood illness and disease. But we in Congress should not take the credit.

Parents and other advocates for children throughout the United States should.

I especially want to acknowledge the parents. I've met with many parents this year, and I am proud that this bill translates their straightforward and eminently justifiable goals into action.

These parents want to see children's health research given the priority it deserves.

We invest generously in our children's basic needs, their education, their happiness . . . we should invest at least as generously in the kind of research that can protect and restore their health.

Many of the parents I spoke with were bringing their stories to Congress not for themselves, not for their own children, but for children and families they will never meet.

These parents are working to prevent others from experiencing the trauma and pain a childhood illness can inflict on a child and their loved ones.

I want to thank the parents for their hard work, dedication and unwavering conviction that we can do much, much more to ease the way for our children.

This same conviction underlies the portion of the Children's Health Act that reauthorizes the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA).

In this year's reauthorization of SAMHSA, we do more to address substance abuse and mental health issues as they relate to children—under age drinking, children and violence, and fetal alcohol syndrome, to name a few.

To the extent we can protect our children from alcohol and substance abuse, we reduce their chances of addiction or abuse as adults.

We owe them that.

This is a great success, but once again, it's the public's accomplishment.

Substance abuse prevention is a public priority and has garnered overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle.

We have been asked to make this, as well as children's health, a priority for this Congress.

I am pleased to be among those helping to fulfill those wishes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4365, the Children's Health Act of 2000. This bill, which now contains provisions from the Senate's bill, authorizes a variety of programs for expanding and intensifying children's health research. It also includes prenatal care initiatives (including the first formal authorization of the Healthy Start Program) that were included in the bill we passed in May of this year.

The bill also covers a wide range of youth drug and mental health services programs that will strengthen America's communities. I am very pleased that this Congress is reauthorizing programs administered by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). These programs provide critical safety-net services for individuals and families with substance abuse problems and mental illness.

I wish to commend a number of my colleagues for their fine contributions: Representative DIANA DEGETTE, for championing provisions on pediatric organ transplants, juvenile diabetes, limits on the use of seclusion and restraints on hospitalized children, and a study concerning the use of children as participants in clinical research; Representative STRICKLAND for his child mental health provisions and for bringing state-of-the-art services to residents of rural communities; and, Representative CAPPS for her efforts in this Chamber not only to make the SAMHSA reauthorization a reality, but for her fine provision on underage drinking. The ranking member of the Health and Environment Subcommittee, Representative BROWN, has done a splendid job with this bill and he deserves our gratitude. Virtually every bill affecting public health bears the mark of my good friend and colleague, Representative WAXMAN, and this one is no exception. Many other of our colleagues made significant contributions to this bill, as well.

Giving credit where it is due, this bill has been improved by our Senate colleagues. Childhood obesity, now a focus of the bill, is one of the Surgeon General's priorities for Healthy People 2010. I am also delighted to see the program for newborn screening for heritable metabolic disorders, an issue of great concern to my colleague, Representative PALLONE. This provision would establish an advisory counsel to guide the Secretary in making timely and informed responses to rapid advances in genetic technologies. State and local public health departments will benefit from their provision as resources would be made available to improve programmatic uniformity, from laboratory infrastructure, to counseling, and healthcare services.

Other new provisions for America's children will develop strategies for improving childcare facilities, increase funds for the early detection and treatment of childhood lead poisoning, and fund a longitudinal study of influences that shape child development. The new National Center for Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention will track and identify causes of birth defects and developmental disabilities with the goal of creating effective interventions to prevent the conditions, or their secondary health impacts. But without the full support of our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee in fiscal year 2001 to build and operate the Center, and in successive years to sustain and expand it, the Center will only be a shell.

Despite its many worthy provisions, this bill has been marked by a number of procedural irregularities. No bill of this scope and magnitude should proceed to the House floor without going through the committee process. No children's health bill worth its name should neglect such programs as: (1) supplementing S–CHIP and Medicaid to provide seamless access to state-of-the-art prenatal services to all pregnant women; (2) assuring equal access to pediatric specialists, medically necessary drugs and clinical trials for children with rare and/or serious health problems; (3) establishing guidelines for the administration of psychotropic medications to children under five, which is a major concern to my good friend Representative Towns; and, (4) addressing FDA regulation of youth tobacco use. Ironically, the provision promoting safe motherhood includes a public education initiative addressing the dangers of alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drug use in pregnancy. Most women do not begin smoking during pregnancy; they begin as adolescents. Yet, our Committee was unable to even debate this issue this year.

The provision on narcotic addiction treatment unfortunately fails to provide coverage for the majority of heroin addicts who cannot afford new drugs, such as buprenorphine, which were developed with taxpayer resources. Implementation of this provision, which exempts certain physicians from future guidelines for treatment with a not yet approved and labeled drug, will bear watching.

Finally, it is unfortunate that at a time when our Nation has more than 120,000 children in the foster care and the child welfare system who need homes, the only provision in this bill addressing adoption is based on a very limited, heavily criticized, sixteen year old study of how women with unintended pregnancies are counseled about their options. It speaks volumes that not a single organization involved with special needs adoptions has written to express support for this bill. This provision is based on a pejorative assumption about our publicly funded primary health care system and it burdens the already extended community health centers and Title X family planning clinics. Our tax dollars would be better spent addressing the needs of the more than 120,000 children of this Nation who so desperately need loving, caring homes.

I will vote for this bill. However, I want America's children to know that while H.R. 4365 is a significant step toward improving the quality of your collective health, we can do better. It now seems clear that the horizon of the 106th Congress will be rather limited with respect to health issues. I have great hope and great confidence that in the 107th Congress we will do better.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment of the House Committee on Commerce, the committee of jurisdiction, I wish to clarify my intent in voting or H.R. 4365. Section 3207 imposes new requirements on residents of certain facilities with respect to the use of techniques of ''restraint'' and ''seclusion.'' While such practices should be avoided whenever possible, I trust that the regulatory agencies implementing this law will do so in a reasonable, practical manner. New Section 591(d)(1) of the Public Health Service Act defines ''restraint'' to exclude ''any . . . method that involves the physical holding of a resident . . . to permit the resident to participate in activities without the risk of physical harm to the resident . . .'' I construe this phrase to allow facilities covered under this section providing services to children and youth with serious emotional disturbances to continue using a practice known as a ''therapeutic hold'' when appropriate to allow a resident to resume activities as soon as possible.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the underlying legislation which includes within it an important bill that I sponsored in the House, the Methamphetamine

Anti-Proliferation Act of 2000. Methamphetamine is a powerful and dangerous drug. It differs from other popular illegal narcotics because it can be made from readily available, domestically produced, legal but dangerous chemicals and substances. It puts both human life and the environment at risk and it is reaching epidemic proportions.

Meth has become the fastest growing illegal narcotic in America. Within the last five years, meth use has increased in some communities by as much as 300 percent. In some areas meth accounts for as much as 90 percent of all drug cases. An increasing amount of meth is imported, but there are also hundreds of small ''Mom and Pop'' clandestine labs manufacturing meth in my State of Utah and throughout the country. Cheaply produced, but with a street value as high as $1,500 an ounce, it is no wonder that meth has become the drug of choice for gangs and criminals.

This legislation that I sponsored, and which we consider today, will address the proliferation of methamphetamine and club drug manufacturing, trafficking, use, and addiction in America. It provides Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials with tools and training to combat the methamphetamine and club drug epidemic in America today. It furthermore authorizes comprehensive prevention and treatment programs to combat abuse and addiction as well.

H.R. 2987 provides funding to the Drug Enforcement Administration [DEA] and Office of National Drug Control Policy [ONDCP]. These additional resources will be used to assist State and local law enforcement officials in methamphetamine investigations and establish additional DEA offices in rural areas. It provides training for toxic methamphetamine waste clean up, and authorizes federal reimbursement to states and localities for meth lab cleanup expenses.

H.R. 2987 also increases penalties for amphetamine production, trafficking in meth precursor chemicals, and drug manufacturing that creates a risk to human life or to the environment. The bill also contains provisions to address the problems associated with ''Ecstasy,'' gamma-hydroxbutyric acid (GHB) to so-called ''date rape drug,'' other enumerated ''club'' drugs, as well as similar controlled substances. And finally, the bill contains a number of provisions authorizing effective and science-based methamphetamine and club drug prevention and addiction treatment programs and federal resources for those programs.

Mr. Speaker, by passing this bill today we will be upholding our responsibility to provide additional federal resources that will help local law enforcement take back our cities and towns from the rising tide of methamphetamine and club drugs. I thank all the Members who worked on this bill for their efforts, and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, when the Children's' Health Act was passed by the Senate, the Anti-Methamphetamine Proliferation Act was added as an amendment. I wish to speak about the importance of this provision in the fight against methamphetamines.

Those of us who live on the east coast have not experienced the devastation that methamphetamines can wreak on a community. Unfortunately, in California, where 80 percent of the Nation's Meth supply is produced, we know all too well the dangers of this drug. Methamphetamines are a powerful drug that leaves a path of destruction in its wake. Meth is highly addictive, giving the user a sense of power and paranoia. As a result, a staggering proportion of violent crime in many communities is tied to Meth use. Would you believe that in Sacramento, 27 percent of male arrestees tested positive for Meth? In other western cities, the numbers are equally alarming: San Diego—26 percent; Salt Lake City—25 percent; San Jose—24 percent; Spokane—20 percent; Portland—19 percent; Las Vegas—16 percent; Phoenix—16 percent.

The Meth crisis is full of youth tragedies as well. Since Meth is largely produced on kitchen stoves, children are extremely vulnerable to exposure to lethal chemicals. In addition, I have personally heard horrific stories of child abuse at the hands of Meth users.

In March of this year I hosted a congressional field hearing in Woodland, CA to discuss the Meth crisis. During the hearing I heard from State and local law enforcement officials who fight the Meth crisis. From them I learned the unique challenges that this drug presents. The Anti-Methamphetamines Proliferation Act, for the first time ever, takes a comprehensive approach to fighting Meth and addresses those very problems that I heard from my local sheriffs and police chiefs.

The Anti-Meth Proliferation Act would: increase penalties for possession of precursor chemicals used to make Meth; add $15 million to the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTAs) specifically targeted towards fighting Meth; increase funds to help state and local officials clean up Meth labs, which are filled with dangerous chemicals that threaten both human lives and the environment; adds funds for research and treatment of Meth.

I congratulate the gentleman from Utah, Mr. CANNON and the gentleman from Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM for their hard work on this important bill. With this legislation, we are finally giving our law enforcement officials the resources they need to fight Meth production and distribution.

Let's pass this bill and get serious about fighting the scourge of methamphetamines.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 4365, the Children's Health Act. I am very pleased this bill represents a bipartisan, consensus combination of the children's health legislation and a long overdue reauthorization of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration [SAMHSA].

This legislation contains many important provisions which will advance the treatment, cure and prevention of many childhood diseases and disorders. Among other benefits, they promise to make significant advances in the treatment and prevention of childhood asthma and of autoimmune diseases, like multiple sclerosis, juvenile diabetes and lupus, as well as in education and outreach regarding Tourette Syndrome. And children participating in clinical research will be afforded stronger protections under Federal law.

Title V of this bill consists of H.R. 2840, the Children's Asthma Relief Act of 1999, introduced by Congressman FRED UPTON and myself. Title XIX is based on H.R. 2573, the NIH Office of Autoimmune Diseases Act of 1999, which was authored by Congresswoman CONNIE MORELLA and myself. Title XXIII consists of an amendment, ''Children and Tourette Syndrome Awareness,'' authored by myself. Title XXVII includes enhanced protections for children participating in clinical research, based on H.R. 4605, the Human Research Subjects Protection Act introduced by Congresswoman DIANA DEGETTE, Congressman JOHN MICA and myself.

Equally important, this legislation authorizes programs and grants administered by SAMHSA which are essential to the health of many Americans. The reauthorization of this agency's statutory authority is long overdue and comes at an important juncture in our efforts to improve our health care services

NIH INITIATIVE ON AUTOIMMUNE DISEASES

I am pleased that H.R. 4365 establishes a new initiative at NIH to ''expand, intensify and corrdinate'' research and education on autoimmune diseases.

Last year, Congresswoman MORELLA and I introduced the NIH Office of Autoimmune Diseases Act of 1999. This legislation created an office in the NIH Office of the Director to ensure that federal funding of autoimmune disease research is used optimally and that clinical treatments are developed as rapidly as possible.

There are more than 80 autoimmune diseases—including multiple sclerosis, lupus, and rheumatoid arthritis—in which the body's immune system mistakenly attacks healthy tissues. These diseases affect more than 13.5 million Americans and are major causes of disability. Most striking of all, three-quarters of those afflicted with an autoimmune disease are women.

Research on autoimmune diseases is spread through many institutes of the National Institutes of Health [NIH], just as treatments involve many clinical specialties. Increasingly, however, scientists are identifying the common risk factors and symptoms of autoimmune diseases. This is why greater coordination and additional resources are needed in our Nation's autoimmune research effort.

Title XIX of H.R. 4365 adopts our office, transferring its activities and mission to an Autoimmune Diseases Coordinating Committee. Composed of NIH institute directors and permanently staffed with scientists and health professionals, the coordinating committee would be advised by a public advisory council.

Most significantly, the coordinating committee, in close consultation with the advisory council, will develop a plan for research and education on autoimmune diseases. The plan will establish NIH priorities and the Director of NIH will ensure the plan is fully and appropriately funded. The strategic plan would create crucial new funding opportunities for autoimmune research, based on the professional and scientific judgements of researchers, patients and clinicians. Finally, the committee would report to Congress on implementation of the plan, including the actual amounts dedicated by NIH to autoimmune disease research. The committee will also prospectively identify areas and projects of great promise which Congress should support. I cannot overstate the importance of these activities. In conjunction with the strategic plan, these reports will provide an objective, scientifically sound roadmap to Congress and NIH to follow in the pursuit of new treatments and cures for autoimmune diseases.

ASTHMA SERVICES FOR CHILDREN

Title V will benefit the more than five million American children who have asthma, one of the most significant and prevalent chronic diseases in America. Surgeon General David

Satcher recently concluded that the United States is ''moving in the wrong direction, especially among minority children in the urban communities.''

That is why the Children's Asthma Relief Act provides new funding for pediatric asthma prevention and treatment programs, allowing states and local communities to target and improve the health of low-income children suffering from asthma. The act would also increase the enrollment of these children into Medicaid and state Children's Health Insurance Programs [CHIP], such as California's Healthy Families.

I am particularly pleased that Title V includes mobile ''breathmobiles'' among the community-based programs eligible for funding. These school-based mobile clinics were developed by the Southern California chapter of the Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America, in conjunction with Los Angeles County, Los Angeles Unified School District and the University of Southern California.

Finally, this title reflects the leadership and work of Senators DICK DURBIN and MIKE DEWINE. It also has the strong support of leading child health and asthma organizations, including the American Lung Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs, the National Association of Children's Hospitals, the American Academy of Chest Physicians and the Children's Health Fund.

CHILDREN AND TOURETTE SYNDROME AWARENESS

Because I had intended to offer title III of this legislation as an amendment to the House legislation, I am very pleased it has been included. This title provides grants to develop and implement outreach programs, with a particular emphasis on children. These programs will target health providers, community groups and educators with enhanced information about the etiology, diagnosis and treatment of Tourette Syndrome [TS], a serious, often misunderstood and frequently misdiagnosed inherited neurological disorder.

I am particularly pleased that this provision reflects the contributions and expertise of the Tourette Syndrome Association, a national organization dedicated to providing information about TS, its treatment and support services and current research to individuals with TS and their families.

RESEARCH SUBJECT PROTECTIONS FOR CHILDREN

I am also very pleased that provisions from Congresswoman DEGETTE's Human Research Subjects Protection Act have been included in title XXVII of this legislation. This bipartisan legislation represents the first comprehensive reforms of research protections in a quarter century. This provision benefitting children is a downpayment on the additional reforms which are urgently needed in informed consent and our national system of Institutional Review Boards [IRBs]. These protections are indispensable to medical research, and recent abuses and failures have understandably shaken public confidence.

In the past, Congress has acted to protect research volunteers in the face of crisis or scandals like Tuskeegee, Willowbrook, and the government's cold war radiation experiments. But today, there is a clear consensus that we must strengthen and expand current protections. In doing so, we will restore the confidence of courageous people who are willing to put their health and welfare on the line to help find new cures and treatments. Without their trust, research simply cannot continue.

ADOPTION POLICY

Finally, the adoption awareness provisions in title XII were the subject to great controversy and debate. The original language raised many serious objections concerning adoption policy as well as abortion policy. These objections were made by Members, including myself, and important public health organizations including the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the National Association of Community Health Centers, and the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League.

I recognize the sincerity of Chairman TOM BLILEY's concern on the issue of adoption and the significant efforts he has made to achieve a compromise and to remove the more troubling provisions from this Title.

SAMHSA REAUTHORIZATION

With respect to the reauthorization of SAMHSA, substance and alcohol abuse remain complex, troubling issues which elude simply or quick solutions. In light of surveys which indicate a recent increase in teenage drug use, it was particularly troubling to recently learn that nearly half of all parents are simply resigned to having their teenage children be exposed to illegal drugs. Unmet treatment needs continue to drive the annual $160 billion in societal costs from substance and alcohol abuse. Instead of receiving appropriate care, millions of Americans actively seeking treatment are being forced onto waiting lists. This is an unacceptable situation, especially as we have begun to receive conclusive data on the cost-effective health outcomes and dramatic savings produced by effective treatment.

For these reasons, I want to commend Congresswoman LOIS CAPPS on her authorship of the provisions on youth alcohol and fetal alcohol syndrome, Congressman TED STRICKLAND for his hard work on the mental health provisions, and Congresswoman DEGETTE on her provision strengthening protections against the use of seclusion and restraints. I am also particularly pleased that the grant programs targeting homeless individuals, the Grants for the Benefit of Homeless Individuals [GBHI] and the Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness [PATH] have been reauthorized.

CHARITABLE CHOICE

There is one provision which I regret has been included in the SAMHSA reauthorization. It relates to ''charitable choice,'' and wholly exempts faith-based organizations from the application of Federal employment and discrimination laws in the provision of services funded by SAMHSA. I am also concerned that ''pervasively sectarian'' organizations may receive such funding, weakening the clear constitutional separation of church and state. Finally, I question whether this provision weakens the standards for certifying facilities and personnel providing substance abuse or mental health services, and for measuring and assessing the delivery of such services by a faith-based organization.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4365 and commend the House staff for their hard work and dedication on this important public health legislation, particularly Judith Benkendorf, Eleanor Dehoney, Anne Esposito, John Ford and Marc Wheat.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased that the House approved H.R. 4365, the Children's Health Act of 2000, reflecting a compromise agreement that was reached on a bipartisan basis with the Senate last week. This legislation will establish various children's health research and prevention programs conducted through federal public health agencies. The legislation will amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize additional federal resources targeted at many children's diseases, such as traumatic brain injury, autism, Fragile X, juvenile arthritis, childhood skeletal malignancies, diabetes, birth defects, hepatitis C, and epilepsy.

Today, however, I want to specifically make mention of title 22 of the legislation, which mandates increased research by the National Institutes of Health into Muscular Dystrophy. Passage of this title represents the first time that Muscular Dystrophy, and specifically Duchesne Muscular Dystrophy, has been acknowledged in a federal statute. This is long overdue.

As a member of the Health Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee, I am greatly heartened by the efforts of the gentleman from Ohio, ranking member SHERROD BROWN, to include this title in the legislation. Duchesne Muscular Dystrophy is the world's most prevalent lethal childhood genetic disease, cutting equally across all races and all citizens. To look at the record of research on this disease is to realize that despite our country's enormous resources, sometimes many children are left behind. Today, despite all the advances in medical science, victims of this disease—which afflicts one of every 3,500 boys—have no cures and no effective treatments available to them.

Children afflicted with Duchesne Muscular Dystrophy have no ability to produce the protein dystrophin, the protein that binds the muscle cells together. First, they lose their ability to climb and walk, then the disease spreads to their arms, and ultimately pulmonary or cardiac failure results by the late teens or early twenties. It is an exceptionally cruel disease that slowly robs boys of their independence and ultimately immobilizes them, leading invariably to an untimely and early loss of life.

Sadly, the federal response to this disease has been exceptionally poor. This year, in a NIH budget of more than $18 billion, research into Duchesne and Becker Muscular Dystrophies totals $9.2 million. Because it is a difficult disease that affects only tens of thousands of children—not millions—there is no current commitment from private drug manufacturers to conduct research on this disease. If you want to understand why there is nothing available to treat these children, you need look no further than the weak federal response to this disease. The gene that is flawed in this disease is readily identifiable, and has been so for 14 years. But astonishingly, the pace of research on DMD actually slowed down after the gene was discovered.

It is not that the scientists of NIH do not care about the victims of this disease. Rather, there are significant structural problems that have inhibited leadership at the Institutes in creating the platform for expanded research. Specifically, research into DMD is spread among the institutes of NIH. The National Institute of Child Health and Development does nothing on DMD, even though DMD victims exclusively are children. Of even more concern is the reality that of the more than 100 separate study sections at NIH through which scientists seek grants for research, none are devoted to muscle, the largest organ of the

body. The scientists who work in this area are frequently frustrated by the wide array of study sections through which they must apply for grants, and the lack of affinity that the peer review processes afford them.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this legislation will improve coordination of research into the various forms of Muscular Dystrophy. This is imperative. But beyond that, NIH should take additional steps to ensure that DMD gets a fair share of federal resources based on the severity and prevalence of the disease. An Office of Dystrophinopathies, or a branch devoted to study of Muscular Dystrophy, is certainly called for. A study section is essential. I believe that the Commerce Committee should conduct ongoing oversight of NIH's compliance with the Children's Health Act, specifically in this important area.

While I am neither a scientist nor a doctor, I think it is highly probable that sooner or later gene therapy is going to be able to cure diseases of this nature, particularly those that involve flaws on a single, identifiable gene. Yet the words ''sooner'' and ''later'' have profound consequences in the lives of tens of thousands of American children and their families that are suffering with this disease. With the passage of H.R. 4365, we move a step closer to giving those families hope.

Thank you, and I thank the bipartisan leadership of the Commerce Committee for their hard work in producing this important piece of legislation.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to show my commitment and support to the children's health bill before us today. This comprehensive children's health legislation was cultivated out of several individual bills, including the Healthy Kids 2000 Act that I introduced last year with my colleague Senator KIT BOND. It was a tremendous pleasure working with Representatives BILIRAKIS and BROWN in developing the first version of this comprehensive children's health legislation, and I applaud their dedication and commitment to seeing the important issue of children's health addressed this year.

Specifically within this bill, there are three key components that I am especially proud of the conferees for including. The first provision is with respect to safe motherhood. Most Americans are surprised to learn that total maternal mortality has not declined in the United States since 1982. Between 1982 and 1996, the national maternal mortality ratio has remained approximately 7.5 maternal deaths per 100,000 live births. Additionally, the CDC estimates that of the 10,000 women who give birth in the United States every day: 2–3 women die from pregnancy-related conditions; 2,100 women experience major pregnancy related complications before labor; 2,500 women have Caesarean section delivery; 2,600 women experience severe labor-related complications.

These rates of mortality and morbidity are simply unacceptable. Fortunately, with passage of the children's health bill today, the CDC will now have the ability and resources to increase surveillance research on maternal health issues, and also implement additional prevention and maternal health promotion programs nationwide.

A second provision I was pleased to sponsor and support earlier this year with my colleague Representative LUCILLE ROYBALL-ALLARD was the folic acid education initiative. This bill contains the authorization of a comprehensive national health education campaign promoting folic acid to prevent serious birth defects. In 1991, research proved that the B vitamin folic acid could prevent serious birth defects of the brain and spine, known as neural tube defects [NTDs]. Spina bifida and anencephaly are two common NTDs. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC] has stated that if all American women of childbearing age consumed 400 micrograms of the B vitamin folic acid each day up to 70 percent of all cases of neural tube defects could be prevented.

However, this scientific breakthrough has not been translated into a reduction in neural tube defects because millions of women are not aware of the role of folic acid in preventing NTDs. While public awareness is improving, a majority of women are uninformed about the benefits of folic acid and they are not consuming the recommended daily amount. According to a June 2000 March of Dimes national survey conducted by the Gallup Organizations, only 34 percent of women of childbearing age reported taking a multivitamin with folic acid on a daily basis. The survey also found that 9 out of 10 women do not know that folic acid must be consumed before pregnancy to be effective, and that only 1 in 7 know that folic acid prevents birth defects.

This provision outlines the components of a comprehensive national campaign that would enable CDC to assist states and others to develop and implement programs to reduce the incidence of neural tube birth defects which effect an estimated 2,500 babies each year.

Lastly, I want to take a moment to express my support for title XXII of the bill, which directs the National Institutes of Health to develop a more coordinated research strategy with regards to muscular dystrophy, giving particular attention to Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy. This form of the disease is the most common and most devastating of the muscular dystrophies. One in 3,500 male children born worldwide will be born with Duchenne and will lose the ability to walk by age 10; however, most children are diagnosed between the ages of two and three. Muscle deterioration will continue in the back and chest making it more and more difficult to breathe. The deterioration process will continue until it takes the life of a child some where in their late teens or early twenties. This is a process that no family should ever have to undergo, and I am happy to see that the National Institute for Neurological Disorders and Stroke has been challenged with the task of ensuring a stronger federal focus at NIH towards finding a cure and alternative treatments for Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy. I applaud and thank my colleagues for pushing NIH to take a more responsible role in finding a cure for this devastating disease, and for their commitment to ensuring passage of this important legislation impacting the lives of millions of children throughout the country.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Children's Health Act (H.R. 4365), legislation that would reauthorize children's health research and prevention programs, graduate medical education programs for children's hospital, substance abuse and drug abuse prevention and treatment programs, and safety of children care programs.

As an original cosponsor of many of initiatives that were included in this comprehensive bill, I am pleased that Congress will be acting to protect children's health. One of the most important provisions is the reauthorization for 5 years of the graduate medical education program for independent children's hospitals. I strongly support the role that pediatric hospitals play in advancing pediatric medicine and the training of physicians dedicated to children's health care needs. Under current law, Medicare does not provide funding for pediatric residencies for freestanding children's hospitals such as Texas Children's Hospital in my district because these hospitals do not treat a large number of Medicare patients. Last year, we enacted a law that provided a one-time capped entitlement for pediatric graduate medical education programs. This legislation would extend this valuable program for five years.

I am also working to ensure that the pediatric graduate medical education program receives sufficient funding through the annual appropriations process. Earlier this year, the House of Representatives approved the Fiscal Year 2001 Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill (H.R. 4577) that includes $80 million for the pediatric graduate medical education program, an increase of $40 above this year's program. I am committed to maintaining this funding level as the budget is finalized.

Another important issue is the bill is the Pediatric Research Initiative that would require the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to conduct pediatric biomedical research at the NIH. In particular, this initiative will ensure that more research is done on how diseases affect children as compared to adults. In most cases, clinical trials are conducted on adults without any consideration of how these drugs will affect children.

This initiative would also encourage the development of pediatric clinical trials to ensure that safe and effective drug treatments are available for children. When children face life-threatening diseases, it is very difficult to determine how much and what types of treatments should be given to them, because there is insufficient information about how these treatments affect children. With more data and clinical trials, there will more options for children who are fighting for their lives.

This bill would also direct the National Institutes of Health to conduct more research on diseases which directly affect children such as hearing loss, autism, asthma, and juvenile diabetes. For autism, this legislation requires the NIH to establish five Centers for Excellence on autism research as well as three regional centers at the Centers for Disease Control. For asthma, this legislation would establish a grant program to provide comprehensive asthma services to children, equipping mobile health care clinics and conducting patient and family education on managing asthma. For juvenile diabetes, this bill establishes a national database at the Centers for Disease Control. With more information about juvenile diabetes, it will be easier to delineate potential environmental triggers related to type 1 diabetes. This bill would also provide funding for research related to a vaccine to prevent juvenile diabetes.

Another important initiative in this legislation is the creation of a nationwide toll-free phone number for parents to call to get information about poison control centers. Regrettably, the number of accidental poisonings is a real threat to our children. This initiative will ensure

that parents have one location to call to determine what is the best treatment for an accidental poisoning. This legislation also includes funding for a national public information campaign to educate the public about poison prevention and how to access poison control centers in their area. With appropriate information, parents can learn how to reduce the number of poisonings each year.

I am also supportive of provisions in this legislation that would provide new funding to prevent birth defects. In particular, this legislation would authorize the Centers for Disease Controls to conduct a public health program about the effects of folic acid in preventing birth defects in pregnant women. This bill would also establish a National Center on Birth Defects and Development Disabilities to collect and analyze available data on birth defects. With more information, I believe we will discover new ways to prevent birth defects.

This bill would also provide several new programs to address the mental health of our children. This measure authorizes $75 million for a program to provide grants to public and nonprofit organizations to prevent suicide among children and adolescents. This bill also authorizes $300 million next year for grants to prevent substance abuse among children. The legislation also creates a High-Risk Youth Program to help public and nonprofit organizations to combat drug abuse for high-risk youths.

Another importation provision in this bill would create a grant program to improve the health and safety of children in child care facilities. This bill authorizes $200 million next year to ensure that child care facilities are safe for our children. These grants can also be used to improve the training for child care providers as well as rehabilitating existing centers to meet current health and safety requirements. Today, with more children enrolled in child care centers, it is critically important that these facilities are well-equipped so that our children will learn and prosper.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this effort and vote for H.R. 4365.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of this legislation. I also wish to thank the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions for including language in H.R. 4365 that will help those who have suffered traumatic brain injury receive cognitive therapy. Traumatic brain injury or TBI is one the leading causes of death and disability among young persons in the United States. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recently announced that there are currently 5.3 million Americans living with a serious long-term disability as a result of brain injury.

This important measure will, for the first time, clarify that cognitive therapy is necessary for individuals who have suffered traumatic brain injury. In many cases, rehabilitation focuses exclusively on physical treatment without regard for cognitive treatment, such as reading, speaking, comprehension, reasoning and deductive capabilities.

This provision is based on H.R. 477, which I introduced on February 2, 1999, to clarify that cognitive therapy is a necessary component of treatment for TBI.

There is no widely accepted nor standardized long-term procedure for TBI treatment. The availability of cognitive therapy varies by state, which causes inequitable and varying treatment for TBI victims. But this measure seeks to change that. It clarifies that the National Institutes of Health should conduct research on cognitive therapy needed for TBI patients and that cognitive therapy for TBI should be funded by the Health Resources and Services Administration under its TBI grant program.

Persons with traumatic brain injuries are greatly in need of help to rehabilitate and recover their mental, as well as their physical, capabilities. By passing H.R. 4365, we can help those persons do just that.

I urge all Members to vote for this important legislation.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. I am particularly pleased with the provisions authorizing the Healthy Start Project and pursuing an aggressive effort to address the epidemic of autism in America today. I was pleased to play a role in moving both of these initiatives forward. The Healthy Start project will reduce the rate of infant mortality and improve prenatal care by providing grants to areas with high rates of infant mortality and low birth weight infants. Healthy Start authorizes new grants to provide research and services like mobile health clinics which will provide poor women and their developing child access to ultrasound screenings. This will undoubtedly enhance access to prenatal care, ultrasound services, and prenatal surgery.

I have become increasingly concerned about the rapid increase in the incidence of autism among our children. I have spent a considerable amount of time over the past year on this very issue. I believe this bill will be a great help in addressing this issue. This bill ensures that the Director of National Institutes of Health [NIH] expands of NIH's autism research initiatives. The centers of excellence in autism research that are established under this program will lead to significant advances in basic and clinical research into the cause, diagnosis, early detection, prevention, control, and treatment of autism.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations. Our subcommittee's jurisdiction concerns the welfare of America's children in many ways: their health, their education and well-being, and the economic security of their families, which is certainly related to their well-being.

What we see in that subcommittee, from the scientists who come in and tell us what the possibilities are now in science and what they know about the development of children, is how essential it is for children to have quality health care even before they are born. The research has shown time and time again that investments in their good health are very good investments for our country indeed.

The opportunities are great. The knowledge that we have gained through our investments in biomedical research increases the opportunities to help our children not only reach their own personal fulfillment and strengthen the families from which they come, but also enrich our country in terms of our family values and our economic strength. So we all have a responsibility to all children. Every parent, of course, has a responsibility to his or her child, but on the Subcommittee we must think of every child in America as our child, all the children as our children, because indeed they are our responsibility. So in Congress, we have a responsibility to do all that we can to prevent and treat childhood disease. The Children's Health Act comprehensively addresses this responsibility by increasing our commitment to children's health research, health promotion, and disease prevention activities.

Although I strongly support the Children's Health Act, I would like to join my colleagues who have expressed their concerns about the Charitable Choice provisions included in the bill. These provisions would weaken important anti-discrimination civil rights protections; violate the constitutional separation of church and state; and entangle religious institutions in the purview of government. These provisions explicitly enable faith-based organizations to proselytize to those receiving public services and discriminate in employment decisions with public funds.

I am disappointed that the Republican leadership did not allow an amendment to strengthen prohibitions against proselytizing and prevent discrimination against beneficiaries. These needed protections are very important to ensure that the religious rights and the civil rights of Americans can be exercised, and where they overlap, there is an appropriate balance. They also would serve to protect the separation of church and state. Despite these concerns, I do support the underlying language in this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Children's Health Act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. 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, the 15-minute vote on this motion will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5272, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered yesterday.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 25, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 496]

YEAS—394

Abercrombie	Becerra	Boucher
Ackerman	Bentsen	Boyd
Aderholt	Bereuter	Brady (PA)
Allen	Berkley	Brady (TX)
Andrews	Berman	Brown (FL)
Archer	Berry	Bryant
Armey	Biggert	Burr
Baca	Bilbray	Burton
Bachus	Bilirakis	Buyer
Baird	Bishop	Callahan
Baker	Blagojevich	Calvert
Baldacci	Bliley	Camp
Baldwin	Blumenauer	Canady
Ballenger	Blunt	Cannon
Barcia	Boehlert	Capps
Barr	Boehner	Capuano
Barrett (NE)	Bonilla	Cardin
Barrett (WI)	Bonior	Carson
Bartlett	Bono	Castle
Barton	Borski	Chabot
Bass	Boswell	Chambliss

Chenoweth-Hage
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
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
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
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
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
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—25

Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Fattah
Gejdenson
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kilpatrick
Lee
Lewis (GA)
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Miller, George
Payne
Sanford
Scott
Slaughter
Towns
Waters
Watt (NC)

NOT VOTING—14

Brown (OH)
Campbell
Ewing
Jones (OH)
Klink
Lazio
McCollum
McIntosh
Paul
Rush
Sandlin
Saxton
Vento
Wynn

1216

Messrs. CONYERS, CLAY, TOWNS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. GEJDENSON, HASTINGS of Florida, LEWIS of Georgia, MEEKS of New York, GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. KILPATRICK changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEACE THROUGH NEGOTIATIONS ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5272.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5272, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 27, answered ''present'' 4, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

YEAS—385

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner

Udall (CO)	Watkins	Whitfield
Udall (NM)	Watts (OK)	Wicker
Upton	Waxman	Wilson
Velazquez	Weiner	Wise
Visclosky	Weldon (FL)	Wolf
Vitter	Weldon (PA)	Woolsey
Walden	Weller	Wu
Walsh	Wexler	Young (AK)
Wamp	Weygand	Young (FL)

NAYS—27

Bonior	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Carson	Lee	Rohrabacher
Clay	McDermott	Sabo
Clayton	McKinney	Serrano
Conyers	Miller, George	Stark
Danner	Moran (VA)	Sununu
Dingell	Murtha	Traficant
Hilliard	Obey	Waters
Jackson (IL)	Payne	Watt (NC)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—4

Capuano	Kucinich
DeFazio	Rivers

NOT VOTING—17

Campbell	Klink	Pickett
Doolittle	Lazio	Sandlin
Ewing	McCollum	Thomas
Goodling	McIntosh	Vento
Hilleary	Meek (FL)	Wynn
Jones (OH)	Paul	

1225

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

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. Pursuant to the provisions of 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, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BIOMEDICAL IMAGING AND BIOENGINEERING ESTABLISHMENT ACT

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1795) to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Engineering, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1795

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 Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering Establishment Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Basic research in imaging, bioengineering, computer science, informatics, and related fields is critical to improving health care but is fundamentally different from the research in molecular biology on which the current national research institutes at the National Institutes of Health (''NIH'') are based. To ensure the development of new techniques and technologies for the 21st century, these disciplines therefore require an identity and research home at the NIH that is independent of the existing institute structure.

(2) Advances based on medical research promise new, more effective treatments for a wide variety of diseases, but the development of new, noninvasive imaging techniques for earlier detection and diagnosis of disease is essential to take full advantage of such new treatments and to promote the general improvement of health care.

(3) The development of advanced genetic and molecular imaging techniques is necessary to continue the current rapid pace of discovery in molecular biology.

(4) Advances in telemedicine, and teleradiology in particular, are increasingly important in the delivery of high quality, reliable medical care to rural citizens and other underserved populations. To fulfill the promise of telemedicine and related technologies fully, a structure is needed at the NIH to support basic research focused on the acquisition, transmission, processing, and optimal display of images.

(5) A number of Federal departments and agencies support imaging and engineering research with potential medical applications, but a central coordinating body, preferably housed at the NIH, is needed to coordinate these disparate efforts and facilitate the transfer of technologies with medical applications.

(6) Several breakthrough imaging technologies, including magnetic resonance imaging (''MRI'') and computed tomography (''CT''), have been developed primarily abroad, in large part because of the absence of a home at the NIH for basic research in imaging and related fields. The establishment of a central focus for imaging and bioengineering research at the NIH would promote both scientific advance and U.S. economic development.

(7) At a time when a consensus exists to add significant resources to the NIH in coming years, it is appropriate to modernize the structure of the NIH to ensure that research dollars are expended more effectively and efficiently and that the fields of medical science that have contributed the most to the detection, diagnosis, and treatment of disease in recent years receive appropriate emphasis.

(8) The establishment of a National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering at the NIH would accelerate the development of new technologies with clinical and research applications, improve coordination and efficiency at the NIH and throughout the Federal government, reduce duplication and waste, lay the foundation for a new medical information age, promote economic development, and provide a structure to train the young researchers who will make the pathbreaking discoveries of the next century.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BIOMEDICAL IMAGING AND BIOENGINEERING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part C of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following subpart:

''Subpart 18—National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering

''PURPOSE OF THE INSTITUTE

''SEC. 464z. (a) The general purpose of the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering (in this section referred to as the 'Institute') is the conduct and support of research, training, the dissemination of health information, and other programs with respect to biomedical imaging, biomedical engineering, and associated technologies and modalities with biomedical applications (in this section referred to as 'biomedical imaging and bioengineering').

''(b)(1) The Director of the Institute, with the advice of the Institute's advisory council, shall establish a National Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering Program (in this section referred to as the 'Program').

''(2) Activities under the Program shall include the following with respect to biomedical imaging and bioengineering:

''(A) Research into the development of new techniques and devices.

''(B) Related research in physics, engineering, mathematics, computer science, and other disciplines.

''(C) Technology assessments and outcomes studies to evaluate the effectiveness of biologics, materials, processes, devices, procedures, and informatics.

''(D) Research in screening for diseases and disorders.

''(E) The advancement of existing imaging and bioengineering modalities, including imaging, biomaterials, and informatics.

''(F) The development of target-specific agents to enhance images and to identify and delineate disease.

''(G) The development of advanced engineering and imaging technologies and techniques for research from the molecular and genetic to the whole organ and body levels.

''(H) The development of new techniques and devices for more effective interventional procedures (such as image-guided interventions).

''(3)(A) With respect to the Program, the Director of the Institute shall prepare and transmit to the Secretary and the Director of NIH a plan to initiate, expand, intensify, and coordinate activities of the Institute with respect to biomedical imaging and bioengineering. The plan shall include such comments and recommendations as the Director of the Institute determines appropriate. The Director of the Institute shall periodically review and revise the plan and shall transmit any revisions of the plan to the Secretary and the Director of NIH.

''(B) The plan under subparagraph (A) shall include the recommendations of the Director of the Institute with respect to the following:

''(i) Where appropriate, the consolidation of programs of the National Institutes of Health for the express purpose of enhancing support of activities regarding basic biomedical imaging and bioengineering research.

''(ii) The coordination of the activities of the Institute with related activities of the other agencies of the National Institutes of Health and with related activities of other Federal agencies.

''(c) The establishment under section 406 of an advisory council for the Institute is subject to the following:

''(1) The number of members appointed by the Secretary shall be 12.

''(2) Of such members—

''(A) 6 members shall be scientists, engineers, physicians, and other health professionals who represent disciplines in biomedical imaging and bioengineering and who are not officers or employees of the United States; and

''(B) 6 members shall be scientists, engineers, physicians, and other health professionals who represent other disciplines and are knowledgeable about the applications of biomedical imaging and bioengineering in medicine, and who are not officers or employees of the United States.

''(3) In addition to the ex officio members specified in section 406(b)(2), the ex officio members of the advisory council shall include the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (or the designees of such officers).

''(d)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), for the purpose of carrying out this section:

''(A) For fiscal year 2001, there is authorized to be appropriated an amount equal to the amount obligated by the National Institutes of

Health during fiscal year 2000 for biomedical imaging and bioengineering, except that such amount shall be adjusted to offset any inflation occurring after October 1, 1999.

''(B) For each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003, there is authorized to be appropriated an amount equal to the amount appropriated under subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 2001, except that such amount shall be adjusted for the fiscal year involved to offset any inflation occurring after October 1, 2000.

''(2) The authorization of appropriations for a fiscal year under paragraph (1) is hereby reduced by the amount of any appropriation made for such year for the conduct or support by any other national research institute of any program with respect to biomedical imaging and bioengineering.''.

(b) USE OF EXISTING RESOURCES.—In providing for the establishment of the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering pursuant to the amendment made by subsection (a), the Director of the National Institutes of Health (referred to in this subsection as ''NIH'')—

(1) may transfer to the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering such personnel of NIH as the Director determines to be appropriate;

(2) may, for quarters for such Institute, utilize such facilities of NIH as the Director determines to be appropriate; and

(3) may obtain administrative support for the Institute from the other agencies of NIH, including the other national research institutes.

(c) CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES.—None of the provisions of this Act or the amendments made by the Act may be construed as authorizing the construction of facilities, or the acquisition of land, for purposes of the establishment or operation of the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering.

(d) DATE CERTAIN FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL.—Not later than 90 days after the effective date of this Act under section 4, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall complete the establishment of an advisory council for the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering in accordance with section 406 of the Public Health Service Act and in accordance with section 464z of such Act (as added by subsection (a) of this section).

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 401(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 281(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following subparagraph:

''(R) The National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering.''.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act takes effect October 1, 2000, or upon the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. 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. 1795.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1795, the National Institute of Biomedical Engineering and Bioengineering Establishment Act, is supported by over 170 of our colleagues in the House. It passed out of the Committee on Commerce under voice vote, and I want to commend my colleague on the other side, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), for her great support and co-sponsorship of this legislation. H.R. 1795 establishes a new National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering at the NIH, the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Speaker, in an age where we talk about producing more resources for the National Institutes of Health to do additional research, it is incumbent on this institution to create a structure that makes sure that we are chasing the best and the brightest. When we talk about the issue of biomedical imaging, we need to look at ways to detect at an earlier stage breast cancer and many other terminal and chronic illnesses.

1230

It is incumbent on this institution to make sure that this institute is there so that the resources that are made available for imaging changes the latest and greatest breakthroughs that could possibly be brought to the patient community.

MRIs and CT scans were not created in this country, but they were refined in this country because of the emphasis we put on research and development and on the refinement to make sure that every possible tool is available for early detection of disease.

H.R. 1795 creates a research environment in which new imaging and biotechnologies, techniques, and devices can be developed for clinical use much more rapidly than under the present system.

For those that might say this does not require a new institute, let me assure them that for 3 years we have tried to work with the National Institutes of Health to make sure that the proper attention was paid to this very important field of imaging and what we found was that every disease in its research stages uses basic imaging, but there was not an effort to move to the next generation of imaging that can mean the difference between the number of options that patients are provided in their treatment, in many cases the difference between life and death because of early detection.

In the last Congress, 80 bipartisan House Members cosponsored this bill, but it was to create only an imaging institute. Others supported a bill by my dear friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), to establish a bioengineering center. It was our belief that to combine these was in the best interest of both efforts and that we could rely on the administrative resources of a single institute versus dual.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that our colleagues know our effort here is to not create a new bureaucracy but it is to put somebody in charge of this new exciting field that is driven by technology to make sure that every patient in America has early detection as a tool against disease whether it is chronic or whether it is fatal.

My hope is that every Member will support this legislation and that we can move it so that it becomes law and this institute becomes a permanent part of the National Institutes of Health.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1795 amends the Public Health Service Act to require the director of the National Institutes of Health to establish a National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Engineering for the purposes of conducting and supporting research, training scientists and health professionals, disseminating relevant information, and sponsoring other programs with respect to biomedical imaging, biomedical engineers, and associated technologies and modalities with biomedical applications, such as bioinformatics and telemedicining.

Bioimaging is truly the diagnostic tool of the 21st century. I am proud to be a cosponsor, and I am also particularly proud of the hard work that my colleagues, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), have done on the legislation; and I commend them for this excellent bill.

More than any other area of medicine, medical imaging has radically changed the way physicians detect, diagnose, and treat disease. In the coming years, additional breakthroughs in imaging promise to save more lives and further reduce the need for expensive, invasive, and painful surgery.

This proposed institute fulfills all five of the criteria stipulated by the Institute of Medicine in its 1984 report responding to the health needs of the scientific community, the organizational structure of the National Institutes of Health. It would also coordinate all imaging research through the Federal Government in order to enhance communication and avoid duplicity, activities now sorely lacking.

I have been assured by my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), that the proposed institute has been structured to control administrative costs and mitigate against administrative growth.

Indeed, the numbers are sobering. Based on fiscal year 1998 figures, the biomedical imaging program at the National Cancer Institute administered a grant portfolio of nearly $60 million and 220 grants. Given a generous ratio staff-to-grant, the newly proposed institute should easily maintain itself with the 62 full-time employees already working in this discipline through the NIH institute and centers.

It would draw most heavily from currently funded positions at the National

Cancer Institute and have a responsibility for collection of 932 grants totaling $201.5 million.

These figures, together with this great promise of this cutting edge biomedical discipline, make a compelling case for moving forward with the new institute; and I, therefore, support wholeheartedly the legislation.

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

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), the sponsor of the legislation.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to join with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) in this very important effort, and I salute him for his leadership. I am pleased to have partnered with him, because I think this is a very important idea for the people of our country. So I am very, very proud of being the chief Democratic sponsor on H.R. 1795.

This legislation, as Members have already heard, creates a new institute, a Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering, at NIH. Dramatic advances in both of these areas have really revolutionized medical practice in recent years. New noninvasive imaging techniques such as magnetic resonance imaging, MRI, and those three letters are mentioned with all the familiarity of patients across the country and many, many people speak of going in for an MRI; and also computed tomography, or CTs. These have both paved the way for earlier detection and diagnosis of diseases, and they have dramatically improved the quality of treatment for so many people across our country.

But the next generation of breakthroughs, Mr. Speaker, will be longer in coming, or they may not come at all unless we modernize the structure at NIH.

The MRI and the CT, I was really taken aback to learn that they were not developed in the United States. The lack of a dedicated research effort in our country has forced the greatest country in the world really to be relying on other countries for breakthroughs in medical imaging and bioengineering. And that really is the basis and the intent of the bill to change this.

H.R. 1795 ensures the continued and rapid development of new diagnostic technologies by creating an independent research institute at NIH which is focused specifically on medical imaging and bioengineering. Establishment of a National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering will reduce duplication, it will lay the foundation for a new medical information age, and it will provide a structure to train young researchers who will make the breakthrough discoveries for the rest of this very new and promising century.

At a time when the Congress is committed to doubling the NIH budget, we must ensure that research dollars are expended more efficiently and more effectively and that the field of medical science that has contributed the most to the detection, the diagnosis, and the treatment of disease receives appropriate emphasis.

I am very fond of saying that the NIH represents our national institutes of hope. And I think that with this legislation we extend that hope in an area that really holds a great deal of promise not only for the genius of America but how that genius is applied to the betterment of our people and for the breakthroughs that they are counting on to be made to fight the war of diseases that have not yet been conquered.

So, again, I want to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), and everyone that has joined this effort. I think it is a worthy one, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, again I thank the sponsors of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to once again thank my friends, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and all the members of our committee and staff who have worked on what I think is very important legislation.

I will end with a quote from the hearing that we had on this bill. It was given by Dr. Nick Bryant, a former Director of Diagnostic Radiology at the NIH.

Dr. Bryant said, ''I believe that the creation of a National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering is essential to promote the development of new imaging techniques and technologies. In order to flourish and grow consistently at the NIH, a scientific field requires an organization with the mandate, the responsibility, the authority, and the resources to direct and drive investigation in that field. In the NIH structure, only institutes possess those attributes.''

I believe his testimony to our committee best sums up why every Member of Congress should support this legislation.

Most Members of Congress strongly support an increase in NIH funding. Additional resources are important. But we should pass H.R. 1795 before we commit more money. Our legislation will ensure a greater return on our investment in medical science.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to have major doubts about the wisdom of H.R. 1795, the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering Establishment Act. Because this rushed process has not resolved my doubts, I oppose this legislation.

At the September 14 Commerce Committee markup on this bill, I expressed my longstanding concern about the administrative burdens and duplication that come with authorizing new Institutes at the National Institutes of Health. I understand that the intent of this bill is to bring together programs in biomedical imaging and bioengineering that support clinical research in other disciplines, thereby fostering basic research in the development of improved diagnostic technologies. This is a laudable goal, yet all Institutes come with Directors who appoint administrative personnel, and new Institutes create opportunities for needless duplication of existing work. NIH's budget is finite, and we must be careful to use it wisely.

Do we need to spend more money on administrative bureaucracy or risk duplication of existing work to achieve the goals of this legislation? I think not, and neither does Secretary Shalala. Her attached letter to me, received last night, concludes that a newly created Office of Bioengineering, Bioimaging, and Bioinformatics ''ensures the most effective and efficient deployment of resources to foster research in this area.''

Are we prepared to say she is wrong, before the Office has a chance to work? Are we prepared to substitute our judgment for that of the National Institutes of Health? Are we prepared to take money from research to spend on administrative support?

My answer to these questions is no. I cannot support this legislation at this time.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
Washington, DC, September 25, 2000.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Committee on Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: On September 14, the Committee on Commerce marked up and ordered reported H.R. 1795, which would establish a new National Institute on Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). During the markup, you raised questions about the impact of the legislation on the operations of NIH. I am writing in response a request made by your staff to address these concerns.

NIH invests heavily in this promising field of research. The majority of its Institutes and Centers (ICs) have significant research efforts underway in bioimaging and bioengineering. We believe that the application of imaging techniques to scientific questions about health and disease is part of the basic mission of NIH. We further believe it is imperative that the ICs maintain their support for imaging and engineering projects that are informed by compelling biological questions.

The discovery of new imaging modalities and approaches is being fostered in this collaborative environment, since the engineers and physicists are constantly being challenged by their biologist/clinician colleagues to develop new approaches to studying the body. A critical mass of engineers and physicists is present in many of these programs, providing the necessary technical and theoretical insight to develop advances in the biological sciences. There are many examples in the various ICs of this synergy leading to significant discoveries.

Three Institutes—the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the National Institute on Aging—are using bioimaging advances to evaluate cognition. The

National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute is collaborating with other Government as well as private sector researchers to develop new cardiac magnetic resonance imaging and ultrasound techniques. The National Cancer Institute is developing new, more sensitive diagnostic and treatment tools using bioimaging techniques to detect and cure malignancies that heretofore have been recalcitrant to current interventions.

These are but a few examples of the tremendous amount of research being conducted within the ICs, where collaborations among scientists, physicists, and engineers are essential to developing new technologies.

The establishment of another NIH Institute would require an expensive administrative structure, for which additional resources would be required, so as not to rob the existing NIH ICs of their expertise and funds. While this Department and NIH are thoroughly committed to this rich and exciting research area, we have concluded that the newly created Office of Bioengineering, Bioimaging, and Bioinformatics in the Office of the Director, NIH, ensures the most effective and efficient deployment of resources to foster research in this area. The mission of the Office, for which a director is no being recruited, is to provide a focus for biomedical engineering, bioimaging, and biomedical computational science among the ICs and other Federal agencies. The Office will develop programs aimed at fostering basic understanding and new collaborations among the biological, medical, engineering, physical, and computational scientists and among the various ICs. The purpose of the Office is to develop effective research strategies while maintaining the core of the research at the individual ICs that have the necessary expertise to ask the appropriate questions and conduct the best research. In sum, we have carefully considered various approaches and are convinced that at this time a new Office, rather than a new Institute with its attendant organizational layers and administrative costs, offers the best and most practical opportunity to exploit the many potentials of this critical research. Experience with the new Office will contribute to the evaluation of the need for a separate Institute for bioengineering and bioimaging at NIH.

I would be delighted to answer any further questions that you may have regarding bioimaging and bioengineering research at NIH, and I look forward to working with you as you consider legislation that would enhance our research efforts. An identical letter on this subject has been sent to Chairman Bliley.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to the transmittal of this letter from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

DONNA E. SHALALA.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to join my colleague from North Carolina, Representative BURR, in sponsoring H.R. 1795—legislation to create a new Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering at NIH.

Dramatic advances in bioimaging and bioengineering have revolutionized medical practice in recent years. New noninvasive imaging techniques, such as Magnetic Resonance imaging (MRI) and Computed Tomography (CT), have paved the way for earlier detection and diagnosis of disease, dramatically improving the quality of treatment.

But, the next generation of breakthroughs will be longer in coming, or may not come at all, unless we modernize the structure at NIH. The MRI and CT were not developed here in the United States. The lack of a dedicated research effort makes us rely on other countries for breakthroughs in medical imaging and bioengineering.

H.R. 1795 ensures the continued and rapid development of new diagnostic technologies by creating an independent research institute at NIH focused specifically on medical imaging and bioengineering. Establishment of a National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering will reduce duplication, lay the foundation for a new medical information age, and provide a structure to train young researchers who will make the breakthrough discoveries of the next century.

At a time when Congress has committed to doubling the NIH budget, we must ensure that research dollars are expended more efficiently and effectively and that the fields of medical science that have contributed the most to the detection, diagnosis, and treatment of disease receive appropriate emphasis. This is the goal and the effect of H.R. 1795 and I urge the support of the full House.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1795, the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Engineering Establishment Act. This legislation, introduced by Representatives RICHARD BURR and ANNA ESHOO, would establish a National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Engineering at the National Institutes of Health.

Earlier this month, members of my Subcommittee heard testimony from three distinguished professors from Radiology departments throughout the country. They indicated that breakthroughs in imaging, such as magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and computed tomography (CT), have revolutionized the practice of medicine in the past quarter century.

However, these technologies are inadequate in diagnosing some diseases. The NIH itself has recognized the importance of this discipline by designating imaging as one of the top four research priorities at the National Cancer Institute. However, testimony indicates that NIH's focus on imaging research should be broadened beyond cancer.

Representatives BURR and ESHOO have introduced this legislation to create an institute at NIH to focus on imaging research. This will create a climate that promotes discovery and innovation in imaging, as NIH has done in other fields of scientific discovery.

By approving the legislation before us, we can move into an era of non-invasive medicine. I urge Members to support passage of H.R. 1795, the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Engineering Establishment Act.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of legislation, H.R. 1795, that would establish a National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering at the National Institutes of Health [NIH]. As an original cosponsor of this bill, I am pleased that the House of Representatives will be considering this legislation today.

The National Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering Institute would conduct and support research on biomedical imaging and bioengineering and associated technologies that have biomedical applications. There are current 25 Institutes at the NIH. This new Institute would help in the development of innovative imaging technologies to help patients.

Today there are currently two types of imaging technologies called magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] and computed tomography [CT or ''CAT'' scans]. These technologies are critically important to physicians who use them to diagnose disease. As a result of these diagnostic tools, physicians can avoid costly and invasive surgeries because they can determine whether operations are necessary to help their patients. Regrettably, many of these technologies have been developed in other nations.

In addition, there is not one Institute at the NIH which is conducting this type of cutting-edge research technologies that will save lives and reduce health care costs. Under the current system, the NIH focuses its research on disease-specific or organ-specific research. However, imaging and bioengineering is not disease-specific or organ-specific and therefore does not fit well into the structure of the NIH.

This legislation would correct this inequity by ensuring that the NIH conduct basic biomedical research on imaging techniques and devices, including those involving molecular and genetic biology. This research would include scientific projects on engineering, mathematics, and computer science. This legislation would authorize funding for this Institute through 2003. In order to be fiscally responsible, this bill does not include any funding to purchase land or construct an Institute. Rather, it would require the NIH to coordinate research being done at other NIH facilities into one Institute. The measure also establishes a 12 member Advisory Council of health care professionals who are directly involved in biomedical imaging and bioengineering to help in the establishment and research priorities of this Institute.

I believe that this bill will benefit our nation's health care system. First, it would accelerate the development of new technologies by funding clinical and research applications. Second, it would require coordination at the NIH and throughout the Federal Government on biomedical imaging. Third, it would provide a foundation for the new medical information age. Fourth, it would help to ensure that young scientists have the resources they need to conduct cutting-edge research projects. Without this investment, I am concerned that many of our brightest scientists will abandon their academic research to join private sector firms which do not fund these basic research programs. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1795, 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 Public Health Service Act to establish the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO INCREASE CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS, TREATMENT, AND RESEARCH

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H.Res. 576) supporting efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 576

Whereas an estimated 12,400 children will be diagnosed with cancer in the year 2000;

Whereas cancer is the leading cause of death by disease in children under age 15;

Whereas an estimated 2,300 children will die from cancer in the year 2000;

Whereas the incidence of cancer among children in the United States is rising by about one percent each year;

Whereas 1 in every 330 Americans develops cancer before age 20;

Whereas approximately 8 percent of deaths of those between 1 and 19 years old are caused by cancer;

Whereas a number of opportunities for childhood cancer research remain unfunded or underfunded;

Whereas limited resources for childhood cancer research hinder the recruitment of investigators and physicians to pediatric oncology;

Whereas peer-reviewed clinical trials are the standard of care for pediatrics and have improved cancer survival rates among children; and

Whereas a recent study indicates that, based on parental reports, 89 percent of children with cancer experienced substantial suffering in the last month of life: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) public and private sector efforts to promote awareness about the incidence of cancer among children, the signs and symptoms of cancer in children, and treatment options;

(2) increased public and private investment in childhood cancer research to improve prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and long-term survival;

(3) policies that provide incentives to encourage medical trainees and investigators to enter the field of pediatric oncology;

(4) policies that provide incentives to encourage the development of drugs and biologics designed to treat pediatric cancers;

(5) policies that encourage participation in clinical trials; and

(6) medical education curricula designed to improve pain management for cancer patients.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 576 concerning childhood cancers.

Sadly, most of us have had a personal experience with cancer. We have seen it attack a family member or a friend, a coworker, or we have been diagnosed ourselves. But even more sadly, cancer takes the lives of some 2,300 American boys and girls every year. Imagine a school of 100 classrooms empty because of childhood cancer.

We stand with our colleagues, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), who have both lost children to cancer, in resolving to ensure that opportunities for childhood cancer research are funded, that we attract the best and the brightest scientists to pediatric oncology, and that as many children as possible participate in and benefit from the discoveries made through clinical trials. We will work together so that no other parent has to feel the loss of a child due to cancer.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 576, supporting efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment and research, introduced by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), is a sobering reminder of the rising incidents of pediatric cancer.

We cannot overemphasize the importance of protecting America's children. They are our Nation's future and its most precious resource. Hence, they deserve the same breadth of our Nation's biomedical resources as we devote to fighting cancer in adults, namely, cutting-edge research, targeted treatments, and medical education initiatives based on their unique needs and physiology.

1245

Children are not simply ''little adults.'' The recommendations in this resolution are critical to decreasing the burden of childhood cancers and should guide public policy.

With that said, I am also pleased to remind the Members of this Chamber that the bill we just passed, H.R. 4365, the Children's Health Act of 2000, contains an expanded provision from its original title on skeletal cancers in childhood to authorize the Secretary of HHS to devote research resources to learning more about all childhood cancers and improving treatment outcomes. Indeed, these are all steps in the right direction and a clear message to all children and the families whose lives have been forever altered by this disease.

I am pleased to support the gentlewoman from Ohio's resolution. I look forward to working with her over the years to increase funding for research into childhood cancer and all pediatric diseases in this Congress. In addition, I would like to highlight one of the provisions from this resolution that Congress should support:

''Public and private sector efforts to promote awareness about the incidence of cancer among children, the signs and symptoms of cancer in children, and treatment options.''

As such, I think that it is important to point out that 11 million children in this country still remain uninsured despite passage of the Children's Health Improvement Act. Uninsured children often do not get the same prevention, diagnosis or treatment needed to save their lives. Consequently, we should take action in this Congress to address the barriers that exist to health insurance coverage that continue to harm the health of children. We should take action to streamline enrollment of kids into Medicaid and CHIP. We should improve outreach efforts to get eligible children enrolled. We should expand coverage to pregnant women which would reduce infant mortality, another leading cause of mortality in children.

We should also do everything to encourage States to spend all the money that we have provided them to get children into CHIP. It is a terrible shame that 40 States have failed to spend $1.9 billion. For example, the State of Texas is scheduled to return over 70 percent of its CHIP allocations. That is unfortunate. I encourage Members to consider passage of the Improved Maternal and Children's Health Coverage Act this year. My own State of Colorado also stands to lose money because it has not covered all of the children in Colorado. If we have health insurance for children, parents will be able to take the children to their physicians at the first hints, at the first physical symptoms of cancer, and if that happens, then we should be able to diagnose and treat that cancer at an earlier stage and to save many thousands of lives every year.

Again, I commend my colleague for raising this issue. I urge its passage.

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

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H. Res. 576, the Childhood Cancer Awareness, Research and Treatment Act, I rise today in strong support of efforts to increase awareness of this disease, one which is stealing the very life from our children.

I would also like to thank the lead Democratic sponsor, my distinguished colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), for all the support he and his wife Janet have provided. Sadly, they also know all too well the importance of this fight to raise awareness. I also want to thank my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES) for his early leadership on this initiative.

A year ago, my daughter Caroline, just 9 years old, succumbed to an ailment we too often view as only an adult disease, that is, cancer. This is, however, a tragically flawed assumption, as the devastation of cancer knows no age limits. Cancer is the leading cause of death by disease in all children, killing more children than any other disease, more than diabetes, cystic fibrosis, asthma, congenital defects and AIDS combined.

Cancer strikes 46 children like Caroline every school day, forcing them into a cycle of pain, test tubes, needles, multiple medications and debilitating limitations. The median age at diagnosis is 6, placing the child's entire lifetime at risk.

Unfortunately, Caroline was not accurately diagnosed when she first complained of pain in her leg just more than 2 years ago. Her doctors, while well intentioned and caring, lacked the expertise to correctly identify her early symptoms. In fact, she was sent home twice from her pediatrician with a casual observation that she must be suffering from shin splints and ''growing pains.'' Compounding the nightmare, the initial diagnosis of the type of cancer she had was incorrect, causing further delays as specific treatments vary for different forms of cancer. As a result, our little girl did not receive the necessary attention early on in treating her cancer which most likely reduced her chances for survival. My husband and I still spend a part of every day wondering if Caroline's death could have been prevented if she had been able to get treatment sooner. Sadly, we are not alone in this melancholy world of ''what if.''

Caroline's story illustrates an issue we must confront as a Nation, how to ensure the best possible treatment of children and teenagers with cancer.

One vitally important step is the recent merger of the four main childhood cancer research cooperatives into one, the Children's Oncology Group, or COG. It will address the dilemma faced by parents like us when one set of doctors recommends a certain type of treatment plan while another group aggressively pushes a different treatment plan. How are terrified parents supposed to sort that one out?

This new merger will lead to a single recommended treatment plan for each type of childhood cancer, and it will ensure that 90 percent of children in North America have access to the best standardized care no matter where they live. But we must do more. Childhood cancer has a unique set of characteristics and problems, yet research into childhood cancer is at one of the bottom rungs of the funding ladder. Our goal should be to increase funding to a level commensurate with the public health issues and personal challenges that our children face.

Clinical research remains the brightest hope for stemming the tide of childhood cancer. So cutting the bureaucratic red tape that slows funding to support some of the most successful cooperative research of our time, that of childhood cancer research, is a must. And we must ensure that children have early access to cutting-edge cancer-fighting drugs, and pediatricians should be trained to look for even the most subtle signs of cancer. In addition, we must do more to deal with the pain that our children endure as they go through their cancer treatments, especially those in the final days of a losing battle with the disease.

As a parent watching my child suffer, I could not comprehend why more relief could not be provided in a hospital compared to what was available in hospice care. The average medical student receives only 4 hours of training in palliative care, or pain relief. Four hours. The cycle of myth and ignorance surrounding the treatment of pain, even in our own medical community, has to change. However, I do not believe that discussions about childhood cancer need to be confined to hospital corridors or public policy debates. During this month of September, people have demonstrated their support for childhood cancer research by wearing a gold ribbon to commemorate Childhood Cancer Month. This gold ribbon is a symbol for hope, for innovation through continued research, for the courage of children in need and for their families. Wearing the gold ribbon demonstrates our willingness to hold this issue, and our precious children, close to our hearts.

During Childhood Cancer Month, many of these families, friends, doctors and supporters came to Washington to share their personal experience and to participate in a variety of events designed to raise awareness about the incidence of childhood cancer and the work we have to do to find a cure. This is just the beginning of an annual tradition that will serve to educate Congress and recruit people to our cause. Over 30 witnesses came from across the country to testify on this issue which has touched each of them in a profound and too often devastating way. I hope these firsthand accounts of courage and frustration will spur my colleagues into action.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 576, the Childhood Cancer Awareness, Research and Treatment Act, formalizes this fight to raise awareness and find a cure by stating that Congress should:

Support public and private sector efforts to promote awareness about the incidence of cancer among children, the signs and symptoms of cancer in children, and treatment options.

Support increased public and private investment in childhood cancer research to improve prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and long-term survival.

Support policies that provide incentives to encourage medical trainees and investigators to enter the field of pediatric oncology.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to enter a field and be prepared to watch children suffer and die every day. But we must encourage these brave professionals. They are our hope.

Support policies that provide incentives to encourage the development of drugs and biologics designed to treat pediatric cancers.

Support policies that encourage participation in clinical trials; and finally, to support medical education curricula designed to improve pain management for cancer patients.

In passing this resolution today during Childhood Cancer Month, my hope is to take an important step forward in our fight to help more 9-year-olds with cancer reach age 10 and for all children to celebrate even more birthdays in the years ahead.

Once again, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for all his support. I am grateful to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the Committee on Commerce for clearing this resolution so that we may consider it today.

Finally, I would like to thank the Members on both sides of the aisle who have cosponsored this resolution. I urge adoption of it.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, let me urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I think that it is time that we move towards an era that in this great country we can create an atmosphere that ensures hope and eliminates what-ifs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 576, which calls for increased efforts for childhood cancer awareness, treatment and research. I am pleased that we are able to bring this bill to the floor in September, during National Childhood Cancer Month.

H. Res. 576 expresses the sense of Congress supporting public and private efforts to promote awareness of signs and symptoms as well as treatment options for childhood cancer; increased investments in research to improve prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and long-term survival; policies to encourage medial professionals to enter the field of pediatric oncology; policies to encourage the development of drugs and biologics to treat pediatric cancers; policies to encourage participation in clinical trials; and medical education curricula to improve pain management for cancer patients.

Cancer does not discriminate based on race, sex, religion, economic position or age. This legislation demonstrates the need for more awareness of and research in childhood cancer. This commitment will help thousands of children each year and allow them the opportunity to grow into healthy and productive adults. I applaud my colleague from Ohio, Ms. PRYCE for her personal strength and commitment to this issue and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I commend my good friend and colleague from Ohio, DEBORAH PRYCE, for offering H. Res. 576, a ''Sense of the House Resolution'' supporting efforts to increase awareness, treatment, and research of childhood cancer.

September is Childhood Cancer Month. Unfortunately, the incidence of cancer among children in the United States is a growing problem. It is estimated that this year 12,400 children will be diagnosed with cancer, and 2,300 children will die from this dread disease. In fact, cancer is the leading cause of death by disease in children under age 15.

Our colleagues on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HHS-Education have recognized the seriousness of the problem of cancer by increasing the appropriation for the National Cancer Institute over the past five years from $2.761 billion to $3,793 billion for FY 2001. Despite this increase, we still hear that opportunities for childhood cancer research remain unfunded or underfunded. For this reason, it appropriate for us to consider this resolution.

It is important to increase the resources directed toward childhood cancer research. Children are amazingly resilient and can often tolerate higher doses of experimental drugs. Therefore, clinical trials on children can offer insights on the treatments of all cancers.

From personal experience, I know of the dedication of the doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel who treat children with cancer, and of the researchers who have devoted their lives to finding cures. With significant advances such as completing the mapping of the human genome, I think that we are on the verge of a new understanding of how cancer develops and how it can be cured. Childhood cancer is a problem that can be conquered.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, ask anyone you know or even someone you pass on the street if they know someone who has cancer and nearly every single person will respond with a heart-wrenching ''Yes.'' Today I come before my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ask for their support in helping the littlest cancer warriors—children.

Anthony Peca is a grandfather from my district who recently lost his granddaughter, Catie, to cancer. Catie had neuroblastoma and was denied access to a clinical trial. She fought valiantly like only a child can, but in the end the cancer overcame her. And now, Anthony Peca and his family are left with a hole in their hearts, knowing from experience that eight years old is too young to die.

According to the National Childhood Cancer Foundation, cancer kills more children than any other disease. Each year cancer kills more children than asthma, diabetes, cystic fibrosis, congenital anomalies, and AIDS, combined. In recent years, cancer research has made leaps and bounds in progress, yet the incidence of cancer among children in this country is rising almost 1 percent per year. The research is simply not keeping up. And children are suffering because of it.

And it's not just the disease itself that exacts such a heavy toll. How much do families suffer emotionally and financially? How do we rebuild a child's youthful spirit and innocence once it has been shattered by the disease inside them? There isn't a medicine strong enough to mend the soul of a child.

That's why this resolution is so important. Thanks to the tireless and courageous efforts of Congresswoman DEBORAH PRYCE, Congress has the opportunity to address childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research. We have the power to encourage both the public and private sectors to conduct research, expand medical education, and open up more clinical trials to children. Childhood should be something that you grow out of, not something that gets ripped out from underneath you.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 576, which expresses Congress' advocacy for improved efforts to battle childhood cancers.

Every one of us has a friend or family member who has fought or is fighting a personal battle with cancer. We have colleagues who show us daily the strength that comes from living with cancer and recovering from its effects. But nothing touches our hearts more than a child stricken with this devastating disease, and no one has shown us courage like our colleagues, DEBORAH PRYCE, whose young daughter succumbed to cancer only a year ago.

It is in her memory and for the 46 children who will be diagnosed with cancer today and every school day that we must pass this resolution. Innovative research and aggressive treatment have improved the odds that these children will live longer, happier lives.

In fact, 70 percent of children diagnosed today will be alive 5 years from now. By passing this resolution, and standing firmly behind its call, we can give the other 30 percent hope and a future.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 576.

The question was taken.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. 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.

CORRECTIONS CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of September 26, 2000, this is the day for the call of the Corrections Calendar.

The Clerk will call the bill on the Corrections Calendar.

KNOW YOUR CALLER ACT OF 1999

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3100) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit telemarketers from interfering with the caller identification service of any person to whom a telephone solicitation is made, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3100

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 ''Know Your Caller Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION OF INTERFERENCE WITH CALLER IDENTIFICATION SERVICES.

Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e) PROHIBITION ON INTERFERENCE WITH CALLER IDENTIFICATION SERVICES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States, in making any telephone solicitation, to interfere with or circumvent the ability of a caller identification service to access or provide to the recipient of the call the information about the call (as required under the regulations issued under paragraph (2)) that such service is capable of providing.

''(2) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the enactment of the Know Your Caller Act of 1999, the Commission shall prescribe regulations to implement this subsection which shall—

''(A) require any person making a telephone solicitation to make such solicitation in a manner such that a recipient of the solicitation having a caller identification service capable of providing such information will be provided by such service with—

''(i) the name of the person or entity on whose behalf the solicitation is being made; and

''(ii) a valid and working telephone number at which the caller or the entity on whose behalf the telephone solicitation was made may be reached during regular business hours for the purpose of requesting that the recipient of the solicitation be placed on the do-not-call list required under section 64.1200 of the Commission's regulations (47 CFR 64.1200) to be maintained by the person making the telephone solicitation; and

''(B) provide that any person or entity who receives a request from a person to be placed on such do-not-call list may not use such person's name and telephone number for any other telemarketing, mail marketing, or other marketing purpose (including transfer or sale to any other entity for marketing use) other than enforcement of such list.

''(2) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—A person or entity may, if otherwise permitted by the laws or rules of court of a State, bring in an appropriate court of that State—

''(A) an action based on a violation of this subsection or the regulations prescribed under this subsection to enjoin such violation;

''(B) an action to recover for actual monetary loss from such a violation, or to receive $500 in damages for each such violation, whichever is greater; or

''(C) both such actions.

If the court finds that the defendant willfully or knowingly violated this subsection or the regulations prescribed under this subsection, the court may, in its discretion, increase the amount of the award to an amount equal to not more than 3 times the amount available under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

''(A) CALLER IDENTIFICATION SERVICE.—The term 'caller identification service' means any service or device designed to provide the user of the service or device with the telephone number of an incoming call.

''(B) TELEPHONE CALL.—The term 'telephone call' means any telephone call or other transmission which is made to or received at a telephone number of any type of telephone service. Such term includes calls made by an automatic telephone dialing system, an integrated services digital network, and a commercial mobile radio source.''.

SEC. 3. EFFECT ON STATE LAW AND STATE ACTIONS.

(a) EFFECT ON STATE LAW.—Subsection (f)(1) of section 227 of the Communications

Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(f)(1)), as so redesignated by section 2(1) of this Act, is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) interfering with or circumventing caller identification services.''.

(b) ACTIONS BY STATES.—The first sentence of subsection (g)(1) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(f)(1)), as such subsections is so redesignated by section 2(1) of this Act, is further amended by inserting after ''this section,'' the following: ''or has engaged or is engaging in a pattern or practice of interfering with or circumventing caller identification services of residents of that State in violation of subsection (e) or the regulations prescribed under such subsection,''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Commerce.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Know Your Caller Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION OF INTERFERENCE WITH CALLER IDENTIFICATION SERVICES.

Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e) PROHIBITION ON INTERFERENCE WITH CALLER IDENTIFICATION SERVICES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States, in making any telephone solicitation—

''(A) to interfere with or circumvent the capability of a caller identification service to access or provide to the recipient of the telephone call involved in the solicitation any information regarding the call that such service is capable of providing; and

''(B) to fail to provide caller identification information in a manner that is accessible by a caller identification service, if such person has capability to provide such information in such a manner.

For purposes of this section, the use of a telecommunications service or equipment that is incapable of transmitting caller identification information shall not, of itself, constitute interference with or circumvention of the capability of a caller identification service to access or provide such information.

''(2) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the enactment of the Know Your Caller Act of 2000, the Commission shall prescribe regulations to implement this subsection, which shall—

''(A) specify that the information regarding a call that the prohibition under paragraph (1) applies to includes—

''(i) the name of the person or entity who makes the telephone call involved in the solicitation;

''(ii) the name of the person or entity on whose behalf the solicitation is made; and

''(iii) a valid and working telephone number at which the person or entity on whose behalf the telephone solicitation is made may be reached during regular business hours for the purpose of requesting that the recipient of the solicitation be placed on the do-not-call list required under section 64.1200 of the Commission's regulations (47 CFR 64.1200) to be maintained by such person or entity; and

''(B) provide that any person or entity who receives a request from a person to be placed on such do-not-call list may not use such person's name and telephone number for telemarketing, mail marketing, or other marketing purpose (including transfer or sale to any other entity for marketing use) other than enforcement of such list.

''(3) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—A person or entity may, if otherwise permitted by the laws or rules of court of a State, bring in an appropriate court of that State—

''(A) an action based on a violation of this subsection or the regulations prescribed under this subsection to enjoin such violation;

''(B) an action to recover for actual monetary loss from such a violation, or to receive $500 in damages for each such violation, whichever is greater; or

''(C) both such actions.

If the court finds that the defendant willfully or knowingly violated this subsection or the regulations prescribed under this subsection, the court may, in its discretion, increase the amount of the award to an amount equal to not more than 3 times the amount available under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.

''(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

''(A) CALLER IDENTIFICATION SERVICE.—The term 'caller identification service' means any service or device designed to provide the user of the service or device with the telephone number of an incoming telephone call.

''(B) TELEPHONE CALL.—The term 'telephone call' means any telephone call or other transmission which is made to or received at a telephone number of any type of telephone service and includes telephone calls made using the Internet (irrespective of the type of customer premises equipment used in connection with such services). Such term also includes calls made by an automatic telephone dialing system, an integrated services digital network, and a commercial mobile radio source.''.

SEC. 3. EFFECT ON STATE LAW AND STATE ACTIONS.

(a) EFFECT ON STATE LAW.—Subsection (f)(1) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(f)(1)), as so redesignated by section 2(1) of this Act, is further amended by inserting after ''subsection (d)'' the following: ''and the prohibition under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (e),''.

(b) ACTIONS BY STATES.—The first sentence of subsection (g)(1) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(g)(1)), as so redesignated by section 2(1) of this Act, is further amended by striking ''telephone calls'' and inserting ''telephone solicitations, telephone calls, or''.

SEC. 4. STUDY REGARDING TRANSMISSION OF CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.

The Federal Communications Commission shall conduct a study to determine—

(1) the extent of the capability of the public switched network to transmit the information that can be accessed by caller identification services;

(2) the types of telecommunications equipment being used in the telemarketing industry, the extent of such use, and the capabilities of such types of equipment to transmit the information that can be accessed by caller identification services; and

(3) the changes to the public switched network and to the types of telecommunications equipment commonly being used in the telemarketing industry that would be necessary to provide for the public switched network to be able to transmit caller identification information on all telephone calls, and the costs (including costs to the telemarketing industry) to implement such changes.

The Commission shall complete the study and submit a report to the Congress on the results of the study, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3100, the Know Your Caller Act, deals with the business practice of telemarketing. There are thousands of reputable telemarketing companies that provide a benefit to consumers by offering a broad range of consumer options and opportunities. Some companies are helping to grow our economy, employing thousands of citizens and fueling the economy with literally billions of dollars. Increasingly, however, telemarketers are the cause of complaints. Consumers are concerned that telemarketers are intruding into their homes. We continue to see stories about telemarketing schemes that separate consumers from their hard-earned money.

1300

In fact, the telemarketing complaints lodged with the Federal Trade Commission seem to underscore these concerns. In 1997 there were 2,260 complaints. In 1999 that number rose to 17,423. Today's bill takes these complaints seriously.

Thanks to the excellent work of the bill's sponsor, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the legislation strips away the ability of telemarketers to hide behind anonymous telephone calls.

H.R. 3100 prohibits telemarketers from blocking the transmission of caller identification information. In addition, the bill affirmatively requires telemarketers to transmit caller identification in their equipment, if their equipment is capable of doing so. I believe this bill strikes the appropriate balance between the consumer's right to privacy and safety and the telemarketer's legitimate business interests.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by complimenting the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN). He did good work here. In our committee process, we were able to take his legislation, fine tune it a little bit, and to ultimately bring it out here to the floor of the House for action by every Member.

Consumers who want to exercise their right to be placed on a do-not-call list or to take a telemarketer to small claims court after being called are often frustrated when they cannot get the Caller ID information from the telemarketer to identify them. This legislation addresses whether telemarketers may actively block Caller ID information, and contains a prohibition against anyone making a telephone solicitation who interferes with or circumvents the capability of Caller ID services to work with consumers.

An amendment was made in the Committee on Commerce. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and I and other members of the committee worked to construct an amendment to make clear that telemarketers will not be forced to buy all new equipment, and that the use of equipment that is incapable of transmitting Caller ID information is not in and of itself a violation.

In my view, however, telemarketers who solicit the public in their homes for commercial gain should not be permitted to evade the purpose and functionality of Caller ID services. This bill will prevent telemarketers from doing so, while further empowering consumers to control the communications going to and from their home.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that the telecommunications revolution gives enormous opportunities for telemarketers, but it also gives to consumers powers, and those powers should include the ability, using Caller ID, to prevent information from going to their family which they believe is inappropriate. I think that this balances something which is very much consistent with the nonpartisan, nonideological way in which we have been constructing telecommunications policy over the last generation in Congress.

I again congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) for yielding me time and for his leadership and assistance, and particularly the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and the staff on the Committee on Commerce for their assistance with this bill, and also thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) for his kind words and for his assistance in fine-tuning this bill as well.

Mr. Speaker, I also need to thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman TAUZIN) and the ranking member of the Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and their staffs for their help with this bill.

Further, I want to thank the chairman of the Corrections Advisory Group, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and members of the Corrections Advisory Group for their prompt acceptance of this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the Know Your Caller Act will provide a simple but important consumer protection. Many consumers purchase and pay for the Caller ID service and Caller ID equipment for several reasons: to protect their privacy, to provide security by identifying an incoming call, and to allow them the opportunity to decide before picking up the receiver whether or not to answer that call.

But, guess what? Some of the most frequent calls, those from telemarketers, appear with the message on Caller ID box, ''Out of the area; caller unknown.''

Mr. Speaker, telemarketing is a commercial enterprise. As such, what would be the reason for not disclosing your business telephone number? There simply is no reason.

I believe that all commercial enterprises that use the telephone to advertise or sell their services to encourage the purchase of property or goods or for any other commercial purposes should be required to have the name of their business and their business telephone number disclosed on Caller ID boxes.

Some telemarketer enterprises purposely block out Caller ID, yet these same companies know your name, your address, and your telephone number. Is it not only fair that they share their company name and their telephone number so a person can make sure that they are a legitimate company?

Also, if you are like me and politely ask to have your name removed from their list, I think you should also be able to track the name and number of these telemarketing callers to ensure that they do not call back again repeatedly. My legislation will simply require any person making a telephone solicitation to identify themselves on Caller ID devices.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation I think will greatly help separate legitimate telemarketers from fraudulent telemarketers. While a majority of these telemarketers are legitimate business people attempting to sell a product or service, there are some unscrupulous individuals and companies violating existing telemarketing rules and scamming consumers.

Consumers pay a monthly fee to subscribe to a Caller ID service because they want to protect their privacy and their pocketbooks, but they have little recourse because most telemarketers intentionally block their identity from being transmitted to Caller ID devices.

Mr. Speaker, we already require telemarketers under present law to identify themselves over the telephone and via telephone fax transmissions. This bill simply extends that protection to consumers with Caller ID devices.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, when someone knocks at your door, do you not usually look out the window to see who it is before you answer it? Well, Caller ID acts as a window for consumers to let them know who is calling before you answer the telephone.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, again I echo what the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) just said. I urge all Members of the House to support this good legislation.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3100, the Know Your Caller Act, which will help protect the privacy of consumers from telemarketers. I cannot begin to tell you how many constituents have complained to me about the number of annoying telephone calls they get at home. These calls come from credit card companies and other telemarketers trying to make a sale. These calls are intrusive and are wrong. H.R. 3100 would prevent telemarketers from interfering with consumers' caller-identification machines and require the companies to make their name readable to applicable caller ID services. Most importantly, because consumers have very little recourse, telemarketers would have to provide a phone number to the ID service that consumers can call to have their names and numbers removed from call lists. In addition, consumers could sue telemarketers for up to $500 per unidentified call. Because we live in a very fast paced world where every free moment with our family and friends is valuable, we cannot allow these companies and businesses to violate our privacy. I support this measure and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman BLILEY of the Commerce Committee for all of the work he has done on this bill. I would also like to thank Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN for authoring this bill. He has demonstrated his dedication and leadership on this issue.

On July 25, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN presented H.R. 3100 before the Speakers advisory group on corrections. The corrections group is a bipartisan group that seeks to fix, update or repeal outdated or unnecessary laws, rules or regulations.

H.R. 3100 would prohibit telemarketers from intentionally hiding their identity by blocking caller ID devices. This would ensure someone knows if a telemarketer is calling them. One simple rule of telemarketing is that once you get a person on the phone your chances to make a sale are greatly increased. This is especially true with senior citizens who are seen as easy targets by telemarketers. That is why

this bill is supported by the American Association of Retired People, the National Senior Citizens Law Center and the Federal Trade Commission.

During the meeting several Members shared stories about how their constituents have been affected by telemarketers who hide their identity.

I am proud as chairman of the advisory group to speak in favor of H.R. 3100 and would advise my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support it.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. 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. 3100, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the amendment recommended by the Committee on Commerce and on the bill.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. 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.

AUTHORIZING ENFORCEMENT OF REGULATIONS ON CITIZENS BAND RADIO EQUIPMENT

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2346) to authorize the enforcement by State and local governments of certain Federal Communications Commission regulations regarding use of citizens band radio equipment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2346

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

SECTION 1. ENFORCEMENT OF REGULATIONS REGARDING CITIZENS BAND RADIO EQUIPMENT.

Section 302 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 302a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a State or local government may enact a statute or ordinance that prohibits a violation of the following regulations of the Commission under this section:

''(A) A regulation that prohibits a use of citizens band radio equipment not authorized by the Commission.

''(B) A regulation that prohibits the unauthorized operation of citizens band radio equipment on a frequency between 24 MHz and 35 MHz.

''(2) A station that is licensed by the Commission pursuant to section 301 in any radio service for the operation at issue shall not be subject to action by a State or local government under this subsection. A State or local government statute or ordinance enacted for purposes of this subsection shall identify the exemption available under this paragraph.

''(3) The Commission shall provide technical guidance to State and local governments regarding the detection and determination of violations of the regulations specified in paragraph (1).

''(4)(A) In addition to any other remedy authorized by law, a person affected by the decision of a State or local government enforcing a statute or ordinance under paragraph (1) may submit to the Commission an appeal of the decision on the grounds that the State or local government, as the case may be, enacted a statute or ordinance outside the authority provided in this subsection.

''(B) A person shall submit an appeal on a decision of a State or local government to the Commission under this paragraph, if at all, not later than 30 days after the date on which the decision by the State or local government becomes final, but prior to seeking judicial review of such decision.

''(C) The Commission shall make a determination on an appeal submitted under subparagraph (B) not later than 180 days after its submittal.

''(D) If the Commission determines under subparagraph (C) that a State or local government has acted outside its authority in enforcing a statute or ordinance, the Commission shall preempt the decision enforcing the statute or ordinance.

''(5) The enforcement of statute or ordinance that prohibits a violation of a regulation by a State or local government under paragraph (1) in a particular case shall not preclude the Commission from enforcing the regulation in that case concurrently.

''(6) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to diminish or otherwise affect the jurisdiction of the Commission under this section over devices capable of interfering with radio communications.

''(7) The enforcement of a statute or ordinance by a State or local government under paragraph (1) with regard to citizens band radio equipment on board a 'commercial motor vehicle', as defined in section 31101 of title 49, United States Code, shall require probable cause to find that the commercial motor vehicle or the individual operating the vehicle is in violation of the regulations described in paragraph (1). Probable cause shall be defined in accordance with the technical guidance provided by the Commission under paragraph (3).''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. 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. 2346.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2346. It is an important initiative to improve compliance with FCC rules governing citizens band radio service.

Citizens band radio service can serve some very important functions. For instance, many people use CB radios in order to communicate in times of emergency. America's trucking community uses CB radios to report accidents and traffic problems on our Nation's highways and roadways. Many other people use CBs for simply short-distance communications, and others use it as a source of entertainment.

These constructive uses, however, are being overshadowed by the practice of a few bad actors. A number of individuals have taken advantage of the unlicensed nature of CB radio to operate outside the boundaries of FCC rules. In particular, a recurrent problem is CB users boosting their signal strength with power amplifiers. Further, some CB users operate outside the permit frequencies allocated for CB radio service.

When these violations occur, unexpected and potentially harmful interference can result for others who use the service. Traditionally, Congress has looked to the FCC to enforce its rules. In fact, current communications statutes give the FCC great authority to enforce its rules and take remedial action when the rules are not followed.

Unfortunately, the FCC has made clear that reported violations regarding CB radios will be investigated only as time, manpower and priorities permit. The FCC has also indicated that it will only investigate CB violations where there is convincing evidence that results from a violation of the rules has occurred, and then only on a low-priority basis.

H.R. 2346 is an effort to provide a back-up enforcement mechanism. Under H.R. 2346, a State or local government is given authority to enact a statute or ordinance requiring operators of CB radio service within their jurisdiction to obey FCC rules. Violators would be subject to enforcement by State or local government.

The bill is carefully drafted so as not to interfere with the FCC's enforcement authority and provides suspected offenders with an appeals process.

This noncontroversial bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce by voice vote and enjoys bipartisan support.

I commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for his work on

this bill, and ask all Members to support its passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) from Michigan have spent a considerable amount of time dealing with an issue which I think should be of great concern to everyone because of the increase in its occurrence as a phenomenon.

We have millions of CB operators across the country. They have a lot of fun with it, and they do not really cause anybody any problems at all. They are kind of like the original Internet, in a lot of ways. They are out there with their own separate sets of networks on which they are able to communicate, and it is really a great thing for our country.

1315

But there has been a rising incidence of individuals using CB frequencies abusively. They actually build towers in their neighborhoods, and they start broadcasting over the CB frequency.

It has several severe adverse consequences for all of the rest of the people who live in the neighborhood. It has the effect of interfering with television broadcast reception. It has the impact of interfering with telephone reception. It has the impact of interfering with every electronic piece of equipment in the home.

Moreover, it has even more consequences. That is, the content of many of these CB frequency broadcasters is profane, and it interferes with the ability of families to be able to live in peace and quiet without having someone in the neighborhood broadcasting in a way that actually goes into the homes of others who live in that community.

The Federal Communications Commission does not have the resources to be able to deal with this essentially local phenomenon, this set of brush fires that are cropping up increasingly across the country in community after community.

What this legislation does is to give to the States the ability to move in and to enforce the laws which ensure that these neighborhood nightmares, these nuisances are shut down, and that those individuals use the CB frequency in the same way that the millions of others in America who use the CB frequency use it, that is, for their own enjoyment and not in a way which creates a nuisance for everyone else in their community.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), in my opinion, have done an excellent job on this legislation. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) for bringing it out to the floor at this time.

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

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the bill's author.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation that is before us which will combat unlawful use of citizen band radios. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman BLILEY), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) for their assistance in bringing this legislation to the floor. I also thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) for his active efforts here.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time that they all have taken to address this problem and pass it through the Committee on Commerce.

This legislation is not only important to my district, but to many other cities that are dealing with the same problems that this bill addresses. For several years, many of my constituents have been fighting a losing battle against illegal CB radio operators. Most CB radio operators use their equipment within the low-power levels prescribed by the FCC rules and regulations and do not cause any problems. However, some users illegally boost the range of their home-based CB equipment by using high-powered external linear amplifiers. Also, occasionally, they modify the frequencies illegally.

When the CB level is amplified above legal levels, or the frequency is changed, it causes interference with television, radio and phone signals and damages other electronic equipment in the surrounding houses. The interference can be so bad that surrounding residents hear CB conversations over their televisions, radios, and phones. This can be extremely frustrating as telephone conversations can be cut off, television signals can be distorted, and other electronic equipment can suffer interference.

Sometimes it is so bad that neighbors have to suffer through profane and abusive language that is being picked up by their own television sets, radios, or telephones.

This is not an isolated problem. Most of the cosponsors of this legislation have exactly the same problems in their districts, and that is true of many other areas of the country as well.

The Federal Communications Commission (the FCC), knows about the problem and has outlawed the sale and the use of these amplifiers. However, they are still on sale for other purposes and can be easily modified for use with CB radios. Even worse, the FCC does not have the personnel to enforce the law. Localities are powerless to help, because the FCC has a total preemption over enforcing regulations regarding CB radio use.

The legislation before us will allow State and local authorities to enforce the FCC regulations regarding CB equipment and frequencies. This would be a narrow exemption from the total Federal preemption of CB radio regulation enforcement and would give residents recourse against an unlawful CB operator by capitalizing on the enforcement capabilities of local government and on the FCC's years of experience in setting rules governing CB use. In other words, the best of both worlds.

The intent of this provision is to allow State and local governments to pass ordinances that will mimic Federal law and allow for its enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, let me emphasize, does not change what equipment is and is not legal. People who are operating CB equipment in accordance with the FCC rules will not be affected at all by this legislation. I have also worked with the ham radio operators (amateur radio operators) on this provision to ensure that their concerns about this legislation were addressed. Frankly, the ham radio operators in my district are very pleased with the bill. They were the ones who initiated it by asking me to address this particular problem, because it affected them as well.

The bill also contains a provision that exempts anyone who possesses a ham radio license from this legislation.

Lastly, the legislation contains a provision that specifically restates that local law enforcement officials must have just cause to investigate whether or not someone is operating an illegal amplifier before they take action against someone.

Just to summarize in a nutshell, we have a real Catch-22 at the moment. The Federal Government has the power to enforce these laws. Not only that, we preempt the law from other communities so that they cannot enforce them. And yet the Federal Government, through the FCC, does not enforce them. So we tell people we will enforce it, but we cannot enforce it. This bill resolves that problem by allowing those on the scene, the local law enforcement agencies, to deal with the problem that the Federal Government has preempted but does not enforce. I believe that this will be beneficial to everyone.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge the House to approve this legislation. It is supported by the Committee on Commerce, the FCC, and local law enforcement officials. Again, I thank the leaders of the Committee on Commerce for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any other requests to speak at this time; and with the request to all Members to support this good piece of legislation, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY). Again, I

thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the authors of this bill. I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2346.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO TITLE X OF ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 1992

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2641) to make technical corrections to title X of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2641

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

SECTION 1. DATE EXTENSIONS.

Section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 2296a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(B)(i), by striking ''2002'' and inserting ''2007'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(B)(ii), by striking ''placed in escrow not later than December 31, 2002,'' and inserting ''incurred by a licensee after December 31, 2007,''; and

(3) in subsection (b)(2)(E)(i) by striking ''July 31, 2005'' and inserting ''December 31, 2008''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2641 will make date extensions to title X of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, which specifies how and when the Federal Government reimburses the private sector licensees for the Federal Government's share of the cost of cleaning up uranium and thorium milling sites. We have learned that it costs a lot more and takes a lot longer to clean up these mill sites than we originally anticipated back in 1992, due in large part to the difficulties of dealing with groundwater contamination.

Therefore, H.R. 2641 makes some adjustments to the time line of the current reimbursement scheme to recognize these realities and to make sure that the government continues to pay its fair share of the cleanup costs.

The current scheme of reimbursement on an annual basis is due to end in 2002, with DOE required to place into escrow sufficient funds to cover the estimated post-2002 costs. Both industry and the Department of Energy want to continue the current arrangement of reimbursement of actual costs on an annual basis for several more years until all or almost all of this cleanup work is completed.

This bill was changed significantly as it moved through the committee process. I commend the Members and staff on both sides of the aisle, particularly the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT), for working to improve this bill. What is before the House today was reported out of the Committee on Commerce with unanimous bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2641 represents an effective compromise measure that has the full support of the Department of Energy and the industry. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to vote for this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2641, which makes constructive and noncontroversial changes to title X of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BARTON) of our Subcommittee on Energy and Power, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT), and their respective staffs for working with us at the subcommittee level and at the level of the full House Committee on Commerce to address a range of concerns that the minority originally had concerning these provisions.

As the gentlewoman from Wyoming indicated, the bill reported by the Committee on Commerce makes a number of useful administrative changes to the uranium and thorium mill tailings cleanup program. First, it extends for 5 additional years the period during which licensees may apply to the Department of Energy for reimbursement of their share of the costs of approved cleanup projects.

Secondly, the bill eliminates the requirement that certain funds be placed in escrow which will benefit all licensees by providing more flexibility to provide reimbursements for completed projects.

And third, the bill extends the date by which the Secretary of Energy must determine that there are excess funds for cleaning up the gaseous diffusion plants. These changes reflect the reality that while the title X cleanup program has been largely successful, the work has taken longer than expected. I would stress, however, that the bill does not alter the formula for Federal reimbursement or in any way increase the program's previously authorized spending ceiling.

The bill reported by the Committee on Commerce is supported by both the administration and industry. It has bipartisan support, and I am pleased to join with the gentlewoman in urging the approval by the House of this measure. I want to thank her, the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BARTON) of our Subcommittee on Energy and Power, and the leadership of the full Committee on Commerce for their cooperation in addressing the concerns we originally had.

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

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT).

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) for yielding me just a moment of time to talk about H.R. 2641.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2641 to make technical corrections to title X of the Energy Policy Act of 1992. This legislation is a clean reauthorization that extends the program of annual reimbursements for 5 more years to clean up uranium and thorium mill tailings sites by extending these reimbursements for 5 more years. It eliminates the requirement for DOE to place into escrow sufficient funds to cover estimated post-2002 cleanup costs, and it changes the date when the Secretary must determine whether any excess funds remain from 2005 until 2008.

H.R. 2641 is a bipartisan bill reported out unanimously by the Committee on Commerce. The bill is supported by the Department of Energy, by industry, and by the PACE union which represents workers at the gaseous diffusion plants.

1330

H.R. 2641 will keep the industry licensees focused on completing their cleanup work and will keep DOE focused on reimbursing its fair share of the cleanup costs.

Finally, I want to thank Kevin Cook from the Committee on Commerce for all of his fine work; Sue Sheridan from the staff of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for her efforts and cooperation and from the staff of the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), Bryan Jacobs for all of his work and time on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I would just add that this bill is environmentally sound and responsible and economically sound, fiscally sound and responsible as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, once again I want to thank the staffs on both sides of the

aisle. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), his cooperation and good temperament is always a joy to work with and I thank him very much.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2641, 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.

LANCE CORPORAL HAROLD GOMEZ POST OFFICE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1295) to designate the United States Post Office located at 3813 Main Street in East Chicago, Indiana, as the ''Lance Corporal Harold Gomez Post Office.''

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1295

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF LANCE CORPORAL HAROLD GOMEZ POST OFFICE.

The United States Post Office located at 3813 Main Street in East Chicago, Indiana, shall be known and designated as the ''Lance Corporal Harold Gomez Post Office''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the post office referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Lance Corporal Harold Gomez Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) 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 S. 1295.

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, we have before us S. 1295 introduced by the distinguished senator from Indiana, Senator LUGAR, on June 6, 1999. The legislation passed the Senate on November 19, 1999 and was received in the House soon thereafter.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) introduced identical legislation, H.R. 2358, on June 24 of 1999 and, pursuant to the policy on the Committee on Government Reform, the entire House delegation of the State of Indiana cosponsored H.R. 2358, and the committee passed the bill.

Both of these bills has been noted to designate the United States Post Office located at 3813 Main Street in East Chicago, Indiana as the Lance Corporal Harold Gomez Post Office.

Mr. Speaker, we have had the opportunity and, indeed, the honor to do a number of these bills in this session as in previous years, and it is always truly a pleasure. I want to begin by extending my compliments both to Senator LUGAR and to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for their efforts in bringing this worthy nominee to our attention.

One of the true joys of having the opportunity to handle these kinds of proposals, Mr. Speaker, is that it provides us with the opportunity to honor the widest possible range of United States citizens and to, in that fashion, recognize their achievements, and they are the kinds of achievements that really do span the entire horizon of contributions to country, contributions to community, and all worthy points in between.

Mr. Speaker, today, we have in Corporal Gomez just such an example. The corporal was a fire team leader in a rifle company of the Third Marine Division when in 1967, he was killed by a land mine explosion in South Vietnam. He was the first citizen from Northwest Indiana to die of casualties in that war.

Corporal Gomez received numerous awards, including the Purple Heart, the Combat Action Ribbon, the Presidential Unit Citation, the National Defense Service Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal, RVN, Military Merit Medal, RVN Gallantry Cross Medal, the Vietnam Campaign Medal and the Rifle Sharp Shooters Badge.

Corporal Gomez was posthumously awarded the Silver Star Medal for his courageous leadership and heroism. As these medals so eloquently attest, Mr. Speaker, Corporal Gomez was truly a hero.

He was a man who put the needs and the safety of his troops, of his fellow servicepeople before himself; and through him, we have again underscored the history of this Nation, a Nation founded upon the principle that in the pursuit of life and liberty and happiness, there is no cost too great, no price too high, that citizens like Corporal Gomez are willingly to extend it, even when that means the loss of their life. That kind of lesson can never be restated too often, I would suggest respectfully, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly, his heroism, his example was felt far and wide. And in his hometown, I think it is important to note that after his death, Central High School in East Chicago, the place from which Corporal Gomez had graduated, named and dedicated the library to him and the American GI Forum of the United States chartered the Harold Gomez Chapters in East Chicago.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to join with Senator LUGAR, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), with the entire House delegation from that great State, and in working with, as always, the minority on the Subcommittee on Postal Service, particularly the gentleman from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member, in ensuring that these kinds of worthy initiatives are brought quickly to this floor.

Mr. Speaker, just one final word of urging that all of our colleagues join us in supporting of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Postal Service, for his efforts in helping us bring to the floor this very important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a note, even though we act today on a Senate bill, it was the House bill of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) that was introduced, as the gentleman from New York (Chairman MCHUGH) has indicated, first and in cooperation with obviously the entire congressional delegation, we now move this Senate bill. I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana for introducing this bill decades after the death of this young man in service to his country.

The gentleman, my good friend, took it upon himself to introduce this legislation to acknowledge the sacrifice of Mr. Gomez and his family on behalf of a grateful Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my good friend.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today to urge my colleagues to support S. 1295, a bill that was sponsored in the United States Senate by Senator LUGAR, a bill to rename the Harbor Branch Post Office at 3813 Main Street in East Chicago in honor of a true hero, Lance Corporal Harold Gomez.

I did have the privilege of introducing the House version of this measure, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) mentioned, H.R. 2358 and would like to thank each of my colleagues from the State of Indiana, Republican and Democrat alike, for their complete bipartisan support of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to give special thanks to the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, for all of his assistance in bringing this bill to the floor and would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman MCHUGH) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), for all of

their diligent service in ensuring that this legislation would be heard.

Mr. Speaker, as the first resident of East Chicago, Indiana to be killed while in service to his country during the Vietnam war, Corporal Gomez is a hero and his community would like to honor him in this special way.

The gentleman from New York has already reiterated on the House floor the numerous awards and battle ribbons that the corporal has received and though Harold Gomez' life was tragically cut short, he touched many lives and was admired by both friends and colleagues alike.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored to offer this legislation to honor a true hero of Northwest Indiana. Corporal Gomez distinguished himself in combat and is a source of inspiration to both the residents of East Chicago and the rest of our Nation.

He is worthy of the recognition. On behalf of all of the citizens of Northwest Indiana, particularly our young people and our veterans, I am proud to support this legislation to name the East Chicago Post Office in honor of Corporal Harold Gomez and do ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, let me say in conclusion, because we have no further speakers on our side, that I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman MCHUGH) and I would hope that the naming of this post office, even though it is in East Chicago, Indiana, in some symbolic way represents our appreciation for so many young men who gave their lives in service to this country in the conflict that we now refer to as the Vietnam War.

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, I have no further requests for time but let me just state for the RECORD what many of us understand, but I think it is an important note, that was very legitimately raised by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) who has worked tirelessly on this beginning in 1998, the adoption of the Senate bill today is merely a parliamentary procedure that in no way reflects his lack of concern and, indeed, I would suggest that without his hard work and without his ensuring that indeed the Committee on Government Reform has considered his bill and, to my recollection, unanimously endorsed it, we may not be here today. So I want to pay a final compliment to him and to his diligence and a word of thanks again for his bringing to us a very worthy individual. With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to join us in support of this initiative.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of H.R. 2358, a bill to honor Lance Corporal Harold Gomez, a hero of the Vietnam War. My colleague, PETE VISCLOSKY, has introduced the bill to name the East Chicago, Indiana, Post Office for this young hero, the first resident of East Chicago to be killed during the Vietnam War. It is appropriate to recognize Corporal Gomez' bravery and gallantly in battle.

Corporal Gomez was born in East Chicago in 1946 and perished in action on February 21, 1967, at the young age of 21. His adventuresome spirit and love for America led him to volunteer in the Marine Corps. He was sent to Vietnam in 1966, where he became a fire team leader in a rifle company of the Third Marine Corps. In the brief one year period he fought in Vietnam, he received numerous military awards, including the Purple Heart Medal, Combat Action Ribbon, Presidential Unit Citation, National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Campaign Medal and the Rifle Sharpshooters Badge. Posthumously, he was awarded the Silver Star Medal for valiant leadership and bravery during the battle that took his life.

This young man of Hispanic (Mexican) heritage of the East Chicago neighborhood represents the best of what it means to be an American. His heroism is a proud symbol of his love for his country and his willingness to defend American democratic principles at the expense of his own life.

His spirit lives on and today we have the opportunity to honor this young hero, whose audacity and fighting spirit will shine as an example for his fellow citizens in the East Chicago, Indiana, neighborhood.

In addition, I think it is important to note that Corporal Gomez is only survived by his mother. She stands as a symbol of the thousands of parents who share in the ultimate sacrifice of losing their only son. Nobody can prepare another for battle, however, it is clear that parents such as Mrs. Gomez ingrained the desire for liberty, courage and selflessness that was so exemplary in their sons. Of such Americans is our country made of.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I y8ield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1295.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1345

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on H.R. 3100, the bill on the Corrections Calendar, and then on the motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 3100, by the yeas and nays, and House Resolution 576, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

KNOW YOUR CALLER ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of passage of the bill, H.R. 3100, on which further proceedings were postponed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
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
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
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
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
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
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
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
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
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)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Campbell
Ewing
Gutknecht
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jones (OH)
Klink
Lazio
McCollum
McIntosh
Paul
Rangel
Sandlin
Vento

1407

So (three-fifths having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present earlier today for rollcall Vote No. 498 due to a previously scheduled radio debate with my challenger in the upcoming election. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye".

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Pursuant to the provisions of 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 the motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO INCREASE CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS, TREATMENT, AND RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 576.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 576, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
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
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
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
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
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
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
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
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
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)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Campbell
Ewing
Ganske
Gordon
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jones (OH)
Kingston
Klink
Lazio
McCollum
McIntosh
Paul
Pickett
Rangel
Sandlin
Vento

1418

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.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). 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.

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

(Mr. BROWN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. PORTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. THUNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to focus attention on the topic of prescription drugs. The topic of affordable prescription drugs for seniors is a critical one for families in Michigan and across the nation. Last summer I set up a hot line in Michigan asking those who had stories to tell to call and share them with me, and also for individuals to write me letters and send me copies of their prescription drug bills.

I have received hundreds from across the state, and I have heard heartbreaking stories from seniors about their struggles—about having to choose between putting food on the table and paying the utility bill or being able to get their medications. Because this is such a pervasive problem, it is critical that we pass prescription drug coverage under Medicare, that modernizes the Medicare program to cover the way health care is provided today.

On April 12 of this year, I led an hour of debate on the topic of prescription drug coverage for senior citizens, I read three letters from around the state from seniors who shared their personal stories. At that time, I made a commitment to continue to read a different letter every week until the House enacts reform. This week I will read a letter form Paul and Lois Van Valkenburgh of Buckley, Michigan:

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN STABENOW: You say three out of four Americans do not have adequate prescription drug coverage. My wife and I have no prescription drug coverage; how is that for not having adequate coverage? We have never found prescription drug insurance we could afford.

Attached to this letter are copies of our prescription drug bills. They cost us over $2,200 per year, which we really cannot afford. If we had prescription drug coverage like people [who are not retired] (and make much more money than we), then we could afford to pay the premium on insurance coverage for prescription drugs. But the premium has got to be affordable and the deductible reasonable. . . .

Anything you can do to either lower the prices or get retired people a prescription drug insurance that's affordable will be appreciated.

Thank you for giving us this opportunity to talk to someone about this awful situation.

Sincerely yours,
PAUL AND LOIS VAN VALKENBURGH.

The Van Valkenburghs have a combined income of $13,500 a year. Under the Democratic prescription drug plan which I have cosponsored they would be entitled to significant help with their drug costs. I would like to thank the Van Valkenburghs for sharing their story, and on their behalf and the others that need this assistance, I will continue to work to pass an affordable, voluntary prescription drug benefit for all of our seniors during the 106th Congress.

THE MESSAGE MATTERS: WORDS THAT WORK

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the final stretch of legislative business for this Congress and as we prepare to engage in the campaigns back home, as a member of Florida and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of Congress, I wanted to assure residents in Florida that, in fact, Republicans have initiated prescription drug coverage for seniors in our community.

Back in 1994, then Governor Lawton Chiles was running for reelection to the governorship and was being challenged by Jeb Bush. Governor Chiles ran negative ads saying, if Jeb Bush was elected the governor, he would take away Social Security.

Now, everyone knows the governor of a State does not control Social Security. But the scam worked and, in fact, Jeb lost. The governor went on later to apologize after a thorough investigation found that the campaign did, in fact, make those spurious claims that were false and misleading.

Now we are being told that if we do not elect a majority to the other side of the aisle that we will not see prescription drug coverage for senior citizens.

Let us put people before politics; and let us make certain that, at the end of the day, we come together in a bipartisan fashion to bring about prescription coverage for our seniors.

In town hall meetings in Florida, I meet with seniors all the time of every political stripe, not just Republicans, but Democrats and Independents. Their first thought to me is, we do not want something free, but we certainly do not want to be forced into a government-run HMO-style system that makes everyone in the same system one size fits all. They would like access to prescription drugs. Yes, they would like lower pricing of prescription drugs.

In this House, we are trying do that. We recognize the cost is becoming a big burden on many seniors in our community. But we want to make certain that we only cover the poorest and the sickest.

When the President's drug plan first came to our Committee on Ways and Means, there was no provision for catastrophic coverage. We are most concerned in our bill of finding a way for the sickest Americans who may have diabetes, who may have hypertension, who may have suffered from cancer, who may have to depend daily on a multiple dose of medications that they, in fact, have some safeguard against financial ruin.

Our bill does that. But our bill also provides a voluntary system in which they can decide whether they want to enroll in a new drug plan.

Senator EDWARD KENNEDY of Massachusetts stated that two-thirds of Americans currently have prescription drug coverage who are 65 and older. So it begs the question, why are we going to upturn, if you will, or turn over the entire prescription drug benefit to those two-thirds when it is really the one-third we should be seeking to remedy.

Those may again be the poorest. And we can help through our plan to provide for prescription drug coverage both through the States and the Medicaid system and through our innovative care.

Again, people before politics.

We want to put families back in charge of the decisions they make relative to their prescription coverage and their health care and what policies they may or may not want to join, not a forced plan by the Federal Government.

But we also have to recognize some of the other things that we have to consider, long-term care insurance, another serious issue facing Americans. We should not just be talking, Mr. Speaker, about prescription drugs. We have to face reality that our community and our country is growing older and that the need for long-term health care insurance or coverage will become even more profound in the years ahead.

Now, fortunately this Congress is on its way to paying down with surplus dollars, 90 percent of that surplus, to pay down the Federal debt. When we first came to Congress, many of us prescribed a bill that would in fact use

any anticipated surplus for paying down debt, strengthening Social Security and Medicare, and providing some tax relief for our citizens.

I think we are on the threshold of greatness in being able to announce to the people that, yes, both sides of the aisle can take credit, because $356-some billion of the debt has been retired in the last 3 years of this Congress's existence.

Now, that is a monumental achievement in as much as now the interest that was going to be paid on that $356 billion can now be used to fund and strengthen Social Security, fund and strengthen Medicare and, yes, provide prescription drugs.

So before people who are listening to our voices get scared by TV ads suggesting that some party is going to do more for them than the other, at least listen to the facts at hand and recognize that I believe so many people in Congress on both sides of the aisle are in fact striving to provide the coverage to make certain our seniors have the drugs they need that they may not be able to afford; but thankfully for the pharmaceutical industry, which has brought some miraculous drugs to the forefront, we will provide a way to provide them cheaper, more affordably and more accessibly.

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

(Mr. ALLEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. SHAYS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. STRICKLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

UNIFIED BUDGET

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to spend a few minutes talking about some terminology associated with the debt. There are a lot of terms that are used.

I hear terms like the ''public debt,'' the ''trust fund debt,'' the ''national debt.'' The other day I heard someone say ''Federal debt.''

What are all these debts, and how do they relate to each other?

Before we can talk about debt, though, we have to talk a little bit about the balanced budget and what the balanced budget means.

The budget that we had hoped to balance and have balanced, as a matter of fact, is the unified budget. The unified budget is all the money that comes into Washington and all the money that leaves Washington, and that budget is balanced.

But about 10 percent of the money that comes into Washington should not be Washington's money to spend because a big percent of that is monies that come from the American people taken from them presumably to be put in trust for them.

The two biggest trust funds are the Social Security trust fund and the Medicare trust fund.

But in the unified budget, which looks at all the money that comes into Washington and all the money that leaves Washington, we take that trust fund money, we took it all up in the lockbox for Social Security and now the lockbox for Medicare, we took all that money and spent it.

And what is in the trust fund is not money. There are IOUs in there. And it is a very special IOU. It is an IOU; it is a non-negotiable U.S. security.

1430

Although the Social Security trust fund should have about $900 billion in it and the total trust fund should have roughly double that in it, there is in fact no money in the trust funds. All that is in the trust funds is IOUs.

In the past years when we were running a $300 billion deficit, the real deficit in terms of accounting for the trust funds which we took and spent, the real deficit would have been about $160 billion more than that.

What we have done is just phenomenal. At the beginning of this administration, the President never thought that we could balance the budget, and he was showing $300 billion deficits which were really $460 billion deficits if we account for the trust fund. He was showing those out as far as the eye could see. When we balanced the unified budget, the total debt, the national debt, continued to go up. If you will look at national debt figures, you will see that they went up.

Now, let us come to the debt and what we are doing today. What we are doing today is paying down the publicly held debt. The publicly held debt is the Wall Street debt. It is the debt which is owed to people who have bought bonds and securities, government bonds and securities and so forth. That publicly held debt represented, or it did until we started paying it down, we are now paying it down, represented about two-thirds of the total debt and the other debt was the trust fund debt. We are now paying down the publicly held debt but we are doing that largely with moneys from the trust funds, so as we pay down the publicly held debt, we are accumulating an equivalent amount of trust fund debt, which would mean that, all things being equal, the national debt or the total debt would stay at exactly the same figure. But all things are not equal and the truth of the matter is that at least for the next couple of years or so, the national debt, which is the total debt, will continue to go up a little. If this roaring economy continues, we will in fact have a true surplus and the total debt, the national debt, will begin to go down.

What we are doing is very advantageous and it is what we ought to do, because as we pay down the publicly held debt, the Federal Government is competing less for dollars, which means that interest rates will drop, and we expect interest rates to drop by about 2 percent. That is great good news if you are buying a home or buying a car or putting your kid through college. But the flip side of that is that as we pay down that publicly held debt, we are, and by law we can do nothing else but invest the moneys in these nonnegotiable U.S. securities.

We are driving up the trust fund debt. That trust fund debt now becomes a liability. We will not have to pay that. I will not. But my kids and my grandkids are going to have to pay that money. And starting about 2012 or 2013 or 2014 depending upon your projections the way our economy is going, not enough money will come in Social Security to meet the obligations, and we are going to have to go to the trust fund. There is no money there. There is only IOUs there. And so we are going to have to borrow the money to make good on that. It is great good news for the present, but we must really do something about Social Security or it is not all that great good news for our children and our grandchildren.

H. RES. 587, EXPRESSING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE U.S. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PEOPLE OF OKINAWA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 587, which expresses the appreciation of the United States to the people of Okinawa for hosting U.S. defense facilities, commends the Government of Japan for choosing Okinawa as the site of the recent summit meeting of the G–8 countries, and urges the President to work with the leaders of Japan to implement a joint U.S.-Japan education initiative.

In his speech at Peace Park in Okinawa, Japan, on July 21, 2000, President Clinton noted that he was the first American president to visit Okinawa in 40 years. He also acknowledged the vital role that Okinawa plays in hosting more than 50 percent of America's forces in Japan on just 1 percent of its land mass.

We know the tremendous impact that the presence of American troops has had on Okinawa's society and economy. Some 24,000 troops are headquartered there and military

bases and facilities use 11 percent of land in the prefecture.

In his speech, President Clinton acknowledged the United States' responsibility to be a good neighbor and to work to bring the benefits of peace and prosperity to Okinawa, which is one of Japan's poorest prefectures. President Clinton announced plans for a new scholarship program by the United States and Japan to send young Okinawan graduate students to the East-West Center in Hawaii.

The East-West Center is an internationally respected research and educational institution based in Hawaii. Established in 1960 through a bipartisan effort of the Eisenhower Administration and the Congress, the Center has worked to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations and peoples of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training, and research. It is an important forum for the development of policies to promote stability and economic and social development in the Asia-Pacific region.

Before the 1972 reversion of Okinawa from American control to Japan, Okinawans made up the largest percentage of students from any of the 34 countries at the East-West Center. Since 1972, Okinawa's status as only one of Japan's 47 prefectures meant that far fewer were selected for these prestigious scholarships. Last year, the Center had only one Okinawan participant. Despite this fact, the Center's most active alumni chapter is in Okinawa, primarily made up of graduates from programs in the 1960s and early 1970s. This new scholarship program will add a strong and symbolic non-military dimension to a U.S. relationship with Okinawa that is now dominated by the military bases.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this resolution, which recognizes the importance of our connection to and friendship with the people of Okinawa.

CONGRATULATING LEONARD ''BULLY'' KAPAHULEHUA

I also wish to acknowledge the contributions of a remarkable man, Leonard ''Bully'' Kapahulehua of Kihei on the island of Maui. Bully Kapahulehua received the Excellence in Promoting Diversity in Coastal or Ocean Resource Management Award in the 1999 Walter B. Jones Memorial and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Excellence Awards for Coastal and Ocean Resource Management. The award recognizes Mr. Kapahulehua's extraordinary commitment to integrating cultural or ethnic diversity into coastal or ocean resource management programs.

Bully Kapahulehua is the first person from the state of Hawaii to receive this national recognition. I am inserting the nomination summary that led to Mr. Kapahulehua's selection for this award because it eloquently describes why he is so deserving of this great honor.

He kane kupaianaha (an exceptional man)!

How does one begin to describe the difference that this man has made in the lives of thousands of Maui's youth? Bully Kapahulehua has devoted countless hours teaching, playing and working with the children of Maui to instill in them a sense of stewardship for the natural coastal resources of Hawai'i. He has the uncanny ability to transfer the ways and values of ka wa kahiko (time of old) to the children of today.

Bully has been able to increase public awareness of coastal issues by integrating them with hands-on projects. He not only teaches about the importance of canoeing to the Hawaiian culture but also enlists Hawai'i's youth to help prepare a canoe for a journey to Lana'i. He is also responsible for helping to create and organize the annual ''Celebration of Canoes'' festival. This annual festival draws thousands of residents and tourists to Lahaina for a week long celebration featuring South Pacific nations (Hawai'i, Tahiti, New Zealand, etc.). Canoe carving, haka ceremonies, food booths, an evening parade down Front Street, followed by an evening filled with the mele (music) of local musicians highlight the ancient art of canoe carving and navigation.

Mr. Kapahulehua has used innovative approaches such as creating youth programs (Ku l Ka Mana and Kamali'i programs) that provide an opportunity for children to not only learn a new sport, canoe paddling, but also stresses important values such as caring for the ocean and the land. He then channels their youthful energy into worthwhile projects such as beach clean-ups at Kamehameha 'Iki Park in Lahaina and pulling weeds and planting native Hawaiian coastal plants (naupaka and poehuehue) at Kealia Pond National Wildlife Refuge, Mai Poina 'Oe la 'u Beach Park and the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary. The children learn Hawaiian values, work hard and make a difference in Kihei's coastal zone.

In addition, Bully has taken his knowledge about ocean processes and native plants and, with the help of countless volunteers, has applied for and secured grants to fund projects like Kokua Kealia that grows and plants native plants. He has also been instrumental in erecting and maintaining a sand fence along North Kihei Road. The sand fence effectively serves three purposes: helps restore the sand dunes, prevents the endangered Hawksbill turtles from crossing onto the road and prevents 4-wheel drive trucks from driving on the sand dunes.

He is a kumu (teacher) who teaches by doing. He is a kumu of celestial navigation, canoe paddling, coral reef ecology (how coral reefs interact with sand dunes), coastal processes and cultural awareness. He is uniquely qualified to blend Hawaiian values about caring for the land and the ocean into educational programs for Maui's youth that actually help preserve Maui's coastal zone.

He kane kupaianaha (an exceptional man)!

I join all the people of our nation and Hawaii in honoring Bully Kapahulehua for his remarkable achievements. In his love of the land and his commitment to Hawaii's youth, Bully embodies the true spirit of aloha.

POWER AND POLITICS

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

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor today to share with my colleagues some of the information we dug out last week in a series of hearings in the Committee on Government Reform focusing on the energy challenges we face as a country. I would like to specifically address the issue of electricity and how it is generated and distributed throughout the country, particularly the Southwest of which California is a certain portion.

In our hearings last week, we had the various investor-owned utilities come and testify with us, a couple of environmental groups, we had the Department of Energy, we had the administrator for the EPA and we had one of the representatives of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission come and visit with us.

What became apparent is that the mix of electricity in this country is quite complex. There are different generators of different sizes and utilities that contribute to us having electricity throughout our country. Interestingly enough, two of the largest electric generators in the country are the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers. I would like to specifically focus my comments today on those two entities.

In the West, the Bureau of Reclamation is a huge power generator. The Army Corps of Engineers more so in the Northwest at Bonneville but the Bureau, along the Colorado River and elsewhere, generates huge amounts of electricity. If you look at our electric markets and you consider different end users, California in fact is a huge end user of this electricity.

Now, the challenge we face is how do we plan for the delivery of electricity to the end users in a manner timely enough to make it possible for our economy to continue to thrive and for people to be cool in their homes in the summer and warm in the winter. If you look at the Bureau of Reclamation Web site, you will see on their map, they have four different regions in the West.

The two that I would like to specifically address today are the Sierra Nevada region and the Desert Southwest region. In particular, the Desert Southwest region focuses along the Colorado River and in fact includes southern California as part of its delivery market.

If you examine the facilities that the Bureau runs in the Desert Southwest region, you will see the Hoover Dam; and you will see a number of other facilities, one of which is the Glen Canyon Dam. In the midst of power shortages this summer in June, July and August, the interesting thing that you will see in this information is that the Bureau of Reclamation was running most of their facilities flat out, all the way to the red line, but the Glen Canyon Dam was running at a rate 50 percent of what it was running at last year. In other words, the Bureau had reduced generation by 300,000 megawatts in the face of severe energy shortages.

Now, that manifested itself in San Diego and elsewhere, because electricity is very fluid. It comes from somewhere, it goes somewhere, and when one is down, another might be up in terms of generating capacity. The consequence, the reality is that Glen Canyon's generating capacity was reduced, for what? For what purpose? If you track back the legislation or the historical data, you will see that in 1992, the 104th Session of this Congress, legislation was passed that allowed the Bureau, working with the Fish and Wildlife Service to try and experiment

with the water flow from Glen Canyon that is used to generate electricity in the turbines. The legislation is very clear. It says, you will test this low flow regime along the Colorado River to see its environmental benefit. But the legislation also includes a waiver provision that says in a period of huge or unexpected power disruptions, the Bureau is authorized to run the turbines flat out. In other words, abandon the low flow regime.

In June, July, and August, the Bureau chose, they elected, they made a conscious decision to keep generation low. What that did was it hammered areas like San Diego and Silicon Valley and others who rely on this electricity to power industry and provide jobs and to cool houses and the like. It is interesting. Last Monday, the Bureau issued a waiver and they ran those turbines up to respond to a peak demand for electricity in the Desert Southwest region. But that was the first time this summer they have done that.

Mr. Speaker, the very clear message here is that this administration chose to run Glen Canyon over the summer at 50 percent of capacity and the consequence in San Diego and elsewhere in California were brownouts, blackouts and seniors having to choose between maintaining a low temperature in their house, for instance, and being able to buy food or prescription drugs. That is a reality. It is as much a reality as any other comparison we have. The administration is at fault. I have yet to hear a rational explanation of why this had to occur.

IN HONOR OF MURRY ORMAND PHILLIPS

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, Harnett County and the town of Coats lost one of its most indefatigable education, civic, and business leaders with the death on May 16, 2000, of Murry Ormand Phillips. His lifetime resume of accomplishments could well do credit to 10 men.

Born in 1913 in a Mississippi county that the U.S. Department of Commerce ranked the poorest in the entire United States, Mr. Phillips turned to education as a way out, eventually gaining entrance to Mississippi State University, where he graduated with a degree in vocational agriculture and a commission as a 2d Lieutenant in the Army Reserve. His graduation came in the midst of the Great Depression when jobs were almost nonexistent. The university placement center offered one opportunity—a teaching job in far off Coats, NC. Mr. Phillips set off for North Carolina and a lifelong love affair with his adopted state.

The teaching job in Coats turned out to be teaching vocational agriculture at Coats High School in the mornings and vocational agriculture in Angier in the afternoons. Mr. Phillips proved very popular with his students, so much so that one student introduced the teacher to a sister, Kathryn Stewart Smith. The two young people were married a year later. The marriage was to produce a daughter and a son. Mrs. Phillips died in 1998.

Mr. Phillips' career was interrupted by World War II. He entered active duty on February 14, 1942, barely 2 months after Pearl Harbor. He was to serve under Gen. George S. Patton and Gen. Mark Clark and see action in North Africa and Italy. He participated in the landing of Allied forces on Anzio Beach.

His military record was a distinguished one. Mr. Phillips was a liaison officer, company commander, and a headquarters executive officer, among other assignments. He received the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the American and Silver Star, European Service medals, the Legion of Merit Award, a Presidential Unit Citation, six campaign stars and two commendations for meritorious service, one from the Army and one from the Navy. One citation for battlefield merit detailed how Mr. Phillips ''disregarded his personal welfare and safety by carrying'' a message ''through artillery fire in an exposed one-fourth ton truck.'' He also received an Army commendation for his teaching methods in training tank commanders. After the war, Mr. Phillips came home to Coats. He remained a member of the Army Reserve, eventually retiring as a Major.

But it was to be in his chosen profession, education, that Mr. Phillips would make his greater contribution. Almost immediately upon his return to Coats, he began a night carpentry class for veterans. More than 1,500 veterans were to pass through that carpentry class. He and his agricultural students constructed a new agricultural building and later built and operated a cannery on the school grounds for use by the community every summer.

Mr. Phillips' educational career had many highlights. He taught vocational agriculture in Harnett County for more than 28 years, worked for the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction for more than 10 years as a curriculum specialist and supervisor for curriculum development, and designed the course of study for several divisions in vocational education. He wrote, photographed, and developed a fourth grade curriculum for the study of North Carolina that included a resume of six sound color filmstrips with a teacher's text and guide to utilization. He worked closely with NC State University, an institution from which he received the Master's Degree in 1958, over a period of 25 years and supervised some 100 student teachers during that period.

He received many honors for his activities. He received the Honorary American Farmer Degree in 1958, the highest honor that a vocational agriculture instructor can receive. He won the Teacher of Teachers Silver Award in 1968 from the National Vocational Agricultural Teachers Association. Former students established an ''M.O. Phillips Scholarship'' in 1966, and a day was set aside in Coats as M.O. Phillips Day with a large celebration and life story at the Coats school. This scholarship is given each year to an outstanding student who has been accepted to attend a four-year college or university. North Carolina State University award him its ''Outstanding Alumni Award'' posthumously in 1999–2000.

Mr. Phillips was active in all agriculture associations as well as the North Carolina Association of Educators and the National Education Association. One of his enduring gratifications was that he was a member of the Future Farmers of America nominating committee that nominated Jim Hunt for FFA president. Hunt won, then later went on to serve as North Carolina Governor for 16 years.

Under Mr. Phillips' leadership, the Coats FFA chapter won more honors than any other chapter in North Carolina. The chapter received the ''Gold Service Award'' twice, the highest award given by the national organization. A total of 23 Future Farmers received the ''American Farmer Degree,'' under Mr. Phillips' leadership.

Mr. Phillips was executive secretary of Meredith Publishing Company's Successful Farmers Teaching Aids for 13 years. As executive secretary, he recommended to the publisher what aides were to be published monthly and from those recommendations would prepare the monthly teaching aid kits which Successful Farming mailed to some 5,000 vocational education teachers each month. A lover of roses, he was the publication's rose editor for 13 years.

In 1994, Governor Hunt gave Mr. Phillips the ''Governor's Volunteer Award'' for his activities. Those activities included service to the American Legion, the Lions Club, the Chamber of Commerce, the Coats Development Group, and the Coats Senior Citizens Center, as well as numerous other civic endeavors. Mr. Phillips was founding member of the Coats Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors. He was named ''Coats Man of the Year'' in 1983 and was a grand marshal of the Coats 85th Farmers Day Parade in 1997. He was also a charter member of the Coats Lions Club and the Coats Senior Citizens Center.

A member of Coats Baptist Church for 64 years, Mr. Phillips taught Sunday school for 45 years and was Sunday school superintendent for 26 years. He was a deacon for 40 years and chairman of the Baptist Men for 11 years. He served as a tour escort for a tour group formed at the church and made some 30 trips with the group. He was a popular speaker in both Methodist and Baptist churches in North Carolina and in his home state of Mississippi.

Mr. Phillips survivors include one daughter and son-in-law, Carolyn S. and Ben Spears of Greensboro; one son and daughter-in-law, Murry T. and Dora Phillips of Dunn; one sister, Evelyn Collier, five grandchildren and one great granddaughter.

If an individual's role is to leave the world a better place than he found it, Murry Ormand Phillips did an inestimable job. When his country was threatened, he rallied to the colors. When courage was called for, he responded. When his community needed vision, he supplied it. When students needed inspiration, he offered it. When children needed an adult model from whom they could learn, he was always available.

Coats and North Carolina have lost an outstanding citizen. But we can thank a Kind Providence that placed us on the same highway of life as this good man.

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

(Mr. UNDERWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

A BIPARTISAN SOLUTION TO EDUCATION CRISIS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, of the many challenges that our country faces in this new century, there is none greater than education, educating our populace so that we have a skilled workforce and so that everybody has the level of education that they need in today's economy.

When I go around my district and go visit businesses and it does not matter what size or what level of skill they are looking for and I ask them what their greatest challenge is, the answer is always the same, finding employees. This is particularly true certainly of high-skilled jobs, computer, engineers, math, science, but it is also true across the board of just about any level of job that you could need in any business. We are not educating our population to fill the jobs that are available in our country. If we are going to maintain the economic growth that we have enjoyed for the last 7 or 8 years, we are going to have to start doing that.

Increasingly, the battle over education has broken down into an either/or partisan debate that is not benefiting either party or certainly not benefiting the people of this country. On the one side you have people saying that all we need to do is spend more money on public education and the problems will be solved. On the other side, you have people saying all we need to do is privatize the system and it will magically be solved. The truth is that neither answer really works or really applies to the challenge we face in this country.

I rise today to talk about a new solution to this that will bring some of the ideas from both sides and hopefully forge a bipartisan solution to the education crisis that we have in our country. As a member of the New Democrat Coalition, this is something that Members like the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), myself, and many others have been working on to forge a solution to our education problem that gets away from the old partisan polemic, that gets away from the idea of trying to score political points on education and to actually work towards a solution. And it blends together a couple of very basic ideas. Yes, we need to support public education. Ninety percent of the students in this country, more in most places, are educated in public institutions. They need our support. Anyone who says money does not matter in education is not being realistic.

I do not think you would hear any businessman say that money does not matter in his or her ability to run their business. It matters. But it also matters every little bit as much how you spend that money. Not only do we need to support public education, we also need to make sure that there is accountability and choice at every level of the education establishment. Right now in K–12 education that really is not true. Either for the students or the employees, whether it is administrators, teachers, principals, students, whatever, we really do not have many methods to measure results, to measure how well our students are doing, how well our teachers are doing, how well our administrators are doing. The people of this country are demanding that accountability. They will support public education, they will support lower class sizes, better school construction, mandatory preschool, a variety of different things but they want to make sure they are getting their money's worth.

What we need to advocate is programs that give parents and students reasonable reason to believe that we are going to have that sort of accountability within our education system. We need to measure results. I understand that nobody is excited about having their results measured. If you show up to work and someone says, ''Okay, today we're going to do a 2-week evaluation of how well you're doing at your job.'' It is not something that anybody is looking forward to nor is it easy to do. I am not advocating that we simply have one multiple choice test fits all. It is a complicated process to evaluate. But some evaluation has to be done.

It is not enough for those of us who advocate public schools to stand up and say, ''Well, it's too tough to evaluate. We can't really tell you what schools are working and which ones are not.'' We need to figure that out.

We also need to give parents choice. Expanding charter schools in this country would give parents realistic public school choice. They could mold and shape their local community school and be invested in it. Those options would help improve public schools. But at the end of the day, we also need to fund schools. If we are going to tell teachers that we are going to hold them more accountable, we are going to have to pay them more. You will not attract people to the teaching profession if they know they are starting out at $24,000 and topping out at $50,000 when they have other options.

Another good idea, something that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) has worked on a lot, is the idea of alternative certification, the idea of taking people who have been working in the business world, have developed skills and giving them an alternative method to allow them to teach perhaps for a short period of time to help fill that quality issue. So we are going to have to increase quality through increasing pay and increasing accountability if we are truly going to move forward in education.

In this election year, I ask both parties to step up to this problem. This should not be an issue where we try to advance an idea or a piece of legislation for the political purpose of making the other party look like either, A, they do not support public schools or, B, they do not support accountability. We need people working together who both support public schools and support accountability and choice. I think that is the majority of this body, frankly. We just need to forge that coalition and work on that so that we can move forward.

Mr. Speaker, one final point. Local control is going to be a critical aspect of this. This cannot be solved from Washington, D.C. Local schools have to make the difference, and we have to empower them to make that difference.

1445

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE JOSEPH CLEMENS HOWARD, SR.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to note the passing from this life on September 16 of a great American. I rise to pay homage to a man of peace, United States District Judge Joseph Clemens Howard, Sr.

Judge Howard served the cause of justice for many years, first on the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City, and later on the United States District Court for the District of Maryland.

Some may think it unusual that I characterize this man who was such a fierce and tenacious fighter for justice as a man of peace. We must never forget, however, what Dr. Martin Luther King taught this Nation when he said, ''Peace is more than the absence of war. Peace is the presence of justice.''

All too often in this life, we fail to recognize, Mr. Speaker, the greatness of the people around us. Judge Joseph Howard was a man, however, whose elevated stature as a human being, whose intellectual capability and moral character, as well as physical presence, demanded recognition.

As a consequence of that stature, Joe Howard was acknowledged in his own time as both a legal scholar and as a trailblazer for civil rights.

President Jimmy Carter nominated Judge Howard to serve on the United States District Court for the District of Maryland in 1979. That action on the part of President Carter was an historic event.

In recognition of Joe Howard's capabilities and proven accomplishments as a member of the Maryland judiciary, both Maryland Senator Charles Mathias and our Democratic Senator Paul SARBANES strongly supported Judge Howard's nomination. The Senate gave its advice and consent, and on October 25, 1979, Judge Joseph Howard was sworn in as the first African American to ever serve on Maryland's United States District court.

No one who loves justice has ever had cause to regret this historic event.

I have been taught that a true leader stands up for what is right, whatever adversity that may bring, hanging on to his principles until the rest of the world catches up. This is how I will always remember Judge Joseph Howard.

He cleared the path and set the standards of excellence and principle for all of us who followed him into the law. Those of us who were blessed to know Judge Howard understand that the principles he fought to advance are far from being secured. We will carry on in the certain knowledge that a man who loved humanity has chartered our course and won the opening argument.

Judge Howard used to remind us that justice must always seek to improve the human condition. He quoted Eleanor Roosevelt's words so often:

> Human rights must begin in small places close to home. They are the world of the individual person, where every man, woman and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity and equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere.

Judge Howard understood the fundamental truth in Eleanor Roosevelt's words. That conviction was the source of his greatness.

Judge Howard's funeral last Friday was one of those brief moments when everyone, both black and white, became one heart and one mind. Baltimore came together last Friday to pay respect to the life of a man who taught us lasting lessons about the seeds of justice within the human spirit.

''There was a fury about Judge Joseph Howard, a sense of justice that lay at the center of his soul,'' recalled District Court Chief Judge J. Frederick Motz. ''At the same time, he was a man of compassion to all, whatever their station in life.''

Maryland's Chief Judge, Robert Bell, concurred, observing, ''Joe Howard was a man who built bridges so that those who followed could cross to opportunity on the other side.''

What touched me most deeply, Mr. Speaker, though, was the honesty and the candor with which those of us who spoke addressed the struggles in Joe Howard's life. We talked openly about how in 1968 as a young man and Assistant State's Attorney, Joe Howard had gone against the legal establishment of that time, challenging racial disparities in sentencing and pushing for a higher level of equity.

We remembered how the system attempted to punish Joe Howard's pursuit of justice during his campaign for a seat on the Supreme Bench. In a free society, the seeds of justice can take hold and grow only in the shared soil of our respect for ourselves and each other as human beings.

So, my colleagues and friends, I rise not to mourn the death of Joseph Clemens Howard, but to celebrate the life of a man who exemplified ''equal justice under the law.''

To the beloved ones in Judge Howard's life, his wife, Gwendolyn Lynn Howard; his son, Joseph; his brother, Lawrence; and the entire Howard family, we simply say thank you for sharing with us the life of a great man. Judge Joseph Clemens Howard was beloved by all who loved justice, and he will be sorely missed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INJURED COLD WAR VETERANS DESERVE ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise during this unusual period of the day when we should be busy at work moving our appropriation bills on this floor in the full light of the public to talk and plead about an issue that should be resolved through the appropriations process and the defense authorization bill that is moving both through this body and the other body, and it concerns Americans who worked, who fought on behalf of this country's Cold War efforts, working in the nuclear industry, the beryllium industry, the gaseous diffusion industry, and who are now dying or have died because of illnesses contracted as a part of their working life.

We have tried to bring that issue to bear in the current bills being worked on in the back rooms here somewhere. We have been told that those provisions have now been dropped from the bill.

I am here this afternoon to say, pay attention to what I am saying, because these Americans are veterans, just like those who fought on foreign soil or defended us here at home.

It is terrible to be a Member of Congress and to have someone walk into your office on a breathing machine and say to you, ''Congresswoman KAPTUR, I worked in the beryllium industry, and I am dying, and I cannot get workman's compensation, I cannot get decent health benefits for myself, and what is going to happen to my family after my life is over?''

I stand here today in memory of Galen Lemke, just one of hundreds of people, patriotic Americans, who served, worked every day, and produced the weaponry that now has made America the premier military and economic power on the Earth. I would plead with the Defense conferees to listen to them, to care for their lives and their families, and to do what is right, what is just.

The Department of Energy, under the leadership of Secretary Bill Richardson, has produced a piece of legislation that covers most, but not all, of the workers who worked in the nuclear industry, the gaseous diffusion industry, and the beryllium industry.

We have a bipartisan effort here in the House comprised of people like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) of Ohio, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), myself, and, in the other body, several Members, including two Senators from my home state of Ohio, who are very supportive of this legislation.

There is absolutely no reason that this Congress cannot help these Americans, who are truly deserving of our respect, and, behind that respect, placing the kind of assistance they need in the most difficult moments of their lives.

If the American people were sitting here, they would vote on this 100 percent. They would not leave out one of those families. Yet we are poised to move bills through here which cast them aside. That is truly wrong, when we know it is a discrete number of workers, we know who they are, we know how they have suffered, and we have this time, this year, in the beginning of the year 2000, to put the unfinished business of the 20th century behind us and to take care of these families, as we properly should.

So I would say to the defense conferees, to the conferees on the appropriations bill, there is no better time than now. Do what is right, do what is in the interest of America, and treat these families like the true American patriots and veterans that they are. Include these beryllium workers, gaseous diffusion workers and nuclear workers in a compensation bill that is no different than any other Federal compensation program that exists.

I would say to Secretary Richardson, thank you; and I would say to the Secretary of Defense, where are you? Where are you lobbying on behalf of people who helped this country win the Cold War?

Please conferees, do not do this to Americans who truly deserve the support of the American people.

''THE REST OF THE STORY'' ON THE BUDGET SURPLUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, we will be taking this hour, I will be joined by many of my fellow Democrats, Blue Dogs, and perhaps several others today, to talk about the budget, to talk about debt reduction, and, as Paul Harvey says quite often, to talk about ''the rest of the story,'' that which we are not hearing in much of the rhetoric that is going on today.

The first point I want to make is that through August 31, 2000, there has been no surplus, other than trust fund surpluses. You would not believe that with

the carried-away rhetoric that all of us have been guilty of using of late.

The $4.6 trillion projected surplus over the next 10 years, remember, that is projected. But, more important, remember that as of August 31 of this year, there still has been no surplus, other than trust funds, and, therefore, that is why many of us on this side of the aisle have been arguing that before we spend these projected surpluses, that we ought to fix Social Security and Medicare first, that we ought to be doing the Nation's business today. Instead of adjourning at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, or completing business at 2:15, we ought to be dealing in the respective committees with how do we fix Medicare and the tremendous needs of rural health care.

Why have we been on the floor for the last several weeks talking about tax cuts of $1.3 trillion, when you add them all up, again spending projected surpluses, before we fix Social Security and Medicare? Again, let us calm ourselves and acknowledge the fact that as of August 31, there is no surplus, other than trust fund surpluses.

That is why today the Blue Dog Democrats reiterated the plan that we were talking about at the beginning of this session of Congress, the same plan that we brought to the floor of the House that got, if memory serves me correct, 177 votes, 144 Democrats and I believe 37 Republicans joined with us. That would be 181. Not quite a majority, but there was a significant bipartisan group that recognized that you needed a plan if you were going to accomplish all of the rhetoric that both sides take part in from time to time.

Today we come to the floor to discuss in quite some detail the plan that the Blue Dogs put forward months ago that we reiterate today. The Blue Dog outline demonstrates that it is still possible to reach an agreement on a fiscally responsible budget plan that pays off the debt, maintains fiscal discipline and provides substantial tax relief, including estate tax relief and marriage penalty repeal.

The Blue Dogs have been advocating debt reduction since surplus projections first materialized 2 years ago. The Republican leadership has adopted Blue Dog rhetoric in the last few days on debt reduction, but only for 1 year, and the question we ask today of the leadership of this House is why only 1 year? If debt reduction is truly something that we all agree on in a bipartisan way, why not do it over a 10-year period?

The Blue Dogs believe that to be meaningful, a commitment to debt reduction must be long-term. That is why we are calling on the leadership of this House to extend the principles of their debt reduction lockbox for 10 years. Under the Blue Dog framework, $3.65 trillion, 80 percent of the unified surplus, would be devoted to debt reduction over 10 years. This would put us on the path to eliminate the publicly held debt by 2010.

1500

That is what we say we are for.

Why do we not have policies on this floor that do that which we say? Why do we continue on having political rallies talking about debt reduction when we really do not mean it except for 1 year? That is a question we ask, and hopefully someone will come to the floor and answer that question. It would be nice to have some simple discussions of these points, instead of just one side talking to the other in the absence of the other. We will be here.

By contrast, the debt reduction lockbox passed last week would only reserve 60 percent of the unified surplus for debt reduction over the next 10 years. Blue Dogs say 80, Republican leadership says 60, and still says we are doing a better job. We do not understand that.

The Blue Dog framework would result in the budget being balanced without counting any trust funds beginning in 2001.

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) has been the one that continues to bring the record from Treasury, source monthly statement of the public debt that anyone can pick up, which is what I was talking about when I started my comments today. There is no surplus except trust fund surpluses. If we are conservative in our approach, we can begin paying off the debt without using any of the trust fund surpluses beginning in 2001.

If we can only reach an agreement on a 10-year debt reduction plan, it will establish a foundation that will make it much easier to reach an agreement on significant tax cuts, including estate tax relief and repeal of the marriage penalty, without jeopardizing fiscal discipline.

The Blue Dogs are prepared to work within the 90/10 framework for fiscal year 2001 to balance competing priorities. Ironically, where we have been talking about 50/25/25, for 10 years, 90/10 fits almost exactly with where we believe we ought to be in the year 2001.

The Blue Dogs believe that it is important that Congress and the President look beyond the short-term cost of legislation and keep in mind the long-term impact of budget decisions we make today. Before agreeing on any tax cuts or new spending programs, we need to know how all of these proposals add up over the next 5 to 10 years, even if they fit within the 90/10 framework for next year. It is important that this Congress consider the 10-year costs of any tax cuts and new spending initiatives, not just the cost in fiscal 2001.

Likewise, once Congress and the President agree on the level of discretionary spending for next year, and this is what is being fought out. It bothered me considerably when I see on the front page of the Washington Post this morning that members of the other body in the other party are talking about ''spending is going to go out of the window.'' It should not. All we have to do is agree on a framework of what spending should be this year, in a bipartisan way, working with the White House. I believe that is achievable. That is the Blue Dog plan.

Mr. Speaker, we have looked at the President's proposals. We have looked at the Republican budget, and we have said somewhere in between is where we need to be, close to the middle. I think if all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle would look at this proposal, we hope they would find the same degree of enthusiasm for it that we bring to the floor today.

Once we get through the 90/10 for 2001, let us talk about the 10 percent. How do we propose spending that 10 percent of the projected surplus? Remember, there is no surplus as yet. It is projected. But we do believe if we stay fiscally conservative with our spending and our tax-cutting euphoria, that what I am saying today can be achieved.

We have a projected surplus of $268 billion for fiscal year 2001. Ten percent of that is $26.8 billion, and that is to be divided between tax cuts and spending, divided equally between Medicare provider restorations and discretionary spending and tax cuts. The Blue Dog framework would allow a tax cut of $8.5 billion in 2001 and $377 billion over the next 10 years. This will allow for estate tax and marriage tax penalty relief with room for other tax cuts of $4.4 billion in 2001 and approximately $200 billion over the next 10 years.

Why should we be considering today going home without dealing responsibly with the marriage tax penalty? Why should we be going home in a few weeks or days without dealing responsibly with the death tax, when everyone in this body knows there is a good, sound, conservative middle ground that would be very appealing to every single small businessman and woman in the United States and give significant relief to everyone above $4 million in estates? Why would we go home without completing our work?

Devoting an additional $8.5 billion for discretionary spending will provide room to increase spending in the appropriation bills to fund agricultural disaster relief, increase funding levels for education, health care, veterans and military retiree health care, all of which have bipartisan agreement that we do need to make some increases in those areas.

We also provide for $8.5 billion in 2001 to address problems facing health care providers as a result of the reductions of the 1997 balanced budget agreement, the kind that our rural hospitals are clamoring, praying for the relief so that they do not have to close. All of this can be achieved within the framework of debt reduction, sincere debt reduction, recognizing also that the surpluses that everybody talks about are projected.

One of the fundamental questions this body should be concerned a little bit about is when we look at this debt that we are talking about, one-third of

it is owned by foreign interests and the question that we all want to answer, I think, sooner than later, how much longer can our economy continue to grow at the unprecedented rate that it has for the last 8 years? How much longer can we go in the longest sustained peacetime economic expansion in the history of our country? Can we go another 2 months, 3 months, 6 months, 1 year, 2 years? No one knows the answer to that question.

But the Blue Dogs believe that the most conservative thing we can do right now is spend our time discussing how we fix Social Security and Medicare for the future. And until we do that, let us pay down the debt and let us be very fiscally prudent with the expenditure of our taxpayer dollars. That is our message.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN).

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding to me, and I also thank him for his work on this issue. He has been a real bulldog at dealing with fiscal matters of this Nation.

I just left a Blue Dog press conference just hours ago, and our message was very simple. It is that there is still time in this Congress to get something done. I believe that there are some people in this Congress that have thrown in the towel, have raised the white flag and said: we are not getting what we want, so we are going to go home. Go back to the American people and say they would not let us do anything.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is the wrong approach. I think we give up a golden opportunity to do something because we have it in hand. What we heard the gentleman from Texas so eloquently articulate, our position, is not a new position. It is a position that we have been advocating for over 2 years now: 50 percent for debt reduction, 25 percent for targeted tax cuts, 25 percent for priority spending.

But we underscored today in our press conference that it was good 2 years ago, it was good last year, it was good 2 weeks ago, and it is better today because there is no other plan on the table as comprehensive as this is today.

I believe it is reasonable for this body to come together and do what I think the American people want us to do: be conservative with their money. I frankly think being conservative with their money is being conservative, is looking at it as we would in our families, in our businesses. What is the first thing we do with a windfall? Pay down our debt. The Blue Dogs have talked about debt reduction until we are blue in the face, frankly; and it finally caught some traction. Now everyone is talking about it. No one was talking about it a year ago; but now they are talking about it, and I think it is a good thing.

The best tax cut that we could give our children and our grandchildren is keeping down the interest rates on our credit cards and our mortgages. How do we do that? We get out of debt with this country. That is what the centerpiece of our proposal is. Whatever the surplus is, let us pay down the national debt.

Another piece of our puzzle is 25 percent to targeted tax cuts. We go home, and we have heard in this Congress a lot of rhetoric about tax cuts. Well, I am for this tax cut, I am for that tax cut, I am going to be for this, and I am going to be for that. But I believe that it has been all rhetoric up to this point in time.

Frankly, that is the legislative process. We take 2 years to debate, talk about different angles, let everyone come in. That is the American way. It is representative democracy at its best, and it has worked.

But now is the time to fish or cut bait, as we say back home in Louisiana. This is the only program on the table that can be done. It is doable. It is reasonable. It is affordable.

In the area of tax cuts, I believe we would be derelict in our duties in this Congress not to go home with a significant tax cut. A reasonable tax cut. Something we can afford. We could not afford a trillion dollars. That is why the program failed. But I believe there is room for it, and this is the way to go.

Estate tax. Everyone talks about estate tax. I left a press conference just 30 minutes ago, right after our Blue Dog press conference, where we unveiled the Estate Tax Relief Now plan of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER). A wonderful plan. If my colleagues are truly for estate tax relief, they must embrace this plan. It is the only plan on the table. It is a plan that my friends on the other side of the aisle have basically abandoned, saying we either want repeal or no repeal.

Well, I have come to this Congress to compromise. We do it in our business life every day. We do it in our married life every day. We do it in State legislatures, and it is done here every day. Compromise. And if we do not do it, we go home with nothing; and I think that is a serious mistake.

What does the Tanner bill do for estate tax? It cuts the rate in January 1, 2001, 20 percent. I have heard from every person in my district, from the coffee shops to the bus stops, to the rice fields, to the boats that we need to cut the rates. We ought not to pay 55 percent of our income just because one of our loved ones has passed away. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think they are correct; and that is what this bill does. And it does not backload it, and it does not phase in. It starts January 1. It cuts the rate 20 percent.

What else does it do? It doubles the deduction from $675,000 to $1.3 million, which is $2.6 million for couples. It is a reasonable plan. It covers most small businesses and also small farms, and it is what we should be doing. It fits in the Blue Dog proposal. It fits in any reasonable proposal. It fits very well.

The marriage penalty, I think we ought to do it. I have voted for it in the past. It was vetoed by the President. But what do we do? Take our marbles and go home? I do not believe that. I think if we look at marriage penalty and double the deduction, for a married couple double the deduction, that is marriage tax penalty relief in its truest form.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are so many more other smaller tax cuts that we can do if we live within the means and not just go off on some spending spree and say we are going to do all of these tax cuts or we are not going to do any. I would tell my colleagues, there is middle ground and this is it.

The other part of our program is 25 percent of whatever the surplus is to priority spending. My farmers in southwest Louisiana have been devastated. Salt water intrusions in our wells have killed our rice crop. Prices are low because this Congress has not been able to, I believe, fulfill our promise in the Freedom to Farm bill and open new markets, especially Cuba. We need to give our farmers a break.

Disaster relief. Something that we can do that fits in priority spending. Veterans and health care. Education. Our Conservation and Reinvestment Act that is now in the midst of being enacted into law. We need some priority spending and we ought to spend it on programs that are important to the American people.

1515

That is your program. Our program is very simple and very straightforward. And it is very serious. It is a proposal that I commend and I beg the other side that we need to get engaged with, with only 2½ weeks left, because I can say all I want about how I fought for my people of the seventh district, but I do not want to go home and say we could not get a budget package together, a framework, and bring us forward for the next 10 years, because I know I would do that in my business, and I know my constituents want me to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to look at the Blue Dog plan seriously. I beg of the Senate, the administration and the other aisle, because I think it is the way that we should go. And as we say so many times, ''follow the Dogs, we'll lead you out of this problem.''

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the 4th District of Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS).

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for allowing me to be up here and thank him for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I guess this gets down to priorities; and when we are talking about priorities do we care more about tax cuts or do we care more about protecting and giving our country a future? I was talking to the Rotary Club and a lot of businessmen were in the

Rotary Club, and one of the gentlemen asked me a question, ''do you think it is more important to give tax cuts or pay down our national debt?'' I said to him paying down our national debt, and when I got on the stand, there was applause for me for making that recommendation, because it is true; the future in this country is in us paying down our national debt. The Blue Dogs have the right idea, that is the reason I am proud to be a Blue Dog.

We have our 50–25–25 plan to lower the national debt, protect Social Security and Medicare, lower taxes, secure health care, promote family life policy and in supporting and helping our farmers. It is the safest, most affordable and workable plan being offered today, and I am proud to be a part of it.

Let us think about what are we going to do with Social Security. Well, the first thing we ought to do, let us say this is the Social Security surplus, we ought to set it in a trust fund and take it off budget and let us leave it off budget and let us leave it for Social Security. The same thing with Medicare. That way we are working with a true budget surplus, 50 percent of the non-Social Security and nonbudget Medicare budget surplus will eliminate the national debt by 2010.

Let us think about it, 50–25–25. We take Medicare, Social Security, Medicare off budget, we operate from a true budget surplus. We take 50 percent of our budget surplus and pay down our national debt. Within several years, we will have our debt down to what it was in 1970. Helping to lower interest rates, what does that do? That keeps businesses going.

What started the economy going any way was lowering interest rates. These are the things that are going to give our children and our country a future.

What do we do with the rest of it? We have 25 percent that we can use for tax cuts. We were talking about this estate tax in the press conference that went on a while ago. And I guess all of us here supported some kind of elimination of the estate tax one way or the other or cutting down on it, that is something we should do.

The marriage penalty tax, we ought to do something about that. Tax incentives for retirement savings; tax incentives for small business for employers to provide their employees with insurance, give them tax credits for that; tax credits to expand access to health insurance, which we have already said; tax incentives for school construction and educational tax breaks; tax incentives to encourage economic development in distressed communities.

There are so many things that we can do to help reinvest into our people in this country, and we ought to be looking for that.

The other thing we ought to go look at is the other 25 percent of the balanced budget surplus, that ought to go into priority spending programs. We were talking about prescription medicine.

I will tell this story. I did a bus tour in our district last year. We made 17 speeches in 4 days, and what we did, we took 30 Federal agencies and State agencies in the district and we went to courthouses and we asked people to sit there, and the people who were having problems to meet there, having problems with housing, medical, health care, farming issues and agendas, something like this, to meet with us there and we would subdivide the group up.

Mr. Speaker, I was standing there in the front and this elderly couple came walking up to me and said we need to talk about our hospital bill and prescriptions and our health care. Well, I directed them over to the lady that was handling them. Well, I was talking to some other folks, and I looked over there and the elderly man was crying and his wife was crying and the lady who was helping them was crying. We all started crying because of the situation.

Well, what happened to this man? Here is a person, part of the greatest generation of this country, he worked hard, he was a carpenter. He provided for kids, they have good jobs and gone out on their own, and now he is having a problem with his health care. He was self-employed, and he cannot pay his hospital bills.

He cannot buy the medicine for his prescriptions, now he is being turned in for bad credit because he cannot pay his hospital bills.

These are the priorities we ought to be talking about. These are the priorities we ought to be investing into, we should be investing in our people. That is not throwing money away, reinvesting back into the people.

Think about it, 50 percent of the budget surplus going to national debt, 25 percent of it going to priority spending, tax cuts, and then 25 percent of it going for discretionary spending on priority programs, such as Medicare, prescription drug benefits, restored Medicare cuts that hurt our small health care providers, improving and extending safety net for our farmers who are going out of business and the gentleman from Texas was good enough to come talk to our farmers not too long ago, and our foreign military retirees, the men and women who have saved this country, who have given to this country so we can get on the floor and talk today about what we can do for this country. We are not keeping the promise to them, they are broken promises.

The military retirees should have better health care benefits. Veterans, we are not providing those kinds of benefits, because we need to take this budget surplus and reinvest back in the people. Also increase defense spending, pass a patients' bill of rights, discretionary spending, with some increases in inflation for these hospitals, and for education, health care to our veterans.

These are issues that are really close to our heart, and we feel really serious about it. Remember the formula, 50–25–25. It is the best deal in town, and we ought to take. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for this time.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) for his contribution today and for his contribution to the 106th Congress and to the Blue Dogs. He has been one of our real bulldogs, as we heard him saying, in sticking with the plan.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), my fellow colleague, let me kind of refocus why we are here. We are supposed to complete our work in this body by September 30, that is what the Constitution requires. We do not always do that. When Democrats were in control, we quite often did not accomplish that goal, but usually we ended up with a plan of how we were going to complete our work.

We now have only two appropriation bills that have been completed. It seems to those of us on the outside of the appropriation process that the leadership of the House and the Senate are having a difficult time coming up with a plan to get us out of here. We are submitting the Blue Dogs' perspective that this is a plan that can get bipartisan support. We believe that it not only can get bipartisan support here, but that it can get Presidential support, that is what it is going to take for us to complete our work. And when we complete our work, it is something that we all want to go home and take a little credit for and take credit for it in an honest way.

Mr. Speaker, so often around here, most of us tell the truth most of the time, if not all of the time, but many of us do not tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and what the Blue Dogs are trying to say today is the rest of the story, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. There is no surplus yet through August the 31st.

When we hear $4.6 trillion in projected surpluses, the word that should be emphasized is projected. We readily acknowledge that this is your money and we are just trying to give some of it back to you. And in the rhetoric prior to last week, certainly Congress has no money, other than what we take from the American people in the way of taxes, it is your money.

But the Blue Dogs also remind you it is your debt, the $5 trillion 678 billion debt as of August 31, 2000, which is $21 billion more debt than we had 1 year ago.

It is your debt, and that is why we have suggested the 50–25–25, and that is why we come back to the floor today and reiterate debt reduction, program priorities, tax cuts targeted carefully towards meeting a real human need.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding to me, and I certainly want to thank him for the leadership that he has shown for so many years now on these budgetary issues.

I am pleased to join with him and my fellow colleagues in the Blue Dog Democrat Coalition, our group of about 30 or so Democrats, who believe in the balanced budget, who believe in paying off the debt, who believe in a responsible tax cut plan. I think that the reason that we have come to the floor today is because of our mutual sense that the leadership of this Congress has failed in the area of budgetary policy.

The Republican leadership started off this year with a big tax cut plan. Now, we all know it was based on some estimates of a future surplus that may never arrive, and so the Blue Dog Democrats put together our own budget plan.

As has been said by previous speakers, it is really a pretty simple plan. It says keep your hands off the surplus and the Social Security trust fund, keep your hands off the surplus that accrues in the Medicare trust fund. And with regard to the general fund surplus, we call it the on-budget surplus, let us use 50 percent of that money to pay down the national debt, 25 percent to give reasonable and meaningful tax cuts to the American people, and let us reserve 25 percent for spending priorities. That is the plan shown on the chart to my right, the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. Speaker, it provides debt reduction of $955 billion over the next 10 years from the on-budget surplus, a net tax cut of $387 billion plus the savings of $91 billion in interest costs since we are paying down the debt with $955 billion. And program priorities, things like being sure we save our rural hospitals, who are struggling today to keep the doors open, to be sure that we have money set aside so that when the baby boomers retire and the stresses and strains come on the Social Security trust fund and the Medicare trust fund, we will be able to take care of that generation; priorities like strengthening national defense.

Within the Blue Dog budget, we take care of program priorities, areas where we can all agree we need to spend dollars, and yet we provide a meaningful tax cut for the American people.

Our Blue Dog plan, I think, is the most fiscally responsible plan, and it is also the plan that recognizes as a priority debt reduction.

On the chart that I am showing my colleagues now, we can see the comparison of the debt reduction plans that have been presented to this Congress. The first one that is mentioned is the Blue Dog plan that I have referred to which reduces the national debt $3.6 trillion over the next 10 years. That reduction, debt reduction plan, will totally eliminate the publicly held debt over the next 10 years.

We went 30 years in this Congress spending more money every year than we took in. We are just now at the point where we are able to say we have a balanced Federal budget, that is because of the fiscal restraint that we have exercised, and that is because the American people have worked hard to produce a prosperous economy. And those additional tax revenues have brought us to the balanced Federal budget.

While times are good, we need to take advantage of what is, I think, a historic opportunity to pay off that national debt so our children and our grandchildren will not inherit the free spending practices of the past generation. And if we can pay off the national debt, we will, in fact, give our people the best tax cut they could ever have.

Even the trillion dollars tax package that the Republican leadership advocated in this House, that would only give middle-income families about a dollar a day in tax relief. If we pay down the national debt, economists tell us that it will lower interest rates across the board for everybody that has to borrow money.

1530

In fact, the economists tell us, and Alan Greenspan himself has testified before this Congress many times, that the best use of the surplus is to pay off the national debt. If we get the government out of the business of borrowing so much money every year and rolling that debt over year after year, the economists say that it will take this pressure off the credit markets, and interest rates will go down.

So folks trying to borrow money to own a home, folks borrowing money to buy a car, people who borrow money to send their children to college, they will all experience lower interest rates. A 2 percent reduction in interest rates for a family that has a $100,000 home mortgage they are paying on, it would save them $2,000 a year. That is a much better tax cut than the $323 that a middle-income family would get under the trillion dollars Republican tax cut plan.

Yes, we Blue Dog Democrats and all Democrats believe in tax cuts, but we believe that they must be granted within the context of reality. The reality is that, even though the surplus we are talking about is about $2 trillion over the next 10 years, it is just an estimate. If we cut taxes with about 70 to 80 percent of that number, which is Governor Bush's plan, we may very well find out that the surplus has never materialized. If the economy is not as strong as we assume it may be, that surplus may never arrive; and we, as the Federal Government, will be back into deficit spending again.

Our Blue Dog plan leaves room for $77 billion of tax cuts over 10 years. That is a conservative plan. That is a realistic plan. That is a plan that will keep us on the road to economic prosperity by lowering interest rates for the American people.

But let us compare the plans. The Blue Dog plan reduces the national debt $3.65 trillion over the next 10 years. That is equal to using 80 percent of what we call the unified surplus for debt reduction. The unified surplus simply means we devote all of the Social Security trust fund surplus to paying down that debt. We devote 100 percent of the Medicare trust fund to paying down debt, and we devote 50 percent of the general fund, the so-called on-budget surplus, to paying down debt. So 80 percent of the surplus that will accrue over the next 10 years goes to debt reduction.

The Clinton administration budget allocates 75 percent of the unified surplus to paying down debt. Vice President GORE's proposal that he has talked about in his campaign dedicates 68.5 percent of the unified surplus to paying down the debt.

If we look on the other hand at the Republican proposals, the Republican proposal in this House would dedicate 60 percent of the unified surplus to paying down debt. Governor Bush's proposal would dedicate only 58 percent of the unified surplus to paying down the national debt.

The question I ask my colleagues is, who are the fiscal conservatives in the Congress? I think it is the party that advocates paying off the national debt. The Blue Dog plan would pay it off the fastest. This plan would pay it off in 10 years. Governor Bush's plan, by our calculations, would still, after 10 years, leave us owing a trillion dollars. We believe the thing that we should do for the American people is pay down the national debt over the next 10 years.

It is interesting that our 50/25/25 budget plan has received bipartisan support. During the budget debates on the floor of this House, our plan was presented. As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) mentioned, it received over 170 votes in this 435 Member House. Thirty-three Republicans joined with Democrats in supporting that Blue Dog plan.

It is the right plan for the American people. It will ensure our future prosperity. It represents what my daddy always taught me, and that is, the first thing you do if you have a little extra money is pay off what you owe. That rule applies at my colleagues' house, it applies at my house, and it should apply in the people's house here in the United States House of Representatives.

So we hope that our Republican leadership will adopt our plan. Frankly, I was disappointed in the Republican leadership after they so vigorously pushed for over a trillion dollars in tax cuts, not setting the priority that we wanted to on paying down the national debt. After their plans were vetoed, as the President vetoed tax cut after tax cut, they threw in the towel and said, well, we will just forget about tax cuts.

Democrats in this House believe the American people need tax relief. We just believe that we need to give that

tax relief within the framework of a sound and sensible Federal budget.

With $377 billion in tax cuts under our plan, we can eliminate the marriage penalty; we can reduce estate tax. For all estates of $2 million or less, that means a family, husband and wife, could be worth $4 million and pay absolutely no estate tax under our plan. It reduces all estate tax rates above that 20 percent.

We believe that within our $377 billion plan, we can increase the amount that families can put in an IRA or put in their 401(k) plan, saving more for the future, and being able to deduct more on their income tax return.

We believe we can provide some relief for our seniors, many of whom have to pay tax on their Social Security benefits. We believe we can provide meaningful tax relief to allow urban and rural areas some incentives to invest and do projects that would renew their communities.

These are tax cuts that make sense for the American people. They are tax cuts that fit within an overall budget plan that will allow us to pay off the national debt over the next 10 years.

I believe and I hope that our Republican colleagues will listen to this plan and listen to our appeal and join with us in these closing weeks of this session to put America on the right course for the next decade.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for his contribution today and, again, for the last several months as he has been, again, one of our Blue Dog bulldogs.

When my colleagues sit here and they listen to what we are saying today and they listen to what our colleagues from the other side of the aisle are saying, I get confused sometimes as to what are we fussing about. What is it that divides us so much? What is it that causes colleague after colleague on the other side of the aisle to come over and point the finger at this side of the aisle and blame us for the impasse in the Congress?

We Democrats are in the minority. We got there the old fashioned way in 1994. We earned it. We are no longer in the majority.

It is my understanding the majority leader will be coming over to take his hour after we finish. I would be glad to yield the remainder of my time for an honest discussion with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) regarding the plan that we are talking about and what is wrong with it. Perhaps we can change it.

The Blue Dogs have suggested all along that bipartisanship is what it is going to take for us to do the Nation's work. A lot of times, we will hear we are spending too much. Well, perhaps we are. But let us work that out.

The Committee on Appropriations gets blamed for doing a lot of things. But if we give them the numbers of what they have to spend, they usually stay within that. But it is the majority of this body that determines what we are going to spend, and the majority is now in the other side of the aisle's hands.

If we do not want to spend any more money on Medicare, say so. Let us tell our hospitals we are not going to spend any additional money. The solution for our Nation is to close the hospitals that cannot cut it with the balance-the-budget agreement, the plan that was put into effect in 1997 that was supposed to be the salvation of health care. Well, it has not worked out that way.

Come to the floor and say we are not going to spend on Medicare. Come to the floor and say we are not going to deal with veterans and military retirees; that we are not going to deliver on the promise that we have made; that we have been shortchanging. Come to the floor and say we are not going to recognize the disasters that have occurred, weather related, fire, drought. Come to the floor and say we do not give a rip whether communities will not have drinking water because we do not wish to spend any more than the budget we submitted 6 months ago.

That is an honest debate. It is an honest discussion to have. I think we will find that we will have bipartisan agreement, that we can find something close to what the Blue Dogs are suggesting.

Do not take our marbles and go home because we did not get the tax cuts we were for. Respect some of us on this side of the aisle that say we are for dealing with the estate tax, the death tax. We just believe it ought to be done from a fiscally responsible way; that we ought not to leave the problems of Social Security 10 years from today to some future Congress because we want to deal with the repeal of the death tax in 2010. Some of us believe we ought to deal with it in 2001, but deal with it in a fiscally responsible way, an honest discussion, an honest debate. I feel very strongly that we could come to a bipartisan agreement.

Understand the process around this place. The process is, if we have got 218 votes and 51 votes and a presidential signature, it becomes law. If we do not have 218 votes, 51 votes, and a presidential signature, it does not become law. That means we have to sit down and, in a good-faith effort, with folks on the other side of the aisle, if one is in the majority, to find that middle ground. That is the way our Founding Fathers intended that this place should work.

Where have we lost that? Why is there no sincere effort ever to reach out to this side of the aisle from the current leadership when we are here extending the hand of saying we are prepared to work with you, and we offer a plan to start with? Did we say it is perfect? No. Can it be improved? Absolutely.

Spending. We proposed today that we should not have abandoned caps on discretionary spending that worked pretty darn good for 3 years before we began to run into the unrealistic level of the caps. Because even those in the majority party refuse to live up to what they said we were going to do because it could not have been done. We would have gutted Defense had we done that.

We are suggesting now, let us agree on the spending levels for this year within the 90/10 philosophy that we have heard espoused. Then let us set a new set of caps for the next 5 years at this year's level with inflation and demographic adjustment. We believe that that is a very fiscally prudent way for us to handle the prospects of future spending. If my colleagues disagree, come to the floor and disagree with us.

October 6 is going to be here before we know it. What is the plan for getting out? Remember, we have to get a presidential signature or we do not go home, nor should we. But what is the plan? What is the plan that can get the kind of bipartisan support that is going to be required?

This is what the Blue Dogs are saying today, and we say it not in a confrontational way. We remind our friends on the other side of the aisle, we were here in February, in March, in April, in May, in June and July and August. Now here we are in September saying the same thing that we have been saying all year. Here is a plan that can get support including presidential support. But somehow, some way, and I do not point this finger in an accusing way, because I was reminded a long time ago, when you point the finger, Mr. Speaker, there is always three pointing back at you. I accept the three pointing back at me.

But I do not sincerely understand why the leadership of this House has chosen not to come forward and to have a serious discussion regarding how do we get out of this place and complete the 106th Congress.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the points that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) made there deserves our further discussion. I noted, when the Republican leadership abandoned their plans for tax cuts, they came back and began to talk as we have for 2 years now about debt reduction as a priority. I think they have said for this year it would be okay with them to use a portion of that surplus for debt reduction.

I believe that when we look at what they have proposed for the next year, if we could just persuade them to put that in place, that plan for the next 10 years, we could basically have the Blue Dog budget plan that we have advocated.

So I think we are really at a point where we could possibly reach some accord with regard to the future Federal budget and probably do the American people a great service by letting them

know now that, in 10 years, we will pay down the publicly held national debt, and we will provide some meaningful tax relief to the American people.

1545

I think it all comes down to what the gentleman said earlier, and that is it comes down to one's view of how this process is supposed to work. The Republican leadership knew before they passed their almost trillion dollar tax cut bill that the President was going to veto it. He told them that. It was passed anyway. And that is fine, that is the process working its will. But once that occurred, then it seems to me that the right thing to do was to realize that a half a loaf, from their point of view, would have been better for the American people than none at all.

And if we come back to a more realistic Federal budget plan that puts a priority on the national debt and that provides about $377 billion, as we have in our plan, in tax cuts, then we can tell the American people that we have done the people's work; that we have set our Nation on a course of fiscal responsibility and we have taken the good times that we have and the projected surplus and we have allocated it in a way that is going to work for the American people and work to keep this prosperous economy going.

So I hope that this hour has not been spent in vain. I hope our Republican leadership will take a look at the Blue Dog plan, which we have advocated for 2 years now, and perhaps get us back to the point where we can come together and do the job the American people expect us to do, both Democrats and Republicans, and do the right thing. Even though it might not be what everybody wants, it will at least represents a true compromise. And after all, that is what the legislative process is all about.

So I really appreciate the time that we have had here to talk about this issue. And again I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for his leadership on this issue on our side of the aisle.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and will now yield to the gentleman from the 19th District of Illinois (Mr. PHELPS), one of our Blue Puppies, that has now achieved the full rank of Blue Dog in this year.

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), and I want to also commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and many others. The leadership of the Blue Dog organization has been right on target and made me feel very comfortable in being a part of the membership. I have learned a lot as a new Member in looking at this budget.

And I want to thank the Blue Dogs for being consistent. To me that is very important. My father gave me some advice a long time ago. He said, ''Don't reject an idea just because it is not your own.'' I think that is what we are coming down to here.

Mr. Speaker, as the budget discussions continue, I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to look at the Blue Dog budget framework as a workable fiscally sound solution. This budget framework shows that it is still possible to responsibly pay down the debt while providing critical funding for education and health care programs.

I am pleased to see that both sides are now focused on paying down the debt, something the Blue Dogs have supported from the very beginning. Under the Blue Dog plan, the debt reduction lockbox would be extended 10 years to save 100 percent of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses, plus half of the on-budget surpluses for debt reduction.

We owe it to our children to not squander the surplus but invest it into their future by paying down what we already owe. At the same time, this budget would suggest that 10 percent of the fiscal year 2001 surplus be divided between tax cuts, BBA relief, and discretionary spending. I have favored some of the tax cuts proposed this year, and I will continue to do so, but we must provide necessary funds for the problems we are now facing in health care and education.

In my district these are critical funds. In my district, for example, education funding is critical to providing our students, especially those with special needs, with the education they need to make it in the real world.

In my district, home health and rural health centers are the only point of access to health care for many people. Funding of these programs and providing them with BBA relief, which is included in the Blue Dog alternative, literally can mean life or death for these programs and the patients they serve.

In 1997, with the Balanced Budget Amendment, we asked our citizens to accept cuts to put us on the path to a fiscally secure future. Well, now we are fiscally responsible and we have a surplus. It is our duty to also use the surplus responsibly by investing in our kids' education and providing access to necessary health care for our citizens. The Blue Dog alternative best meets these goals.

It is not too late to come to agreement on a fiscally sound budget that pays down the debt, gives tax relief, and provides for health and education. I ask my colleagues to use the Blue Dog framework and agreement to come to the end of this budget impasse. I hope that we all are reasonable and will come forward and be sure that we act responsibly on behalf of our citizens.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

In closing, I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that we have taken this hour in good faith, in the spirit of which we have spoken. We believe that we have some ideas worthy of consideration, Mr. Speaker, and we hope that our colleagues will give them their just due.

HUNGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, hunger is an issue that many in America would prefer to ignore, and I perhaps wish I did not have to speak on it. I have spoken on this before and have said many of the things I must repeat again.

The economy is soaring for some. In fact, it is good for most. Unemployment is at a 30-year low. Welfare rolls have been slashed. Still, every day in America, 31 million Americans, 31 million Americans, are either hungry or living under the specter of hunger. The economy is sinking for far too many of our citizens: Those who are hungry.

There is evidence of hunger in 3.6 percent of all households in America. Close to 4 million children are hungry. Fourteen million children, 20 percent of the population of children, live in food insecure homes. In food insecure homes, meals are skipped or the size of the meal is reduced. More than 10 percent of all households in America are food insecure.

Because there is such hunger and food insecurity, there is also infant mortality, growth stunting, iron deficiency, anemia, poor learning, and increased chances for disease. Because there is such hunger and food insecurity, the poor are more likely to remain poor and the hungry more likely to remain hungry.

It seems strange that we must fight for food for those who cannot fight for themselves. It really is time to stop picking on the poor. Less than 3 percent, less than 3 percent of the budget goes to feed the hungry. It is for those reasons that Congress should, Congress must pass hunger relief legislation. If we do, we can achieve several important goals: We will build on the bipartisan progress we made in 1998 with the passage of the Agriculture Research Act. In that act we restored some benefits for legal immigrants.

In legislation I have co-sponsored in this Congress, we restore food stamp benefits for all immigrants, including the working poor, families with young children, and needy seniors. With the Hunger Relief Act of 1999, we also seek to update the food stamp rules.

We change the vehicle limit so that families can retain a reliable car without losing food stamp benefits. We change the shelter cap, raising it from $275 to now $340 over the next 4 years, and then we index it to inflation. Finally, the Hunger Relief Act authorizes another $100 million over 5 years for commodity purchases and food distribution.

With the will, we can pass this act this Congress. We cannot move from poverty to progress without a fair chance for all. We cannot prepare our children for the future if we insist upon policies that relegate them to the past. We cannot ensure the quality of life for every citizen if we fail to provide programs for all of our citizens. And we cannot protect and preserve our communities if we do not adequately provide the most basic commodity for living: Something to eat.

Nutritional programs are essential for the well-being of millions of our citizens. The disadvantaged, our children, the elderly, and the disabled, these are groups of people who often cannot provide for themselves and need help for their existence. They do not ask for much: Just a little help to sustain them through the day; just a little help to keep children alert in classes and adults to be productive in their jobs or as they search for jobs.

The Hunger Relief Act provides that help. Food for all is worth fighting for. And as we end this Congress, we have a chance to change this shocking and the scandalous situation. I am so proud to have joined 181 of my colleagues in the House and 38 Senators, Republicans and Democrats, in support of legislation that focuses on food and takes notice of this Nation's nutritional needs.

The Hunger Relief Act, H.R. 3192 in the House and S. 1805 in the Senate will help the one in ten families in our Nation who are affected by hunger. Mr. Speaker, let us pass this act before we end this Congress.

VICE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, a few of my colleagues will soon be joining me and we will be spending the next hour discussing the details of the Vice President's economic plan. Certainly during that period of time we will have a broad overview, but at this point I would like to just focus very narrowly on one aspect of the Vice President's plan.

My colleagues may recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Vice President was one of many voices that urged the President of the United States to veto the marriage penalty tax relief that was passed by this Congress and sent to the President. Soon after the President vetoed the marriage penalty tax relief, the Vice President announced that he would give marriage penalty relief by doubling the standard deduction.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is probably worth our while to realize what this means exactly in terms of the Vice President's claim that it is marriage penalty tax relief; certainly what it means by way of comparison with the marriage penalty tax relief that was granted by this Congress and vetoed by the President.

The first thing my colleagues should realize is that in the congressional bill, written by the Republicans and passed on to the President, vetoed by the President, all married couples, irrespective of their filing status, received relief from the unfair marriage penalty. The Vice President's proposal that he now outlines only gives relief to those people who do not itemize their taxes.

If a couple owns a home and decides to deduct their mortgage interest, they will get no marriage penalty relief under the Vice President's plan. If a couple gives to their church and deducts charitable contributions, they get no marriage penalty relief under the Vice President's plan.

1600

If you, your spouse, or your child is ill and you deduct your skyrocketing medical bills, you get no marriage penalty relief under the Vice President's plan. If you or your spouse work at home and deduct the cost of a home office, you get no marriage penalty relief under the Vice President's plan. And, Mr. Speaker, if you jump through hoops to become eligible for one of the new credits that the Vice President has proposed, complicating our Tax Code even further than it is now, than the Vice President will not give you relief from the unfair marriage penalty. And, Mr. Speaker, that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, that is just the beginning of the serious concern I have with the details of the Vice President's plan.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, it is a commonplace observation in this town that the devil is in the details. Armey's axiom is, if you make a deal with the devil, you are the junior partner. And I am about to demonstrate in this next hour that indeed the devil that we do not want to make a deal with is in the details of the Vice President's plan.

Let us take a look at the big picture first. The Vice President would spend the on-budget surplus, he would rob the Social Security trust fund, and he would provide a measly tax cut designed to manipulate behavior instead of giving meaningful tax relief.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that we are very proud of in this Congress, one of the things that we have been able to do, thanks primarily to the success of the American people in creating an enormous economic success story here in America and the revenues that have accrued to the Government out of our economic success, is that we have managed to stop the raid on Social Security.

Not only do we set aside 100 percent of all Social Security tax dollars that people find in their payroll stubs as FICA tax, 100 percent of all Medicare tax surpluses set aside by this Congress, thus ending the 40-year raid on Social Security and Medicare; but we have even managed in this Congress to set aside a large portion of the on-budget budget surplus.

What is the on-budget budget surplus? That is the part of the budget surplus that accrues to the Government from your Social Security taxes, not from your Medicare taxes, but from your income taxes. So that we are now setting 90 percent of all budget surplus aside for debt reduction.

The Vice President's plan would take all of that income tax surplus, which we call on-budget surplus, and he would spend it. But worse than that, he would renew the old practice, a practice that should be forgotten, of robbing from the Social Security trust fund for new risky spending schemes that we will talk about later.

At the same time, he would provide a bureaucratic government-run prescription drug plan that is not guaranteed to bring the cost of drugs down. Indeed, Madam Speaker, the Vice President's one-size-fits-all, you-must-join-the-Government plan threatens to force the price of prescription drugs up.

Let us address his spending plans first.

According to Vice President GORE's numbers, he would increase Federal spending by about $900 billion through the year 2010. However, the Senate budget committee shows a much higher price tag. They added up the numbers and found that the Vice President would spend $2.1 trillion of new spending and he would not stop there.

Think of it this way: the Vice President's plan is 191 pages. That means that each page of his book would cost taxpayers an amazing $18.4 billion per page. It means that for every dollar by which the Vice President would cut taxes, he would spend $6.75.

If you look at the details, Madam Speaker, we find that Vice President GORE dramatically underestimates the cost of his new retirement entitlement program built on top of the Social Security program. That is not new. This has been a part of our problem historically in the past with Democrat Congresses that created new mandatory spending programs and dramatically underestimated their cost.

The Vice President says his new retirement program, which is very similar to the Clinton universal savings account, which was a trial balloon which the Clinton administration floated until it popped, that this would cost $200 billion over 10 years.

But an analysis by Dr. John Colgen of Stanford University shows that, if everyone eligible to participate in it, it would cost $160 billion in the first year alone. The Vice President says his plan would cost $200 billion over 10 years. Professor Colgen of Stanford University says, if everybody eligible participated, it would be $160 billion for the first year alone.

The Vice President mistakenly calls this brand new massive retirement spending program a tax cut.

True enough, it would be run through the IRS and that would give this agency still more power and control over

the lives of Americans. But this is no tax cut. Instead, the Vice President would give government checks to people, some of whom do not even pay taxes. Our budget rules would score it on the spending side, not on the tax side.

Other parts of this Big Government agenda include massive new spending on energy, environment, transportation and crime, all important items on our policy agenda. But to pay for this, the Vice President would rob the Social Security system.

Madam Speaker, we have stopped that raid on Social Security; and I believe that the American people would agree with me, there is no going back.

Madam Speaker, I see the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), one of our brighter and younger newer Members of the Republican Caucus, has joined me; and I see he has some very interesting graphs there. So, Madam Speaker, I yield to Professor RYAN so that he can help us look into this case even further.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) for yielding to me, and I appreciate his leadership on this issue.

I also serve on the House Committee on the Budget. We actually spend a great deal of time crunching these numbers, looking at the surplus, and evaluating the different plans that come through Washington that are being proposed.

What we have done through the Senate budget committee's analysis is look at the different proposals, looked at what Governor Bush is proposing to do with the Government's surplus, looked at what Vice President GORE is proposing to do with the surplus. And as we did an apples-to-apples comparison and took a look at the priorities, it is a pretty stark difference.

One of the things that I have heard as I have gone around my district, which is the First Congressional District in Wisconsin, is we talked to a lot of people about this election and the thing that really gets to me sometimes that I hear is that some people think there is not much of a difference, that there is no difference between who they pick in Washington.

Well, I have got to tell my colleagues, of all the elections, this election is clearing about differences. The differences between the visions for America as proposed by AL GORE and George Bush are worlds apart from each other.

To quickly summarize it, the Vice President wants to take the hard-earned surplus, and the surplus by definition are people overpaying their taxes, the Vice President wants to keep it in Washington. He wants to spend it on new government programs. Governor Bush wants to pay off our debt, protect Social Security and Medicare, and give us our money back as we continue to overpay our taxes.

But let us not just listen to me. Let us take a look at the hard numbers. I have here a chart that breaks up the surplus dollars. It basically says, for every one dollar coming into Washington in government surplus, how does each plan spend that money, how does each plan treat that money?

Well, if we look at Vice President GORE's plan, 46 cents of every surplus dollar is committed to new government spending. On the contrary, in the Bush plan, 6 cents of all surplus dollars are committed to new spending.

What about preserving Social Security, Medicare, and paying off our national debt? A lot of them serve the same purpose. Paying off our debt helps us preserve Social Security and Medicare.

The Bush plan commits 58 cents of every surplus dollar over the next 10 years toward preserving Social Security and paying off the debt and shoring up Medicare. The Gore plan commits 36 cents of every surplus dollar.

What about tax relief? This is the lowest priority in the Gore budget. Vice President GORE is saying that, for every surplus dollar coming into Washington, Americans, after they overpay their taxes, should only get 7 cents of that dollar back.

Governor Bush is saying 29 cents of every surplus dollar should be returned back to the taxpayer after dedicating 58 cents back towards Social Security and Medicare and paying off the debt.

And increased interest costs, something that we have to do to manage the interest, the balance payments, 11 cents for GORE, 7 cents for Bush. That basically means that the Vice President is paying off debt at a slower pace. The Vice President, if all of his new spending plans get enacted, will likely wind us up into the point where we will have to dip into the Social Security trust fund.

If you want to take a look at what the difference is in plans over the surplus are, just take a look at who wants to spend money and who wants to save the money.

Vice President GORE is proposing the greatest expansion of the Federal Government in 30 years. He is proposing to take $2.1 trillion of the surplus and spend it on new programs here in Washington. To the contrary, Governor Bush is saying let us spend $278 billion on needed things in Washington, such as committing ourselves to the fundamental problems we have in this country, funding the education unfunded mandates, funding our critical needs in health care, rebuilding our national defenses.

When it comes down to it, it is basically this: the Vice President wants to spend the surplus in Washington, the greatest expansion of the Federal Government in 30 years, at the expense of Social Security and Medicare and paying off our debt.

Governor Bush is saying this: here is the priority of how we deal with the surplus. Pay off our national debt, shore up Social Security and Medicare. And if people still continue to overpay their taxes to Washington, give them their money back rather than spend it on new programs in Washington.

That is what Bush is proposing. And there is a huge world of difference between these two men running for President and their visions for America with respect to how they treat our surpluses.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to look at that graph. You notice in this graph on the Bush proposal that Governor Bush proposes 29 cents out of that dollar for tax relief. And I notice that you see Vice President GORE is proposing 7 cents.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. ARMEY. But is it not true that the Vice President is proposing 85 new tax increases?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. ARMEY. And 36 targeted tax cuts? So that 7 cents is really a net tax.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I ask, does the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) know how many tax increases are being proposed by Governor Bush?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, it is my understanding that he is not proposing any tax increases at all.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, the understanding of the gentleman is absolutely correct. And I appreciate that.

I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) can stay around, and maybe we can talk some more.

But, Madam Speaker, we have also been joined here by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) on the Committee on Education and the Workforce. And when we start talking about our responsibilities here in Washington, certainly we can take a look at big-picture items, what are our broad-based plans for the creation of new programs, all the new programs the Vice President would like to create, whether or not we would like to cut taxes, or whether or not we will keep our commitment to America to stop the raid on Social Security and pay down the debt. But in doing that, we also have an administrative responsibility.

Now, the Vice President has been a key member of the Clinton administration for 8 years; and during those 8 years, he accepted the responsibility for doing what he called reinventing government, the idea being that he was going to make the agencies of this government administratively work efficiently, effectively, and be cost effective on behalf the American people.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) from the Committee on Education and the Workforce has spent a good deal of time examining just what is the record of performance of the agencies of the Federal Government under the stewardship of the

Clinton/Gore administration and especially in light of the enormous amount of applause this Nation has given the Vice President for his efforts to bring, what should I say, common sense good business practices to government.

I wonder if I yield to the gentleman, maybe he would share with us some of his discoveries along those lines.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

1615

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think this really builds off of the discussion that our colleague from Wisconsin was just leading in that when we take a look at the Vice President's plans to significantly increase spending, before we significantly increase spending anywhere, we ought to take a look at how we are spending the $1.7, $1.8 trillion that we currently collect and we hand over to the executive branch and say, ''How's it going?''

The majority leader is absolutely right. This is the publication that came out on September 7, 1993, it came from the Vice President, signed by Mr. GORE. The book is, From Red Tape to Results, Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less.

It is the report of the National Performance Review, Vice President AL GORE. He was clearly mandated by the President to lead this effort. Where we are in the year 2000 is with this question, there are nine departments whose books cannot be audited. They can be audited but the auditors come back and say, ''We can't give you a clean audit.'' The first one is the Department of Treasury. Think about this. The national bank or whatever we want to call it, the Department of Treasury cannot get a clean audit.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. The gentleman is saying that we have nine Cabinet departments that cannot pass an audit?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I am not sure they are all Cabinet, but we have nine significant agencies that cannot receive a clean audit.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. What would happen if a small or medium-sized business in Michigan or Texas or Wisconsin could not pass their audit with the IRS?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We actually had testimony from the accounting and the investment field. We asked them if they knew of any $1.8 trillion or even a $1 billion company publicly held in the last year, the last 2 years that had failed their audit to the extent that the Department of Education had, where they have not had a clean audit for 2 years and do not expect a clean audit for 3 more years and they said, ''We can't think of one.'' Because what would happen if you were in the private sector and the auditors failed your audit, most likely the value of the stock would drop significantly immediately. The other thing that would happen is most likely the Securities and Exchange Commission would suspend the trading of your stock, because you could not with any reasonable certainty go to your shareholders and indicate that what you represent in your financial statements in any way reflects the real world.

Let us take a look. The Treasury Department, Justice cannot get a clean audit, Education, Defense, Ag, the EPA, HUD, OPM, AID. None of these can receive a clean audit. I chair the Subcommittee on Oversight for the Committee on Education and the Workforce. We miss the majority leader on the committee. But he knows the work that we have done at that committee in taking a look at exactly what is going on in the Education Department.

In 1993, here is what the Vice President said: ''The Department of Education has suffered from mistrust and management neglect almost from the beginning. To overcome this legacy and to lead the way in national educational reform, Ed must refashion and revitalize its programs, management and systems.'' That is directly out of this book.

In 2000, here is what the General Accounting Office said: ''Serious internal control and financial management system weaknesses continue to plague the agency.''

In 1993, the Vice President said: ''The Department is redesigning its core financial management systems to ensure that data from accounting, grants, contracts, payments and other systems are integrated into a single system.''

In 2000, here is what GAO said: ''Pervasive weaknesses in the design and operation of Education's financial management systems, accounting procedures, documentation, record keeping and internal controls including computer security controls prevented Education from reliably reporting on the results of its operations for fiscal year 1998.'' That is also true for fiscal year 1999, and we are expecting that they will again fail their audit for the year 2000.

Now, in the private sector when the auditors say you cannot keep your books, we know that there are real consequences. Here are just some of the examples of what is going on in our Department of Education. Most of these are examples not from us in Congress but they are from the General Accounting Office, they are from their own Inspector General, and so these are well documented.

Congratulations, You're Not a Winner. In February, the Department of Education notified 39 young people in America that they won the prestigious Jacob Javits scholarship. My daughter just went to school this fall, went to college, my first one in college, and a Jacob Javits scholarship awards kids 4 years of graduate school at government expense. Paying undergraduate bills, I can imagine how excited the kids were and how excited the parents were. These kids were thrilled. Two days later, they got a call back saying, ''Sorry, you're not the winners.'' Poor management, real results, real impact.

In September of 1999, they printed 3.5 million financial aid forms. This is what kids use to apply. They printed them incorrectly. A cost of $720,000.

Mr. ARMEY. Does the gentleman mean the Department of Education incorrectly printed financial aid forms for the students wishing to apply for college to learn how they might correctly use the English language?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. 3.5 million forms containing errors, incorrect line references to the IRS tax form were printed, 100,000 of them were distributed, had to be recalled, the other ones all had to be destroyed. A cost of $720,000.

Dead and Loving It. The Department of Education improperly discharged almost $77 million in student loans for borrowers who claimed to be either permanently disabled or deceased. This was a double good news for these people. The good news, number one, is that their loans were forgiven because they were disabled or dead. The second bit of good news is they were neither disabled nor dead. But the Education Department had identified them as such and had forgiven their loans.

Most recently a theft ring, and this is what happens when you do not have proper controls. They had a purchasing agent within the Department of Education who could order materials, certify that they came in, certify that they should be paid for and certify that other individuals, independent contractors, should receive overtime. They ordered over $330,000 of electronic equipment, authorized the payment, the $330,000 of equipment was shipped around to various employees' and friends' homes around the Nation's capital. This was all done through the phone guy. What was in it for the phone guy? The phone guy got $660,000 of overtime that he had not worked.

More recently, we had a hearing on this last week. Another theft ring. Impact Aid funds. This is dollars that we send to needy school districts or districts that have a lot of Federal facilities in them. In this case, two school districts in South Dakota, actually I believe on Indian reservations. The Department of Education wired them the money, found out a couple of days later because a local car dealer had somebody coming in and wanted to buy a Corvette, came in and were ready to pay cash or a cashier's check to pay for the Corvette. The dealership did a credit check on this individual and found out that it did not check out. They called the FBI. They found out that this group had bought a Lincoln Navigator, a Cadillac Escalade and they were looking at buying a Corvette. They also bought a home, $135,000. So somebody was checking this to see where did this money come from. Somebody had gone into the computer systems at the Department of Ed, and this is one of their other problems, they do not have computer security,

and had changed the routing, so instead of sending this money to an account into the school districts in South Dakota, the money went into these individuals' accounts in Washington to the tune of $1.9 million.

Mr. ARMEY. If I may ask the gentleman, Madam Speaker, I want to continue this with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and I certainly want to get back to my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) as well but I think it is very important that we make this note. The gentleman from Michigan is the oversight chairman of the subcommittee on education. It is his job to see to it that the Education Department under the jurisdiction of his committee does a good job. And the information we have here is about that committee. But as the gentleman from Michigan pointed out, we have how many agencies that are inauditable, they cannot be audited?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We have nine significant agencies.

Mr. ARMEY. Nine significant agencies, including the Treasury Department which I will bet has in its employ a more than generous number of CPAs and they cannot be audited. So what happens, it seems, is that when people come to Washington, they cannot even do what they do do well. The CPAs malfunction at Treasury, the educators malfunction in the Department of Education.

I want to make this point very quickly. Why are we being tough on the Department of Education? It is not that we dislike the Department of Education. It is certainly not that we dislike education. We would stand here and we would say there is no thing that any culture can do that can be more important than how we educate our children. And if we have an agency of the Federal Government that is committed to that purpose by an act of Congress, committed, then it is the responsibility of Congress to see that that agency functions for the children. And to find this kind of inefficiency, neglect, sloppy work, abuse, who pays for that? That all translates into the neglected children from an agency of this government that we created.

I would commend the gentleman from Michigan for his good work. I want to hear more about his findings.

Mr. Speaker, we have with us the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), and she has agreed to participate but is on a very tight schedule. I yield to our good friend the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. MYRICK. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I just wanted to make a couple of comments, not on education because the gentleman from Michigan is covering that quite thoroughly and I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin is covering budget surplus information. But I wanted to just mention a couple of things relative to Vice President GORE's budget that he has presented, because I think there are some things that we could point out that maybe do show a difference in the way that we philosophically go about spending our government's money and the people's money at home.

I know that the Vice President made the comment at the Democratic National Convention that in the next 4 years he wanted to pay off all the national debt we have accumulated over 200 years, and this would be the plan that would put us on track for completely paying off debt by 2012. Then I remember back last year how President Clinton's administration only wanted to save 63 percent of the surplus and if it had not been for us really forcing the issue and saying that we are going to lock away 100 percent of the surplus, we might not be in the position today where those statements could even be made that we are going to be able to save and pay off the debt.

I think we need to look at that. Plus the fact that the National Taxpayers Union estimates that the Vice President's spending proposals would actually increase government spending by $2.7 trillion. We do not hear about the increase in spending that is being talked about. That is more than the budget surplus for the next year. And that would send us right back into the days of deficit spending where we do not want to be. Then it also comes out to say that for every dollar that the Vice President's budget would cut taxes, he would raise government spending by $6.75. I am not a brilliant mathematician but that kind of tells me that this is not going to work. You cannot on one hand cut taxes by a dollar and then raise spending and expect that you are going to be in a good financial position.

When we look at this proposal that has been put on the table, it does closely mirror what the administration is also proposing. I think back to 1995 because if my colleagues remember if we had adopted that proposed budget, we would still have $200 billion in deficits today. It was a lot of my colleagues here who forced this issue that we would sign a balanced budget agreement. Remember that, back in 1995? I think there were five budgets presented by the President before we finally got to one that was agreeable that we could sign when we stood our ground and said we are going to balance this budget.

Look at the results. The American people are definitely reaping the results. We have worked hard to make this happen. We have turned the tide. We really have turned the tide by all the policies, the things that the gentleman from Michigan has been working on with all the oversight that he has been doing, that has been going into it and what we are talking about now with these generous surpluses that are really the people's money that we want to give back to them, that we do not want to keep here in Washington.

I think it is important that the American people do understand and know that this would not have happened if we had not stuck to our guns and really kept these policies in place. That is something that we need to be doing for the future for our children and our grandchildren.

I appreciate all of my colleagues being here today to really share this information with the American people, because otherwise they do not hear. We do not say, they do not hear.

1630

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentlewoman. I would like to make this observation: Listening to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, I am reminded it takes leadership, and it takes cooperation, to really get big jobs done in government. People must work together.

I have to say I am very proud of this record we have of working on this very big issue of our budget. We said we were going to balance the budget. The naysayers in this town said it could not be done. When we got to that point, the President recognized it, and in fact when the surplus began to emerge, he recognized that.

I remember the President said, ''I am going to commit 63 percent of the Social Security revenues to debt reduction.'' We appreciated that gesture on his part, but we said, ''How about 100 percent?'' Again, the naysayers, they said it could not be done.

But we challenged the President to work with us. What we saw is when you have a disciplined leadership and two agencies of the government, the Congress and the White House, working together, we managed to accomplish a 100 percent total stop of the raid.

Now, what we need is a new administration after these elections that understands the fruits of that discipline and retains that commitment. Here we have the Vice President saying, elect me to the Presidency and I will start a new spending spree in Washington. I will introduce these new high-risk spending schemes in Washington that promise to spend so much that we will not only backslide on the accomplishments of this Congress, but, more discouragingly, backslide on the accomplishments of this Congress working together with this Presidency.

So he turns his back not only on the work of the Republicans in the House and the Senate, but on the work of President Clinton, and says never mind all that, I want to go back to large-scale, big risky spending schemes.

I see the gentleman from Wisconsin would like to make a point, and I also would like to get back to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), I imagine he has more information here. We also have the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) here.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I appreciate the majority leader. I was really struck with what the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) had to say. It really is about priorities.

When you put together a budget, you are putting together a vision for the

country. When you take a look at the good economic prosperity and times we have enjoyed here in America, it has given us a wonderful opportunity. It has given us a wonderful opportunity to take care of the challenges and needs that are facing the country.

As I travel throughout southern Wisconsin, the constituents I listen to tell me, you know, finally we have a chance to get our hands around paying off the national debt. We have a looming crisis occurring when the baby boomers begin to retire in Medicare and Social Security. Let us take care of those problems so that Social Security and Medicare are programs that can be enjoyed not only for this current generation of retirees, but future generations of retirees.

Finally, we are an overtaxed Nation. We are paying a higher amount of taxes than we do on food, shelter and clothing. We are paying the highest level of taxes in the peacetime history of this country. So when we are talking about budgets, it gets a little dry when you look at the numbers, but what it really means is what is your vision for the country, how are you going to address these challenges.

This chart shows you the different visions for this country, the Gore vision and the Bush vision. The Bush vision is first pay off national debt, stop raiding the Social Security trust fund and modernize Medicare, and, as we accomplish those goals, if people are still overpaying their taxes, give them their money back, rather than spend it on new programs in Washington.

What the Vice President is proposing is just the opposite. Spend the bulk of the money on new programs in Washington, pay off some debt, but he is putting us on a path to where we will be forced to dip back into Social Security to the tune of $906 billion to fund the new spending initiatives that the Vice President is proposing.

The good fortune is this Congress has been able to keep the line on spending, so we can pay off the debt. We have already paid off $354 billion. If we get our way, as we are trying to with these negotiations, we will have paid off half a trillion dollars of debt just in the last 3 years alone.

So what we are looking at here is the future. Are we going to take advantage of this prosperity, of this surplus, to use it to pay off the debt, to shore up Social Security and Medicare and let families keep some more of their hard earned money, or are we going to spend the money on new programs in Washington, as Vice President GORE is proposing? These are the choices that will be determined in this next election.

As you look at the details underneath these policies, the details underneath these numbers, I just take a look at the Vice President's idea for saving Social Security. I would just like to quote two economists that the Vice President often listens to on his plan to revive Social Security.

''The Vice President does nothing more than add more IOUs to the Social Security trust fund. It is a papering over of the Social Security trust fund. To quote the General Accounting Office, 'the Vice President's plan amounts to a pledge to provide that much more money for Social Security in the future somehow. It does not specify the sources. Thus, by itself, it does not fulfill any of the funding gap with Social Security.' ''

That is what Alan Blinder said, who is the Vice President's economic adviser.

David Walker, comptroller to the GAO, says, ''The Gore and Clinton proposal does not come close to saving Social Security. Under this proposal, the changes in the Social Security program will be more perceived than real. Although the trust funds will appear to have more resources as a result of the proposal, nothing about the program has changed.''

So we are seeing a rhetoric being cast about across the country that the Vice President is giving us a program, a proposal to save Social Security, but when we actually take a look at it, it is just adding more money, more IOUs to the Social Security program. It does nothing to advance the solvency of Social Security. In fact, the spending plan that the Vice President articulated in his acceptance speech in Los Angeles, that he has articulated in his prosperity plan for America, is one in which he is proposing to take $2.1 trillion, almost half of the surplus over the next 10 years, and spend it on new programs in Washington, to the point where he is proposing to dip into the Social Security trust fund by almost as much as $906 billion.

Madam Speaker, that is not how you manage the surplus. What we are trying to accomplish with this surplus, what Governor Bush is trying to do with the surplus, is to stop the raid on Social Security. Do not dip into the trust fund anymore, pay off our national debt, modernize Medicare and Social Security, not on paper, but in reality, so that those of us who are near and dear to us, our grandparents, our fathers, our mothers, will have the program to rely upon in the future.

As our constituents, as working families, continue to pay more and more and more to Washington, the highest level of taxation in the peacetime history of this Nation, we are saying, let us let them keep some of their money back as they continue to overpay their taxes, rather than spending it on new programs in Washington. That is the difference in this election. That is the choice that you have as a voter here in this election by choosing either the Bush vision or the Gore vision.

I see the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is here, and I would like to yield back to the majority leader who is controlling the time.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I am sitting here listening to the logic of this whole campaign season. We all know it is often thought of as the silly season, but just look here.

Governor Bush talks about 29 cents on the dollar he would like to return to the people who created the surplus. No matter how you define that tax reduction, whether it be marriage penalty tax relief, inheritance tax relief, no matter how you define it, it is always said to be, by Vice President GORE, a risky tax scheme. We label everything that. Everything gets labeled that way.

Yet in the Gore plan you have a situation where he has the IRS writing checks to give to people who do not pay taxes. He counts that as a tax cut, instead of saying this is what it is, a risky spending scheme. So there is that kind of confusion.

If the gentleman from Florida will just bear with us a little bit, I think the gentleman from Michigan was just about to complete pointing out that kind of confused thinking is what gives you the sort of sloppy work that he has uncovered in one of our Nation's most important agencies. I know the gentleman from Michigan has been very patient and had wanted to complete his summary of those findings. I think we ought to give the gentleman from Michigan that extra couple of minutes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I enjoy being down here and being part of this special order.

Just a couple of other examples. The Education Department placed a half billion dollars in the wrong Treasury account, then disbursed the money without leaving an auditable paper trail. They also have something in the Department of Education, which I think in the private sector if you were a vendor with the Department of Education you would find fascinating. It is called duplicate payments.

I cannot believe it happens. You provide a service to the Department of Education, you bill them, and they pay you, and they pay you again. You get paid twice. This year alone there have been $150 million of documented duplicate payments. There is no telling how much we do not know. These are the vendors that have contacted us and said, hey, you paid us twice. I wonder if there are any out there that we do not know about who maybe have been paid twice, closed shop and said, hey, this is a pretty good deal.

I think the other thing that we really do have is we have got a phenomenal education strategy to improve schools at the local level, saying when you send a dollar to Washington, we want to get 95 cents back into a local classroom. Today that is about 60 cents.

We know the local classroom is where we make a difference. We are saying get the money out of Washington, out of this failed bureaucracy, get it into a local classroom, get it to a teacher, get it to a teacher who knows our kids' names. We are saying get the money back to the local school district. Let them decide whether they need computers, teachers, teacher training, whether they need construction or whatever. But let local schools

make the decisions as to how they are going to spend those dollars.

We have 760 programs. You have to apply for each one of these programs. It is a huge paperwork bureaucracy, and we know the Department cannot handle it. Get the money back into the local school district; say we are going to make the investment, but let you decide how to spend it. Get rid of the Federal paperwork.

We know we have been in 20 States. Governors will come in and say we get 6 to 7 percent of our money from Washington; 60 percent of the paperwork comes from Washington.

Let us get rid of the red tape and bureaucracy and create an environment where schools get back to reading, writing and arithmetic, the three R's. Secretary Riley recently gave a speech and he has three new R's: Relationships, readiness, and resiliency. It is kind of like, I think we need our kids focusing on the basics. The only reason our kids need to be resilient today is because they are not scoring well enough on international test scores and we need them to bounce back. But we need to focus not on relationships and readiness and resiliencies, we need our kids learning the basics. We have got a great education program that does not depend on the failed bureaucracy, but puts power back where it needs to be, with local teachers and administrators and parents.

I thank the majority leader for allowing me to participate and for the extra time.

Mr. ARMEY. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin would agree with me you could go into any community in America and talk to the local school superintendent, talk to the members of the local board of education, and I will bet you not only is their judgment sounder and they have a better understanding of what we need in their community, but I bet you every one of these people can balance their books and survive an audit. So the folks back home know what is going on with those precious tax dollars that pay for that education back home.

We have just got to do better in Washington. We cannot ask for so much of this money, create these new agencies and programs, and then just leave them to run without supervision.

Finally, let me just say, we also saw that this kind of error is committed in other agencies of the government as well. We found that the Veterans Administration was able to have their computers hacked with the kind of technology and practice that apparently any 12-year-old might be able to figure out, and in the process of learning how easy it was to hack the VA's computers, they too found two VA employees that had each separately gone into the computers illegally and paid themselves over $600,000 apiece. That kind of waste, inefficiency, fraud and abuse casts a pall on the good, decent honest people that work in agencies all over this country. It gives them a bad reputation, but it shows the weaknesses in administration.

So we want to have good plans, good programs, good ideas, what we want to accomplish in America, and a good sense of discipline in the administration.

The gentleman from Florida, who I will yield to, is taking a look at that now. Not only do we have this kind of failed ability to administer existing programs, but we also see a great deal of risk in a continued desire on the part of the Gore campaign, with Vice President GORE wanting to continue to create programs put together on an arbitrary, mandatory and potentially dangerous, risky basis, as they have been so often in the past.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) has taken the time to look into one in particular of Vice President GORE's proposals that affects so many of your constituents. If wonder if I yield to the gentleman if he would like to help us.

1645

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), our majority leader. I would like this afternoon to focus on prescription drugs. We have talked about the waste, fraud and abuse, the incompetency that the gentleman from Michigan brought up, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, when he talked about under a Gore administration they would spend $2.5 trillion over the next 10 years, and this would go into the Social Security surplus.

I want to talk about one of the most potential political questions in this election year. The Democrats have proposed a prescription drug program that was defeated, and the Republicans proposed a prescription drug program here in Congress that passed. So I want to focus on the difference of these plans. And more particularly, about the difference between the plan that the Gore campaign is talking about and what we have passed here in Congress and what we think is better, which the Bush campaign has adopted.

All of us in this House, all of us in the Senate are committed to helping our seniors with access to affordable prescription drugs through the Medicare program. But there is a key difference. Joshua Hammond wrote a book called The Seven Cultural Forces That Shape Who Americans Are, and the number one is choice, because we believe that Americans should have choice in what they do and what is offered to them by different programs. So I would like to discuss just briefly today the proposed plans by Republicans and Democrats that have been before this House and talk about the difference.

Madam Speaker, I might point out to my colleagues, this House has been controlled by Republicans since 1995. But if prescription drugs was such a problem, why is it that the Democrats did not propose a solution to this before we took the majority in 1995? And why did we have to wait for Republicans to come forward with a solution? So it is easy for them to criticize, but they had 40 years when they controlled the body over here to come up with their own plan and present it to the American people. Why did they not do it?

It is only because Republicans have tackled this issue, which is very controversial, and the Republican bill, H.R. 2680, would give beneficiaries a choice. The hallmark of the American approach is choice. We do it through two private sector drug plans. In addition to having choice, the question becomes: Who do we trust? The government running the program? Or do we believe that through choice and competition we will get a better program?

Our program will allow beneficiaries to choose plans that best suit their needs. Our plan is market-based rather than relying on the Government to run the plan.

Now, why is this so important? Because we know that overwhelmingly, the components of any plan that we must offer must have this choice. It must be the centerpiece of any plan that we offer to the American people dealing with prescription drugs.

How affordable are these plans? Let us look at these two plans and see why they actually provide what they actually provide and how much it would cost our seniors. Our bill, which is H.R. 4680, passed on the House floor here on June 28. So the Democrats say the Republicans do not have a plan. We have a plan; it passed here on the House floor.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I cannot help but point out it was such a high drama day here in the House on the day we voted a prescription drug plan for our senior citizens, one with universal coverage, that had freedom and choice in it, that had a premium subsidy for low-income seniors. It had a stopgap so that nobody would be bankrupted by that.

On the day that we brought that to the floor to discuss it and pass it, the Democrats, under the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), I remember him rising from his seat over there, got up and walked out. Walked out on the debate. Walked out on the seniors. Walked out on the whole issue.

To me, it was an enormously dramatic moment. And I thought to myself, why they would walk out on that debate? But now they are back and saying that we do not have a plan. I have to say to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) and my friends on the other side of the aisle, if they had stayed at work and listened to the debate, if you had participated, they would not have forgotten that we passed a plan that day.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I think what the gentleman from Texas

is saying in a larger measure is just because they do not control the House does not mean they cannot contribute. They could have been on the House floor offering proposals, trying to make this bill in their estimation better to their determination.

But we passed it. And as I point out, they have had years and years to solve this problem and they did not. So now we have tackled it, and I think it takes political courage.

We provide taxpayers a subsidy to encourage insurers to offer policies which are affordable to our seniors. One key aspect about our program it is voluntary and seniors taking part can choose from at least two plans. All plans start with a $250 deductible, and it would establish the Medicare Benefits Administration. This is an agency that would run the program, but it would be private sector-oriented and provide volume buying for these seniors. It would cover 100 percent of drug and premium costs for couples with income up to $15,200 and singles with incomes up to $11,300.

For all participants, it covers at least half of all drug costs up to $2,100 annually and 100 percent of out-of-pocket costs up to $6000.

So we have something that private companies are providing, the Government is giving incentives and subsidies to help them, it is helping Americans get choice through at least two private sector choices, and it is voluntary.

But let us take a look at the Democrat plan that the House defeated here on the House floor. Currently, seniors pay a premium and receive reimbursement for a portion of their hospital and doctor costs through Medicare. Under the Democrat plan, they would use the new government benefit to reduce the cost of pharmaceutical drugs. As I point out, it is a government program. Translation: they put government in charge of seniors' prescription drugs through the Health Care Financing Administration, which is HCFA, which would choose, they would choose and they would control the drug purchasing contractor for every region of this country. HCFA would be doing it.

In other words, it would be a new Big Government program, a one-size-fits-all plan. And this is a key element of their program.

In a recent survey done with seniors talking about drug coverage, they prefer by a margin of two to one a program that is private sector-oriented, that is voluntary, and not having the Government through HCFA provide the pharmaceutical drugs. So the Clinton-Gore plan for seniors dealing with prescription drugs is like a government-chosen HMO for drugs; and, therefore, I do not think it is good.

Another thing I would like to say is that seniors would lose their private sector coverage, whether they participate or not. This is a key element.

I say in closing, the premiums for the drug coverage under the Clinton-Gore plan come directly out of the monthly Social Security check. Do not think this is going to be a choice. This is government coming into seniors' Social Security check and taking the payment out every month, whether they like it or not in this program that is not voluntary. So I think the real questions seniors have to come to grips with in this political season is do they want to have choice, do they want to have competition or a voluntary approach to this plan, or do they want to have the Government run it?

So I say to the distinguished Majority Leader, I think it is clear. If the American people look at the two plans, the prescription drug will be a plan that is much more favorable to seniors with what we offered, what we provided on the House floor, and I regret that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) walked out on us.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his comments. If the gentleman would hold for a second, there is an old story that a picture is sometimes worth a thousand words. One of the things I think we should remember, today in America right now 70 percent of our seniors have already gone into the private markets and purchased prescription drug coverage. They have shopped around. They have checked out what is available. They decided and they chose coverage that they are happy with. They do not want to lose it. They are content. They understand it. They appreciate it. They want to keep it.

A year ago, President Clinton offered a plan that would be mandatory. ''Go into my plan, forsake yours''; and the seniors rejected it.

Now, my friends on the left, the liberals, Vice President Gore and others who want the government-run plan, will say about the seniors: well, we cannot leave them to their own devices to go in the marketplace and buy for themselves, because they cannot understand those plans. Yet 70 percent of them are happy with what they decided for themselves and do not want to be forced out of their plans.

But I should say this to Vice President GORE, if he is concerned that today's seniors cannot understand what is available to them now, how then would he expect them to understand this nightmare, this bureaucratic nightmare? Every one of these little dashes, this horrible snake here cut into slices, every slice is a new, better Federal Government bureaucratic regulation.

Madam Speaker, the answer is very simple from the left: they do not have to understand it. We decided it. They do not have a choice. They will not make a choice. They do not need to know. The Health Care Finance Agency will tell them what they are going to get.

I have to say, I know the gentlemen here on this floor will be surprised by this, but I am over 60 years old. I am soon to be 65. I refuse to accept any agency of the Federal Government declaring me on that moment of my 65th birthday, ''Today Mr. ARMEY, you suddenly became senile. You do not need to understand anymore. We will take over your health care destiny.''

I have to tell my colleagues if they do not run my health care destiny any better than they have been running the Department of Education, I am not trusting them. I would rather choose for myself, and I think most of America would.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, just one final comment. I do not know how soon the gentleman will be 65, but under the Gore plan, at age 64½, if the gentleman does not want to join at that time, or changes his mind later, he is out of luck because he has got to make his decision at 64½ to do this, or there is no other chance.

The other point I want to make is that the Government will decide which drugs are and are not covered. If the people, like the gentleman from Texas, want to have drugs, the Government can decide it is too expensive; and they will tell him to go to another drug. So all the concerns we had about Mrs. Clinton's health care plan is coming back with this pharmaceutical drugs plan. I think the American people should understand that.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The bottom line is very simple. The plan we passed where they walked out, would not participate, gives choice. What the Vice President's plan gives is an ultimatum: join us now or never.

We have here the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE), who was listening to my earlier remarks and wanted to come down and make a point about the Vice President's tax plan. I think it is a very good point, so I yield to the gentleman from California for that purpose. I also understand the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) wants to make a few comments as well.

Mr. OSE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, yielding me this time. His earlier comments focused on our attempt to override the President's veto of the marriage tax penalty relief. In that legislation there were two primary components. One was relief for marriage tax penalty consequences, the other was an adjustment to the threshold at which earned income tax credits could be realized.

In my district where we have a significantly higher or above the norm unemployment rate, we have a number of young people, a number of elder Americans who actually work for wages, hourly wages who would be eligible for the earned income tax credit if it had been adjusted for inflation over these past 8 years. But in fact just as the Democrats walked out of here back when we passed that bill, this Clinton administration has walked out on lower-income people for an adjustment in the earned income tax credit.

The President's veto of the marriage tax penalty relief right here in this bill

also was a veto of an inflation adjustment to the level, the threshold at which the earned income tax credit would be eligible for. That veto cost a low-income family with two children $421 per year in terms of the earned income tax credit. That is real money.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman from California. That benefit denied by the Clinton veto was a benefit that would have accrued to the most low-income earners in America, not only all of my rich friends as they were discussing earlier.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) is a man of great insight on the budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, let me say I am going to invite the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) to come back next week for another such session and let him lead off with his good insight.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

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

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), our majority leader, very much for leading this very informative hour on programs that are so very important to our Nation, to our seniors, to our American taxpayers.

Madam Speaker, I would like just to comment some on that. I have had the great privilege this last 8 years of serving on the Committee on the Budget, and I have seen over the last 6 years during the time that we have had the Republican Congress accomplishing some tasks that many thought we could never do, i.e., the first balanced budget in 60 years. Something which, by the way, President Clinton and the Vice President, AL GORE, vetoed not once or twice, but three times.

Also, something we thought we would never see was welfare reform. And, again, even though Ronald Reagan once said that, ''There is no limit to what you can accomplish as long as you don't care who takes the credit''; well, our Republican Congress, we were able to reform welfare. It has been reduced by more than 50 percent on the average in the 50 States.

1700

Those are individuals who are now out working being productive. Again, the President vetoed this twice, not once, but twice, and then I know he and the Vice President were out taking credit for it. Again, it does not matter who gets the credit, but it happened, and it happened under the watch of this Republican Congress.

What have we done balancing the budget? Welfare reform? We have seen that we have been able for again for the first time in some 40 years to begin paying down the national public debt. As a matter of fact, up to this point, we paid it down by $350 billion. And in this next year, we are down, that is over the last 3 years, for another $240 billion paying down the public debt; that debt which rests on the shoulders of our children and our grandchildren, money that past Congresses have spent more than what we had.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, and those who are watching look on this chart that I have here, what it does, it compares Vice President AL GORE'S budget and proposal, spending proposals, that he has and compares it with Governor George W. Bush's.

Now, this chart was prepared and the statistics were put out by the National Taxpayer Union Foundation, and it shows that right now the on-budget surplus for the next 10 years is projected to be $2.1 trillion. It is interesting to look at Vice President GORE, who is running for President, his spending, his expenditures add up to $2.8 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, I might mention Governor Bush's spending adds up to $766 billion, his spending proposals. Well, the difference from what is projected as surplus over the next 10 years and what Vice President GORE would spend would put us in some $638 billion deficit again. In other words, under his administration, we would again return to deficit spending. And where does that come from?

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, knows of the legislation which I authored and which passed this last year. We, as Republicans, put a lock box on not spending the Social Security money that had not been spent yet. And we passed that overwhelmingly out of this House, 416–12 this year, and that had been spent since 1935, all that money, and it amounts to several hundred billion dollars a year, but we had been spending that which was a surplus spending on ongoing programs.

This year we passed an additional lockbox on the Medicare. Now, where would this $638 billion come from what GORE would spend? Well, it would come, Mr. Speaker, come from the Social Security money that should be going to pay our seniors. Is that right? No, it is not. Can we afford, this country, to turn around and go back into the direction that we were going for years here where we spend on promises to everyone that may be well meaning, but spending money that we do not have? I think the answer is clearly no.

Mr. Speaker, of course, here in about another month and a half we are going to have an election that will determine whether the American public is going to go back to the failed policies of tax and spend that we have had in the past, or whether or not we are going to continue the direction that this Republican Congress has led us in in the last 6 years moving towards again fiscal responsibility.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Texas, the majority leader for this time.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me just say what the gentleman's charts shows is that the pundits are right, if Governor Bush is President during the worst of time, we might lose the surplus, but it also shows that if Vice President GORE is President during the best of times, he will spend the surplus.

Mr. HERGER. That is right; he only spends one-third of the surplus, the rest is for paying down the debt further and for perhaps some tax relief and some other good things.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS ALTERNATIVE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we are about to approach the end game negotiations, probably behind the scenes, the end game negotiations on the budget, and the appropriations process has started already.

We have gone through a process of preparing a budget which sets forth the general contours, the outlines of where we want to go with respect to our expenditures for each particular function of government. We did that some time ago, and then we have gone through the passage of 13 appropriations bills in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I understand they have not passed all of those bills in the other body, but we have passed them in the House of Representatives. In a situation where there is disagreement between the majority party in the House, they have the votes to pass whatever they want to pass, if there is disagreement between the majority party in the House and the White House or the majority party in the House plus the other body, they agree but then the White House disagrees, then the only way we resolve those disagreements is through a negotiation process, which takes place at the very end of the progress of the other steps that we have taken.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to approach that point in the year when we have a special situation. For the first time in many decades, this Nation has a surplus, and it is not a small surplus at all. The Federal surplus keeps changing every day, but positively changing. It was $200 billion a few weeks ago, and now I understand we are talking about $230 billion as the most conservative estimate of what the budget will be available for some kind of processing by the House and the executive branch.

There is another surplus for Social Security, which is a lockbox; that means we are not talking about money that would be taken away from Social

Security, because they have generated their own surplus, whereas we can give some part of the $230 billion to Social Security, they have their own surplus already.

We do not have to rush to the rescue of Social Security with the surplus. We have some alternatives for what we do with the surplus. Mr. Speaker, I want to just go back to the point where the budget process started. I want to speak for the Congressional Black Caucus, which set forth its alternative budget during the beginning of the budget process.

Now that we are at the end of the process, the negotiations that are going to take place will take place between the Democrat-controlled White House and the Republican-controlled Congress, both Houses of Congress. And we need to get on the agenda and we have to talk to the public in order to get on that agenda.

We need to have you, members of the public, understand that public opinion will decide whether certain items go on to the agenda of the discussions that take place.

We would like very much to get on the agenda from the White House side of the table to have the President understand what our final concerns are in this budget. We are concerned, like everybody else is, about certain priorities, but now that we are down to the last moment and the clock is ticking, we want to emphasize certain very special concerns that we have.

Let me just go back and read from the introduction of a Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget to set a frame of reference for my final proposals today.

We started with an introduction which reads as follows, carrying forward the great Democratic party traditions, Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, Harry Truman's Marshal Plan, Lyndon Johnson's Great Society that produced Medicaid and Medicare, as advocates for the Democratic party mainstream philosophy, the Congressional Black Caucus sets forth this budget for maximum investment in opportunity.

We call our budget a budget for maximum investment and opportunity. As we prepare the year 2001 budget, we are blessed by the long, warm rays of the sun of a coming decade of surpluses. Compassion and vision are no longer blocked by the spectrum of budget deficits. The conservative estimate is that there will be a $1.9 trillion nonSocial Security surplus over the next 10 years.

I made that statement several months ago. We know it is greater than $1.9 trillion, the estimate. Using very simple logic, we should be able to project about $200 billion for the year 2001 budget as this window of opportunity opens.

Investment for the future must be our first priority. Maximizing opportunities for individual citizens is synonymous with maximizing the growth and expansion of the U.S. superpower economy. It is the age of information, stupid. It is the time of a computer and digitalization. It is the era of thousands of high-level vacancies, because there are not enough information technology workers with enlightened budget decisions. We can, at this moment, begin the shaping of the contours of a new cybercivilization.

If we fail to seize this moment to make investments that will allow our great Nation to surge forward in the creation of this new cybercivilization, then our children and our grandchildren will frown on us and lament the fact that we failed not because we lacked fiscal resources, but our failures, our very devastating blunder, was due to a poverty of vision.

We have custodians of unprecedented wealth in a giant economy, but midget minds and tiny spirits have seized control and the only big sweeping idea being generated during this budget discussion is a negative Republican proposal for a monster tax cut for the wealthy. At a time when positive generosity is possible, such a proposal maximizes great selfishness.

Now, this was at the time of the consideration of the budget and since that time, the Republican majority has retreated somewhat on the size of its proposed tax cut. We welcome that retreat, but we think of the lack of voices for investment, we want to invest a portion of the surplus in human resources, and we want to follow up that budget statement which was made, a very general statement made at that time, we want to follow up with more specific recommendations now.

The boldest and the most vital proposal contained in our CBC budget alternative was at the heart of this function; that is, funding for school construction, responding to the fact that the American people in numerous polls have indicated that their number one priority for Federal budget action is education.

Each of the budgets being present that were presented at that time offered education increases, but only the CBC budget has chosen to focus on the kingpin issue of school physical infrastructure. While we applaud the President's inclusion of $1.3 billion for emergency repairs, we deem it to be grossly inadequate.

We support school financing via the Tax Code, however, most of the local education agencies cannot borrow money without a lengthy taxpayer referendum procedure.

The CBC proposes a $10 billion increase over the President's budget for school construction. This amount would be taken from the $200 billion surplus. In addition to this 5 percent for infrastructure repair, security, and new construction, the CBC budget proposes another 5 percent, another $10 billion to address other education improvements. In other words, only 10 percent of the overall surplus would be utilized for the all-important mission of investment in human resources, only 10 percent.

1715

We proposed that at that time. We would like to underscore that proposal and say that we were talking about education, of course education improvements for everybody, education improvements for the entire Nation.

In fact, in my piece of specific legislation, our school construction, H.R. 3071, I proposed construction funding to be allocated to all schools throughout the Nation based on the number of school-age children in each State. There would be no other qualifying features except school-age children, which meant that every school district in the country would be able to receive some of the proposed Federal school infrastructure and modernization and construction funding.

We are now, as I said before, at the point where the negotiations specifically on amounts of money to go into this so-called omnibus budget that we hear about, omnibus appropriation act, the actual allocation of funds is going to take place somewhere between now and October 15. We have various projections on when Congress will adjourn. But I suspect that the outer limit in an election year like this that we will dare go will probably be in the middle of October.

So, therefore, I think it is reasonable to project that somewhere between now and October 15, this omnibus budget, this end-game negotiation product will be produced; and we will have to vote on it.

Right now I want to appeal to everybody listening who cares about education to become a part of the process. They become a part of the process by understanding the power of public opinion in this process. Public opinion is always being monitored by both parties. Leadership is always watching the polls, watching the results of focus groups. There are various ways in which public opinion makes itself felt here in Washington.

So I want my colleagues to understand that there is a danger right here that, despite the fact that we have enormous wealth, we have a huge budget surplus, the danger that we are going to make some ridiculous blunders. There is a danger that we are going to make some decisions about how to spend the first $200 billion or $230 billion of the surplus over this 10-year period which will set a pattern; and we will get set in that pattern, and we will find ourselves spending, utilizing funding in the same way for the next 10 years.

It is possible for the political leadership to make horrendous blunders. We know that wars and all kinds of catastrophes have been caused in the past by political leadership. Very intelligent, very well trained, very experienced, but still they make outrageous blunders. We know that is possible.

I would like to use the Roman Empire as an example that Rome was a great civilization, and it was in terms of technology, in terms of military

power, in terms of law. The Roman law is the basis on probably most of the civilized nations' legal systems today. The Romans started it all, a huge system of law with a level of courts and appeals. In addition to their military might and their technology prowess, the great civilization of Rome seemed to have it all.

But at the same time the Romans were inventing concrete and building magnificent structures and conquering the rest of the world at that time, the Romans were feeding the Christians to the lions in the Coliseum. The leadership of the Roman Empire, the politicians of the Roman Empire, the elected officials such as they were of the Roman Empire, were feeding the Christians to the lions at the height of the Roman civilization.

Politicians can make great blunders sometimes, and we must be aware of that. Public opinion has to be the check and balance on some of these blunders. We could look at the education situation in America now in terms of where it was a century ago and continue to make decisions as if we had little red schoolhouses and as if we still had teachers who were so dedicated that they would give their lives to the profession without being appropriately compensated.

We could act as if we are fighting wars with rifles. It was a long time when the rifle was supreme in the war, in any wars fought. We have evolved modern military technology.

The cost of a rifle now is not the way we judge whether or not we have a decent defense budget. Rifles are the least expensive item. If we were to look at the cost of rifles and say, well, we ought to have a defense budget which is reflective of the cost of rifles, it must be greatly reduced. We do not do that with the Department of Defense.

We have nuclear aircraft carriers that cost $4 billion and $5 billion. One nuclear aircraft carrier costs more than $4 billion. We recognize in modern warfare one has to have that kind of system. One F–22, talking about 20 some million dollars a piece, each time we make a mistake and fire one of these test rockets in our new proposed antimissile defense system, the mistake costs us $100 million. So in terms of defense and technology for the 21st century, we are ready to spend the money.

But when we start talking about education and schools, we want to go back to the Dark Ages, we want to go back to the horse and buggy era; and we think that 10 percent, 10 percent of the surplus is too much to dedicate to an increase in the education budget.

That is what the Congressional Black Caucus introduction, as I have just read, said we needed. It is a conservative request to say that if one has $200 billion, dedicate 10 percent of the $200 billion to an improvement in the school and education system. Invest in human resources.

Let us not think of schools as not needing that kind of money because, after all, it is only chalks and blackboards and low-paid teachers. Let us think of schools in the 21st century and all the kinds of needs that they face and be willing to invest at least 10 percent of the surplus in education.

Updating our Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget is a statement that we are preparing now to address to the leadership of the Democratic Party. We would like to at this point become more specific. Time has gone by. No one is addressing the request for 10 percent, half of which was to go to school construction. No one is addressing that. We are running out of time.

So we would like to go back and approach our leadership with a new request. The members of the Congressional Black Caucus are convinced that we are at a pivotal point in this 106th session of Congress and we are at a critical point in the history of our Nation.

For the first time in many decades, we have a Federal budget surplus, and we anticipate a significant surplus every year for the next 10 years. We have a window of opportunity to make positive budget decisions this year which will set a pattern for the next 10 years.

We, members of the Congressional Black Caucus, have already stated our general budget and appropriations priorities through the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget which emphasized the need to use our surplus to invest in human resources.

Since the countdown for the endgame negotiations has now begun, we wish to state our priorities in more specific and concrete requests. First, we wish to state that we agree with the prevailing wisdom that a large percentage of the $230 billion surplus should be used for debt reduction.

Remember, I said we had now gone beyond $200 billion, and the conservative estimate now is that the surplus after we get through with the Social Security surplus, and it has its own lockbox, leaving that aside, we still have $230 billion surplus as a conservative estimate.

We agree that the greater portion of that ought to be used for debt reduction. Pay down the national debt. Why is it important to pay down the national debt? Because when we pay down the national debt, we eliminate the interest payment on that debt that happens every year. We have a huge amount of money that just goes into the budget every year to pay the interest on the money that we owe.

If we pay down the debt, we eliminate the need for the interest payment at such a large size, and the money that would have gone into the interest payment can now be put into the regular budget for meaningful and productive activities. Or we can continue to pay down the debt with the money we save. It makes sense to use a large part of it to pay down the debt.

We also concur that some portion of the allocation of funds from the surplus should be used to strengthen Medicare and to provide for prescription medicine benefit. We are in agreement. If we have $230 billion, then most of it should go to pay down on the debt, but not all of it. Because, I mean, who would make this kind of choice?

If one receives an income bonus, either one's stocks pay off well or better than one expected, one suddenly receives a bonus at one's house, one's family, and one of one's children is going to college, one can now pay for their college tuition without having to borrow money, would one pay one's mortgage off instead of paying for the tuition of one's child who is about to go to school? Or would one invest in that tuition for that child, let them go to school, and continue one's mortgage for a little while longer?

I mean, we do not rush to pay off debts because there is a great virtue in paying off all debts. In the system that we have concocted, sometimes it makes sense to have long-term debts while we invest in immediate priorities.

I always say now do not use all of the money to pay down the debt. Invest some of the money in human resources. Is it so difficult to understand that? We want to emphasize the need to use our surplus to invest in human resources.

Since the countdown for the endgame negotiation has now begun, we wish to state our priorities in more specific and concrete requests. We were talking about a round figure of 10 percent for education for school construction, and another 10 percent for other education improvements. We were talking about focusing on the priority of school construction but also having money recognizing the other kinds of needs that we have.

First, we wish to agree with the prevailing wisdom, as I said before, that a large percentage should go to pay down the debt. Secondly, however, we contend that, after these priority steps are taken, there should be a significant investment in human resources. At least 10 percent of the surplus should be invested in education, 5 percent for school construction, and 5 percent for other school improvements.

We propose that another 10 percent be invested in housing, health care, and social services in our Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget. For the benefit of the Nation, the Congressional Black Caucus still stands firm on the adoption of all of these proposals.

If we had 10 percent for education and 10 percent for housing, social services and health care, that is 20 percent. We still have 80 percent. Out of that 80 percent, we can deal with shoring up Medicare, providing a Medicare prescription medicine benefit, giving a tax cut, a tax cut starting with the people at the lower rung instead of at the top, and paying down the debt. We still have quite a bit of money left. So give us our 10 percent for education.

Since the hour is late and the negotiations have begun, we now find it

necessary to move from general concerns to specific emergencies. Within the African American community, education remains as our greatest emergency. This is a solution that makes it possible to resolve most of the other problems we face. Education remains as our greatest emergency, the solution that makes it possible to resolve most of the other problems we face.

I might add that the problems faced by the African American communities are not unique. Low-income communities, working families communities face similar problems all over America. So when I propose a solution for problems that we face, particularly in the areas represented by the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am proposing solutions that apply to much of America where working families live who are not necessarily African American.

Our crisis education situations require a systemic and well-targeted Federal emergency education initiative. Right now, we are weary of the ability to deal with the problem in the terms we state it. There probably will not be an overall 10 percent for education. The mechanism is not there.

The leadership in charge appears to be ignoring the polls and public opinion for a change. Very rarely are the polls and public opinion ignored. But in a case of the demand for more government support for education, it is very interesting how the leadership of both parties choose to sort of talk about the problem without committing resources equal to the public demand.

1730

So the public demand has to be louder. We need to hear more from the public. And I will talk about that in terms of school construction in a few minutes. But I think that we have to now think in terms of a Federal emergency education initiative to deal with the fact that, in general terms, the problem of the worst schools in America escalates. The problem in the worst communities, which need the greatest amount of help, continues to escalate. So we want a Federal emergency education initiative which directly addresses the most critical problems of the worst schools of the Nation.

While the larger national education problems are being considered, we must have an immediate intensified initiative to address the Nation's schools which serves populations where more than 50 percent of the students qualify for free school lunches or where schools are failing and their local systems or the State authorities are ordering that they be closed down because they are just not functioning. They do not meet standards that have been set. Those are crisis schools. They are in crisis situations. They are in crisis school districts. So we need an emergency initiative to meet the crises.

I am defining the crisis situation quite clearly. The school lunch program, children who qualify for the school lunch program, are the poorest children in America. We have used that as a benchmark for measuring how funds are allocated by the Federal Government. The E-rate, for example, the most recent and most creative allocation of national funds, is done on the basis of the number of children who qualify for free school lunches. A school where 90 percent of the children qualify for free school lunches can get a 90 percent E-rate discount; where less qualified, the E-rate goes down. So the discount for the E-rate is less in the schools that are a little better off, and the wealthier schools of course can get a 15 percent standard discount, but no greater than that in the areas where the schools are serving students who do not qualify at all for the school lunch program.

So for crisis situation schools we need a Federal education initiative, and that initiative should contain the following components:

One major component has to be accelerated school construction and modernization. We must move faster to relieve our school systems of the burden of some of their cost for school construction, school repairs, school modernization. We must do that.

I regret to report the fact that there seems to be this determination, a dogged determination, to ignore school construction needs, not only here in Washington, but a dogged determination in State governments and in city governments. Certainly New York is an example of a situation where 2 years ago the mayor of the City of New York had a $2 billion surplus. $2 billion is not like $200 billion, but for a city to have a surplus of $2 billion is significant, especially since this city has seen hard times and we have had deficits and had a brush with bankruptcy at one point in the last 20 years. So to have a $2 billion surplus was a great window of opportunity for the city.

Not a single penny of that surplus was spent on school repairs and school construction. Now, this is in a city which at that time had more than 175 schools that were still burning coal in the school furnaces. We have something like 1,200 schools in New York, and 175 are so old or neglected that they still have furnaces that burn coal. This is in a city where the air already is polluted enough; in a city where asthma is a major problem. We still burn coal in some of the school furnaces and not a single penny of the $2 billion surplus was allocated by the mayor of the City of New York to assist with school repairs.

Not a single member of the city council, certainly no member representing part of my district, spoke up. Some of them, who are quite friendly with the mayor of the City of New York, did not speak out against the coal-burning furnaces in our district. They did not say, look, we ought to use some of this money to get rid of the coal burning furnaces. We have a situation where children are placed at risk. Certainly if they have asthma, it is aggravated by the fact they go into a situation where there is coal dust in the air. Coal dust is in the air no matter how good the filter situation is.

I know this is true because the first house I ever owned was a house that had a coal burning furnace, and we had all kinds of filters and did all kinds of cleanup, but the coal dust still got through and the coal dust was there. I was very happy to replace that coal-burning furnace with a gas-burning furnace because just the battle with the dust was enough to merit a movement as fast as possible away from a situation with a coal-burning furnace.

When we have hundreds of children who go to school every day throughout the winter into a situation where they are placed at risk by coal-burning furnaces it ought to be declared an emergency. We ought to have both the city and the State, as well as the Federal Government, moving as rapidly as possible to remove those remaining 175 coal-burning furnaces.

I am told by the school construction authority that, as a result of our agitation for the last 3 years, they now have a schedule whereby by the end of the year 2001 all of the coal-burning furnaces will be eliminated. Now, they will be eliminated after having existed for all these many decades since the invention of better, more efficient oil-burning and gas-burning furnaces. But this is an emergency which is ignored by public officials.

Yet this is only one of many emergencies related to the problem of school construction. We need funds at every level to go into play and to deal with basic problems that schools face. I do not ever represent school construction as being the only problem or the only priority that our schools face. The training of proper teachers, certified teachers, science teachers, math teachers, that is a problem equally as important; and I do not want to downplay that. Having decent laboratories in schools and decent libraries, there are many priorities.

But I do point out the fact that the school building, the edifice, sends a message like no other component of the education system sends. It says to the children and it says to the teachers and the community that the people who are in charge, the elected officials who make decisions, whether they are Congresspeople or city council people or State legislators, the people who make the decisions care. It is a highly visible statement.

If a school no longer has a coal-burning furnace, it meant that we cared about the situation enough, we cared about education, we cared about the students. If a school is not overcrowded to the point where classrooms have to be held in the hallways or in closets converted into classrooms, or there is a situation where the children have to start eating lunch at 10 a.m. in the morning because the students have to be cycled through the lunchroom because the lunch building that was built

for 500 children now has 1,500. There are schools that must have three or four lunch periods and the first lunch period begins at 10 a.m., when the child just had breakfast.

Now, some of my colleagues might say, well, that is an unusual situation; why should I talk about an extreme situation. Well, if a survey were to be conducted in any big city in America, we would find similar things are happening; and it happens in New York City on a large scale. There are a large number of schools where children have to eat lunch at 10 a.m. in the morning. And yet we are in a situation now where we have surpluses at the State level, surpluses at the city level, and surpluses here in Washington.

I would like to say to every parent listening, or every decent citizen listening and who knows a situation where children are being forced to eat lunch at 10 a.m. in the morning, just after they have had breakfast, I would like to see our sense of decency and fair play be brought to bear on this outrageous practice. It is child abuse to force a student to eat lunch before 11 a.m. in the morning or after 1 p.m. Those who eat after 1 p.m. are hungry; those who eat at 10 a.m. do not want to eat breakfast. They are not hungry. They are being force-fed. That is child abuse.

We have accepted this as a routine, ordinary part of getting through the school emergency situation in New York. The school space emergency situation is like routine now. Every year they announce, well, we are 26,000 or 20,000 seats short. That happens at the beginning of the school year and we wonder, what happened; how did they deal with the problem? Well, somehow they crammed them into hallways, they crammed them into closets, they put them into situations where they have to eat lunch at 10 a.m. in the morning. They come to grips with the problem. They solve the problems by dehumanizing the children.

So every parent, every decent human being in New York City should do all of us a favor by rising up and saying, look, we will not tolerate this kind of child abuse any more. Join us in a court suit. Let us go to the health department. The health department regulates day care centers and Head Start. They have tight regulations on what happens in facilities that serve children, but they put a waiver on the board of education. They have nothing to do basically with the operations of the board of education and the schools.

So many kinds of horrendous things happen in respect to school space, ventilation and, in this case, the actual serving of lunch, which would not be allowed to happen in a day care center or Head Start center. We should not tolerate it any longer.

For those people down here in Washington who are now pushing aside all discussions of school construction, school repairs, and are genteelly talking about everything else in education, but who refuse to recognize that there is a need in the area of school construction, I say that they are part of the problem of forcing this child abuse situation where we are forcing children to eat lunch just after they have had breakfast. These people must bear part of the blame. They may not be as bad as the Romans, who were feeding the Christians to the lions at a time when they had great prosperity and a high civilization, but they are guilty of something on a smaller scale that I think their grandchildren would not be very proud of.

We have the money, we have the wealth, we have a surplus, we can deal with the problem of school construction. If the Federal Government were to give a portion of the money, it would stimulate and force the State governments and city governments to do more. We could eliminate these major problems of school overcrowding. We could eliminate that in the next 10 years. We have the resources to do it. So let us stop the child abuse. Do not force students to eat lunch, and parents should be indignant, and everybody else indignant, about that kind of child abuse.

A second problem is that the outdoor and inside pollution caused by coal-burning furnaces constitutes a direct threat to the health of all children, and teachers too. Children with asthma are particularly placed at risk in these situations, in a city with an asthma epidemic. The mayor of the city, a little more than a year ago, had a special asthma initiative. And they are so cruel, so much like the Roman politicians, because they deliberately never mentioned coal-burning furnaces as part of the problem. That was not an accident.

There are coal-burning furnaces in schools. If they draw the map of where the largest concentration of asthma cases are, where the asthma epidemic is, we can see the overlap with the places where we have the schools with the coal-burning furnaces. Any intelligent person can see the correlation, but the correlation was not recognized deliberately. Many articles in the newspapers were written, but nobody wanted to offend his majesty in city hall so they never said coal-burning furnaces are part of the problem, Mr. Mayor. Why not appropriate some money to get rid of coal-burning furnaces?

We are part of the problem if we do not take the initiative now and use some of the funds we have here. Whose money is it, the $200 billion surplus? Does it belong to the Federal Government? My friends on the other side are telling us all the time it is the people's money. All taxes are local. All funding of government comes from the local level. We want to give it back. It is not a great act of generosity by the Federal Government to make money available for school construction or any other local purpose. It is one way we can help education without becoming involved, without being accused of trying to take over the decision-making process at the local level.

1745

It is a capital expenditure, school construction. Go in, give the money, and oversee the process of getting the building going and get out. You do not have to stay around to interfere with operational decisions of the school board. Just help with the immediate physical infrastructure problem.

Item three: the departments of government should fully enforce all health and building codes in school buildings and no waivers should be granted.

Along with coal-burning furnaces, which should not be allowed by the health department in schools, you have many other violations. There was a survey done with the help of the United Federation of Teachers. The teachers union pushed for a survey. And every school building in New York has been inspected and there is a record of violations, a computerized record of violations. And many of them have numerous violations which, if they were not schools, they would be forced to immediately make the repairs or close down.

So we elected officials, members of government, decision-makers are part of the problem if we allow these violations to continue to exist jeopardizing the safety and health of children in our schools.

We also have a problem with school libraries and laboratories and facilities which allow children to really get the kind of education they need.

The Board of Regents of New York State, like many other State bodies, have established certain standards and no child will be able to graduate and receive a diploma of any kind. They used to give a general diploma. If you did not pass the mathematics, the science and the English and the couple other regents tests, you got a general diploma. Well, they have decreed that no child will get any diploma if they do not pass certain Regents tests.

Among those tests is a Regents science examination. We ought to postpone, eliminate the mandated Regents science examination required before a student can qualify for a diploma unless and until we have all high schools equipped with laboratories where they can have real science teaching take place.

Science teachers will tell us now that theoretical science teaching, teaching only through theory, is not complete science instruction; you have to have laboratories. And yet, if you do not have the physical facilities, you use these old buildings which if you probably installed a decent laboratory, something will malfunction. They will catch fire or blow up.

They do not have the wiring or the ventilation. They need in many cases totally new buildings, or they need massive renovation in order to have a decent science laboratory.

We are enforcing standards and we are dumping on the students' backs the

responsibility of learning while we do not want to use valuable resources. The dollars are here. The money is here at the Federal level and at other levels, and we want to ignore it. I am not sure why. Some people say because the majority of the Members of Congress, their children are either in private schools or they are in suburban schools, which are very well taken care of. They do not have construction repair problems.

I hate to believe that my colleagues do not accept the responsibility for all the schools and all the children in the Nation. At a time when we have the resources, I hate to believe that they turn their back on a portion of the population which very much needs to have an investment in their education.

We have shortages of all kinds. Everybody is complaining about information technology shortages; we do not have young people who can actually fill the jobs. In the information technology industry, we do not have the people to do the computer programming, and we are importing people from outside.

On the floor of the Congress, we are going to have a discussion of H–1B which lifts the quota for the number of professionals who can come into the Nation because we need those professionals from outside the Nation to fill the jobs.

And on and on it goes, the discussion which ignores the simple fact that, in the long run, we have to train our own population, we cannot rely on school systems of foreign countries to provide us with the manpower, with the professionals or any other degree of manpower in this digitalized economy that we need.

So let us invest and let us have the broad view, the compassion necessary to see that, in our inner city schools, in our schools which serve the poorest youngsters. And there is a correlation between the construction problems and the schools which have overcrowding and the schools which do not have laboratories the schools which have the least number of certified teachers, the correlation is always in income.

The low-income schools, where the parents have the least education and the least ability to deal with the system, they are always the ones who have these problems.

Another item: the use of trailers in school playgrounds. The use of trailers in school playgrounds to relieve overcrowding should be limited to situations that are temporary substitutes for buildings under repair or in the process of construction. We should become indignant. Everybody out there should look at those trailers, and sometimes they have been around 10 years or more, and say that this was supposed to have been a temporary solution.

Children should not have to go to school in trailers. They should not have to be in situations where in the winter time, in order for them to go to the bathroom, they have got to come out of the trailer and go into the main building. They should not be in situations where the ventilation and the situation is not up to par in terms of the square footage necessary to accommodate a full class of children.

We should become indignant about the continuation of an emergency use of trailers when we have a $200 billion surplus. The mere dedication of 10 percent of that will allow us in 10 years to wipe out these kinds of problems.

Teachers for the classrooms is another program that we have emphasized greatly. We want to reduce the ratio of children to teachers. We want teachers to have smaller classes. All of us are in favor of that. I never heard of a Republican or Democrat against teachers having smaller classes.

But there is a racketeering process set in the inner-city communities, certainly in New York City. We have taken the money to reduce the ratio of children to teachers, but since we do not have the classrooms, it is not happening. Sometimes they put in an additional teacher, an additional teacher goes into a crowded classroom. That is not what we meant. And you do not have the kind of teaching taking place when you have children crowded into a classroom, even though you have a second adult. That is not what is meant.

We are spending large sums of money for teacher development or a number of other kinds of options that are in the law which they can take, while they stall on the basic problem of getting more teachers into the classroom.

You cannot get classrooms that have smaller class sizes unless you build more classrooms or renovate classrooms. Teachers for the classroom funding ought to be used to lower the ratio of students to teachers within separate classrooms, not for the assignment of a second teacher to a crowded classroom or for some other auxiliary purpose. More classrooms must be made available.

Otherwise, the number one item in our program, in our platform of teachers to the classroom, which we all are proud of, that item is sabotaged and we are really not honest about what we are doing.

Finally, accreditation should be denied to any school which lacks an adequate physical infrastructure. I talked about laboratories. But the playroom space, the gym, all these things are part of the experience necessary to educate young people.

Substandard and nonaccredited school buildings ought to be closed. We ought to create a crisis. Instead of continuing to accept these half measures which are dangerous to the psyche of kids as well as to their physical bodies, let us wage war on our own decision-makers. Let us understand that it is possible that we can make real blunders here and have blinders on. They are blinders which say school construction, that is too radical, anything related to school construction will give the impression that we are big spenders; and we do not want to be accused of being big spenders.

It is all right to have $4 billion for an aircraft carrier. It is all right to spend $218 billion for highways and roads over a 6-year period. But do not talk about school construction $10 billion a year. Do not even talk about $2 billion a year.

I want to applaud the President for at least putting $1.3 billion in the budget that he proposed. But since he proposed that, there is very little discussion. As we get closer to the end-game negotiations, I do not hear any discussion about the $1.3 billion direct appropriation in the budget that the President proposed.

All I hear about is the $25 billion that is being proposed in the Committee on Ways and Means to loan. We have a proposal that $25 billion would be available. The Government is willing to pay interest on up to $25 billion. So a local school district or the State can borrow money, and we will pay the interest. Rah, rah, rah.

We have a $200 billion surplus, and all we are willing to do is to pay between $3 billion and $4 billion in interest or money borrowed by the local governments.

Will it help New York City and New York State? Not likely. Because you have to have a school bond issue on the ballot. People have to approve the borrowing of money to build schools before you can borrow the money. And there are other places in the Nation with similar problems.

I am all for what is now called the Rangel-Johnson school modernization bill. I am one of the cosponsors. And we should go forward with it. But it is only a small part of the problem. It can help districts which are able to use borrowed money and use it rapidly, but do not have to go through a process of taking it to the voters. We have turned down in the last 10 years two bond issues that might have helped schools.

So we need direct appropriation. The Congressional Black Caucus would like to specifically request that we have more direct appropriation to be allocated to the schools in crisis situations. That is the schools that are serving large numbers of low-income youngsters who qualify for the free lunch program and the schools that are being closed down because they are not functioning properly.

There is a crisis. There is a crisis out there, and we need to rally to meet that crisis. We should not allow future generations to look upon the situation we face now when we have a golden window of opportunity, a $230 billion surplus and we are so blind, so hard-hearted, so mean-spirited, so whatever that we cannot see the need to invest in students and young people.

What other reason is there to not set aside a substantial portion of a $230 billion surplus for education?

Substantial is conservative. We talked about we are asking for 10 percent. Ten percent of $200 billion is $20

billion. Ten percent of $200 billion is $20 billion. Over a 10-year period, 10 percent is $200 billion for school construction and other education improvements.

Why are we going to pass up this opportunity and be guilty of history saying that we were no better than the great Romans? We had the technology. We had the economy. We had the military might. Rome was really a village compared to the United States of America at this point in history. There is nothing that has ever existed like the United States of America colossus. We are a colossus.

Given all of this, how can we not make an investment in every human being out there? The human investment is the key now. Brain power drives everything. Brain power is obviously the kind of power that sustains us now and will carry us into the future. Let us at least have the vision to make the investment in the brain power.

There are alternative education proposals being proposed by the Republican candidate for President and the Democratic candidate for President, the leadership of the House. All of the general outlines and the general plans that are being set forth we cannot quarrel with; we applaud. Most of the approaches on both sides are approaches that address serious problems related to education in America.

The problem is priorities. The problems is seeing an emergency. The worst schools in America should not be deserted. The worst schools in America should not be abandoned as we prepare plans and we allocate resources for education. The worst schools have to be dealt with first.

If we solve the problems of the worst schools and we deal with the challenges that are faced by the worst school systems, then we are in a position to deal with all the others. They become much easier. If we solve the problems faced by the worst schools, we also recoup the lost resources that we face as those youngsters fail to enter into the stream that carries them through high school graduation into higher education institutions.

We need improvements of all kinds. The Congressional Black Caucus will be proposing to the leadership in the next few days as we move into the finality of the end-game negotiations that we examine not only the school construction, which is the first priority, but Pell Grants need to have more money. We need a technical research center for Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Teacher recruitment needs more funds. Training and the certification of teachers is still a major problem. The 21st century learning centers, the after-school centers, we need more of them. In our crisis, school districts, every district should have some of those learning centers.

1800

They should not be allocated on the basis of competitive grants but allocated on the basis of need. We should have more money, produce more centers and allocate them on the basis of need. We are firmly convinced that a demand of this kind is in the interest of all of America. If you address the problems that are the worst problems, you will certainly be in a position to solve all the rest of the problems. Construction should not be pushed off to the side and abandoned as an undesirable activity because it might cost money. It will cost so much more to build prisons in the future, to build correction facilities in the future. It will cost so much more to have to compensate for the waste of human resources that will result from our failure to educate those who are in greatest need.

I would like to end by saying we are at the end of a process we started when we covered the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget. Our priorities are the same. We would like to zero in and talk about specific dollar figures for school construction in the communities where they have the greatest need. If you are not going to do it for everybody, at least we should do school construction in the communities with the greatest need. At least we should have an aggressive program for teacher training, teacher recruitment and certification of teachers in the communities with the greatest need. If we are not going to address the education problem generally as we should address it, at least we insist that you focus the dollars that are available through the surplus on the schools which have the greatest need. We can do no less.

NIGHTSIDE CHAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, again another nightside chat. I have two very important subjects that I want to address with my colleagues this evening. The first subject is going to be Wen Ho Lee. That is a name that is familiar to all of you. He is the gentleman, and I can tell you that I stretch the words when I utilize the word ''gentleman,'' you will follow me a little later on, out of New Mexico who was arrested by the FBI at Los Alamos lab. I intend this evening to tell the other side of the story of Wen Ho Lee.

The second thing, of course, is a complete shift of agenda. I want to talk about Social Security and the obligations all of us have to the future generations on saving Social Security, on doing something about Social Security that is going to make a difference for these generations, on doing something about Social Security so that Social Security is there for these future generations, on doing something about Social Security so that those young people, the generations behind those of us who are midlife in our working careers, so that those people have some kind of voluntary choice, some kind of voice in how their investments are made, so that they can get a return better than the 1 percent return that most of us on Social Security will experience under today's program.

But first of all let me begin with Wen Ho Lee. The last few days have been amazing to me in the press. In fact, the last month. I used to be a police officer. My district is in Colorado. I used to be a police officer out in Colorado. So I do have kind of a law enforcement slant. But through my years of law enforcement and also through my years in the practice of law, especially the areas where I did family law, I found out something pretty interesting in my early career. It is kind of like if you have a small child that comes up to you, you have two kids, two small children that have gotten in a fight with each other. The one child comes up to you and explains their side of the fight. They tell you what in their mind is the truth. Then the other child comes up to you and tells you their side of the story which is exactly contrary to the side of the story that you just heard but in their eyes that is the concept of the truth. In other words, the truth usually is out there and there are almost always, and I learned this time after time, when I would arrive at the scene of an accident or at the scene of a fight or at the scene of a domestic dispute, I always found that when I first got there, most of the time you better listen to the other side of the story because most of the time the facts are not as they appear upon first arrival. That is exactly what has happened here.

In the last few days or the last month, I have almost been sickened by reading some of the national media that makes Wen Ho Lee, this gentleman right here, sound as if he is a martyr, makes him sound as if he is a hero. And these news media reports and some of the people, one of the things they like to jump up and they play the race card. Forget it. It is not going to work in this one. They play sympathy. ''Well, he was picked upon. The poor guy was abused.'' Forget it.

You better listen to the second side, the other side of the story. How easy it is to trash the FBI and trash the Attorney General. I can tell you I am no fan of the Attorney General, but in this case the Attorney General is right. In this case the Federal Bureau of Investigation is right. I stood on this floor in front of you as one of the harshest critics of the Federal Bureau of Investigation as a former police officer when they goofed up at Ruby Ridge which in my opinion was one of the darkest black eyes that the FBI has given to law enforcement in law enforcement's entire career in this country.

So I think I approach this from a fairly impartial view. I criticize the FBI when I think they should be criticized. I am not a fan of the Attorney

General, Janet Reno, but on the other hand when they are right, we ought to stand up here and talk about it. What we are doing is letting the media get away with what I think is one of the most atrocious incidents in recent history.

At the beginning of my remarks, I told you how I wanted to address today Social Security and future generations. If you want to talk about something that is going to have an impact on future generations, wait till you hear my story today about what this gentleman's contribution is to future generations.

The question is here, who is the victim? That is the newest concept. I used to practice law as I mentioned. There are a couple of ways that you defend a client who is guilty, who you know is guilty. First of all you try and point out that the client, really the defendant, the person that you are defending did not intend to commit the crime. And if that does not work, then what you do is you attack the witnesses. You try and show that the prosecution witnesses are biased or somehow they are crooks themselves or they are not worthy of their testimony. And then the third approach you do in trying to defend somebody is make your client look like the victim. My client is the victim here, not the person that got raped or murdered or shot or burglarized. My client is the victim. Look at how abused they were in their childhood, look at all of the things they did out in our society and this is what caused him to commit that kind of crime. That is exactly what has happened in the last few days or in the last month. This guy is being victimized. This is the victim.

Wait till you hear my story. I am going to bring you out the other side of the facts on this. My question, my comment is here, who is really the victim? Is it Wen Ho Lee? Or is it us, the United States? Is it us, the citizens, our future generations? I advance to you this evening that the victims in this particular case are not the defendant, the victims in this case is the United States of America and all future generations of the United States of America.

Let us start with some facts. First of all, as many of you know, Wen Ho Lee was a scientist who had access to the most secret nuclear information and material we have in this Nation. He had one of the most trusted positions that we divvy out, so to speak, in our government. He had access to the basics and the fundamental scientific knowledge and the construction knowledge and the practical knowledge of the most devastating weapons known in the history of mankind. We do not just willy-nilly give out that kind of access. Why? That is self-explanatory. We all know in this Chamber what will happen if that information gets into the wrong hands. We know, too, that if that information gets into the wrong hands, that is one weapon, just one weapon is all it takes, but you can make numerous weapons. But that weapon alone is a weapon that could destroy the United States of America. It is the only weapon in existence we know of today, nuclear capabilities, maybe some biological but primarily nuclear capabilities are about the only weapon today that could destroy the destiny of the United States of America. I cannot emphasize on my colleagues enough the importance of the secrecy of this information that we have in the Los Alamos lab. And this gentleman, this guy right here, Wen Ho Lee, he was entrusted by the American people to keep those documents secret. And now some of the very people who, in my opinion, he has betrayed, and I use that word with some caution, I do not typically stand on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and talk about betrayal by a citizen but I am telling you today, that is what has happened.

Let us go into some facts, the other side of the story. As Paul Harvey would say, now it is time for the rest of the story. These quotes, by the way, are a direct testimony, given under oath, in front of the United States Senate by the Director of the FBI and by the Attorney General. Let us go over some facts about this scientist, Wen Ho Lee. It is critical to understand that Wen Ho Lee's conduct was not inadvertent. It was not careless. And it was not innocent. Over a period of years, Lee used an elaborate scheme to move the equivalent of 400,000 pages of extremely sensitive nuclear weapon files from a secure part of the Los Alamos computer system to an unclassified, unsecure part of the system which could be accessed from outside of Los Alamos, indeed from anywhere in the world.

Another additional fact here. At one point in time, this scientist, while he was overseas in Taiwan, tried to access this equipment. We have it on the computer. We traced it through on the computer. What are we talking about here? What this fellow did is that kind of information is highly classified obviously and on the computers there are indications that give you the different levels of classification. The classification for this material is highly top secret or whatever classification they use, they call it the X information, so it was classified as X information.

Wen Ho Lee used a very methodical method to move the classification as top secret or as an X file, to remove that from the designation and replace it with a nonclassified designation. So, in other words, he made top secret material look like it was not top secret, that it was regular material. Then he moved it onto his computer and then he accessed it and made copies of that kind of thing. To move a document from highly classified or top secret to nonclassified, it does not happen by a bump of an elbow or you push the wrong button on the keyboard. It takes several coordinated, sophisticated steps.

We know that Wen Ho Lee, in fact, for a long period of time failed in his attempts. He had to work his way through, which he did by experimentation until he mastered how to take top secret classification heading, take it off the document and put a nonclassified documentation on there so then you could move the documents without suspicion. And 400,000 pages. That is the equivalent of what he transferred out of top secret; 400,000 pages of the most sensitive secret nuclear weapon material that this government possesses. Yet some people are out there trying to make this guy look like some kind of martyr or that he has been picked upon by our government or that somehow it is abusive for us to go and accuse him of being a spy or make these kind of accusations.

By the way, he is a felon. There is no mistake about it. He is not an accused felon. He is a felon. Keep that in mind. In order to achieve his ends, Wen Ho Lee had to override the default mechanism. He had to override them, an intentional movement that required several steps that were designed to prevent any accidental or inadvertent movement of those files. His downloading process consumed nearly 40 hours over a period of 70 different days.

1815

So do not let anyone tell you when they arrive upon the scene of an accident that this transfer of material was inadvertent, or that it was an oversight, or that this scientist did it by pushing the wrong button. These systems are built for fail-safe, so that that kind of thing does not accidentally happen.

Let us go on. Nor was this all. Wen Ho Lee carefully and methodically removed classification markings from documents. He attempted repeatedly to enter secure areas of the Los Alamos labs after his access had been revoked, including one attempt at 3:30 in the morning on Christmas Eve.

Now, imagine, every one of you in here, what were you doing at 3:30 in the morning on Christmas Eve? Were you trying to use a stairwell to get up to an office here in the Capitol? Those are what we call burglar hours. The only people up trying to gain access at that time in the morning, generally you have to be a little bit suspicious about what is going on. And on Christmas Eve, most people are home with their families on Christmas Eve.

It would be highly unusual to see somebody trying to enter into an area of which their access had been revoked, of which they were denied access to, highly unusual to see them all of a sudden at 3:30 in the morning going up a stairwell trying to gain access to a top secret area.

Let us continue. He deleted files in an attempt to cover his tracks before he was caught.

I am going to go over that in a little more detail too. I have a chart here.

We are going to go to this chart, and I will show you what happens when this fellow fails a lie detector test. I will tell you what happens when the FBI presents him with evidence.

Primarily what you are going to see is once he figures out they are on top of him, then he tries to get back in there and coverup his tracks by erasing files.

Let us go on. Wen Ho Lee created his own portable secret library of this Nation's nuclear weapons secrets. My gosh, do you see what I have just said? Look at this. A citizen creates his own library, his own personal library, of the Nation's most sensitive nuclear weapons secrets.

Now, does that sound like an innocent bystander to you, somebody is out on Saturday afternoon putting together a butterfly collection? This is serious stuff.

Let us go on. He stood before a Federal Court judge and admitted his wrongdoing and pleaded guilty to a felony. Contrary to some reports, there is nothing minor or insignificant about that crime.

It amazes me that the media and some of the people that I have talked to think that, well, he just pleaded guilty to something totally insignificant, that this poor guy is being picked upon.

The restricted data that Wen Ho Lee downloaded into 10 portable computer tapes included, listen to this, included the electronic blueprints of the exact dimensions and geometry of this Nation's nuclear weapons.

Does that sound like a guy that has been picked on to you? That does not sound that way to me.

There are always two sides to a story. Let us go on with this side of the story.

Here are the steps that are required to download and create tapes. So any of you out there that think, well, this was innocently done, or, you know, it was a distraction, or, you know, he just wanted to experiment, keep in mind 400,000 pages, that is what the equivalent is. Let us talk about the steps to move this over, partition it from classified to nonclassified, download and create tapes.

First of all you have to log into a secure computer system by entering a password and a Z number. You then need to access data in red, which means secure, partition, then hit save, and then CLU equal U, classification level equals unclassified. Then you need to access the C machine and type commands. There are numerous commands that you have to type in to down partition from a secure partition to an open, unsecure machine. You then access that machine to save the data into a green unsecured directory. Then you have to log on to a colleague's computer outside of the X division. Remember, X division is top secret. That is the highest secrets of the Nation. You have to then access outside the X division and insert a tape into the tape drive. Then you access the open directory and copy files on to the portable tape.

In other words, the purpose of that chart right there simply is to tell you, hey, this guy knew what he was doing. This was not some country bumpkin in there playing games on a computer. He knew exactly what he was doing. Not only did he know what he was doing before he was caught, he built his own library. By the way, you will find out later in my discussion a good portion of this library is missing. It is gone.

Now, the guy who lied to us, the guy who tried to evade the truth and who tried to cover his tracks, now tells us, ''There is nothing to worry about, I erased them. They are erased. You don't have to be concerned about this.''

This gives you an idea of what intentionally was required for him to complete his mission.

Let us continue. Wen Ho Lee worked for the X division, which I explained earlier as the top secret division at Los Alamos Laboratory. The X division is responsible for the research, design and development of thermo-nuclear weapons and requires the highest level of security at any division at Los Alamos.

X division scientists most familiar with the downloaded information, so we went to other scientists and said you are familiar with this information that has been downloaded by Wen Ho Lee. Let us talk about it. These scientists would have testified that Wen Ho Lee took every significant, every, he did not miss anything, every significant piece of information to which a nuclear designer would want access, every key piece of information.

He did not just pull up one little piece of information that looked cute and thought this would be kind of fun to experiment with. Every piece of information that was necessary for research, design and development of thermo-nuclear weapons, he changed classification and he downloaded it into his own personal library. And not only did he download into his own personal library, he tried to access the official computers from overseas, and he took copies of his library, and now he claims he has lost it or the files were deleted, he went ahead and erased them because he did not want people to get access.

Before Wen Ho Lee created these tapes, and this is so important, this is so important, before Wen Ho Lee created these tapes, only two sites in the world held this complete design portfolio. Only two sites in the entire world had that information; the secure computer inside the highest security division at Los Alamos and the secure computer system inside the highest security division of another one of our national laboratories. We only had that information in two places in this country.

Now, somewhere, we have got three locations, thanks to Wen Ho Lee, who some people out there are calling a martyr. Some people are saying he has been victimized by an overzealous FBI or an overzealous Attorney General. You are going to get to make the decision.

The first poster I put up had a question mark on it, because I wanted my colleagues at the end of my comments today, you decide, is he the victim, or is the United States of America the victim?

Let us go on. It was not a simple task for Wen Ho Lee to move files from the closed to the open system. The CFS tracking system reveals that Wen Ho Lee spent hours unsuccessfully trying to move classified files into unclassified space, meaning he could not quite get it down. So he worked on it. You know, practice makes perfect.

He practiced on it, and he practiced on it. He would get a step, and over time he got these steps down so he could figure out to a very calculating move how to move material that has been labeled classified to material that is now labeled unclassified.

Wen Ho Lee eventually worked his way around what was designed to be a cumbersome process. By design it is complicated, so this kind of thing is very tough to do. Wen Ho Lee had to command the computer to declassify the files, when he was well aware that the files contained some of the most sensitive classified information at Los Alamos.

Nuclear weapons restricted data downloaded by Wen Ho Lee into portable tapes. Let us go through it again very quickly.

These weapons restricted data downloads, input deck, input file information, so this is some of the material that he downloaded. This is material that this scientist downloaded, switched from classified to nonclassified. The electronic blueprint of the exact dimensions and geometry of this nation's thermo-nuclear weapons, including our most sophisticated modern weapons or warheads; data files including, these are some of the files that he took, nuclear bomb testing protocol, libraries reflecting the data collected from actual tests of nuclear weapons. Next, data concerning nuclear weapons bomb test problems, yield calculations and other nuclear weapon design and detonation information.

Next, information relating to the physical and radioactive properties of materials used to construct nuclear weapons. Source codes that he downloaded. Data used for determining by simulation the validity of nuclear weapon designs and for comparing bomb test results with predicted results.

Let us move on. There is more to the story to come.

This is a quote. Of everything I say this evening to you, this is probably the most important. ''And make no mistake about the scope of this offense and the danger it presents to our Nation's security.'' As an expert from Los Alamos testified in this case, ''The material downloaded and copied by Wen Ho Lee represented the complete nuclear weapons design capability at Los

Alamos at that time, approximately 50 years, approximately 50 years of nuclear development.''

Fifty years, the most sophisticated data we have and 50 years of accumulated data. We had an expert to come in, his name was Dr. Yunger, listen very carefully. I will read it very slowly, because each word has its own meaning in a very substantive way.

''These codes,'' the codes that he downloaded, ''these codes and their associated databases and the input file, combined with someone that knew how to use them, could, in my opinion, in the wrong hands, change, ''change, the global strategic balance.'' Change the entire global strategic balance.

That information that this so-called picked-upon scientist, that this scientist that people are trying to point out as a victim, the information he moved out of our top secret laboratories could change the global strategic balance.

This is serious stuff. You talk about the next generation and future generations? Tell me how much you want to thank this guy for what he has done for our future generations in this country.

They enabled the possessor to design the only objects, and let me repeat this, they enable the possessor to design the only objects that could result in the military defeat of America's conventional forces. They enable the possessor, whoever has this material, can now design the only weapon known that could completely destroy the American conventional forces.

Let us go on. The only threat, for example, to our carrier battle groups. They represent the gravest possible security risk to the United States, what the President and most other Presidents have described as the supreme national interests of the United States. The gravest security risk to the United States of America, and we have newspapers in this country saying, well, this guy was picked upon.

Let us move on, because we got more of the story. Let us talk, for example, about what chronological events concerning this individual occurred.

Let us, for example, take a few days, significant events between December 23, 1998, and February 10, 1999. On December 23, two days before Christmas, 1998, at 2:18 in the afternoon, the Department of Energy polygraph of Lee is completed. They gave him a polygraph that day. They completed that polygraph.

At five o'clock, he was advised by his superiors that his access to the secure areas of the X division, in other words, the top secret compartments at Los Alamos, his access was yanked to both his secure and open X division computer accounts. They suspended it. They said you cannot go in the X area any more. Your computer files, you are not to access them any more. Pretty plain English. Very understandable. Your rights to go in there are suspended. Do not go in there.

At 9:36 that evening, mind you, he worked all day, at 9:36 he reappears at the lab. He makes four attempts, four attempts, to enter the laboratory, the secure area of X division, through stairwell number two. Apparently they have caught him on camera. At 9:39, three minutes later, he again attempts to enter the secure area of X division, but this time trying the south elevator. So he tries four attempts one direction, cannot master it there, so he comes up and now tries it through a different approach.

The next day, December 24, this is Christmas Eve, at 3:30 in the morning on Christmas Eve, 3:30 in the morning on Christmas Eve, he again shows up at the laboratory. He again attempts to enter a secure area of the X division through the south stairwell, number two. December 24th through January 3rd, Thursday through Sunday of that week, Thursday through Sunday of that week, Los Alamos is closed for the holidays.

1830

So the entire laboratory is closed down for the holidays. Remember, Christmas Eve morning, 3 o'clock in the morning, here he is trying to gain access to an area from which he was specifically instructed he was suspended. He was not allowed to enter that area. So during these few days that the lab is closed for the holidays, look what Dr. Lee does.

On January 4, 1999, Monday, he succeeds in having his open computer account reactivated and deletes three computer files. On January 12, he deletes another computer file. January 17, the FBI conducts an interview of Lee at his residence. On January 20, from 11:00 to 12:00, he attempts to delete 47 computer files after the FBI interview. He immediately goes and deletes 47 computer files.

On January 21, he asks the computer Help Desk why files he is deleting are not going away. On many computers, on those computers down there, they have kind of a Help Desk where they can log into and ask for directions how to work the computer. Any who are computer literate know what I am talking about. It is a service there to help them work their way through it. So he asks the computer help desk, he is trying to delete these files, why they are not deleting.

At 10:46, he attempts to enter the secure area of the X Division through Stairwell 3. On January 30, at 2:54 in the morning, almost 3 o'clock in the morning, Los Alamos officials deactivate Lee's open computer account in the security area of X Division after discovering that it has been improperly reactivated. At 4:52 in the afternoon, Lee attempts once again to enter the secure area of the X Division through the south door.

On February 2, Lee attempts to enter a secured area of the X Division through the south door, 9:42 in the morning. In the afternoon, he attempts to enter the secure area of the X Division through the south door. At 1:46 that afternoon, he makes four more attempts to enter the secure area of the X Division through the south door.

On February 8, the FBI contacts Lee and asks him to meet with them to discuss conducting an interview and another polygraph. Right after that, Lee attempts to enter a secure area of the X Division once again. At 4 o'clock, the FBI meets with Lee and arranges for an interview and a polygraph over the next 2 days. 6:30 that evening, he attempts to enter the secure area of the X Division once again.

On February 9 from 11:30 to 12:00 Lee deletes approximately 93 computer files. At 1 o'clock, FBI interviews Lee and obtains his agreement to undergo another polygraph. At 5:03, Lee attempts to enter the secure area of the X Division once again.

February 10, Lee undergoes the polygraph from 9:00 to 4:00. Right after he is done with the polygraph, he immediately goes over and deletes 310 computer files. He then at 5 o'clock attempts once again to get to the X Division through the south door.

Does this sound like somebody who inadvertently or just kind of a country bumpkin walks into the highest most sensitive secrets of this Nation and moves them from classified Top Secret to unclassified then copies them on to his own computer? He lies to the FBI, by the way; and as soon as he is done being interviewed with the FBI, he goes up and starts deleting computer files.

This guy has some history to him. And it is history that he ought not to be proud of.

By the way, when he was first arrested, we should point out that through his lawyers he denied any knowledge. He denied that he copied any of these files. It was only later when the evidence was laid down in front of him that his lawyers thought it was best, probably, to advise him maybe that he ought to tell the truth.

Let us just very quickly summarize. One other thing I guess I should bring up, because I read this in the media. Oh, my gosh, this guy was put in isolation. He was shackled. He did not get to see other people. That is on its face patently false.

They built a special facility for him. They built a special facility for him so he could spend time privately with his lawyers. In the 90 days or so that he was in prison there, 6 hours a day he spent in that special facility with his lawyers. The only time that he was shackled was when he was transferred from one facility to the other, the same as any other prisoner.

If anything, this guy got better treatment than any other prisoner that we had down there. My colleagues should not let these lawyers, or do not let some of these fans of this Wen Ho Lee, or do not let his daughter who understandably has a love for her folks, just like I do, do not let them buffalo them. This Wen Ho Lee is not an innocent guy. He is a convicted felon.

Some people say, well, the FBI filed 59 cases against him or 59 charges against him. Why did the FBI drop 58 of the 59 charges against him? Well, it is pretty simple. We had a Federal judge and the Federal judge said, Okay, we are going to allow you to go ahead with these 59 charges against him. But in order to do it, we are going to have to require you to release some of your secrets. We are going to make this public information.

So the FBI did not drop these charges because they could not prove them. The U.S. Attorney General, Janet Reno, did not instruct the FBI to drop these charges because they could not prove them. The reason they dropped those charges is because they did not want to release further U.S. secrets on thermonuclear weapons.

It is interesting what happens in an election year. As soon as the newspapers start editorializing about old poor Wen Ho Lee and how he has been victimized, and it sounds just like a defense attorney, guess who jumps in? The President of the United States, he makes a comment. He said he is discouraged by this prosecution. That is his policy. He cannot understand this.

What happens this quickly, we can lose control of this quickly. The fact is Wen Ho Lee still has or has the knowledge of where the many, many secrets of the United States of America on our thermonuclear weapons are, and we have every right to go after this guy. He has jeopardized every living citizen in America. In fact he has jeopardized the entire world by accessing and taking out of that laboratory some of the highest level secrets every known to mankind.

He has, in my opinion, put at risk every future generation of every country in this world. And yet he refuses to cooperate up until the time, and we hope we get a little cooperation now, using as his front these defense attorneys.

Then they go out and put together this massive public relations effort. To me it is almost like having a cheer leading conference on the day of impeachment. They have a pep rally when this guy gets out of prison when the judge orders that he be released, and then the people cannot wait to stomp on the FBI or criticize Attorney General Janet Reno. Why did they prosecute this poor guy? Why are they picking on Wen Ho Lee? He is an innocent guy. He has been victimized. Maybe by accident he copied some files. It was inadvertent. He did not know what he was doing.

Of course some of the other groups are playing the race card, saying the only reason he was arrested is because of his ethnic background, whatever that background was.

We ought to take a look at what has happened to this Nation. Take a look at what our losses are. By the way, we cannot really calculate what our losses are because we do not know who has that material.

We do know this: we do know that some of the countries in this world have information that was provided for them from the laboratories out of the United States. We know this: we know that somehow there has been a leak somewhere down in that laboratory.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying to all of my colleagues tonight, I know that my speech has been somewhat impassioned; but I cannot imagine that any one of us who has a fiduciary duty to the people of this country that we would simply nod and turn our face the other way. Or that we would stand here and criticize the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Not that they are above criticism, as I said earlier. That Ruby Ridge was a disaster. Waco, Texas, was a disaster. The FBI deserves plenty of criticism.

But on this case, we too will be contributing, in my opinion, to this huge massive misjustice to all future generations of this world by turning eyes the other way and thinking that this Wen Ho Lee was some innocent guy that we decided to victimize or pick on him to find a spy for the FBI Chronicles.

Let me wrap this portion of my comments up by saying, I cannot think of anything in my entire political career, I cannot think of anything in my adult life that I consider of more serious consequence from a national security interest point of view than the compromise of these thermonuclear secrets. These secrets were compromised by one individual. We know who he is. We have got the facts. We have just heard the other side of the story.

Now, what I would say is all my colleagues should go home tonight, have discussions with their families and let me know tomorrow who is the victim. Is the victim Wen Ho Lee, or is the victim the United States of America?

Mr. Speaker, I really should have made this chart a little different. I should have put United States of America, the rest of the world, and all future generations.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in time I would like to yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. EHRLICH).

A TRIBUTE TO DR. NANCY S. GRASMICK

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership on such an important issue, nuclear security. He is a good friend and a great colleague and a fine Member of this House.

I intend to yield back, but what I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes is truly switch gears.

We talk about education, education policy in this country an awful lot. It is an important debate. It is a debate in the presidential campaigns and a debate on this floor almost every day. And there are special people who stand for educational excellence in this country, and one happens to be a friend of mine, and she happens to be from Maryland.

So for a few minutes I would like to pay tribute to a lady by the name of Nancy S. Grasmick.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud recognition of Dr. Nancy S. Grasmick, superintendent of Maryland State Schools, for having been recently named recipient of this year's Harold W. McGraw, Jr. Prize in Education.

Dr. Grasmick is one of only three individuals nationwide to receive this distinguished award, which annually recognizes outstanding commitment to education in our country.

Dr. Nancy Grasmick defines education reform and excellence in America today. Dr. Grasmick has devoted her entire life to helping young people achieve the American dream. Her beginnings as a special education teacher in Baltimore County Maryland only hinted at what lay ahead for Maryland schools and indeed the entire State.

She advanced through the county school system and constructed a legacy that can be felt in every classroom in Maryland today. Thanks to her leadership and participation in countless school reform efforts in other States, that legacy is also felt across the Nation.

Dr. Grasmick's reform efforts were well under way when she was named Maryland Superintendent for Schools in 1991. At that time I was in the Maryland General Assembly. Her immediate goal was to establish accountability standards for teachers, administrators, and individual schools.

She challenged the status quo by proposing and successfully establishing teacher standards, students standards, and annual school-by-school evaluations.

She fought for unprecedented increases in State funding for education and school construction. At times, and I know this for a fact, Mr. Speaker, her plans met resistance and criticism. But she backed up her reform efforts with real progress in student performance. And is that not what really counts? She exhibited courage by forcing State takeovers of underperforming schools and has used her pulpit to bring every county school system into her reform initiatives.

Nancy Grasmick has simultaneously served as the Maryland Special Secretary for Children, Youth and Families also since 1991. At her urging, the position was established to bring together the myriad components of what she knew then was required to educate our young people: quality schools, stable family lives, and responsible health care.

I am proud to have known and worked with Dr. Nancy Grasmick for more than 10 years. Receiving the McGraw Prize in Education is simply the latest in a series of her professional achievements. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, she is the leading educator and reformer in America today.

By every measure—student performance, school achievement, and teacher certification—she deserves this great

recognition; and we in Maryland are quite proud of her. And, I should add, we in the Ehrlich family are equally quite proud of her.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend who I know also has very serious views on education, education reform and probably enjoyed hearing about this great lady in Maryland, who has brought standards and true reform to Maryland schools, and I yield back.

1845

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Not that this is jumping on media day, we have heard my previous comments about the fellow out of Los Alamos labs, it is interesting in our society today, we can go back to the Roman Empire where the Gladiators get all the attention, and a woman who is outstanding as this woman is, who has devoted her entire life to education, whose entire hope was not for her but for the next generation and the following generation, would probably capture maybe one column in a local newspaper, while the sports section, it is amazing to me, we can pull out a newspaper and take the middle 20 pages or 30 pages or 40 pages out on the sports section, and yet a little paragraph about someone who is as outstanding as your friend.

Mr. EHRLICH. If the gentleman would continue to yield for one second, it will not surprise the gentleman to learn, because she is a true reformer and has demanded accountability, she has taken quite a few hits in Maryland, and she has survived, because she has the factual and the moral high ground on this issue. That is why I wanted to come to this floor and congratulate her in front of the entire country.

Mr. MCINNIS. Of course, as the gentleman knows, the person that has enough guts to get out of the fox hole usually draws the fire but somebody has to get out of it and somebody has to lead the charge. I commend the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, I want to continue, I have about 16 minutes left. I am just going to comment for a few minutes about a speech that I want to make next week in regards to Social Security. It is unfortunate. It is reality, I face it, and it is just natural. It is inherent with the system that we have, but we have a general election coming up here in about 5 weeks or 6 weeks, and unfortunately, a lot of the good ideas, ideas that require bipartisan support, bipartisan coalition building get drowned out by some of the impacts of an election and by the advertising.

I want to tell my colleagues that several months ago, I had the opportunity to go down to Texas. I went to law school in Texas. I have a great fondness for that state, and I was able to sit down with their governor, George W. Bush, and we talked a little about Social Security.

We talked about the threat to future generations. And next week, I intend to expound on what I think is a solution, a solution that has been drowned out in this election process, a solution that George W. Bush parallels, a commitment that he feels very importantly about, because of the fact he is running for President, because he has proposed it as a part of this program instead of a methodological analysis and thoughtful analysis of what he is saying, people say it is a risky scheme. We hear people that say stay with the status quo.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to tell my colleagues that tonight we cannot stay with the status quo of Social Security. Social Security is in trouble. It is not in trouble today. It is not going to be in trouble for my generation, my generation and the generations ahead of me, they are okay. We are going to get our benefits.

Mr. Speaker, where it is going to be in trouble is the generations we ought to be worrying about, the generation behind me, my children. And at some point in time, my children's children. And we have a fiduciary responsibility to make Social Security a system that is sound from a fiscal point of view.

Today Social Security has more cash coming in than it has going out; that is called a cash basis. It has a positive cash flow. But if we take a look at the actuarial numbers, actuarial meaning that while the cash is coming in today, that cash is earmarked for future obligations. So we get the cash today, but we do not have to spend it for a while.

It is coming in today, our younger generations are contributing. My son and my two daughters are contributing to this Social Security system, with the expectation that they will have some return on their money, but without really the knowledge of that on an actuarial basis. Social Security is going to be bankrupt; we have that obligation to go forward.

It got there for several reasons, and I thought this evening I would just go over, with the time I have remaining, how Social Security got in trouble and why some of it frankly is good news. You know, when Social Security first came into place in 1935, we had 42 workers, 42 workers for every person that was retired.

Forty-two workers here working and generating and putting cash into the Social Security system up here, which was distributing to one worker; 42 to 1 was the ratio. Today we have three workers over here contributing to the cash system up here distributing to one retired person here, so ratio is from 42 to 1 down to 3 to 1. And in the next 10 to 15 years it is going to be 2 to 1, and if we are not careful, in about 25 years, it is going to be 1 to 1.

How does a system sustain itself? Well, first of all, the first thing if we look at a system and we are trying to figure out how do we address future obligations, the first thing we need to do is figure out is this system working today? Do we have a sound, economic, smooth-running machine in that Social Security system? If we do not, do we have to oil it? Do we have to replace some parts? What do we have to do?

The facts are clear. The facts are clear. The Social Security machine is broken. Now, it is still not working, but it is not working at the kind of capacity that will be needed to supply what is necessary for those future generations.

Now, there are some of the reasons Social Security got in trouble; one I just went over with you, the retirement ratio; the second one is good news for all of us. When Social Security was first put into place, women could expect to live to be an average of 65 years old and the man could expect to live to probably an age of 61. Today that is well into the 70s for both sexes. So we have had an extended life span, a lot in regards to improvement in our life-styles, like trying to get rid of smoking, a lot of it in regards to our health care system and the new products and the new medicines and the new machines, premature babies used to die in the past, today we can save them.

There is lots of medical technology that has extended the life span, but, unfortunately, in the Social Security system, this machine that we have did not have a part in it that worked faster when people live longer. In fact, it worked at the same speed and enabled us to produce more, because we had more people living to a longer age to an older age. This part of the machine had to generate.

It had to work faster. It is not working faster. In fact, it is working and producing at the same rate that it did 35 years ago, when people would live to 61 in the case of a male or 65 in the case of a female. Mr. Speaker, we have to do something about that.

And the other thing is that the Social Security system, and this is politics, it happens everywhere in the world, it happened in the history of the world, political bodies have a difficult time saying no to consumers that want something for nothing. As time goes on, we have some good sound programs.

By the way, when they want something for nothing, it is not that the program sounds bad, you know, the survivor's benefits or some of these other benefit programs that we have had, Social Security, SSI, things like this, they come to this body with a good sounding program and, in fact, sometimes they are great programs, but nobody really stood up and had the guts to say but can we afford it? I know I am going to be the most unpopular person up here. But slow it down, can we afford it?

And over a period of time, we have indebted this country to further obligations through Social Security. Some of those additional liabilities that we picked up were justified. But if we are going to pick up an additional liability, we have to go to the other side of the ledger. Any of us that have basic accounting, and almost all of us have,

we know any time we have a debit, we have a credit; any time we have a credit, we have to have a debit, except when it gets to the politics.

The politics just continues to put on and put on one side of the ledger, and it continues to put obligations on one side of the ledger without figuring out on the other side of the ledger how we are going to pay for it. So we have got to figure out a program.

When I had my discussions with George W. Bush, and why I am excited about that conversation and why I think it is imperative to bring it up, is because I think the merits of this program are being drowned out by the rhetoric that we have heard out there on the election trail. What is important about the program is, first of all, for our future generation, we have to have a program that is voluntary, not being in Social Security, we have to be in Social Security, but it is your choice. We want to offer people some choice.

I happen to think, and most of us happen to think, the generations behind us, they are very capable, they are the brightest generations this world has ever known, my kids, that generation, they can make good decisions on personal choice. They ought to have some more choice on how their investment or a portion of their investment in Social Security, where they put it. It should be voluntary for them.

And you know what? They should pick up some property rights with their Social Security investment. What I mean by that is, if they die, they ought to be able to pass on to their family the benefits that over their working career they had accumulated. This is the kind of program we need to have. Guess what?

As you will find out from my comments next week, this is not a new program. It is not a new invention. We are not plowing new ground. In fact, there is a program that is almost as identical and we have test marketed it, we have. We have actually gone out and test marketed an alternative to Social Security, an addition to Social Security that gives people choice, that is voluntary, allows people to take a higher risk or lower risk, higher return or lower return.

Do you know what happened in our test market survey? Eighty-five percent of the people that we put into the test market are in it. They like it. They voluntarily signed up and they are staying in the program. In fact, we are growing our numbers in this test market.

Now, where is this, you say. Wait a minute, Scott, what are you talking about? Where is this test you are talking about? What kind of retirement system are you talking about as an alternative or as a way to improve Social Security? It is our retirement. It is our retirement, the U.S. Congress. It is the retirement of every Federal employee, 3 million people are in this test market. It is a program called the Thrift Savings Program.

Every Federal Government employee on a voluntary basis can take a percentage of their salary every month and have it matched by the Federal Government to the extent of 5 percent, and they then exercise the choice of where they want that money to go, whether they want to put it into high risk stock market, which usually brings a higher return, or whether they want to put it into a lower risk bond market or they want to put it into a guaranteed no loss savings account.

And you know what happens if they die, if a Federal employee dies? They get to pass it on to the next family member. So the answer is, wow, it is working. The participants in the program are satisfied with the program. The program allows benefits to continue beyond their death to their family. The program funds itself.

You know what the returns are, take a look at the returns that Social Security has today. Here is the returns from my generation on Social Security, less than 1 percent, and what if we do not change this system, this system is going to produce a return of less than 1 percent. Your certificate of deposit was 0 risk, returns, almost a little over 5 percent, and your government bonds return 7 percent.

Social Security takes your dollars and gives you less than a 1 percent return. And by the way, there is no guarantee of safety. So what I am saying here is, next week I intend to go into much more detail, but I think the American people deserve to know that their government employees have an alternative system.

Now we still participate in Social Security. Do not believe that stuff you see on the Internet that we are exempt, we do not have to; we participate in Social Security, but we have this additional benefit, and it works. It is good. It provides a return.

So next week, I am going to go into a little more detail on that and why I think that George W. Bush's approach is look, stand up. I think it is a bold approach, and any time you make a bold approach, you are going to get criticized because a lot of people are comfortable with the status quo, but the status quo ain't going to hunt, it is a dog that is not going to hunt.

So we need to have change, and we need to have a plan that is going to work. So what we ask the American people and in this discussion I had with George W. Bush several months ago, when we go to the American people, look, they are relying on this, we have to give them a product that has been test marketed. We have the product that has been test marketed. We know it works.

1900

So why resist it.

Well, right now the resistance comes in because of politics. We have an election. So they do not dare. One side does not dare say to the other side, well, that is a good program; that might work.

We have got a good program here, and I look forward in the next week to go into much greater detail on this alternative that I think the Federal Government uses for its own. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. So I think that is exactly what we ought to take a look at.

In conclusion, I look forward to seeing my colleagues next week on this. Let me say, going to the first part of my speech, please take the time to look at the other side of the story on this Wen Ho Lee guy out at Los Alamos. Do not think he is a victim. Do not think he is being picked upon. In my opinion, he has probably committed one of the most egregious transfers of thermonuclear material in the last 100 years.

I do not have much sympathy for him, and I intend to pursue that side of the story. I have heard both sides, and I have made my decision. The victim here in that case is the United States of America; it is not Mr. Lee.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

2247

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 10 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4733, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. PACKARD submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4733) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106–907)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4733) ''making appropriations for energy and water development 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 energy and water development, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, restudy of authorized projects, miscellaneous investigations, and, when authorized by laws, surveys and detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction, $160,038,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That in conducting the Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction Study, Albuquerque, New Mexico, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall include an evaluation of flood damage reduction measures that would otherwise be excluded from the feasibility analysis based on policies regarding the frequency of flooding, the drainage areas, and the amount of runoff: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to use $750,000 of the funds appropriated herein to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Murrieta Creek, California flood protection and environmental restoration project in accordance with Alternative 6, based on the Murrieta Creek feasibility report and environmental impact statement dated June 2000 at a total cost of $90,866,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $59,063,900 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $31,803,100.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by laws; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction), $1,695,699,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as are necessary for the Federal share of construction costs for facilities under the Dredged Material Disposal Facilities program shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, as authorized by Public Law 104–303; and of which such sums as are necessary pursuant to Public Law 99–662 shall be derived from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, for one-half of the costs of construction and rehabilitation of inland waterways projects, including rehabilitation costs for the Lock and Dam 12, Mississippi River, Iowa; Lock and Dam 24, Mississippi River, Illinois and Missouri; Lock and Dam 3, Mississippi River, Minnesota; and London Locks and Dam, and Kanawha River, West Virginia, projects; and of which funds are provided for the following projects in the amounts specified:

San Gabriel Basin Groundwater Restoration, California, $25,000,000;

San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem), California, $5,000,000;

Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana, $10,000,000;

Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky, $4,000,000;

Clover Fork, Middlesboro, City of Cumberland, Town of Martin, Pike County (including Levisa Fork and Tug Fork Tributaries), Bell County, Martin County, and Harlan County, Kentucky, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, Kentucky, $20,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to proceed with planning, engineering, design and construction of the Town of Martin, Kentucky, element, in accordance with Plan A as set forth in the preliminary draft Detailed Project Report, Appendix T of the General Plan of the Huntington District Commander;

Jackson County, Mississippi, $2,000,000;

Bosque and Leon Rivers, Texas, $4,000,000; and

Upper Mingo County (including Mingo County Tributaries), Lower Mingo County (Kermit), Wayne County, and McDowell County, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project in West Virginia, $4,100,000:

Provided further, That using $900,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to undertake the Bowie County Levee project, which is defined as Alternative B Local Sponsor Option, in the Corps of Engineers document entitled Bowie County Local Flood Protection, Red River, Texas, Project Design Memorandum No. 1, Bowie County Levee, dated April 1997: Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be expended or obligated to begin Phase II of the John Day Drawdown study or to initiate a study of the drawdown of McNary Dam unless authorized by law: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed hereafter to use available Construction, General funds in addition to funding provided in Public Law 104–206 to complete design and construction of the Red River Regional Visitors Center in the vicinity of Shreveport, Louisiana at an estimated cost of $6,000,000: Provided further, That section 101(b)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, is amended by striking ''total cost of $8,600,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof, ''total cost of $15,000,000'': Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use $3,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein for additional emergency bank stabilization measures at Galena, Alaska under the same terms and conditions as previous emergency bank stabilization work undertaken at Galena, Alaska pursuant to Section 116 of Public Law 99–190: Provided further, That with $4,200,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue construction of the Brunswick County Beaches, North Carolina-Ocean Isle Beach portion in accordance with the General Reevaluation Report approved by the Chief of Engineers on May 15, 1998: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use not to exceed $300,000 of funds appropriated herein to reimburse the City of Renton, Washington, at full Federal expense, for mitigation expenses incurred for the flood control project constructed pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 701s at Cedar River, City of Renton, Washington, as a result of overdredging by the Army Corps of Engineers: Provided further, That $2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for stabilization and renovation of Lock and Dam 10, Kentucky River, Kentucky, subject to enactment of authorization by law: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use $3,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein to initiate construction of a navigation project at Kaumalapau Harbor, Hawaii: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to use $2,000,000 of the funds provided herein for Dam Safety and Seepage/Stability Correction Program to design and construct seepage control features at Waterbury Dam, Winooski River, Vermont: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to design and construct barge lanes at the Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, project, immediately adjacent to either side of the Houston Ship Channel, from Bolivar Roads to Morgan Point, to a depth of 12 feet with prior years' Construction, General carry-over funds: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, may use Construction, General funding as directed in Public Law 105–62 and Public Law 105–245 to initiate construction of an emergency outlet from Devils Lake, North Dakota, to the Sheyenne River, except that the funds shall not become available unless the Secretary of the Army determines that an emergency (as defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)) exists with respect to the emergency need for the outlet and reports to Congress that the construction is technically sound, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable, and in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.): Provided further, That the economic justification for the emergency outlet shall be prepared in accordance with the principles and guidelines for economic evaluation as required by regulations and procedures of the Army Corps of Engineers for all flood control projects, and that the economic justification be fully described, including the analysis of the benefits and costs, in the project plan documents: Provided further, That the plans for the emergency outlet shall be reviewed and, to be effective, shall contain assurances provided by the Secretary of State, after consultation with the International Joint Commission, that the project will not violate the requirements or intent of the Treaty Between the United States and Great Britain Relating to Boundary Waters Between the United States and Canada, signed at Washington, January 11, 1909 (36 Stat. 2448; TS 548) (commonly known as the ''Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909''): Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army shall submit the final plans and other documents for the emergency outlet to Congress: Provided further, That no funds made available under this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used by the Secretary of the Army to carry out the portion of the feasibility study of the Devils Lake Basin, North Dakota, authorized under the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–377), that addresses the needs of the area for stabilized lake levels through inlet controls, or to otherwise study any facility or carry out any activity that would permit the transfer of water from the Missouri River Basin into Devils Lake.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a and 702g–1), $347,731,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to complete his analysis and determination of Federal maintenance of the Greenville Inner Harbor, Mississippi navigation project in accordance with Section 509 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; and removal of obstructions to navigation,

$1,901,959,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as become available in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99–662, may be derived from that Fund, and of which such sums as become available from the special account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l), may be derived from that account for construction, operation, and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, from the funds provided herein for the operation and maintenance of New York Harbor, New York, is directed to prepare the necessary documentation and initiate removal of submerged obstructions and debris in the area previously marked by the Ambrose Light Tower in the interest of safe navigation: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to use $500,000 of funds appropriated herein to remove and reinstall the docks and causeway, in kind, at Astoria East Boat Basin, Oregon: Provided further, That $500,000 of the funds appropriated herein for the Ohio River Open Channel, Illinois, Kentucky, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, project, are provided for the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to dredge a channel from the mouth of Wheeling Creek to Tunnel Green Park in Wheeling, West Virginia.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary for administration of laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands, $125,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use funds appropriated herein to: (1) by March 1, 2001, supplement the report, Cost Analysis For the 1999 Proposal to Issue and Modify Nationwide Permits, to reflect the Nationwide Permits actually issued on March 9, 2000, including changes in the acreage limits, preconstruction notification requirements and general conditions between the rule proposed on July 21, 1999, and the rule promulgated and published in the Federal Register; (2) after consideration of the cost analysis for the 1999 proposal to issue and modify nationwide permits and the supplement prepared pursuant to this Act and by September 30, 2001, prepare, submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register a Permit Processing Management Plan by which the Corps of Engineers will handle the additional work associated with all projected increases in the number of individual permit applications and preconstruction notifications related to the new and replacement permits and general conditions. The Permit Processing Management Plan shall include specific objective goals and criteria by which the Corps of Engineers' progress towards reducing any permit backlog can be measured; (3) beginning on December 31, 2001, and on a biannual basis thereafter, report to Congress and publish in the Federal Register, an analysis of the performance of its program as measured against the criteria set out in the Permit Processing Management Plan; (4) implement a 1-year pilot program to publish quarterly on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's Regulatory Program website all Regulatory Analysis and Management Systems (RAMS) data for the South Pacific Division and North Atlantic Division beginning within 30 days of the enactment of this Act; and (5) publish in Division Office websites all findings, rulings, and decisions rendered under the administrative appeals process for the Corps of Engineers Regulatory Program as established in Public Law 106–60: Provided further, That, through the period ending on September 30, 2003, the Corps of Engineers shall allow any appellant to keep a verbatim record of the proceedings of the appeals conference under the aforementioned administrative appeals process: Provided further, That within 30 days of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall require all U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Divisions and Districts to record the date on which a Section 404 individual permit application or nationwide permit notification is filed with the Corps of Engineers: Provided further, That the Corps of Engineers, when reporting permit processing times, shall track both the date a permit application is first received and the date the application is considered complete, as well as the reason that the application is not considered complete upon first submission.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

For expenses necessary to clean up contamination from sites throughout the United States resulting from work performed as part of the Nation's early atomic energy program, $140,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Coastal Engineering Research Board, the Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity, the Water Resources Support Center, and headquarters support functions at the USACE Finance Center, $152,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That no part of any other appropriation provided in title I of this Act shall be available to fund the activities of the Office of the Chief of Engineers or the executive direction and management activities of the division offices: Provided further, That none of these funds shall be available to support an office of congressional affairs within the executive office of the Chief of Engineers.

REVOLVING FUND

Amounts in the Revolving Fund are available for the costs of relocating the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers headquarters to office space in the General Accounting Office headquarters building in Washington, D.C.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title shall be available for official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed $5,000); and during the current fiscal year the Revolving Fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed 100 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of the Army shall enter into an agreement with the City of Grand Prairie, Texas, wherein the City agrees to assume all of the responsibilities of the Trinity River Authority of Texas under Contract No. DACW63–76–C–0166, other than financial responsibilities, except as provided for in subsection (c) of this section. The Trinity River Authority shall be relieved of all of its financial responsibilities under the Contract as of the date the Secretary of the Army enters into the agreement with the City.

(b) In consideration of the agreement referred to in subsection (a), the City shall pay the Federal Government a total of $4,290,000 in two installments, one in the amount of $2,150,000, which shall be due and payable no later than December 1, 2000, and one in the amount of $2,140,000, which shall be due and payable no later than December 1, 2003.

(c) The agreement executed pursuant to subsection (a) shall include a provision requiring the City to assume all costs associated with operation and maintenance of the recreation facilities included in the Contract referred to in that subsection.

SEC. 102. Agreements proposed for execution by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works or the United States Army Corps of Engineers after the date of the enactment of this Act pursuant to section 4 of the Rivers and Harbor Act of 1915, Public Law 64–291; section 11 of the River and Harbor Act of 1925, Public Law 68–585; the Civil Functions Appropriations Act, 1936, Public Law 75–208; section 215 of the Flood Control Act of 1968, as amended, Public Law 90–483; sections 104, 203, and 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended (Public Law 99–662); section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, as amended, Public Law 102–580; section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, Public Law 104–303, and any other specific project authority, shall be limited to credits and reimbursements per project not to exceed $10,000,000 in each fiscal year, and total credits and reimbursements for all applicable projects not to exceed $50,000,000 in each fiscal year.

SEC. 103. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to revise the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that such revision provides for an increase in the springtime water release program during the spring heavy rainfall and snow melt period in States that have rivers draining into the Missouri River below the Gavins Point Dam.

SEC. 104. ST. GEORGES BRIDGE, DELAWARE. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any activity relating to closure or removal of the St. Georges Bridge across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, Delaware, including a hearing or any other activity relating to preparation of an environmental impact statement concerning the closure or removal.

SEC. 105. Within available funds under title I, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall provide up to $7,000,000 to replace and upgrade the dam in Kake, Alaska which collapsed July 2000, to provide drinking water and hydroelectricity.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

For carrying out activities authorized by the Central Utah Project Completion Act, $38,724,000, to remain available until expended, of which $19,566,000 shall be deposited into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account: Provided, That of the amounts deposited into that account, $5,000,000 shall be considered the Federal contribution authorized by paragraph 402(b)(2) of the Central Utah Project Completion Act and $14,158,000 shall be available to the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission to carry out activities authorized under that Act.

In addition, for necessary expenses incurred in carrying out related responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior, $1,216,000, to remain available until expended.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The following appropriations shall be expended to execute authorized functions of the Bureau of Reclamation:

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For management, development, and restoration of water and related natural resources and for related activities, including the operation, maintenance and rehabilitation of reclamation and other facilities, participation in fulfilling related Federal responsibilities to Native Americans, and related grants to, and cooperative and other agreements with, State and local governments, Indian tribes, and others, $678,450,000, to remain available until expended, of which $1,916,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and $39,467,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund; of which such amounts as may be necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund; of which $16,000,000 shall be for on-reservation water development, feasibility studies,

and related administrative costs under Public Law 106–163; of which not more than 25 percent of the amount provided for drought emergency assistance may be used for financial assistance for the preparation of cooperative drought contingency plans under Title II of Public Law 102–250; and of which not more than $500,000 is for high priority projects which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1706: Provided, That such transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriation under this heading: Provided further, That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities that can be financed by the Reclamation Fund or the Bureau of Reclamation special fee account established by 16 U.S.C. 460l–6a(i) shall be derived from that Fund or account: Provided further, That funds contributed under 43 U.S.C. 395 are available until expended for the purposes for which contributed: Provided further, That funds advanced under 43 U.S.C. 397a shall be credited to this account and are available until expended for the same purposes as the sums appropriated under this heading: Provided further, That funds available for expenditure for the Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program may be expended by the Bureau of Reclamation for site remediation on a non-reimbursable basis: Provided further, That section 301 of Public Law 102–250, Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991, as amended, is amended further by inserting ''2000, and 2001'' in lieu of ''and 2000'': Provided further, That the amount authorized for Indian municipal, rural, and industrial water features by section 10 of Public Law 89–108, as amended by section 8 of Public Law 99–294, section 1701(b) of Public Law 102–575, Public Law 105–245, and Public Law 106–60 is increased by $2,000,000 (October 1998 prices): Provided further, That the amount authorized for Minidoka Project North Side Pumping Division, Idaho, by section 5 of Public Law 81–864, is increased by $2,805,000: Provided further, That the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978 (43 U.S.C. 509) is amended as follows: (1) by inserting in Section 4(c) after ''1984,'' and before ''costs'' the following: ''and the additional $95,000,000 further authorized to be appropriated by amendments to that Act in 2000,''; (2) by inserting in Section 5 after ''levels),'' and before ''plus'' the following: ''and, effective October 1, 2000, not to exceed an additional $95,000,000 (October 1, 2000, price levels),''; and (3) by striking ''sixty days (which'' and all that follows through ''day certain)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''30 calendar days''.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans and/or grants, $8,944,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by the Small Reclamation Projects Act of August 6, 1956, as amended (43 U.S.C. 422a–422l): Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $27,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the program for direct loans and/or grants, $425,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the total sums appropriated, the amount of program activities that can be financed by the Reclamation Fund shall be derived from that Fund.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

For carrying out the programs, projects, plans, and habitat restoration, improvement, and acquisition provisions of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, $38,382,000, to be derived from such sums as may be collected in the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund pursuant to sections 3407(d), 3404(c)(3), 3405(f), and 3406(c)(1) of Public Law 102–575, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to assess and collect the full amount of the additional mitigation and restoration payments authorized by section 3407(d) of Public Law 102–575.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of policy, administration, and related functions in the office of the Commissioner, the Denver office, and offices in the five regions of the Bureau of Reclamation, to remain available until expended, $50,224,000, to be derived from the Reclamation Fund and be nonreimbursable as provided in 43 U.S.C. 377: Provided, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted as policy and administration expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 201. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to purchase or lease water in the Middle Rio Grande or the Carlsbad Projects in New Mexico unless said purchase or lease is in compliance with the purchase requirements of section 202 of Public Law 106–60.

SEC. 202. Funds under this title for Drought Emergency Assistance shall be made available primarily for leasing of water for specified drought related purposes from willing lessors, in compliance with existing State laws and administered under State water priority allocation. Such leases may be entered into with an option to purchase: Provided, That such purchase is approved by the State in which the purchase takes place and the purchase does not cause economic harm within the State in which the purchase is made.

SEC. 203. Beginning in fiscal year 2001 and thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall assess and collect annually from Central Valley Project (CVP) water and power contractors the sum of $540,000 (June 2000 price levels) and remit, without further appropriation, the amount collected annually to the Trinity Public Utilities District (TPUD). This assessment shall be payable 70 percent by CVP Preference Power Customers and 30 percent by CVP Water Contractors. The CVP Water Contractor share of this assessment shall be collected by the Secretary through established Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) Operation and Maintenance ratesetting practices. The CVP Power Contractor share of this assessment shall be assessed by Reclamation to the Western Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region (Western), and collected by Western through established power ratesetting practices.

SEC. 204. (a) In General.—For fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall continue funding, from power revenues, the activities of the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program as authorized by section 1807 of the Grand Canyon Protection Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4672), at not more than $7,850,000 (October 2000 price level), adjusted in subsequent years to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

(b) VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS.—Nothing in this section precludes the use of voluntary financial contributions (except power revenues) to the Adaptive Management Program that may be authorized by law.

(c) ACTIVITIES TO BE FUNDED.—The activities to be funded as provided under subsection (a) include activities required to meet the requirements of section 1802(a) and subsections (a) and (b) of section 1805 of the Grand Canyon Protection Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4672), including the requirements of the Biological Opinion on the Operation of Glen Canyon Dam and activities required by the Programmatic Agreement on Cultural and Historic Properties, to the extent that the requirements and activities are consistent with the Grand Canyon Protection Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4672).

(d) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—To the extent that funding under subsection (a) is insufficient to pay the costs of the monitoring and research and other activities of the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program, the Secretary of the Interior may use funding from other sources, including funds appropriated for that purpose. All such appropriated funds shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 205. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to use not to exceed $1,000,000 of the funds appropriated under title II to refund amounts received by the United States as payments for charges assessed by the Secretary prior to January 1, 1994 for failure to file certain certification or reporting forms prior to the receipt of irrigation water, pursuant to sections 206 and 224(c) of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 1226, 1272; 43 U.S.C. 390ff, 390ww(c)), including the amount of associated interest assessed by the Secretary and paid to the United States pursuant to section 224(i) of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (101 Stat. 1330–268; 43 U.S.C. 390ww(i)).

SEC. 206. CANYON FERRY RESERVOIR, MONTANA. (a) APPRAISALS.—Section 1004(c)(2)(B) of title X of division C of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 2681–713; 113 Stat. 1501A–307) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''be based on'' and inserting ''use'';

(2) in clause (vi), by striking ''Notwithstanding any other provision of law,'' and inserting ''To the extent consistent with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition,''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(vii) APPLICABILITY.—This subparagraph shall apply to the extent that its application is practicable and consistent with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition.''.

(b) TIMING.—Section 1004(f)(2) of title X of division C of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 2681–714; 113 Stat. 1501A–308) is amended by inserting after ''Act,'' the following: ''in accordance with all applicable law,''.

(c) INTEREST.—Section 1008(b) of title X of division C of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 2681–717; 113 Stat. 1501A–310) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

SEC. 207. Beginning in fiscal year 2000 and thereafter, any amounts provided for the Newlands Water Rights Fund for purchasing and retiring water rights in the Newlands Reclamation Project shall be non-reimbursable.

SEC. 208. USE OF COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT FACILITIES FOR NONPROJECT WATER. The Secretary of the Interior may enter into contracts with the city of Loveland, Colorado, or its Water and Power Department or any other agency, public utility, or enterprise of the city, providing for the use of facilities of the Colorado-Big Thompson Project, Colorado, under the Act of February 21, 1911 (43 U.S.C. 523), for—

(1) the impounding, storage, and carriage of nonproject water originating on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other beneficial purposes; and

(2) the exchange of water originating on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains for the purposes specified in paragraph (1), using facilities associated with the Colorado-Big Thompson Project, Colorado.

SEC. 209. AMENDMENT TO IRRIGATION PROJECT CONTRACT EXTENSION ACT OF 1998. (a) Section

2(a) of the Irrigation Project Contract Extension Act of 1998, Public Law 105–293, is amended by striking the date ''December 31, 2000'', and inserting in lieu thereof the date ''December 31, 2003''; and

(b) Subsection 2(b) of the Irrigation Project Contract Extension Act of 1998, Public Law 105–293, is amended by—

(1) striking the phrase ''not to go beyond December 31, 2001'', and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase ''not to go beyond December 31, 2003''; and

(2) striking the phrase ''terminates prior to December 31, 2000'', and inserting in lieu thereof ''terminates prior to December 31, 2003''.

SEC. 211. Section 202 of Division B, Title I, Chapter 2 of Public Law 106–246 is amended by adding at the end the following: ''This section shall be effective through September 30, 2001.''.

SEC. 211. Section 106 of the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act (Public Law 100–675; 102 Stat. 4000 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) REQUIREMENT TO RESERVE AND FURNISH WATER.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, shall permanently reserve and furnish annually the following:

''(1) WATER.—The first 16,000 acre-feet of any water conserved by the works authorized by title II, to the Indian Water Authority and the local entities in accordance with the settlement agreement.

''(2) CAPACITY AND ENERGY.—Capacity and energy from the Parker-Davis Project at the rates established for project use power sufficient to convey water conserved pursuant to paragraph (1) from Lake Havasu through the Colorado River Aqueduct to Lake Matthews and to the places of use on the Bands reservations or in the local entities service area in accordance with the settlement agreement.

Water conserved pursuant to paragraph (1) may be used on the Bands' reservations or in the local entities' service areas, leased for use outside the Bands' reservations or the local entities' service areas, or exchanged for water from other sources for use by the Bands, the Indian Water Authority, or the local entities, in accordance with the settlement agreement.''.

SEC. 212. (a) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this section, the term—

(1) ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior;

(2) ''Sly Park Unit'' means the Sly Park Dam and Reservoir, Camp Creek Diversion Dam and Tunnel, and conduits and canals as authorized under the American River Act of October 14, 1949 (63 Stat. 853), including those used to convey, treat, and store water delivered from Sly Park, as well as all recreation facilities thereto; and

(3) ''District'' means the El Dorado Irrigation District.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after date of the enactment of this Act and in accordance with all applicable law, transfer all right, title, and interest in and to the Sly Park Unit to the District.

(c) SALE PRICE.—The Secretary is authorized to receive from the District $2,000,000 to relieve payment obligations and extinguish the debt under contract number 14–06–200–949IR3, and $9,500,000 to relieve payment obligations and extinguish all debts associated with contracts numbered 14–06–200–7734, as amended by contracts numbered 14–06–200–4282A and 14–06–200–8536A. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the District shall continue to make payments required by section 3407(c) of Public Law 102–575 through year 2029.

(d) CREDIT REVENUE TO PROJECT REPAYMENT.—Upon payment authorized under subsection (b), the amount paid shall be credited toward repayment of capital costs of the Central Valley Project in an amount equal to the associated undiscounted obligation.

(e) FUTURE BENEFITS.—Upon payment, the Sly Park Unit shall no longer be a Federal reclamation project or a unit of the Central Valley Project, and the District shall not be entitled to receive any further reclamation benefits.

(f) LIABILITY.—Except as otherwise provided by law, effective on the date of conveyance of the Sly Park Unit under this Act, the United States shall not be liable for damages of any kind arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence based on its prior ownership or operation of the conveyed property.

(g) COSTS.—All costs, including interest charges, associated with the Project that have been included as a reimbursable cost of the Central Valley Project are declared to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY PROGRAMS

ENERGY SUPPLY

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for energy supply, and uranium supply and enrichment activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; and the purchase of not to exceed 17 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $660,574,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That, in addition, royalties received to compensate the Department of Energy for its participation in the First-Of-A-Kind-Engineering program shall be credited to this account to be available until September 30, 2002, for the purposes of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology activities.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for non-defense environmental management activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction or expansion, $277,812,000, to remain available until expended.

URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to maintain, decontaminate, decommission, and otherwise remediate uranium processing facilities, $393,367,000, of which $345,038,000 shall be derived from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, all of which shall remain available until expended: Provided, That $72,000,000 of amounts derived from the Fund for such expenses shall be available in accordance with title X, subtitle A, of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

SCIENCE

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for science activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and purchase of not to exceed 58 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $3,186,352,000, to remain available until expended.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97–425, as amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, $191,074,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: Provided, That not to exceed $2,500,000 may be provided to the State of Nevada solely for expenditures, other than salaries and expenses of State employees, to conduct scientific oversight responsibilities pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, Public Law 97–425, as amended: Provided further, That $6,000,000 shall be provided to affected units of local governments, as defined in Public Law 97–425, to conduct appropriate activities pursuant to the Act: Provided further, That the distribution of the funds as determined by the units of local government shall be approved by the Department of Energy: Provided further, That the funds for the State of Nevada shall be made available solely to the Nevada Division of Emergency Management by direct payment and units of local government by direct payment: Provided further, That within 90 days of the completion of each Federal fiscal year, the Nevada Division of Emergency Management and the Governor of the State of Nevada and each local entity shall provide certification to the Department of Energy that all funds expended from such payments have been expended for activities authorized by Public Law 97–425 and this Act. Failure to provide such certification shall cause such entity to be prohibited from any further funding provided for similar activities: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be: (1) used directly or indirectly to influence legislative action on any matter pending before Congress or a State legislature or for lobbying activity as provided in 18 U.S.C. 1913; (2) used for litigation expenses; or (3) used to support multi-State efforts or other coalition building activities inconsistent with the restrictions contained in this Act: Provided further, That all proceeds and recoveries by the Secretary in carrying out activities authorized by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 in Public Law 97–425, as amended, including but not limited to, any proceeds from the sale of assets, shall be available without further appropriation and shall remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for departmental administration in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed $35,000), $226,107,000, to remain available until expended, plus such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.): Provided, That such increases in cost of work are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount, to remain available until expended: Provided further, That moneys received by the Department for miscellaneous revenues estimated to total $151,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, and may remain available until expended, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95–238, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of miscellaneous revenues received during fiscal year 2001 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2001 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than $75,107,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $31,500,000, to remain available until expended.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of

plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 12 for replacement only), $5,015,186,000, to remain available until expended: Provided: That, $130,000,000 shall be immediately available for Project 96–D–111, the National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory: Provided further, That $69,100,000 shall be available only upon a certification by the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to the Congress after March 31, 2001, that (a) includes a recommendation on an appropriate path forward for the project; (b) certifies all established project and scientific milestones have been met on schedule and on cost; (c) certifies the first and second quarter project reviews in fiscal year 2001 determined the project to be on schedule and cost; (d) includes a study of requirements for and alternatives to a 192 beam ignition facility for maintaining the safety and reliability of the current nuclear weapons stockpile; (e) certifies an integrated cost-schedule earned-value project control system has been fully implemented; and (f) includes a five-year budget plan for the stockpile stewardship program.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $874,196,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed $7,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses for national security and nonproliferation (including transparency) activities in fiscal year 2001.

NAVAL REACTORS

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for naval reactors activities to carry out the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition (by purchase, condemnation, construction, or otherwise) of real property, plant, and capital equipment, facilities, and facility expansion, $690,163,000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration, including official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed $5,000), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OTHER DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense environmental restoration and waste management activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; and the purchase of 30 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $4,974,476,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS

For expenses of the Department of Energy to accelerate the closure of defense environmental management sites, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other necessary expenses, $1,082,714,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

For Department of Energy expenses for privatization projects necessary for atomic energy defense environmental management activities authorized by the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), $65,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense, other defense activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $585,755,000, to remain available until expended, of which $17,000,000 shall be for the Department of Energy Employees Compensation Initiative upon enactment of authorization legislation into law.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97–425, as amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, $200,000,000, to remain available until expended.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93–454, are approved for the Nez Perce Tribe Resident Fish Substitution Program, the Cour D'Alene Tribe Trout Production facility, and for official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500.

During fiscal year 2001, no new direct loan obligations may be made. Section 511 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–206), is amended by striking the last sentence and inserting, ''This authority shall expire January 1, 2003.''.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, including transmission wheeling and ancillary services, pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, $3,900,000, to remain available until expended; in addition, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, amounts collected by the Southeastern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures as follows: for fiscal year 2001, up to $34,463,000; for fiscal year 2002, up to $26,463,000; for fiscal year 2003, up to $20,000,000; and for fiscal year 2004, up to $15,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, and for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500 in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, $28,100,000, to remain available until expended; in addition, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, not to exceed $4,200,000 in reimbursements, to remain available until expended: Provided, That amounts collected by the Southwestern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures as follows: for fiscal year 2001, up to $288,000; for fiscal year 2002, up to $288,000; for fiscal year 2003, up to $288,000; and for fiscal year 2004, up to $288,000.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out the functions authorized by title III, section 302(a)(1)(E) of the Act of August 4, 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7152), and other related activities including conservation and renewable resources programs as authorized, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500, $165,830,000, to remain available until expended, of which $154,616,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund: Provided, That of the amount herein appropriated, $5,950,000 is for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account pursuant to title IV of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992: Provided further, That amounts collected by the Western Area Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures as follows: for fiscal year 2001, up to $65,224,000; for fiscal year 2002, up to $33,500,000; for fiscal year 2003, up to $30,000,000; and for fiscal year 2004, up to $20,000,000.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

For operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams, $2,670,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund of the Western Area Power Administration, as provided in section 423 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out the provisions of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed $3,000), $175,200,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $175,200,000 of revenues from fees and annual charges, and other services and collections in fiscal year 2001 shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this account, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced as revenues are received during fiscal year 2001 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2001 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than $0.

RESCISSIONS

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated in Public Law 104–46 for interim storage of nuclear waste, $75,000,000 are transferred to this heading and are hereby rescinded.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated in Public Law 106–60 and prior Energy and Water Development Acts for the Tank Waste Remediation System at Richland, Washington, $97,000,000 of unexpended balances of prior appropriations are rescinded.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 301. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to award a management and operating contract unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures or the Secretary of Energy grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. The Secretary may not delegate the authority to grant such a waiver.

(b) At least 60 days before a contract award, amendment, or modification for which the Secretary intends to grant such a waiver, the Secretary shall submit to the Subcommittees on Energy and Water Development of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report notifying the subcommittees of the waiver and setting forth the reasons for the waiver.

SEC. 302. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to—

(1) develop or implement a workforce restructuring plan that covers employees of the Department of Energy; or

(2) provide enhanced severance payments or other benefits for employees of the Department of Energy,

under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2644; 42 U.S.C. 7274h).

SEC. 303. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to augment the $24,500,000 made available for obligation by this Act for severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2644; 42 U.S.C. 7274h) unless the Department of Energy submits a reprogramming request subject to approval by the appropriate Congressional committees.

SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to prepare or initiate Requests For Proposals (RFPs) for a program if the program has not been funded by Congress.

(TRANSFERS OF UNEXPENDED BALANCES)

SEC. 305. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 306. Of the funds in this Act provided to government-owned, contractor-operated laboratories, not to exceed 6 percent shall be available to be used for Laboratory Directed Research and Development.

SEC. 307. (a) Of the funds appropriated by this title to the Department of Energy, not more than $185,000,000 shall be available for reimbursement of management and operating contractor travel expenses, of which $10,000,000 is available for use by the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Energy for emergency travel expenses.

(b) Funds appropriated by this title to the Department of Energy may be used to reimburse a Department of Energy management and operating contractor for travel costs of its employees under the contract only to the extent that the contractor applies to its employees the same rates and amounts as those that apply to Federal employees under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, or rates and amounts established by the Secretary of Energy. The Secretary of Energy may provide exceptions to the reimbursement requirements of this section as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to reimbursement of management and operating contractor travel expenses within the Laboratory Directed Research and Development program.

SEC. 308. No funds are provided in this Act or any other Act for the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration to enter into any agreement to perform energy efficiency services outside the legally defined Bonneville service territory, with the exception of services provided internationally, including services provided on a reimbursable basis, unless the Administrator certifies that such services are not available from private sector businesses.

SEC. 309. None of the funds in this Act may be used to dispose of transuranic waste in the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant which contains concentrations of plutonium in excess of 20 percent by weight for the aggregate of any material category on the date of enactment of this Act, or is generated after such date. For the purposes of this section, the material categories of transuranic waste at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site include: (1) ash residues; (2) salt residues; (3) wet residues; (4) direct repackage residues; and (5) scrub alloy as referenced in the ''Final Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Certain Plutonium Residues and Scrub Alloy Stored at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site''.

SEC. 310. The Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration may authorize the plant manager of a covered nuclear weapons production plant to engage in research, development, and demonstration activities with respect to the engineering and manufacturing capabilities at such plant in order to maintain and enhance such capabilities at such plant: Provided, That of the amount allocated to a covered nuclear weapons production plant each fiscal year from amounts available to the Department of Energy for such fiscal year for national security programs, not more than an amount equal to 2 percent of such amount may be used for these activities: Provided further, That for purposes of this section, the term ''covered nuclear weapons production plant'' means the following:

(1) The Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, Missouri.

(2) The Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

(3) The Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas.

(4) The Savannah River Plant, South Carolina.

SEC. 311. Notwithstanding any other law, and without fiscal year limitation, each Federal Power Marketing Administration is authorized to engage in activities and solicit, undertake and review studies and proposals relating to the formation and operation of a regional transmission organization.

SEC. 312. Not more than $10,000,000 of funds previously appropriated for interim waste storage activities for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal in Public Law 104–46, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1996, may be made available to the Department of Energy upon written certification by the Secretary of Energy to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that the Site Recommendation Report cannot be completed on time without additional funding.

SEC. 313. TERM OF OFFICE OF PERSON FIRST APPOINTED AS UNDER SECRETARY FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY. (a) LENGTH OF TERM.—The term of office as Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy of the first person appointed to that position shall be three years.

(b) EXCLUSIVE REASONS FOR REMOVAL.—The exclusive reasons for removal from office as Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the person described in subsection (a) shall be inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

(c) POSITION DESCRIBED.—The position of Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy referred to in this section is the position established by subsection (c) of section 202 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7132), as added by section 3202 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (title XXXII of Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 954).

SEC. 314. SCOPE OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF ENERGY TO MODIFY ORGANIZATION OF NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION. (a) SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.—Subtitle A of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (title XXXII of Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 957; 50 U.S.C. 2401 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 3219. SCOPE OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF ENERGY TO MODIFY ORGANIZATION OF ADMINISTRATION.

''Notwithstanding the authority granted by section 643 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7253) or any other provision of law, the Secretary of Energy may not establish, abolish, alter, consolidate, or discontinue any organizational unit or component, or transfer any function, of the Administration, except as authorized by subsection (b) or (c) of section 3291.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 643 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7253) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''(a) Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) The authority of the Secretary to establish, abolish, alter, consolidate, or discontinue any organizational unit or component of the National Nuclear Security Administration is governed by the provisions of section 3219 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (title XXXII of Public Law 106–65).''.

SEC. 315. PROHIBITION ON PAY OF PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN CONCURRENT SERVICE OR DUTIES INSIDE AND OUTSIDE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION. Subtitle C of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (title XXXII of Public Law 106–65; 50 U.S.C. 2441 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 3245. PROHIBITION ON PAY OF PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN CONCURRENT SERVICE OR DUTIES INSIDE AND OUTSIDE ADMINISTRATION.

''(a) Except as otherwise expressly provided by statute, no funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Energy may be obligated or utilized to pay the basic pay of an officer or employee of the Department of Energy who—

''(1) serves concurrently in a position in the Administration and a position outside the Administration; or

''(2) performs concurrently the duties of a position in the Administration and the duties of a position outside the Administration.''

''(b) The provision of this section shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this section.''.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, for necessary expenses for the Federal Co-Chairman and the alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission, for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $66,400,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities

authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 100–456, section 1441, $18,500,000, to remain available until expended.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to establish the Delta Regional Authority and to carry out its activities, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DENALI COMMISSION

For expenses of the Denali Commission including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment as necessary and other expenses, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including official representation expenses (not to exceed $15,000), $481,900,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the amount appropriated herein, $21,600,000 shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: Provided further, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at $447,958,000 in fiscal year 2001 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That $3,200,000 of the funds herein appropriated for regulatory reviews and assistance to other Federal agencies and States shall be excluded from license fee revenues, notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 2214: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2001 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2001 appropriation estimated at not more than $33,942,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $5,500,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at $5,390,000 in fiscal year 2001 shall be retained and be available until expended, for necessary salaries and expenses in this account notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2001 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2001 appropriation estimated at not more than $110,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100–203, section 5051, $2,900,000, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, and to remain available until expended.

TITLE V

FISCAL YEAR 2001 EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

CERRO GRANDE FIRE ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses to remediate damaged Department of Energy facilities and for other expenses associated with the Cerro Grande fire, $203,460,000, to remain available until expended, of which $2,000,000 shall be made available to the United States Army Corps of Engineers to undertake immediate measures to provide erosion control and sediment protection to sewage lines, trails, and bridges in Pueblo and Los Alamos Canyons downstream of Diamond Drive in New Mexico: Provided, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for $203,460,000, that 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, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: 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.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, $11,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for $11,000,000, that 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, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: 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.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in section 1913 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 602. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—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) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—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) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—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, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 603. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to determine the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit until development by the Secretary of the Interior and the State of California of a plan, which shall conform to the water quality standards of the State of California as approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to minimize any detrimental effect of the San Luis drainage waters.

(b) The costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and the costs of the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program shall be classified by the Secretary of the Interior as reimbursable or nonreimbursable and collected until fully repaid pursuant to the ''Cleanup Program—Alternative Repayment Plan'' and the ''SJVDP—Alternative Repayment Plan'' described in the report entitled ''Repayment Report, Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, February 1995'', prepared by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. Any future obligations of funds by the United States relating to, or providing for, drainage service or drainage studies for the San Luis Unit shall be fully reimbursable by San Luis Unit beneficiaries of such service or studies pursuant to Federal Reclamation law.

SEC. 604. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementation, or in preparation for implementation, of the Kyoto Protocol which was adopted on December 11, 1997, in Kyoto, Japan at the Third Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which has not been submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification pursuant to article II, section 2, clause 2, of the United States Constitution, and which has not entered into force pursuant to article 25 of the Protocol.

SEC. 605. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay any basic pay of an individual who simultaneously holds or carries out the responsibilities of—

(1) a position within the National Nuclear Security Administration; and

(2) a position within the Department of Energy not within the Administration.

(b) EXCEPTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATOR FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY AND DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR NAVAL REACTORS.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to the following cases:

(1) The Under Secretary of Energy for Nuclear Security serving as the Administrator for Nuclear Security, as provided in section 3212(a)(2) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2402(a)(2)).

(2) The director of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program provided for under the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Executive Order serving as the Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors, as provided in section 3216(a)(1) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2406(a)(1)).

SEC. 606. FUNDING OF THE COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT. Section 4(a) of the Act of August 9, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 777c(a)), is amended in the second sentence by striking ''2000'' and inserting ''2009''.

SEC. 607. REDESIGNATION OF INTERSTATE SANITATION COMMISSION AND DISTRICT. (a) INTERSTATE SANITATION COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The district known as the ''Interstate Sanitation Commission'', established by article III of the Tri-State Compact described in the Resolution entitled, ''A Joint Resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to enter into a compact for the creation of the Interstate Sanitation District and the establishment of the Interstate Sanitation Commission'', approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 933), is redesignated as the ''Interstate Environmental Commission''.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Interstate Sanitation Commission shall be deemed to be a reference to the Interstate Environmental Commission.

(b) INTERSTATE SANITATION DISTRICT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The district known as the ''Interstate Sanitation District'', established by article II of the Tri-State Compact described in the Resolution entitled, ''A Joint Resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to enter into a compact for the creation of the Interstate Sanitation District and the establishment of the Interstate Sanitation Commission'', approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 932), is redesignated as the ''Interstate Environmental District''.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Interstate Sanitation District shall be deemed to be a reference to the Interstate Environmental District.

TITLE VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

GIFTS TO THE UNITED STATES FOR REDUCTION OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

For deposit of an additional amount for fiscal year 2001 into the account established under section 3113(d) of title 31, United States Code, to reduce the public debt, $5,000,000,000.

TITLE VIII

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Section 6101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 2214) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking ''September 30, 1999'' and inserting ''September 20, 2005''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''or certificate holder'' after ''licensee''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF CHARGES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The aggregate amount of the annual charges collected from all licensees and certificate holders in a fiscal year shall equal an amount that approximates the percentages of the budget authority of the Commission for the fiscal year stated in subparagraph (B), less—

''(i) amounts collected under subsection (b) during the fiscal year; and

''(ii) amounts appropriated to the Commission from the Nuclear Waste Fund for the fiscal year.

''(B) PERCENTAGES.—The percentages referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

''(i) 98 percent for fiscal year 2001;

''(ii) 96 percent for fiscal year 2002;

''(iii) 94 percent for fiscal year 2003;

''(iv) 92 percent for fiscal year 2004; and

''(v) 90 percent for fiscal year 2005.''.

This Act may be cited as the ''Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2001''.

And the Senate agree to the same.

RON PACKARD,
HAROLD ROGERS,
JOE KNOLLENBERG,
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN,
SONNY CALLAHAN,
TOM LATHAM,
ROGER F. WICKER,
C.W. BILL YOUNG,
PETER J. VISCLOSKY,
CHET EDWARDS,
ED PASTOR,
MICHAEL P. FORBES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE V. DOMENICI,
THAD COCHRAN,
SLADE GORTON,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
ROBERT F. BENNETT,
CONRAD BURNS,
LARRY E. CRAIG,
TED STEVENS,
HARRY REID,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
PATTY MURRAY,
HERB KOHL,
DANIEL INOUYE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

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. 4733) making appropriations for energy and water development 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 effects of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The language and allocations set forth in House Report 106–693 and Senate Report 106–395 should be complied with unless specifically addressed to the contrary in the conference report and statement of the managers. Report language included by the House which is not contradicted by the report of the Senate or the statement of the managers, and Senate report language which is not contradicted by the report of the House or the statement of the managers is approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein. In cases where both the House report and Senate report address a particular issue not specifically addressed in the conference report or joint statement of managers, the conferees have determined that the House and Senate reports are not inconsistent and are to be interpreted accordingly. In cases in which the House or Senate have directed the submission of a report, such report is to be submitted to both House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

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.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs, and activities of the Corps of Engineers. Additional items of conference are discussed below.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

The conference agreement appropriates $160,038,000 for General Investigations instead of $153,327,000 as proposed by the House and $139,219,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Within available funds, $50,000 is provided for erosion control studies in the Harding Lake watershed in Alaska. The conference agreement deletes the bill language proposed by the Senate for this project.

The conference agreement does not include funds proposed by the House in this account for the Hamilton Airfield Wetlands Restoration project in California and the Ohio River Greenway project in Indiana. Funding for these projects is included in the Construction, General account. The conference agreement does not include funds in this account for the White River, Muncie, Indiana, project. Funding for this project has been included within the amount provided for the Section 1135 program.

The conference agreement includes $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake studies of potential navigational improvements, shoreline protection, and breakwater protection at the ports of Rota and Tinian in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

The conferees have provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a comprehensive water management reconnaissance study for ecosystem restoration and related purposes in the St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair watersheds in Michigan pursuant to section 426 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

Within the amount provided for Research and Development, $200,000 is provided for a topographic/bathymetric mapping project for Coastal Louisiana in cooperation with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration at the interagency Federal laboratory in Lafayette, Louisiana. The conference agreement does not include bill language proposed by the Senate for this work. The conferees also urge the Corps of Engineers to use available Research and Development funds for a review of innovative dredging technologies for potential implementation in the Peoria Lakes, Illinois, area.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House and the Senate which provides that in conducting the Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction, Albuquerque, New Mexico, study, the Corps of Engineers shall include an evaluation of flood damage reduction measures that would otherwise be excluded from the feasibility analysis based on policies regarding the frequency of flooding, the drainage area, and the amount of runoff.

The conferees have agreed to include language in the bill which directs the Corps of Engineers to use $750,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Murrieta Creek, California, flood control project in accordance with Alternative 6, as identified in the Murrieta Creek Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement dated June 2000.

The conference agreement deletes bill language proposed by the Senate providing funds for the John Glenn Great Lakes Basin Program, the Detroit River, Michigan, project, and the Niobrara River and Missouri River, South Dakota, project. Funds for these projects have been included in the overall amount provided for General Investigations.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate providing funds for the selection of a permanent disposal site for environmentally sound dredged material from navigation projects in the State of Rhode Island. Funds for this work have been provided within the amount appropriated for Operation and Maintenance, General.

Within the amount provided for Flood Plain Management Services, the conference agreement includes $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study of drainage problems in the Winchester, Kentucky, area. In addition, the conferees urge the Corps of Engineers to complete a report on flood control problems on Negro Creek at Sprague, Washington.

Within the amount provided for Planning Assistance to States, the conference agreement includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to update the daily flow model for the Delaware River Basin.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

The conference agreement appropriates $1,695,699,000 for Construction, General instead of $1,378,430,000 as proposed by the House and $1,361,449,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount recommended by the conferees for the Corps of Engineers construction program represents a significant increase over the budget request and the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2000. However, the conferees note that the budget request grossly underfunds many ongoing construction projects, and its enactment would result in increased project costs, major delays in the completion of projects and loss of project benefits. The conferees also note that the Corps of Engineers, through the use of unobligated balances, expects its fiscal year 2000 construction expenditures to be approximately $1,600,000,000.

The conferees note that the Lake Worth Inlet, Florida, sand transfer plant project is behind schedule and expect the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the project as expeditiously as possible.

Within the amount provided for the West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control

Project, $1,000,000 is provided for the following projects within the State of Pennsylvania: Bloody Run/Everett Borough ($25,000); Shoups Run/Carbon Township ($150,500); Six Mile Run/Coaldale ($125,000); Black Log Creek/Boroughs of Orbisonia and Rockhill Furnace ($127,000); Newton Hamilton Borough ($465,500); and Coal Bank Run/Coalmont Borough ($107,000).

The conference agreement includes $150,000 for the Southeastern Pennsylvania project for the Corps of Engineers to prepare a decision document to determine the Federal interest in and the scope of the problems in the Logan and Feltonville sections of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to use $500,000 to initiate the Hillsboro Inlet, Florida, project in accordance with the Jacksonville District's General Reevaluation Report for the project dated May 2000.

The conference agreement includes $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake water related infrastructure projects in northeastern Pennsylvania as authorized by section 502(f)(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

The conference agreement includes $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake water related infrastructure projects in Avis Borough and Renovo Borough, Clinton County, Pennsylvania.

The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for sanitary sewer and water and wastewater infrastructure projects in Towanencin Township, Pennsylvania, as authorized by section 502(f)(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999; $200,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the city of St. Louis, Missouri, as authorized by section 502(f)(32) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999; and $300,000 for water related infrastructure projects in Lake and Porter Counties, Indiana, as authorized by section 502(f)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. In addition, the conference agreement includes $2,500,000 to carry out environmental infrastructure projects in northeastern Minnesota as authorized by section 569 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

The conference agreement includes $25,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to design, construct, and operate water quality projects in the San Gabriel Basin of California; and $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers, in coordination with other Federal agencies and the Brazos River Authority, to participate in investigations and projects in the Bosque and Leon Watersheds in Texas to assess the impact of the perchlorate associated with the former Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant at McGregor, Texas.

The conference agreement includes $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the environmental restoration pilot project at Dog River, Alabama.

The conference agreement includes $1,500,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the City of Lebanon, New Hampshire, as authorized by section 502(f)(37) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999; $1,500,000 for environmental infrastructure projects in Ohio authorized in section 594 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999; and $3,000,000 for environmental infrastructure projects in central New Mexico authorized in section 593 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

The conference agreement includes a total of $37,100,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project. In addition to the amounts included in the budget request, the conference agreement includes: $4,000,000 for the Clover Fork, Kentucky, element of the project; $4,800,000 for the Middlesboro, Kentucky, element of the project; $1,000,000 for the City of Cumberland, Kentucky, element of the project; $700,000 for the Town of Martin, Kentucky, element of the project; $4,200,000 for the Pike County, Kentucky, element of the project, including $1,400,000 for additional studies along the tributaries of the Tug Fork and the initiation of a Detailed Project Report for the Levisa Fork; $3,500,000 for the Martin County, Kentucky, element of the project; $1,200,000 for additional studies along the tributaries of the Cumberland River in Bell County, Kentucky; $800,000 to continue the detailed project report for the Buchanan County, Virginia, element of the project; $700,000 to continue the detailed project report for the Dickenson County, Virginia, element of the project; $1,500,000 for the Upper Mingo County, West Virginia, element of the project; $1,600,000 for the Kermit, Lower Mingo County (Kermit), West Virginia, element of the project; $400,000 for the Wayne County, West Virginia, element of the project; and $600,000 for the McDowell County, West Virginia, element of the project.

The conference agreement includes $7,000,000 for the Dam Safety and Seepage Stability Correction Program. Of the amount provided, $1,000,000 is for repairs to the Mississinewa Lake, Indiana, project, and up to $2,000,000 is for the Waterbury Dam, Vermont, project.

The conference agreement includes $4,000,000 for the Rural Nevada project authorized by section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. Of the amount provided, $1,500,000 is for the Lawton-Verdi, Nevada, sewer inceptor project; $1,000,000 is for the Mesquite, Nevada, project; and $1,500,000 for the Silver Springs, Nevada, sanitary sewer project.

The conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to undertake the projects listed in the House and Senate reports and the projects described below for the various continuing authorities programs. The recommended funding levels for those programs are as follows: Section 206—$19,000,000; Section 204—$4,000,000; Section 14—$9,000,000; Section 205—$35,000,000; Section 111—$300,000; Section 107—$11,000,000; Section 1135—$21,000,000; Section 103—$2,500,000; and Section 208—$600,000. The conferees are aware that there are funding requirements for ongoing continuing authorities projects that may not be accommodated within the funds provided for each program. It is not the conferees' intent that ongoing projects be terminated. If additional funds are needed during the year to keep ongoing work in any program on schedule, the conferees urge the Corps of Engineers to reprogram funds into the program within available funds.

Of the amount provided for the Section 14 program, $580,000 is to initiate and complete the planning and design analysis phase, execute a project cooperation agreement, and initiate and complete construction for the Rouge River, Southfield, Michigan, project.

Of the amount provided for the Section 111 program, $300,000 is to prepare a shoreline stabilization study and plans and specifications, and award a construction contract for the Virginia Key, Florida, project.

Of the amount provided for the Section 205 program, $100,000 is to undertake the Columbus, New Mexico, project; $200,000 is to undertake the Battle Mountain, Nevada, project; and $500,000 is to undertake the Hay Creek, Roseau County, Minnesota, project. The conference agreement deletes the bill language proposed by the Senate for the Hay Creek project. In addition, for the McKeel Brook, Dover and Rockaway Townships, New Jersey, project, the funds provided are to be used to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Morris County plan.

Of the amount provided for the Section 1135 program, $100,000 is to initiate the upland environmental restoration study for the Virginia Key, Florida, project; $300,000 is to prepare an environmental restoration report and prepare a project cooperation agreement for the White River, Muncie, Indiana, project; $250,000 is to initiate and complete a preliminary restoration plan and a feasibility report for the Sand Creek, Newton, Kansas, project; and $200,000 is to initiate the ecosystem restoration report for the Lake Champlain Watershed, Vermont, project. In addition, the Corps of Engineers is directed to proceed with the most cost effective solution to the water quality degradation and related environmental and public impacts associated with the western jetty at the mouth of the Genessee River at Rochester, New York.

Of the amount provided for the Section 107 program, $810,000 is for construction of the Pemiscot Harbor, Missouri, project; $3,000,000 is for construction of the Ouzinkie Harbor, Alaska, project; and $500,000 is to initiate construction of the South Basin Inner Harbor, Buffalo, New York, project.

The amount provided for the Section 206 program does not include funds for the Upper Truckee River project. Funds for this project are included in the Bureau of Reclamation's Wetlands Development Program.

The conference agreement includes $4,000,000 for the Aquatic Plant Control program. Within the amount provided, $400,000 is for aquatic weed control in Lake Champlain, Vermont, $250,000 is for aquatic plant control within the State of South Carolina, and $100,000 is for the control and tracking of aquatic plants in the Potomac River in Virginia and Maryland.

The conferees have included language in the bill earmarking funds for the following projects in the amount specified: San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem), California, $5,000,000; San Gabriel Basin Groundwater Restoration, California, $25,000,000; Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana, $10,000,000; Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky, $4,000,000; Clover Fork, Middlesboro, City of Cumberland, Town of Martin, Pike County (including Levisa Fork and Tug Fork tributaries), Bell County, Martin County, and Harlan County, Kentucky, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project, $20,000,000; Jackson County, Mississippi, $2,000,000; Bosque and Leon Rivers, Texas, $4,000,000; Upper Mingo County (including Mingo County Tributaries), Lower Mingo County (Kermit), Wayne County, and McDowell County, West Virginia, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project, $4,100,000.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House which directs the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the Town of Martin element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project in accordance with a Plan A as set forth in the preliminary draft Detailed Project Report, Appendix T of the General Plan of the Huntington District Commander.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House which directs the Corps of Engineers to use $900,000 to undertake the Bowie County Levee project in Texas, which is defined as Alternative B Local Sponsor Option in the Corps of Engineers document entitled Bowie County Local Flood Protection, Red River, Texas, project Design Memorandum No. 1, Bowie County Levee, dated April 1997.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which provides that none of the funds appropriated in the

Act may be used to begin Phase II of the John Day Drawdown study or to initiate a study of the drawdown of McNary Dam unless authorized by law.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which directs the Corps of Engineers to use available Construction, General, funds to complete design and construction of the Red River Regional Visitors Center in the vicinity of Shreveport, Louisiana, at an estimated cost of $6,000,000.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which increases the authorization for the Norco Bluffs, California, project.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which directs the Corps of Engineers to use $3,000,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act for additional emergency bank stabilization measures at Galena, Alaska, under the same terms and conditions as previously undertaken emergency bank stabilization work.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate directing the Corps of Engineers to use $4,200,000 appropriated in the Act to continue construction of the Ocean Isle Beach segment of the Brunswick County Beaches, North Carolina, project in accordance with the General Reevaluation Report approved by the Chief of Engineers on May 15, 1998.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which directs the Corps of Engineers to use $300,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act to reimburse the City of Renton, Washington, for mitigation expenses incurred for the flood control project constructed on the Cedar River at Renton as a result of over-dredging by the Corps of Engineers.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate subjecting the expenditure of previously appropriated funds for the Devils Lake, North Dakota, project to a number of conditions.

The conference agreement includes language which provides that $2,000,000 shall be available for stabilization and renovation of Lock and Dam 10 on the Kentucky River, subject to the enactment of authorization for the project.

The conference agreement includes language which directs the Corps of Engineers to use $3,000,000 to initiate construction of a navigation project at Kaumalapau Harbor, Hawaii. The project will consist of a 350–foot long breakwater and a channel depth of 19 feet.

The conference agreement includes language which directs the Corps of Engineers to design and construct seepage control features at Waterbury Dam, Winooski River, Vermont. The Dam Safety and Seepage Correction Program includes up to $2,000,000 to initiate this work. The proposed corrective actions will restore the structural integrity of the dam and reduce the chances of potential failure.

The conference agreement includes language which directs the Corps of Engineers to design and construct barge lanes at the Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, project.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

The conference agreement appropriates $347,731,000 for Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries instead of $323,350,000 as proposed by the House and $334,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $900,000 for the Southeast Arkansas feasibility study. The House had proposed to fund this study in the General Investigations account.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which directs the Secretary of the Army to complete the analysis and determination regarding Federal maintenance of the Greenville Inner Harbor, Mississippi, navigation project in accordance with section 509 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

The conference agreement includes $375,000 for construction of the Yazoo Basin Tributaries project and $47,000,000 for continuing construction of Mississippi River levees. The conference agreement deletes bill language proposed by the Senate regarding these projects.

The conference agreement includes $7,242,000 for operation and maintenance of Arkabutla Lake; $5,280,000 for operation and maintenance of Grenada Lake; $7,680,000 for operation and maintenance of Sardis Lake; and $4,376,000 for operation and maintenance of Enid Lake. The conference agreement deletes bill language proposed by the Senate regarding these projects.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

The conference agreement appropriates $1,901,959,000 for Operation and Maintenance, General, instead of $1,854,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,862,471,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $6,755,000 for the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers project in Georgia, Alabama, and Florida. The additional funds above the budget request shall be used to implement environmental restoration requirements as specified under the certification issued by the State of Florida under section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and dated October 1999, including $1,200,000 for increased environmental dredging and $500,000 for related environmental studies required by the state water quality certification. The conference agreement does not include bill language proposed by the Senate regarding this project.

The conferees have provided $5,071,000 for the Red Rock Dam and Lake, Iowa, project. The funds provided above the budget request are for repair and replacement of various features of the project including repair of the scouring of the South-East Des Moines levee.

The conference agreement includes $10,400,000 for operation and maintenance of the Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi, project.

The conference agreement includes $1,500,000 over the budget request for the Corps of Engineers to address impacts of recent fires, undertake habitat restoration activities, and address other essential requirements at Cochiti Lake in New Mexico.

The conference agreement includes an additional $3,000,000 for the Jemez Dam, New Mexico, project for the Corps of Engineers to address the impacts of increased water releases required to help sustain the endangered silvery minnow.

The conferees have provided an additional $600,000 for the Waco Lake, Texas, project for the Corps of Engineers to address the higher lake levels associated with the raising of the dam.

The conferees have provided $12,570,000 for the Grays Harbor, Washington, project, including $650,000 for repair of the south jetty, $1,000,000 to complete the rehabilitation of the north jetty at Ocean Shores, and $1,100,000 for the north jetty operations and maintenance study.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which directs the Corps of Engineers to prepare the necessary documents and initiate removal of submerged obstructions in the area previously marked by the Ambrose Light Tower in New York Harbor.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate providing $500,000 for maintenance and repair of the Sakonnet Harbor breakwater in Little Compton, Rhode Island. Funds for this project are included in the amount appropriated for Operation and Maintenance, General.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate providing $50,000 for a study of crossings across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. The amount provided for operation and maintenance of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal project includes $50,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study to determine the adequacy and timing for maintaining good and sufficient crossings across the canal.

Although the conference agreement deletes bill language proposed by the Senate regarding the marketing of dredged material from the Delaware River Deepening project, the conferees expect the Corps of Engineers to establish such a program.

The conference agreement includes language which directs the Corps of Engineers to use $500,000 to dredge a channel from the mouth of Wheeling Creek to Tunnel Green Park in Wheeling, West Virginia.

The conference agreement includes language which provides that $500,000 of the funds provided for the Columbia and Lower Willamette River below Vancouver, Washington, and Portland, Oregon, project shall be used to remove and reinstall the docks and causeway, in kind, at the Astoria East Boat Basin in Oregon.

The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to extend the sheet pile wall on the west end of the entrance to the Dillingham, Alaska, small boat harbor, and to replace the existing wooden bulkhead at the city dock under the provisions of Public Law 99–190.

The conferees are aware of costs associated with maintaining and operating the complex computer system used to execute and program activities for the entire Operation and Maintenance program. The conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to specifically budget for this computer system in future years and, within available fiscal year 2001 funds, pay for this effort under Operation and Maintenance, General.

The conferees are aware of a plan to improve the effectiveness of public information exhibits located within visitor centers at Corps of Engineers projects. The initial plan will be developed by a multidiscipline team and is scheduled to be completed this year. The conferees expect the plan to be developed within available Operation and Maintenance, General, funds and expect implementation of any plans to be justified in future budget requests.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to extend the existing Bethel Bank Stabilization project in Alaska an additional 1200 linear feet upstream, and to remove sediments from Brown's Slough that hamper safe navigation.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

The conference agreement appropriates $125,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers Regulatory Program as proposed by the House instead of $120,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House and the Senate which will improve the analysis and increase the information available to the public and the Congress regarding the costs of the nationwide permit program and permit processing times.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

The conference agreement appropriates $140,000,000 for the Formerly Utilized Sites

Remedial Action Program as proposed by the House and the Senate.

The conferees concur with the language in the Senate report regarding the Parks Township Shallow Land Disposal Area in Armstrong County, Pennsylvania.

GENERAL EXPENSES

The conference agreement appropriates $152,000,000 for General Expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $149,500,000 as proposed by the House.

REVOLVING FUND

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House and the Senate which provides that amounts in the Revolving Fund are available for the costs of relocating the Corps of Engineers headquarters to the General Accounting Office building.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Section 101. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House which provides for the transfer of responsibility of local sponsorship of recreation development at Joe Pool Lake, Texas, from the Trinity River Authority to the City of Grand Prairie, Texas.

Section 102. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which places a limit on credits and reimbursements allowable per project and annually.

Section 103. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which prohibits the use of funds to revise the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual if the revision provides for increases in springtime water releases during spring heavy rainfall or snow melt.

Section 104. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which provides that none of the funds provided in this Act may used for activities related to the closure or removal of the St. Georges Bridge across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal in Delaware.

Section 105. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which provides that the Secretary of the Army shall provide up to $7,000,000 to replace and upgrade the dam in Kake, Alaska.

Provisions not included in the conference agreement.—The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the House extending the authorization for spending Coastal Wetlands Restoration Trust Fund receipts. This matter has been addressed in Title VI. The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate regarding the use of continuing contracts for Corps of Engineers projects. The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate earmarking funds for the Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi, project and the Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi, project. Funds for those projects are included in the amounts appropriated for Operation and Maintenance, General, and Construction, General, respectively.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate regarding the Kihei Area Erosion project in Hawaii. It is the intent of the conferees that the Kihei Area Erosion study shall include an analysis of the extent and causes of the shoreline erosion. Further, a regional economic development (RED) analysis shall be included. The results of the RED analysis shall be displayed in all study documents along with the traditional benefit-cost analysis including recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate regarding the Waikiki Erosion Control project in Hawaii. It is the intent of the conferees that the Waikiki Erosion Control study shall include an analysis of environmental resources that have been, or may be, threatened by erosion of the shoreline. Further, a regional economic development (RED) analysis shall be included. The results of the RED analysis shall be displayed in all study documents along with the traditional benefit-cost analysis including recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate directing the Secretary of the Army to conduct a study to determine the need for providing additional crossing capacity across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. The conference agreement includes $50,000 under Operation and Maintenance, General for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study to determine the adequacy and timing for maintaining good and sufficient crossings across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate expressing the sense of the Senate concerning dredging of the main channel of the Delaware River and language proposed by the Senate regarding the Historic Area Remediation Site.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
ALABAMA				
ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE LOCK AND DAM, AL	200	---	200	---
BALDWIN COUNTY WATERSHEDS, AL	200	---	200	---
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	100	---	100	---
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	521	---	521	---
BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL	50	---	50	---
CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL	50	---	50	---
COOSA RIVER, AL	---	---	---	150
DOG RIVER, AL	250	---	250	---
LUBBUB CREEK, AL	50	---	50	---
LUXAPALILA CREEK, LAMAR COUNTY, AL	---	---	100	---
VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	250	---	250	---
ALASKA				
AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	108	---	108	---
AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	---	150	---	150
ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK	---	---	50	---
ANIAK, AK	50	---	50	---
BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	150	---	150	---
CHANDALAR RIVER WATERSHED, VENETIE INDIAN, AK	50	---	50	---
CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	50	---	50	---
CRAIG HARBOR, AK	---	---	100	---
DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK	422	---	700	---
DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	109	---	109	---
DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	---	50	---	50
FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK	---	250	---	250
FIRE ISLAND, AK	---	---	100	---
GASTINEAU CHANNEL MODIFICATION, AK	50	---	50	---
HAINES HARBOR, AK	---	---	200	---
KENAI RIVER WATERSHED, AK	50	---	50	---
KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK	---	---	200	---
KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	---	---	150	---
LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK	---	---	75	---
MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	100	---	100	---
MEKORYUK HARBOR, AK	---	---	100	---
NAKNEK RIVER WATERSHED, AK	50	---	50	---
NAPASKIAK HARBOR, AK	69	---	69	---
PERRYVILLE HARBOR, AK	120	---	120	---
PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	107	---	107	---
QUINHAGAK HARBOR, AK	100	---	100	---
SAINT GEORGE HARBOR IMPROVEMENT, AK	---	---	200	---
SHIP CREEK WATERSHED, AK	53	---	53	---
SITKA HARBOR, AK	---	---	100	---
SKAGWAY HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK	100	---	100	---
UNALAKLEET HARBOR, AK	74	---	74	---
UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	209	---	209	---
UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	---	58	---	58
VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	43	---	43	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	---	150	---	150
WHITTIER BREAKWATER, AK	---	---	169	---
AMERICAN SAMOA				
TUTUILA HARBOR, AS	275	---	275	---
ARIZONA				
COLONIAS ALONG THE U.S./MEXICO BORDER, AZ & TX	---	---	---	260
GILA RIVER, NORTHEAST PHOENIX DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	212	---	212	---
LITTLE COLORADO RIVER, AZ	100	---	100	---
PIMA COUNTY, AZ	75	---	175	---
RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	290	---	290	---
RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	---	250	---	375
RIO SALADO ESTE, AZ	175	---	175	---
RIO SALADO OESTE, AZ	175	---	400	---
SANTA CRUZ RIVER (GRANT RD. TO LOWELL RD.), AZ	---	---	300	---
SANTA CRUZ RIVER (PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS), AZ	100	---	335	---
TRES RIOS, AZ	---	250	---	500
TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	---	432	---	800
VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT, AZ	---	---	150	---
ARKANSAS				
ARKANSAS RIVER LEVEES, AR	---	---	---	400
ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, AR & OK	753	---	753	---
MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	247	---	247	---
NORTH LITTLE ROCK, DARK HOLLOW, AR	---	200	---	500
RED RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, SOUTHWEST ARKANSAS, AR	200	---	200	---
WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR & MO	500	---	500	---
WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION, AR	---	---	300	---
WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOW STUDY, AR	---	---	850	---
CALIFORNIA				
ALISO CREEK MAINSTEM, CA	50	---	500	---
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	---	3,285	---	3,285
ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	---	500	---	500
BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	---	300	---	300
CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CA	175	---	175	---
COAST OF CALIFORNIA STORM AND TIDAL WAVE STUDY, CA	---	---	500	---
HUNTINGTON BEACH, BLUFFTOP PARK, CA	---	---	211	---
LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	200	---	200	---
LLAGAS CREEK, CA	---	240	---	700
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	225	---	225	---
LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA	---	375	---	750
LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	---	325	---	325
MALIBU CREEK, CA	---	---	400	---
MARE ISLAND, CA	---	---	---	500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	---	---	500	---
MATILIJA DAM, CA	150	---	150	---
MIDDLE CREEK, CA	---	160	---	160
MOJAVE RIVER FORKS DAM, CA	200	---	200	---
MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	250	---	900	---
MUGU LAGOON, CA	250	---	250	---
MURRIETA CREEK, CA	---	300	---	750
N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA	150	---	150	---
N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	237	---	237	---
N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	90	---	90	---
N CA STREAMS, SUISUN MARSH, CA	65	---	65	---
NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	300	---	300	---
NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	50	---	50	---
NCS, LOWER CACHE CREEK, YOLO COUNTY, WOODLAND AND VIC,	300	---	500	---
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	---	350	---	350
NEWPORT BAY (LA-3 SITE DESIGNATION STUDY), CA	---	---	800	---
NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA	381	---	381	---
ORANGE COUNTY COAST BEACH EROSION, CA	---	---	475	---
ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	100	---	100	---
PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	---	600	---	1,200
PAJARO RIVER BASIN STUDY, CA	50	---	50	---
PENINSULA BEACH (CITY OF LONG BEACH), CA	---	---	250	---
PINE FLAT DAM, FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION,	---	300	---	300
PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	150	---	150	---
POSO CREEK, CA	150	---	500	---
RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	---	200	---	200
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	250	---	250	---
RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	200	---	200	---
SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	300	---	300	---
SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY,	1,500	---	3,000	---
SAN ANTONIO CREEK, CA	125	---	125	---
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA	100	---	100	---
SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	---	---	325	---
SAN DIEGO HARBOR, NATIONAL CITY, CA	125	---	125	---
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA	250	---	700	---
SAN GABRIEL RIVER TO NEWPORT BAY, CA	---	---	150	---
SAN JACINTO RIVER, CA	225	---	225	---
SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D	---	150	---	150
SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D	100	---	100	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CONSUMNES & MOKELUMNE RIVERS,	150	---	150	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CORRAL HOLLOW CREEK, CA	65	---	65	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FRAZIER CREEK, CA	65	---	250	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	180	---	180	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA	150	---	300	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA	213	---	213	---
SAN JUAN CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	50	---	200	---
SAN JUAN CREEK, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY, CA	50	---	50	---
SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA	170	---	170	---
SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	200	---	200	---
SANTA ROSA CREEK WATERSHED, CA	300	---	300	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
SANTA YNEZ, CA	---	---	100	---
SOLANA BEACH, CA	---	---	350	---
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	---	200	---	200
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLANS, CA.	---	---	1,882	---
STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA	150	---	300	---
SUTTER BASIN, CA	150	---	150	---
TAHOE BASIN, CA & NV	150	---	150	---
TIJUANA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	205	---	500	---
TULE RIVER, CA	---	400	---	400
UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	---	500	---	500
UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	300	---	300	---
UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED, CA	100	---	100	---
VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	400	---	400	---
WHITE RIVER AND DEER CREEK, CA	150	---	150	---
WESTMINISTER, CA	---	---	100	---
WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	---	---	---	500
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	---	400	---	400
COLORADO				
CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO.	250	---	250	---
FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CO	---	---	100	---
ZUNI AND SUN VALLEY REACHES, SOUTH PLATTE RIVER, CO	---	---	100	---
COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS				
NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, CNMI	100	---	150	---
CONNECTICUT				
COASTAL CONNECTICUT ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CT	80	---	80	---
DELAWARE				
C&D CANAL, BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE & MD (DEEPE	---	100	---	100
DELAWARE COAST FROM BETHANY BEACH TO SOUTH BETHANY, DE	---	---	---	33
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET/LEWES BEACH, D	---	---	---	124
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, BROADKILL BEACH, DE	---	---	---	304
FLORIDA				
BISCAYNE BAY, FL	543	---	543	---
HILLSBOROUGH RIVER, FL	114	---	114	---
LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	114	---	114	---
MILE POINT, FL	114	---	114	---
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	160	---	160	---
WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER, FL	114	---	114	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
GEORGIA				
ALLATOONA LAKE, ETOWAH RIVER, GA	90	---	90	---
ALLATOONA LAKE, LITTLE RIVER, GA	40	---	40	---
ARABIA MOUNTAIN, GA	---	---	100	---
AUGUSTA, GA	500	---	500	---
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	---	50	---	---
INDIAN, SUGAR, ENTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS,	50	---	50	---
LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	50	---	50	---
METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA	499	---	499	---
SAVANNAH HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, GA	450	---	450	---
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	---	100	---	100
SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA & SC	400	---	400	---
UTOY, SANDY AND PROCTOR CREEKS, GA	100	---	100	---
HAWAII				
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	140	---	140	---
BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	---	173	---	173
HAWAII WATER MANAGENMENT, HI	---	---	200	---
HONOLULU HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, OAHU, HI	200	---	200	---
KAHUKU, HI	---	---	---	200
KAHULUI HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, MAUI, HI	150	---	150	---
KAWAIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HAWAII, HI	40	---	40	---
KIHEI AREA EROSION, HI	---	---	100	---
WAIKIKI EROSION CONTROL, HI	---	---	100	---
IDAHO				
BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID	165	---	165	---
GOOSE CREEK, OAKLEY, ID	---	---	100	---
KOOTENAI RIVER AT BONNERS FERRY, ID	60	---	60	---
LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, ID	165	---	165	---
PAYETTE AND SNAKE RIVER, ID	---	---	100	---
ILLINOIS				
ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	---	200	---	200
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	---	400	---	400
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II)	250	---	750	---
ILLINOIS BEACH STATE PARK, IL	---	---	---	325
ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	500	---	500	---
KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL & IN	300	---	600	---
PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL	400	---	400	---
ROCK RIVER, IL & WI	700	---	700	---
UPPER MISS & ILLINOIS NAV IMPROVEMENTS, IL, IA, MN, MO	2,105	---	2,105	---
UPPER MISS & ILLINOIS NAV IMPROVEMENTS, IL, IA, MN, MO	---	4,707	---	4,707
UPPER MISS RVR SYS FLOW FREQUENCY STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M	888	---	888	---
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	---	300	---	300
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	---	310	---	310

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
INDIANA				
INDIANA HARBOR ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, IN	---	---	500	---
JOHN T MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY	---	2,210	---	2,210
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER (CADDY MARSH DITCH), IN	---	---	---	250
IOWA				
DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	400	---	600	---
INDIAN CREEK, COUNCIL BLUFFS, IA	80	---	80	---
KANSAS				
TOPEKA, KS	200	---	200	---
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	---	353	---	353
UPPER TURKEY RUN CREEK, KS	---	---	100	---
WALNUT AND WHITEWATER RIVER WATERSHEDS, KS	200	---	200	---
KENTUCKY				
BANKLICK CREEK, KY	100	---	100	---
GREENUP LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & OH	---	1,300	---	1,300
LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY	260	---	260	---
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY	100	---	100	---
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	250	---	250	---
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	161	---	161	---
OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	4,141	---	4,141	---
OHIO RIVER SHORELINE, PADUCAH, KY	---	---	---	400
LOUISIANA				
AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA.	200	---	400	---
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER, BAYOUS CHENE, BOENF & BLACK, LA	---	---	250	---
CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	339	---	339	---
CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	100	---	300	---
HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA	---	---	100	---
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	686	---	686	---
JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	---	215	---	500
LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	---	200	---	200
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	1,750	---	1,750	---
ORLEANS PARISH, LA	---	164	---	300
ST BERNARD PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	100	---	500	---
ST. CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL. LA	---	---	100	---
PLAQUEMINES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	---	---	100	---
WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	346	---	346	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
MARYLAND				
ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	500	---	500	---
ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD & DC	455	---	455	---
BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, GWYNNS FALLS, MD	68	---	68	---
CUMBERLAND, MD	---	700	---	700
EASTERN SHORE, MD	400	---	400	---
LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, MATTAWOMAN, MD	100	---	100	---
LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST MARY'S, MD	250	---	250	---
PATUXENT RIVER, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD	---	100	---	100
SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	---	100	---	100
MASSACHUSETTS				
BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI	310	---	310	---
BOSTON HARBOR, MA (45-FOOT CHANNEL)	150	---	150	---
COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA	100	---	100	---
MUDDY RIVER, BROOKLINE AND BOSTON, MA	---	---	---	500
SOMERSET AND SEARSBURG DAMS, DEERFIELD RIVER, MA & VT.	100	---	100	---
MICHIGAN				
BELL ISLE SHORELINE, DETROIT, MI	---	---	100	---
DETROIT RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI	---	---	250	---
DETROIT RIVER MASTER PLAN, MI	---	---	100	---
DETROIT RIVER SEAWALLS, MI	---	---	100	---
JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES BASIN PROGRAM, MI	---	---	100	---
MUSKEGON LAKE, MI	---	---	100	---
GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION SYSTEM, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA, & WI	---	---	500	---
SAULT STE MARIE (REPLACEMENT LOCK), MI	---	1,000	---	1,000
ST CLAIR RIVER AND LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	---	---	200	---
MINNESOTA				
LOWER ST ANTHONY FALLS RAPIDS RESTORATION, MN	---	---	400	---
UPPER MISS RIVER WATERSHED MGMT, LAKE ITASCA TO L/D 2,	250	---	250	---
MISSISSIPPI				
PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS	---	---	50	---
MISSOURI				
CHESTERFIELD, MO	---	250	---	250
HANNIBAL, MO	---	---	100	---
KANSAS CITY, MO & KS	312	---	312	---
MISSOURI & MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT PROJE	500	---	500	---
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, MO	220	---	220	---
RIVER DES PERES, MO	---	330	---	330

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL	---	265	---	265
ST. LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	---	445	---	445
SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	---	170	---	170
MONTANA				
LOWER YELLOWSTONE RIVER DIVERSION DAM, MT	---	---	---	100
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	500	---	500	---
NEBRASKA				
ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	---	275	---	275
LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	217	---	217	---
SAND CREEK WATERSHED, WAHOO, NE	---	220	---	220
NEVADA				
LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	100	---	500	---
TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	---	500	---	500
WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV	100	---	100	---
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
MERRIMACK RIVER BASIN	---	---	500	---
NEW JERSEY				
BARNEGAT BAY, NJ	---	50	---	50
BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	---	---	---	450
BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	---	---	---	391
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, OAKWOOD BEACH, NJ & DE	---	---	---	222
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, REEDS BEACH TO PIERCES POINT	---	---	---	135
DELWARE BAY COASTLINE, VILLAS AND VICINITY, NJ & DE	---	---	---	155
DELAWARE RIVER BASIN, NJ	---	---	100	---
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSENDS INLET, NJ	---	---	---	150
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS TO CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	---	---	---	350
LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	---	---	100	---
LOWER SADDLE RIVER, NJ	---	---	---	100
MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	---	---	---	150
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ	218	---	218	---
PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ	---	---	---	300
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ	550	---	550	---
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ	291	---	291	---
SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES IN MONMOUTH COUNTY, N	120	---	120	---
SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	450	---	450	---
STONY BROOK, NJ	120	---	120	---
UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBS, LONG HILL, MORRIS COUNT	300	---	300	---
UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, MORRIS COUNTY, NJ	300	---	300	---
WOODBRIDGE AND RAHWAY, NJ	200	---	200	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
NEW MEXICO				
ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM.....	50	---	50	---
RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO & TX.....	500	---	600	---
SANTA CRUZ DAM SEDIMENT STUDY, NM.....	---	---	100	---
SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY, ALBUQUERQUE, N	330	---	330	---
NEW YORK				
ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK MONITORING PROGRAM, NY.....	---	---	1,000	---
ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY.	---	347	---	347
AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, ESSEX AND CLINTON COUNTIES, NY...	200	---	200	---
BOQUET RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ESSEX COUNTY, NY.....	200	---	200	---
BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY.....	250	---	450	---
BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY.....	---	---	100	---
CLINTON COUNTY, NY.....	150	---	150	---
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY.....	520	---	520	---
FREEPORT CREEK, VILLAGE OF FREEPORT, NY.....	---	---	100	---
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ.....	800	---	800	---
HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY.....	---	50	---	50
HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY.....	50	---	50	---
HUDSON RIVER, HUDSON, NY.....	120	---	120	---
JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, ARVERNE, NY.	50	---	50	---
JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY.....	296	---	296	---
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY.....	---	---	200	---
LINDENHURST, NY.....	100	---	100	---
MONTAUK POINT, NY.....	---	---	287	---
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ.....	---	2,528	---	2,528
NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY.....	259	---	259	---
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY.....	300	---	300	---
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY.....	250	---	250	---
SAW MILL RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NY.....	50	---	100	---
SAW MILL RIVER AT ELMSFORD/GREENBURGH, NY.....	---	---	---	750
SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY.....	90	---	90	---
SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY.....	400	---	400	---
SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA & MD.	---	100	---	100
UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY.....	776	---	776	---
UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, NY.....	---	---	200	---
NORTH CAROLINA				
BOGUE BANKS, NC.....	---	---	250	---
CURRITUCK SOUND, NC.....	100	---	100	---
DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC.....	50	---	300	---
DARE COUNTY BEACHES, HATTERAS AND ORACOKE ISLAND, NC..	---	---	500	---
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC.....	600	---	600	---
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC.....	---	250	---	250
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC.....	100	---	100	---
SURF CITY, NC.....	---	---	100	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
NORTH DAKOTA				
DEVILS LAKE, ND	50	---	---	4,000
GRAFTON, PARK RIVER, ND	---	900	---	900
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, ND & MN	---	---	200	---
OHIO				
ASHTABULA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH	---	384	---	384
BUTLER COUNTY, OH	100	---	100	---
COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH	600	---	600	---
HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH	306	---	306	---
HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, SUNDAY CREEK, OH	200	---	200	---
MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH & PA	---	---	500	---
MUSKINGUM BASIN SYSTEM STUDY, OH	100	---	100	---
OHIO RIVER FLOW COMMODITY STUDY, OH	---	---	200	---
RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO	100	---	100	---
SANDUSKY RIVER, TIFFIN, OH	---	---	100	---
STEUBENVILLE, OH	---	---	175	---
WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH, IN & MI	---	---	100	---
OKLAHOMA				
CIMARRON RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, OK, KS, NM & CO	200	---	200	---
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK	200	---	700	---
WARR ACRES, OK	200	---	200	---
OREGON				
COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA	---	923	---	---
TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR	274	---	274	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	210	---	210	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR	114	---	114	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	200	---	200	---
PENNSYLVANIA				
BEAVER CREEK, CLARION, PA	---	---	100	---
BLOOMSBURG, PA	441	---	441	---
LOWER WEST BR, SUS RIVER, ENV RESTORATION, BUFFALO CRE	250	---	250	---
NEW CASTLE, PA	---	---	100	---
TURTLE CREEK BASIN, UPPER TURTLE CREEK ENV RESTORATION	66	---	66	---
PUERTO RICO				
RIO GUANAJIBO, PR	---	441	---	441

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
RHODE ISLAND				
QUONSET DAVISVILLE PORT, RI	---	---	100	---
RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, RI	191	---	191	---
RHODE ISLAND SOUTH COAST, HABITAT REST & STRM DMG REDU	54	---	54	---
SOUTH CAROLINA				
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	581	---	581	---
BROAD RIVER BASIN, SC	---	---	200	---
CHARLESTON ESTUARY, SC	150	---	150	---
PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	219	---	219	---
WACCAMAW RIVER, SC	---	---	100	---
YADKIN - PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC & NC	---	50	---	50
SOUTH DAKOTA				
JAMES RIVER, SD	---	---	500	---
NIOBRARA AND MISSOURI RIVERS, SD	---	---	100	---
TENNESSEE				
DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	200	---	200	---
DUCK RIVER WATERSHED, TN	50	---	50	---
FRENCH BROAD WATERSHED, TN	500	---	500	---
NORTH CHICKAMAUGA CREEK, TN	50	---	50	---
TEXAS				
BOIS D'ARC CREEK, BONHAM, TX	200	---	200	---
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	230	---	230	---
CITY OF BROWNSVILLE (RESACAS), TX	---	---	100	---
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, LAQUINTA CHANNEL, TX	456	---	456	---
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,008	---	1,008	---
DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	---	100	---	---
FREEPORT AND VINCITY, HURRICANE/FLOOD PROTECTION, TX	---	---	100	---
GIWW MODIFICATIONS, TX	195	---	195	---
GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	500	---	500	---
GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	728	---	728	---
GIWW, MATAGORDA BAY, TX	---	100	---	200
GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	653	---	653	---
GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	434	---	434
GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	200	---	200	---
HUNTING BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	100	---	500
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	600	---	1,500	---
MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	300	---	300	---
NORTH BOSQUE RIVER, TX	---	50	---	50
NORTH PADRE ISLAND, CORPUS CHRISTI, TX	---	164	---	1,000
NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	280	---	280	---
PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	---	100	---	100

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	---	100	---	700
SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	544	---	544	---
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	114	---	114	---
SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	---	574	---	574
SULPHUR RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, TX	50	---	50	---
UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	500	---	1,100	---
UTAH				
PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	100	---	100	---
VIRGINIA				
AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	342	---	342	---
AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	---	200	---	200
CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, VA	---	---	170	---
ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENVIR RESTORATION, HAMPTON ROAD	247	---	247	---
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	---	277	---	277
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SECTION 216)	200	---	200	---
LAKE MERRIWEATHER, GOSHEN DAM AND SPILLWAY, VA	---	---	---	150
LOWER RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER BASIN, VA	300	---	300	---
NEW RIVER BASIN, VA, NC, & WV	---	---	200	---
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	1,188	---	1,188	---
POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	165	---	165	---
POWELL RIVER, STRAIGHT, REEDS AND JONES CREEK, VA	---	200	---	200
PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY WATERSHED, VA	205	---	205	---
RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, EMBREY DAM, VA	257	---	---	600
WASHINGTON				
BELLINGHAM BAY, WA	60	---	60	---
CENTRALIA, WA	---	250	---	1,750
CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	150	---	150	---
DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	---	222	---	222
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	---	600	---	1,500
LAKE WALLULA NAVIGATION CHANNEL, COLUMBIA RIVER, WA	---	---	100	---
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	350	---	790	---
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA & OR	---	---	100	---
OCEAN SHORES, WA	100	---	100	---
PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	250	---	250	---
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	65	---	65	---
SKAGIT RIVER, WA	270	---	270	---
SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	100	---	100	---
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	---	225	---	225
TRI-CITIES AREA RIVERSHORE ENHANCEMENT, WA	250	---	---	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
WEST VIRGINIA				
ERICSON/WOOD COUNTY PUBLIC PORT, WV	---	---	---	500
ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV	---	200	---	200
LOWER MUD RIVER, WV	---	650	---	---
MERCER COUNTY, WV	107	---	107	---
WEIRTON PORT, WV	---	---	---	750
WISCONSIN				
BARABOO RIVER, WI	---	---	100	---
FOX RIVER, WI	---	---	250	---
SAXON HARBOR, WI	---	---	50	---
WYOMING				
JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	---	100	---	300
MISCELLANEOUS				
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	2,300	---	2,200	---
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	700	---	100	---
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	400	---	400	---
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	9,000	---	8,200	---
GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM	---	---	600	---
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	500	---	500	---
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	500	---	500	---
NATIONAL SHORELINE	300	---	---	---
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	8,900	---	8,000	---
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	6,500	---	6,700	---
PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	400	---	400	---
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	300	---	300	---
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	26,000	---	25,000	---
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	100	---	100	---
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	800	---	700	---
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	800	---	700	---
TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER	650	---	650	---
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE AND CARRYOVER BALANCES	-23,250	---	-47,693	---
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	101,519	36,181	104,496	55,542

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
ALABAMA		
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	2,000	2,000
DOG RIVER, AL	---	300
ELBA, AL	---	1,500
GENEVA, AL	---	500
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	499	499
WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL & GA (MAJOR REH	3,000	3,000
WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL & GA (MAJOR REHAB)	2,500	2,500
ALASKA		
CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	1,312	1,312
GALENA, AK	---	3,000
KAKE HARBOR, AK	5,508	5,508
NOME HARBOR, AK	---	1,000
ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	5,616	5,616
ARIZONA		
RIO SALADO, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ	2,000	2,000
ARKANSAS		
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	3,300	3,300
MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	20,000	40,000
OZARK POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	1,230	---
RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR	---	4,000
CALIFORNIA		
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	10,000	10,000
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS	5,000	4,000
BERRYESSA CREEK, CA	---	1,000
CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	100	100
GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	3,500	7,000
HAMILTON AIRFIELDS WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	---	2,000
HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING, CA	---	2,000
IMPERIAL BEACH, CA	---	800
KAWEAH RIVER, CA	500	3,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	9,821	9,821
LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	1,485	1,485
MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	760	760
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	500	500
MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	2,000	2,000
NAPA RIVER, CA	4,000	4,000
NORCO BLUFFS, CA	---	3,225
PORT OF OAKLAND, CA	---	4,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	3,300	5,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	---	250
SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION, CA	---	25,000
SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	4,000	4,000
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	18,000	23,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	5,000	5,000
STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, CA	---	4,000
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	1,000	1,000
SURFSIDE-SUNSET AND NEWPORT BEACH, CA	---	5,000
UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	1,665	1,665
WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	1,775	1,775
DELAWARE		
DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HELOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, DE	---	3,000
DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	254	254
FLORIDA		
BREVARD COUNTY, FL	---	6,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	847	847
CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	200	200
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	92,423	80,423
DADE COUNTY, FL	3,058	8,000
DUVAL COUNTY, FL	3,800	3,800
EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	20,525	20,525
HILLSBORO AND OKEECHOBEE AQUIFER, FL	4,562	---
HILLSBORO INLET, FL	---	500
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	---	1,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	4,500	4,500
KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	20,000	20,000
MANATEE COUNTY, FL	200	200
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	10,828	10,828
MARTIN COUNTY, FL	2,419	2,419
MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	6,591	6,591
PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL	4,000	7,500
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	706	706
PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	1,321	1,321
ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FL	---	4,000
ST. LUCIE INLET, FL	---	4,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	---	300
GEORGIA		
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	---	250
BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB)	2,455	2,455
LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC	1,500	1,500
MAYO'S BAR LOCK & DAM, GA	---	400
OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA (DEF CORR)	332	332
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	2,666	2,666
THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	5,000	5,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
HAWAII		
IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	239	239
KAUMALAPAU HARBOR, HI	---	3,000
KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	3,437	3,437
MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	325	325
IDAHO		
MILO CREEK, ID	---	1,000
ILLINOIS		
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	2,100	2,100
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL.	400	400
CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	19,192	19,192
EAST ST LOUIS, IL	900	900
EAST ST LOUIS INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL	---	150
LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	5,750	5,750
LOVES PARK, IL	4,010	4,010
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	2,800	7,800
MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	1,400	1,400
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	38,142	56,000
UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MN, MO	18,000	21,000
INDIANA		
CALUMET REGION, IN	---	300
FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	1,088	1,088
INDIANA HARBOR, IN (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY)	3,291	3,291
INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	---	1,000
INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	---	10,000
INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	934	934
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	5,343	8,843
OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN	1,500	1,500
PATOKA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	5,200	5,200
IOWA		
LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	3,210	---
LOCK AND DAM 12, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	5,260	5,260
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	12,000	12,000
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	4,400	4,650
PERRY CREEK, IA	7,178	7,178
KANSAS		
ARKANSAS CITY, KS	5,100	5,100

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	1,000	1,000
DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	3,832	3,832
KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	14,900	30,000
KENTUCKY RIVER LOCK AND DAM #10, KY	---	2,000
MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN	14,000	18,000
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	---	500
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	4,000	4,000
SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY	---	4,000
LOUISIANA		
COMITE RIVER, LA	10,000	10,000
INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	14,349	16,349
GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	---	500
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	18,040	21,040
LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	3,100	10,000
LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	1,414	2,414
MISSISSIPPI RIVER GULF OUTLET, LA	---	500
MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	719	719
NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	1,800	1,800
SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	47,260	69,000
WEST BANK VICINITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LA	8,065	8,065
MARYLAND		
ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	3,951	3,951
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	2,500	2,500
ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	185	185
BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD & VA	5,000	3,000
CHESAPEAKE BAY ENV RESTORATION AND PROTECTION, MD, VA.	608	1,058
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	---	3,000
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	19,190	19,190
MASSACHUSETTS		
CAPE COD CANAL RAILROAD BRIDGE, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	8,600	8,600
TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	100	100
MINNESOTA		
CROOKSTON, MN	---	1,000
LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	5,000	5,000
MARSHALL, MN	1,312	1,312
NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA, MN	---	2,500
PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	3,873	3,873

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
MISSISSIPPI		
DESOTO COUNTY, MS	---	3,000
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	---	200
JACKSON COUNTY WATER SUPPLY, MS	---	2,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	6,663	6,663
WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS, MS	1,337	1,337
PEARL RIVER VICINITY OF WALKIAH BLUFF, MS AND LA	---	1,000
MISSOURI		
BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	---	200
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	10,500	14,500
CAPE GIRARDEAU, JACKSON, MO	2,350	2,350
MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	3,000	3,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	6,500	6,500
ST LOUIS, MO	---	200
STE GENEVIEVE, MO	6,000	6,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR (DAM SAFETY)	5,920	5,920
NEBRASKA		
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	300	1,800
WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	1,600	3,000
NEVADA		
RURAL NEVADA, NV	---	4,000
TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	20,000	21,600
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
LEBANON, NH	---	1,500
NEW JERSEY		
BRIGANTINE INLET/GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET (ABSECON ISL)	---	5,000
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	100	100
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE	29,756	29,756
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	5,100	5,100
NEW YORK HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY CHANN	5,649	10,000
PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	1,700	1,700
PASSAIC RIVER STREAMBANK RESTORATION, NJ	---	3,000
RAMAPO RIVER AT MAHWAH, NJ	---	750
RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	2,717	2,717
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	4,000	4,000
SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	6,383	6,383
TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	---	4,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
NEW MEXICO		
ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	900	900
ALAMOGORDO, NM	3,000	3,000
CENTRAL NEW MEXICO, NM	---	3,000
LAS CRUCES, NM	2,841	2,841
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	600	600
RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	600	600
NEW YORK		
ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY.	5,000	4,000
ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	500	500
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	1,000	1,000
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	500	1,500
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	3,000	3,000
KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ	53,000	53,000
NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY	---	3,000
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	---	5,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
AIWW, REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	1,000	1,000
BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	---	4,200
CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	2,000	2,000
WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET, NC	---	330
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	40,600	40,600
NORTH DAKOTA		
BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION, N	4,700	6,000
DEVILS LAKE EMERGENCY OUTLET, ND	24,000	---
GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	5,300	5,300
GRAND FORKS, ND - EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	13,044	13,044
HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	8,000	8,000
SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	2,600	2,600
OHIO		
BEACH CITY LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY	897	897
HOLES CREEK, OH	---	1,000
LOWER GIRARD LAKE DAM, OH	---	1,000
METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	3,024	3,024
MILL CREEK, OH	500	500
OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, OH	---	1,500
WEST COLUMBUS, OH	6,000	11,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
OKLAHOMA		
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	2,400	2,400
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	4,500	4,500
OREGON		
BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	6,110	6,110
COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA	---	4,500
COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	5,000	5,000
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	500	500
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA	200	200
WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	8,200	8,200
PENNSYLVANIA		
CLINTON COUNTY, PA	---	500
JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	7,000	7,000
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	35,000	60,000
NANTY GLO, PA	---	700
NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA, PA	---	4,000
PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	580	580
SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	4,300	4,300
SCHUYLKILL RIVER PARK, PA	---	1,000
SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA ENVIRON IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	---	20,000
SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA, PA	---	150
TOWAMENCIN TOWNSHIP, PA	---	1,000
WILLIAMSPORT, PA	---	446
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	23,092	23,092
PUERTO RICO		
ARECIBO RIVER, PR	4,102	5,402
PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	9,590	9,590
RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	3,493	3,493
RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR	743	750
RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	198	---
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	11,000	13,800
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	6,940	6,940
RHODE ISLAND		
FOX POINT HURRICANE BARRIER, RI	---	1,950
SOUTH CAROLINA		
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING & WIDENING)	16,227	16,227
LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SC	---	4,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	1,500	1,500
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	4,000	4,000
PIERRE, SD	4,000	6,000
TENNESSEE		
BLACK FOX, MURFREE AND OAKLANDS SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN	---	1,000
HAMILTON COUNTY, TN	---	1,500
TEXAS		
BOSQUE AND LEON RIVERS, TX	---	4,000
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	5,500	6,000
CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	6,104	6,104
CLEAR CREEK, TX	1,525	1,525
DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TX	---	2,000
EL PASO, TX	5,200	5,200
GIWW, ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	1,176	1,176
HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	53,492	53,492
JOHNSON CREEK, TX	---	3,000
NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	9,000	9,000
RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX	---	1,300
RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, TX	---	900
SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	900	900
SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	11,820	11,820
UTAH		
UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	800	800
VIRGINIA		
AIWW, BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	8,492	8,492
ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION, FRONT ROYAL, VA	---	7,000
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (MAJOR REHAB)	4,000	4,000
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	600	600
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	1,000	1,000
SANDBRIDGE BEACH, VA	---	3,000
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	---	20,000
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT)	---	1,100
WASHINGTON		
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	91,000	81,000
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	1,000	1,000
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	710	710
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	2,000	2,000
THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA & OR (MAJOR REH	7,000	7,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
WEST VIRGINIA		
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	6,300	10,000
CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA, WV	---	1,500
GREENBRIAR RIVER BASIN, WV	---	1,000
LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	12,100	37,100
LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV (MAJOR REHAB).	1,800	1,800
LOWER MUD RIVER, WV	---	1,000
MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	6,500	10,200
ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	2,700	2,700
SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA, WV	---	3,000
TYGART LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	4,293	4,293
WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, WV & PA.	---	3,000
WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	300	300
WISCONSIN		
LAFARGE LAKE, KICKAPOO RIVER, WI	---	2,000
MISCELLANEOUS		
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	10,000	19,000
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	3,000	4,000
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)	4,000	4,000
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	3,000	7,000
DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM	5,000	5,000
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14).	9,000	9,000
EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	19,200	19,200
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	25,000	35,000
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSE	45	45
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSE	185	185
NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111)	300	300
NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	7,000	11,000
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	14,000	21,000
RECREATION MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	27,000	---
RIVERINE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION AND FLOOD HAZARD MITIGA	20,000	---
SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	2,500	2,500
SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECT (SECTION 208)	200	600
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE AND CARRYOVER BALANCES	-165,253	-198,753
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL	1,346,000	1,695,699

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
SURVEYS:		
GENERAL STUDIES:		
ALEXANDRIA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	750	750
DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA	1,100	1,100
SPRING BAYOU, LA	100	100
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN ABOVE ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	350	350
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	100	100
MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN & MS	657	657
BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	6,500	6,500
SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR	---	900
MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	2,000	2,000
REELFOOT LAKE, TN & KY	318	368
WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	216	216
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	435	435
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	12,526	13,476
CONSTRUCTION		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	35,690	35,690
FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH (EIGHT MILE CREEK), AR	2,110	2,110
GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	22,800	20,300
HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	2,450	2,450
L'ANGUILLE RIVER BASIN, AR	750	750
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	40,621	47,000
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	3,195	4,195
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	10,000	10,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	26,000	26,000
LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LA	5,500	5,500
MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS	100	100
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	5,000	5,000
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	2,330	2,330
YAZOO BASIN:	(11,195)	(34,200)
BACKWATER PUMP, MS	500	1,000
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	3,500	4,500
DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	---	15,000
MAIN STEM, MS	25	25
REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	300	300
TRIBUTARIES, MS	84	375
UPPER YAZOO PROJECT, MS	6,786	13,000
ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	700	5,000
NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN & MS	2,000	2,000
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	500	500
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	170,941	203,125

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
MAINTENANCE		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.....	58,954	56,500
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR.....	421	421
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR.....	442	442
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR.....	407	407
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR.....	10	10
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	6,160	8,200
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO.....	6,775	7,775
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA.....	2,384	2,384
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR.....	1,070	1,070
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL.....	45	45
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY.....	25	25
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA.....	1,499	1,499
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.....	9,482	9,482
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA.....	210	210
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA.....	56	56
BONNET CARRE, LA.....	1,340	1,340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA.....	389	389
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA.....	5,739	5,739
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA.....	916	916
OLD RIVER, LA.....	4,720	4,720
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA.....	3,048	3,048
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS.....	626	626
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS.....	193	193
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS.....	480	480
YAZOO BASIN:	(24,185)	(34,096)
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS.....	6,242	7,242
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS.....	137	4,500
ENID LAKE, MS.....	3,376	4,376
GREENWOOD, MS.....	1,007	1,007
GRENADA LAKE, MS.....	4,232	5,280
MAIN STEM, MS.....	1,254	1,254
SARDIS LAKE, MS.....	5,180	7,680
TRIBUTARIES, MS.....	1,162	1,162
WILL M WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS.....	358	358
YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS.....	431	431
YAZOO CITY, MS.....	806	806
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO.....	202	202
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO.....	7,000	7,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN.....	113	113
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN.....	1,085	1,085
MAPPING.....	1,129	1,129
SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE.....	139,105	149,602
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-13,572	-18,472
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES.....	309,000	347,731

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA - COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	1,100	1,100
ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	5,355	5,355
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	1,999	1,999
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	19,204	20,704
DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	60	60
DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	66	66
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	4,734	4,734
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	50	50
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA	4,999	4,999
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	18,665	22,665
MOBILE AREA DIGITAL MAPPING, AL	---	150
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	350	350
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	4,962	4,962
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	120	120
TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	23,547	24,547
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	7,373	7,373
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,777	1,777
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,364	1,364
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	423	423
HOMER HARBOR, AK	191	191
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	35	35
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	186	186
NOME HARBOR, AK	386	386
PETERSBURG HARBOR, AK	394	394
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	512	512
WRANGELL NARROWS, AK	2,438	3,838
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,166	1,166
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	69	69
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,186	1,186
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	74	74
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	168	168
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	4,520	4,520
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	5,758	5,758
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,200	1,200
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,565	4,565
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,937	5,937
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,218	4,218
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,058	1,058
DIERKS LAKE, AR	988	988

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	929	929
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	5,933	5,933
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	304	304
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	294	294
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	19,988	19,988
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,602	1,602
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	3,604	3,604
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,416	1,416
NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,626	3,626
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	419	419
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	6,402	6,402
OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,072	4,072
WHITE RIVER, AR	2,258	2,258
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	125	125
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,854	1,854
BODEGA BAY, CA	---	200
BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,580	1,580
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	3,000	3,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,403	3,403
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	---	500
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	4,437	4,687
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	313	313
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,616	1,616
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	4,710	4,710
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	843	843
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	793	793
JACK D. MALTESTER CHANNEL (SAN LEANDRO MARINA), CA	---	1,500
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	170	170
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	3,910	3,910
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,956	3,956
MARINA DEL REY, CA	5,335	5,335
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	288	288
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	251	251
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	170	1,170
MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	---	700
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,778	1,778
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,135	1,135
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	40	40
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	8,118	8,118
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,535	2,035
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,248	2,248
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,256	1,256
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	---	400
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	5,774	5,774
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	2,037	2,037
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.	1,113	1,113
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	163	163

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,382	2,382
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	---	200
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,000	2,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,573	2,573
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	2,028	2,028
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,086	3,086
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,615	1,615
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,153	1,153
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,898	1,898
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	3,117	3,117
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,659	1,659
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,240	3,440
YUBA RIVER, CA	74	74
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	425	425
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,568	1,568
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	707	707
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	67	67
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,543	1,543
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	209	209
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	619	619
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	309	309
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	399	399
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	269	269
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	819	819
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	335	335
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	344	344
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	311	311
THOMASTON DAM, CT	581	581
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	506	506
DELAWARE		
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	19,707	14,757
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	433	433
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,217	3,217
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	910	910
POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	235	235
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	38	38

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
FLORIDA		
AIWW, NORFOLK, VA TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC &.	1,660	1,660
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	7,625	7,625
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	10,558	10,558
ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL	1,000	1,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	2,705	2,705
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	1,051	1,051
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	100	100
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,.	147	147
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	4,035	4,035
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	7,755	7,755
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	5,855	5,855
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	3,080	3,080
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	1,323	1,323
MIAMI RIVER, FL	---	4,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	5,811	5,811
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	4,577	4,577
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	50	50
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	---	2,000
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	46	46
PORT ST. JOE HARBOR, FL	---	500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	600	600
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,340	4,500
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	50	50
ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	3,280	6,580
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	6,308	6,308
WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	35	35
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,520	6,000
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	5,055	6,755
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	2,460	2,460
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	5,271	5,271
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	7,275	7,275
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	7,489	7,489
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	11,875	11,875
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	100	100
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	10,585	10,585
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	6,190	6,190
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	13,869	14,369
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	650	650
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	3,977	4,977
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	153	153
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	165	165
KAHULUI HARBOR, HI	1,296	1,296

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	706	706
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	2,291	2,291
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,689	2,689
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	73	73
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,206	1,206
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	332	332
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	4,758	4,758
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	5,112	5,112
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,762	2,762
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	362	362
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	195	195
ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL, IL	562	562
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	22,808	23,808
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	1,598	1,598
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	473	473
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	2,081	2,081
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	837	837
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,209	5,209
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	39,842	43,842
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	14,499	16,999
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	43	43
REND LAKE, IL	3,904	3,904
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	97	97
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	1,473	1,473
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	782	782
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,937	2,437
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	732	732
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	864	864
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	429	429
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	101	101
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	824	824
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	806	1,206
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	1,182	1,182
MONROE LAKE, IN	799	799
PATOKA LAKE, IN	731	731
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	42	42
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	749	749
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	62	62

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,952	2,952
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	738	738
MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	146	146
MISSOURI RIVER - RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO	5,250	5,950
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA & NE	2,111	2,111
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,058	2,058
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,827	5,071
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,074	4,074
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,621	1,621
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,197	1,197
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	487	487
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	728	728
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,429	1,429
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	908	908
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	36	36
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,186	1,531
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,541	1,541
MARION LAKE, KS	1,354	1,354
MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,872	1,872
MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,906	1,906
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	1,074	1,074
PERRY LAKE, KS	1,966	1,966
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,830	1,830
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	193	193
TORONTO LAKE, KS	673	673
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,546	2,546
WILSON LAKE, KS	2,017	2,017
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	10,330	10,330
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,544	2,544
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,497	1,497
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,685	1,685
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,542	1,542
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	868	868
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,429	1,429
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	361	361
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,890	1,890
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,366	1,366
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,079	1,079
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,917	2,917
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	123	123
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,149	1,149
KENTUCKY RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS 5-14, KY	---	750

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,357	1,357
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	21	21
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	714	714
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	100	100
NOLIN LAKE, KY	2,285	2,285
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	31,813	31,813
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN & OH	6,007	6,007
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,016	1,016
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,827	1,827
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,048	1,048
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	5,892	5,892
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,211	1,211
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	14,026	14,026
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	570	570
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	509	509
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	726	726
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25	25
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	735	735
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	48	48
BAYOU TECHE, LA	132	132
CADDO LAKE, LA	127	127
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	12,117	12,117
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	5,354	5,354
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	19,478	21,478
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	3,175	3,175
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	268	268
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	8,907	11,907
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	559	559
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	108	108
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,933	1,933
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	2,773	2,773
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO,	63,359	63,359
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	11,286	11,286
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	80	80
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	2,000	2,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	233	233
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA	45	45
MAINE		
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,060	1,060
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17	17
UNION RIVER, ME	---	900
WELLS HARBOR, ME	1,455	2,205

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	455	455
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	710	710
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	16,354	16,354
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	141	141
HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	55	55
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	327	327
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,616	1,616
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	1,810	1,810
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	450	450
RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, MD	70	70
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	140	140
ST JEROME CREEK, MD	175	175
TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, MD	5,801	6,801
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	75	75
UPPER THOROFARE, MD	220	220
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	740	740
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	368	368
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	439	439
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	361	361
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	8,787	8,787
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	213	213
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	147	147
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	267	267
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	462	462
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	125	125
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	390	390
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	461	461
NEW BEDFORD AND FAIRHAVEN HARBOR, MA	310	310
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	480	480
PLYMOUTH HARBOR, MA	500	500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	3,113	3,113
SALEM HARBOR, MA	200	200
TULLY LAKE, MA	436	436
WEST HILL DAM, MA	647	647
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	342	342
MICHIGAN		
ALPENA HARBOR, MI	203	203
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	85	85
BLACK RIVER, PORT HURON, MI	306	306
CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI	---	1,000
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	458	458
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	118	118
DETROIT RIVER, MI	2,342	2,342

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	130	130
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,264	1,264
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	905	905
INLAND ROUTE, MI	33	33
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	205	305
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	256	256
LELAND HARBOR, MI	168	168
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	663	663
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	272	272
MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	239	239
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	174	174
MONROE HARBOR, MI	695	695
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI	----	150
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	603	603
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	450	450
PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	1,974	1,974
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	275	275
ROUGE RIVER, MI	417	417
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,453	1,453
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10	10
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	481	481
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	996	996
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	1,194	1,194
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	20,502	23,502
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	3,197	3,197
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	290	290
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	178	178
DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	5,310	5,310
DULUTH ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY STUDY, MN	---	320
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MN	186	186
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	154	154
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	453	453
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	196	196
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION)	42,765	42,765
ORWELL LAKE, MN	315	315
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	25	25
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	101	101
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	2,805	2,805
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	64	64
TWO HARBORS, MN	208	208
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	801	801
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	122	122
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	150	150
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,500	2,500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	360	360
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	133	133
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	955	955
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	3,406	10,400
PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	250	250
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	645	645
YAZOO RIVER, MS	115	115
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	184	295
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,196	5,196
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,015	2,015
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	7,688	7,688
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	473	473
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	854	854
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	931	931
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	13,384	13,384
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	259	354
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,065	2,065
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	26	26
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,160	1,160
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	401	401
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,486	3,486
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	6,485	6,485
UNION LAKE, MO	10	10
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	3,620	3,620
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	2,273	2,273
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	6,151	6,241
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	2,198	2,198
MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,.	709	709
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWK	125	125
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWO	125	125
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	721	721
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	796	796
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE	327	327
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	34	34
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	522	522
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	193	193

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	389	389
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	412	412
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	478	478
HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	984	984
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	554	554
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR & PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME	---	250
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	469	469
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,400	1,400
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	580	580
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	19	19
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	16,355	17,855
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,180	3,180
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,005	2,005
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	120	120
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	425	425
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	140	140
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	120	120
SALEM RIVER, NJ	278	278
SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ	175	175
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,315	1,315
COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,766	3,266
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,037	1,537
GALISTEO DAM, NM	305	305
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	50	50
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	445	3,445
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	846	1,026
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	73	73
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	313	313
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL, NM	---	1,250
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	468	468
ARKPORT DAM, NY	257	257
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	2,966	2,966
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	176	176
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	310	310
EAST RIVER, NY	750	750
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	2,250	2,250
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	473	473
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	340	340
FIRE ISLAND INLET, NY	1,000	1,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	490	490
GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	1,540	1,540
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	1,265	1,265
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	2,485	2,485
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)	1,340	1,340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	460	460
JAMAICA BAY, NY	1,410	1,410
JONES INLET, NY	200	200
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	2,190	2,190
MORICHES INLET, NY	980	980
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,958	1,958
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	6,720	6,720
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ	5,030	5,030
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	740	740
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	12,319	12,319
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	353	353
PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY	200	200
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	3,038	3,038
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	725	725
SAG HARBOR, NY	1,600	1,600
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	2,000	2,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	739	739
STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY	15	15
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	564	564
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	517	517
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,831	5,831
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,500	1,500
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	350	350
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	627	627
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	897	897
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	1,430	1,430
FALLS LAKE, NC	1,276	1,276
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	22	22
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	455	455
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,995	4,995
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	45	45
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	4,737	4,737
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	825	825
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	610	610
PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	139	139
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	64	64
ROANOKE RIVER, NC	100	100
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,742	1,742
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	8,405	8,405

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	241	241
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	8,513	8,563
HOMME LAKE, ND	153	153
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,230	1,230
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	401	401
SOURIS RIVER, ND	292	292
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	790	790
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	750	750
BERLIN LAKE, OH	3,270	3,270
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,309	1,309
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	1,175	1,175
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	3,915	5,915
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	735	735
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	745	745
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	777	777
DILLON LAKE, OH	709	709
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	1,785	1,785
HURON HARBOR, OH	790	790
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	240	240
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	2,152	2,152
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25	25
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	1,033	1,033
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,329	1,329
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	7,993	7,993
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	544	544
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	661	661
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	85	85
ROCKY RIVER HARBOR, OH	---	590
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30	30
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	870	870
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	174	174
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	4,550	4,550
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	350	350
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	565	565
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	821	821
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	417	417
BIRCH LAKE, OK	480	480
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,471	1,971
CANDY LAKE, OK	18	168
CANTON LAKE, OK	2,656	2,656
COPAN LAKE, OK	823	823
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	7,240	7,240

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	5,954	5,954
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	838	838
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	209	209
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	557	557
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,639	1,639
HULAH LAKE, OK	447	447
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	72	72
KAW LAKE, OK	1,756	1,756
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	6,435	6,435
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK.	4,588	4,588
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	2,353	2,353
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	63	63
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	32	32
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,160	1,160
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	4,001	4,001
SARDIS LAKE, OK	944	944
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	386	386
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	947	947
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,178	3,178
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,441	1,441
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,297	3,297
WISTER LAKE, OK	729	1,429
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	748	748
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	332	332
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	6,250	6,250
CHETCO RIVER, OR	435	435
COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	16,274	18,874
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	7,403	7,403
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	357	357
COOS BAY, OR	4,144	4,144
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	316	316
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	919	919
COUGAR LAKE, OR	705	705
DEPOE BAY, OR	3	363
DETROIT LAKE, OR	672	672
DORENA LAKE, OR	580	580
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	619	619
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	1,277	1,277
GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,050	1,050
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	408	408
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	220	220
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	4,507	4,507
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,990	1,990
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	2,919	2,919
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	4,989	4,989
PORT ORFORD, OR	702	702
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	200	200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
ROGUE RIVER, OR	641	641
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	67	67
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	822	822
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	176	176
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	134	134
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	148	148
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,421	1,421
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	1,234	1,234
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	285	285
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	646	646
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	7,895	7,895
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,905	6,905
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	608	608
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	216	216
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	832	832
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,121	2,121
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,259	1,259
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,785	2,035
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,491	1,491
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	659	659
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	903	903
ERIE HARBOR, PA	125	125
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	713	713
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	663	663
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	321	321
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	95	95
JOHNSTOWN, PA	13	13
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,472	1,472
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,778	1,778
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,392	1,392
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	14,293	14,293
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	22,407	22,407
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	218	218
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	88	88
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	437	437
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	13	13
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,533	4,783
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	740	740
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,644	2,644
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	334	334
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	70	70
TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,382	3,352
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,788	1,788
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	258	258
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	817	817
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	517	517
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	2,011	2,011

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
RHODE ISLAND		
PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI	584	1,584
SAKONNET HARBOR, RI	---	500
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	3,629	5,629
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	7,145	7,145
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,235	3,235
FOLLY RIVER, SC	266	266
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	5,234	5,234
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	26	26
MURRELLS INLET, SC	---	1,000
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	21	21
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	60	60
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	477	477
TOWN CREEK, SC	398	398
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,422	6,502
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	496	496
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	172	172
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	8,852	8,942
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	580	580
MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	586	586
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	11,192	11,282
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	306	306
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	6,070	6,070
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,307	5,307
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	1,900	1,900
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,916	4,916
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	4,191	4,191
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	5	5
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,278	3,278
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,326	6,326
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	14,484	14,484
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	348	348
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	738	738
ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,340	1,340
BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	314	314
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,453	1,453
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,810	1,810

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
BELTON LAKE, TX	3,103	3,103
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,975	1,975
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	4,802	4,802
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,029	2,029
CANYON LAKE, TX	2,689	2,689
CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	2,627	2,627
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,036	5,036
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	5,517	5,517
DOUBLE BAYOU, TX	805	805
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	10	10
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	2,801	2,801
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	4,802	4,802
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	87	87
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	752	752
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,573	1,573
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,433	2,433
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	21,765	21,765
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,203	1,203
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	8,137	8,137
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	393	393
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,144	1,144
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	759	759
LAKE KEMP, TX	201	201
LAVON LAKE, TX	2,439	2,439
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	2,959	2,959
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,315	4,315
MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	2,953	2,953
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,524	1,524
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,785	1,785
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,005	1,005
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	941	941
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,709	1,709
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	75	75
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	1,002	1,002
SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	10,013	10,013
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,191	4,191
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	249	249
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,773	2,773
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,744	1,744
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	371	371
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	2,007	2,007
TRINITY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	29	29
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESMENT	---	1,500
WACO LAKE, TX	2,301	2,901
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	1,208	1,208
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	4,680	4,680
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,643	2,643

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	55	55
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	305	305
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	607	607
BURLINGTON HARBOR, VT	---	1,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	46	46
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	561	561
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	583	583
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	629	629
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	464	464
VIRGINIA		
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	593	593
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA	1,750	1,750
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA	1,325	1,325
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	120	120
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	877	877
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,465	1,465
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	995	995
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	77	77
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	4,294	4,294
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	8,041	8,041
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,525	1,525
LITTLE WICOMICO RIVER, VA	605	605
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	225	225
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	6,105	6,105
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	406	406
OCCOQUAN RIVER,VA	---	1,000
PAGAN RIVER, VA	145	145
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	3,060	3,060
POTOMAC RIVER AT MT VERNON, VA	410	410
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	617	617
RUDEE INLET, VA	646	646
STARLINGS CREEK, VA	551	551
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	204	204
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,185	1,185
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	2,113	2,113
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	3	3
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	6	6
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,212	1,212
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	9,820	12,570
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,849	1,849

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	6,094	6,094
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	146	146
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,797	6,797
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,537	1,537
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,291	4,291
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,821	2,821
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	925	925
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	312	312
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	2,440	2,440
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	316	316
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	967	967
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	37	1,037
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	415	415
SEATTLE HARBOR, EAST WATERWAY CHANNEL DEEPENING, WA	100	450
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	714	714
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	205	205
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	56	56
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	78	78
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	3,432	3,432
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	---	650
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,137	1,137
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,689	4,800
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,723	1,723
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,714	1,714
ELKINS, WV	16	16
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	91	91
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	7,782	7,782
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	15,934	15,934
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	2,786	2,786
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,934	1,934
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	1,216	1,216
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,526	1,526
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,903	1,903
TYGART LAKE, WV	3,568	3,568
WHEELING CREEK, WV	---	500
WISCONSIN		
ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	170	170
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	735	735
FOX RIVER, WI	3,252	3,252
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,640	1,640
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	925	925
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	490	490
LA FARGE LAKE, WI	53	53
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	738	738
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	819	819

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	290	290
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	1,534	1,534
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	28	28
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	537	537
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,163	1,163
MISCELLANEOUS		
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	3,000	2,750
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	3,000	1,500
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	13,500	8,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,166	1,000
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	8,000	7,000
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM	2,100	1,500
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	600	500
GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS	---	500
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	975	575
MANAGEMENT TOOLS FOR O&M	1,100	500
MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	2,000	1,700
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	40	40
NATIONAL DAM SECURITY PROGRAM	25	25
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	6,000	4,000
PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,650	415
PROTECTING, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS(SEC 3)	50	50
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM (RMSP)	1,950	1,500
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT SEDIMENT DEMO PROGRAM	1,500	1,500
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675	675
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500	500
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	1,500	700
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,600	4,000
WETLANDS FUNCTIONAL ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	1,000	---
ZEBRA MUSSEL CONTROL	700	700
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-16,867	-43,867
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,854,000	1,901,959

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

The conference agreement appropriates $39,940,000 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act as proposed by the House and the Senate.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs, and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation. Additional items of the conference agreement are discussed below.

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

The conference agreement appropriates $678,450,000 for Water and Related Resources instead of $635,777,000 as proposed by the House and $655,192,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $39,467,000 for the Central Arizona Project as proposed by the House.

The additional funds provided by the House under the California Investigations Program for studies of ways to increase the reliability of water supplies in southern Orange County, California, have been included under the Southern California Investigations Program.

The conference agreement includes an additional $1,000,000 for the Columbia and Snake Rivers Salmon Recovery project. The additional funds may be used for water acquisition and other actions that may be required by Endangered Species Act biological opinions concerning the operation and maintenance of Bureau of Reclamation projects.

The conference agreement includes an increase of $4,758,000 over the budget request for the Middle Rio Grande project in New Mexico for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake research, monitoring, and modeling of evapotranspiration, implement a program for the transplant of silvery minnow larvae and young-of-year, and carry out habitat conservation and restoration activities along the middle Rio Grande River valley as specified in the Senate report. Additional funding is also provided for Bureau of Reclamation participation in the recent settlement regarding the recovery of the Rio Grande silvery minnow.

The conference agreement includes $2,960,000 for the Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program. Of the funds provided, $500,000 is provided for the Bureau of Reclamation to participate with the City of Espanola, New Mexico, in a feasibility study to investigate opportunities to reclaim and reuse municipal wastewater and naturally impaired surface and groundwater, and $300,000 is provided to continue the Phoenix Metropolitan Water Reclamation and Reuse (Aqua Fria) project in Arizona. In addition, up to $1,000,000 is provided for the Bureau of Reclamation to support the WateReuse Foundation's research program as described in the House report.

The conferees have provided $5,000,000 for the Drought Emergency Assistance Program to address the severe drought conditions that currently exist in New Mexico and other western states. The conferees direct the attention of the Bureau of Reclamation to the need for the acquisition of water for the San Carlos Reservoir on the Gila River in Arizona.

The conference agreement includes $8,500,000 for the Native American Affairs Program of the Bureau of Reclamation, of which $200,000 is for the Bureau to undertake studies, in consultation and cooperation with the Jicarilla Apache Tribe, of the most feasible method of developing a safe and adequate municipal, rural and industrial water supply for the residents of the Jicarilla Apache Indian Reservation in New Mexico.

Of the amount provided for the Wetlands Development Program, $1,500,000 is provided for design and construction of the restoration of the Upper Truckee River in the vicinity of the airport at South Lake Tahoe, California, including channel realignment, and meadow and floodplain restoration.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House which provides that none of the funds appropriated in the Act may be used by the Bureau of Reclamation for closure of the Auburn Dam, California, diversion tunnel or restoration of the American River channel through the Auburn Dam construction site.

The conferees have included language in the bill proposed by the Senate which provides that $16,000,000 shall be available for the Rocky Boys Indian Water Rights Settlement project in Montana; provides that not more than $500,000 shall be available for projects carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps; increases the amount authorized for Indian municipal, rural, and industrial water features of the Garrison Diversion project in North Dakota by $2,000,000; and amends the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978.

The conference agreement deletes bill language proposed by the Senate providing $2,300,000 for the Albuquerque Metropolitan Area Water Reclamation and Reuse project. Funding for this project is included in the total amount appropriated for Water and Related Resources.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The conference agreement appropriates $9,369,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program account as proposed by the House and the Senate.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

The conference agreement appropriates $38,382,000 for the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund as proposed by the House and the Senate.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement appropriates $50,224,000 for Policy and Administration as proposed by the Senate instead of $47,000,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Section 201. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House which provides that none of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be used to purchase or lease water in the Middle Rio Grande or Carlsbad projects in New Mexico unless the purchase or lease is in compliance with the requirements of section 202 of Public Law 106–60.

Section 202. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which provides that funds for Drought Emergency Assistance are to be used primarily for leasing of water for specified drought related purposes from willing lessors in compliance with State laws. The language also provides that leases may be entered into with an option to purchase provided the purchase is approved in the State in which the purchase takes place and does not cause economic harm in the State in which the purchase is made.

Section 203. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House which provides authority to the Secretary of the Interior to make an annual assessment upon Central Valley Project water and power contractors for the purpose of making an annual payment to the Trinity Public Utilities District. The language has been amended to clarify that the payments to the Trinity Public Utilities District will be made without the need for appropriations.

Section 204. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate regarding the activities of the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program. The language in the Senate bill has been amended to increase the funding limit for the program to not more than $7,850,000, adjusted for inflation, and to not preclude voluntary contributions to the Adaptive Management Program.

Section 205. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to use not to exceed $1,000,000 to refund amounts received by the United States as payments for charges assessed by the Secretary prior to January 1, 1994, for failure to file certain certification or reporting forms prior to the receipt of project water pursuant to sections 206 and 224(c) of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982.

Section 206. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which amends the Canyon Ferry Reservoir, Montana, Act.

Section 207. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which provides that beginning in fiscal year 2000 and thereafter, any amounts provided for the Newlands Water Rights Fund for purchasing and retiring water rights in the Newlands Reclamation Project shall be nonreimbursable.

Section 208. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which permits the use of Colorado-Big Thompson Project facilities for nonproject water.

Section 209. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which amends the Irrigation Project Contract Extension Act of 1998.

Section 210. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the Senate which extends through fiscal year 2001 the prohibition on the use of funds to further reallocate Central Arizona Project water until the enactment of legislation authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to make allocations and enter into contracts for the delivery of Central Arizona Project water.

Section 211. The conference agreement includes language which amends the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act, Public Law 100–675.

Section 212. The conference agreement includes language providing for the conveyance of the Sly Park Unit in California to the El Dorado Irrigation District.

Provision not included in the conference agreement.—The conference agreement does not include a provision proposed by the Senate related to recreation development within the State of Montana.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	CONFERENCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	CONFERENCE FACILITIES OM&R
WATER AND RELATED				
ARIZONA				
AK CHIN INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT....	---	6,762	---	6,762
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT.....	33,667	---	39,467	---
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I.....	1,068	10,315	1,068	10,315
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM.....	3,722	380	3,722	380
HOPI/WESTERN NAVAJO WATER DEVELOPMENT PLAN.....	---	---	1,000	---
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	300	---	300	---
SOUTH CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	690	---	890	---
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT.....	5,189	---	5,189	---
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION.....	550	---	550	---
TUCSON AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY.....	300	---	300	---
YUMA AREA PROJECTS.....	1,738	17,450	1,738	17,450
CALIFORNIA				
CACHUMA PROJECT.....	666	401	666	401
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	1,293	---	1,293	---
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PROJ.....	500	---	824	---
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION, AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT.	4,740	10,708	10,240	10,708
DELTA DIVISION.....	14,636	4,706	14,636	4,706
EAST SIDE DIVISION.....	585	3,595	585	3,595
FRIANT DIVISION.....	4,170	2,531	4,170	2,531
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS.....	11,824	1,009	11,824	1,009
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, EXTRAORDINARY MAINT.....	---	8,013	---	8,013
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.....	6,171	1,612	8,691	1,612
SAN FELIPE DIVISION.....	897	---	897	---
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION.....	2,608	---	2,608	---
SHASTA DIVISION.....	3,474	7,356	3,474	7,356
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION.....	7,116	4,791	7,116	4,791
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS.....	897	6,490	897	6,490
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT.....	6,385	5,447	7,385	5,447
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION.....	1,800	---	1,800	---
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT.....	2,000	---	2,000	---
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION/REUSE PROJ.....	740	---	740	---
MISSION BASIN BRACKISH GROUNDWATER DESALTING DEMO.....	---	---	503	---
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJ.....	2,000	---	5,000	---
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER. RECLAMATION PROJ.....	2,000	---	2,000	---
ORLAND PROJECT.....	---	617	---	617
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT.....	1,000	---	5,000	---
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM.....	7,500	---	7,500	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT.....	2,000	---	2,000	---
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROG.....	3,500	---	3,500	---
SOLANO PROJECT.....	1,084	1,088	1,084	1,088
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	624	---	1,124	---
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT, CASITAS DAM.....	---	5,500	---	5,500

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	CONFERENCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	CONFERENCE FACILITIES OM&R
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LAPLATA PROJECT, SECTIONS 5 & 8	2,000	---	2,000	---
COLLBRAN PROJECT	132	967	132	967
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	355	7,381	355	7,381
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	188	---	188	---
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	102	16	102	16
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	285	4,653	285	4,653
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP	412	507	412	507
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	469	1,291	469	1,291
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	69	---	69	---
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	---	332	---	332
MANCOS PROJECT	42	22	42	22
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	---	2,058	---	2,058
PINE RIVER PROJECT	90	58	90	58
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN/CONEJOS DIV	410	2,812	410	2,812
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	287	23	287	23
IDAHO				
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	1,746	5,683	1,746	5,683
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	4,622	---	5,622	---
DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, BOISE PROJECT	250	---	500	---
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	248	---	248	---
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	3,466	1,841	3,766	1,841
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAINWATER MANAGEMENT PROJECT	288	---	288	---
KANSAS				
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	400	---	400	---
WICHITA PROJECT	---	226	---	226
MONTANA				
CANYON FERRY RESRVOIR	---	---	325	---
FORT PECK RURAL COUNTY WATER SYSTEM	---	---	1,500	---
FORT PECK, DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTREM	---	---	435	---
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	---	283	---	283
MILK RIVER PROJECT	325	512	325	512
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	251	---	251	---
ROCKY BOYS INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT	16,000	---	16,000	---
NEBRASKA				
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	35	53	35	53
NORTH LOOP DIVISION, MIRDAN CANAL	---	---	1,750	---
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	17	---	17	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	CONFERENCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	CONFERENCE FACILITIES OM&R
NEVADA				
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	800	---	1,500	---
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	6,864	1,577	6,864	1,577
NEWLANDS PROJECT WATER RIGHTS FUND	---	---	2,700	---
SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER RECYCLING	---	---	500	---
WALKER RIVER BASIN PROJECT	---	---	300	---
NEW MEXICO				
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER & RECLAMATION REUSE	---	---	2,300	---
CARLSBAD PROJECT	2,345	607	2,345	857
EASTERN NEW MEXICO WATER SUPPLY	---	---	250	---
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	2,604	8,480	7,362	8,480
NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	---	---	450	---
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	---	176	---	176
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	947	2,287	947	2,287
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	183	---	183	---
SO. NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAMS	238	---	238	---
TUCUMARI PROJECT	18	5	18	5
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	164	---	164	---
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT	3,880	---	3,880	---
NORTH DAKOTA				
DAKOTA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	387	---	387	---
DAKOTA TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	187	---	187	---
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	17,416	3,875	21,416	3,875
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	---	168	---	168
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	---	535	---	535
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	---	232	---	232
NORMAN PROJECT	---	163	---	163
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	234	---	234	---
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	---	262	---	262
WASHTIA BASIN PROJECT	---	638	---	638
OREGON				
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	384	307	384	307
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT	500	---	1,000	---
DESCHUTES PROJECT	294	137	294	137
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	205	249	205	249
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	50	---	50	---
KLAMATH PROJECT	10,837	348	10,837	348
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	601	---	601	---
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	260	623	260	623
TUALATIN PROJECT	197	123	197	123

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	CONFERENCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	CONFERENCE FACILITIES OM&R
TUALATIN VALLEY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	100	---	100	---
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY	100	---	100	---
UMATILLA PROJECT	571	1,723	571	1,723
SOUTH DAKOTA				
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	---	---	---	1,000
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	6,000	40	8,000	40
MNI WICONI PROJECT	23,570	6,165	27,570	6,165
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT	---	30	---	30
TEXAS				
BALMORHEA PROJECT	31	---	31	---
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	---	131	---	131
HASKELL STREET RECLAIMED WATER PROJECT	---	---	500	---
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	---	393	---	393
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT	---	546	---	546
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	---	262	---	262
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	346	---	596	---
UTAH				
HYRUM PROJECT	62	11	62	11
MOON LAKE PROJECT	15	5	15	5
NAVAJO SANDSTONE AQUIFER RECHARGE STUDY	250	---	250	---
NEWTON PROJECT	39	14	39	14
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	230	---	230	---
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	76	29	76	29
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	401	340	401	340
SCOFIELD PROJECT	91	24	91	24
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	235	---	235	---
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	88	7	88	7
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,267	141	1,267	141
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	296	32	296	32
WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	3,600	7,524	3,600	7,524
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	264	---	264	---
YAKIMA PROJECT	523	7,483	523	7,483
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	11,056	---	11,056	---
WYOMING				
KENDRICK PROJECT	4	5,597	4	5,597
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	19	1,295	19	1,295
SHOSHONE PROJECT	42	905	42	905
WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	70	---	70	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	CONFERENCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	CONFERENCE FACILITIES OM&R
VARIOUS				
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II	11,085	---	11,085	---
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 5	3,813	1,455	3,813	1,455
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 8, RFW	7,135	---	7,135	---
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	150	---	150	---
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:				
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,700	---	1,700
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	---	51,600	---	51,600
SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS	---	17,500	---	17,500
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES	---	1,000	---	1,000
DEPARTMENTAL IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM	3,000	---	2,000	---
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	500	---	5,000	---
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	3,169	---	3,000	---
EMERGENCY PLANNING AND DISASTER RESPONSE PROG	---	309	---	309
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENT. PROG	12,179	---	12,179	---
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION	1,824	---	1,000	---
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	2,155	---	1,500	---
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	30	4,740	30	4,240
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,400	---	1,000
GENERAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES	1,842	---	1,700	---
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	6,484	---	5,884	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	13,729	---	11,729	---
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	---	506	---	506
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	1,300	---	1,300	---
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	8,500	---	8,500	---
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,254	---	1,000	---
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	169	865	169	865
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM - OTHER PROJ	3,232	25,667	3,232	25,667
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	1,023	473	1,023	473
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	464	---	464	---
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	4,914	---	4,696	---
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT ACT - TITLE XXVIII	3,743	---	3,743	---
RECREATION, FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMIN	2,766	---	2,000	---
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:				
ADVANCED WATER TREATMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM	1,225	---	1,225	---
APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	3,249	---	3,249	---
DESALINATION RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	300	---	1,300	---
HYDROELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE PROT/EHNANCE	660	---	660	---
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM	283	---	283	---
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	933	---	933	---
SITE SECURITY	---	1,043	---	1,043
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION	263	---	263	---
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	1,840	---	1,000	---
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	1,460	---	2,960	---
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES- TECH SUPPORT	50	---	50	---
WATER MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION PROGRAM	7,605	---	7,100	---
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	3,750	---	3,250	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	CONFERENCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	CONFERENCE FACILITIES OM&R
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	-31,120	---	-47,720	---
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES.....	353,822	289,236	388,864	289,586
LOAN PROGRAM				
CALIFORNIA				
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER SUPPLY PROJECT.....	1,300	---	1,300	---
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION.....	800	---	800	---
SAN SEVAINE CREEK WATER PROJECT.....	6,844	---	6,844	---
VARIOUS				
LOAN ADMINISTRATION.....	425	---	425	---
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM.....	9,369	---	9,369	---

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs, and activities of the Department of Energy. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The conferees strongly support the progress being made by the Office of Engineering and Construction Management in bringing standardization, discipline, oversight, and increased professionalism to the Department's project management efforts. The project engineering and design (PED) process developed by the Department represents significant progress toward correcting serious management deficiencies that have historically plagued the Department's construction projects. The conferees believe that implementation of the PED process for all construction and environmental projects throughout the Department will provide the assurance necessary to eliminate the current requirement for an external independent review of all projects prior to releasing funds for construction. The conferees expect the continuation of the external independent review process as discussed in both the House and Senate reports.

PASSENGER MOTOR VEHICLES

The conferees have provided statutory limitations on the number of passenger motor vehicles that can be purchased by the Department of Energy in fiscal year 2001. These limitations are included each year, but the Department has been interpreting this limitation to mean that sport utility vehicles are not considered passenger motor vehicles and do not count against the appropriation ceiling. The conferees consider this to be disingenuous at best and a violation of the appropriations language at worst.

The conferees expect the Department to adhere strictly to the limits set for the purchase of motor vehicles. It is the intention of the conferees in prescribing these limitations that sport utility vehicles are to be considered passenger motor vehicles and, therefore, subject to the limitation. Further, the Department is to provide a full and complete accounting of the current motor vehicle inventory at each location. The Department should work with the Committees on Appropriations to ensure that the report provides the necessary information.

CONTRACTOR TRAVEL

The conference agreement includes a statutory provision limiting reimbursement of Department of Energy management and operating contractors for travel expenses to not more than $185,000,000. This limitation consists of $175,000,000 for contractor travel and a reserve fund of $10,000,000 to be administered by the Department's Chief Financial Officer and released for emergency travel requirements.

The Department had requested $200,000,000 for contractor travel. The reduction in fiscal year 2001 is not to be prorated, but should be applied to those organizations that appear to have the most questionable travel practices. This is not meant to restrict trips between laboratories to coordinate on program issues.

INDEPENDENT CENTERS

The Department is to identify all independent centers at each DOE laboratory and facility in the fiscal year 2002 budget submission. These centers are to be funded directly in program accounts, rather than overhead, with the exception of those centers which clearly benefit more than one program at a laboratory or facility. The Department is directed to provide a list of any centers that are funded through overhead accounts with the fiscal year 2002 budget submission.

REPROGRAMMINGS

The conference agreement does not provide the Department of Energy with any internal reprogramming flexibility in fiscal year 2001 unless specifically identified by the House, Senate, or conference agreement. Any reallocation of new or prior year budget authority or prior year deobligations must be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in advance, in writing, and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committees.

LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The conference agreement includes an allowance of six percent for the laboratory directed research and development (LDRD) program and two percent for nuclear weapons production plants. Travel costs for LDRD are exempt from the contractor travel ceiling. The conferees direct the Department's Chief Financial Officer to develop and execute a financial accounting report of LDRD expenditures by laboratory and weapons production plant. This report, due to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by December 31, 2000, and each year thereafter, should provide costs by personnel salaries, equipment, and travel. The Department should work with the Committees on the specific information to be included in the report.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY BUDGET AMENDMENT

The conferees have chosen to reflect the amounts requested for safeguards and security funding in the manner proposed in the budget amendment submitted to Congress by the Department. Adjustments have been made in each account to reflect the consolidation of safeguards and security costs into a few major accounts and the transfer of these costs from overhead accounts to specific program line items. However, the conferees do not concur with the amendment to the extent its purpose is to reorganize all safeguards and security functions at the Department under the control and direction of the Office of Security and Emergency Operations, or any other entity not part of line management. The conferees agree that the direct responsibility for safeguards and security must be united and integrated with the responsibility of line operations.

ADDITIONAL DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY REQUIREMENTS

The conferees agree with the House report language on augmenting Federal staff, overhead costs reviews and reprogramming guidelines.

GENERAL REDUCTIONS NECESSARY TO ACCOMMODATE SPECIFIC PROGRAM DIRECTIONS

The Department is directed to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by January 15, 2001, on the actual application of any general reductions of funding or use of prior year balances contained in the conference agreement. In general, such reductions should not be applied disproportionately against any program, project, or activity. However, the conferees are aware there may be instances where proportional reductions would adversely impact critical programs and other allocations may be necessary. The report should also include the distribution of the safeguards and security funding adjustments.

ENERGY SUPPLY

The conference agreement provides $660,574,000 for Energy Supply instead of $616,482,000 as proposed by the House and $691,520,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes the House proposal to make funds available until expended rather than the Senate proposal to limit availability to two years. The conference agreement does not include the Senate bill language transferring funds from the United States Enrichment Corporation or earmarking funds for a variety of projects to demonstrate alternative energy technologies.

RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

The conference agreement provides $422,085,000 instead of $390,519,000 as proposed by the House and $444,117,000 as proposed by the Senate for renewable energy resources.

Biomass/biofuels.—The conference agreement includes $112,900,000 for biomass/biofuels. The conferees have provided $26,740,000 for research to be managed by the Office of Science, the same as the budget request. The conference agreement includes $40,000,000 for power systems and $46,160,000 for the transportation program. The conference agreement does not include prescriptive language specifying funding allocations as contained in the House and Senate reports.

The conferees encourage the Department to continue the integrated approach to bioenergy activities and recommend the use of up to $18,000,000 within available funds for the bioenergy initiative. Funding for this initiative may be derived from both the power and transportation programs.

In the power program, the conference agreement provides $2,000,000 for the Iowa switch grass project which is a multi-year project; $4,000,000 for the McNeill biomass plant in Burlington, Vermont; $395,000 for the final Federal contribution to the Vermont agriculture methane project; $500,000 for the bioreactor landfill project to be administered by the Environmental Education and Research Foundation and Michigan State University; $1,000,000 for methane energy and agriculture development (MEAD) in Tillamook Bay, Oregon; and $1,000,000 for the Mount Wachusett College biomass conversion project in Massachusetts.

The Department is to accelerate the large-scale biomass demonstration at the Winona, Mississippi, site.

The conference agreement provides $4,000,000 in power systems to support a project to demonstrate a commercial facility employing the thermo-depolymerization technology at a site adjacent to the Nevada Test Site. The project shall proceed on a cost-shared basis where Federal funding shall be matched in at least an equal amount with non-Federal funding.

In the transportation program, the conference agreement provides $1,000,000 for continuation of biomass research at the Energy and Environmental Research Center on the integration of biomass with fossil fuels for advanced power systems transportation fuels; $600,000 for the University of Louisville to work on the design of bioreactors for production of fuels and chemicals for ethanol production; and $2,000,000 for the design and construction of a demonstration facility for regional biomass ethanol manufacturing in southeast Alaska.

The conference agreement also includes $2,000,000 for the Michigan Biotechnology Institute to be derived equally from power and transportation systems.

Funding allocated by the Department for the regional biomass program and feedstock production should be derived equally from the power and transportation programs.

Geothermal.—The conference agreement includes $27,000,000 for geothermal activities. The conference agreement does not include language specifying funding allocations as contained in the Senate report. The conferees have provided $2,000,000 to complete

the Lake County Basin 2000 Geothermal project in Lake County, California.

Hydrogen.—The conference agreement includes $29,970,000 for hydrogen activities, including $350,000 for the Montana Trade Port Authority in Billings, Montana; $250,000 for the gasification of Iowa switch grass; and $800,000 for the ITM Syngas project.

The conferees have also provided $2,000,000 for the multi-year demonstration of an underground mining locomotive and an earth loader powered by hydrogen at existing facilities within the State of Nevada. The demonstration is subject to a private sector industry cost-share of not less than an equal amount, and a portion of these funds may also be used to acquire a prototype hydrogen fueling appliance to provide on-site hydrogen in the demonstration.

Hydropower.—The conference agreement includes $5,000,000 for hydropower. The conferees are aware that the Department is funding research that is supposed to be applicable to the needs of the large dams in the northwest United States. The Department is concerned that the Federal power marketing administrations are not involved in developing this research program. The Department is directed to provide a report coordinated with the power marketing administrations that indicates how this hydropower research is applicable to the current and future needs of the power marketing administrations and the schedule by which this research will provide useable products.

Solar Energy.—The conference agreement includes $110,632,000 for solar energy programs. The conference agreement does not include language specifying funding allocations as contained in the House and Senate reports.

The conference agreement provides $13,800,000 for concentrating solar power, including $1,000,000 to initiate planning of a one MW dish engine field validation power project at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas.

The conference agreement includes $78,622,000 for photovoltaic energy systems, including up to $3,000,000 for the million solar roofs initiative. The conferees have provided $1,500,000 for the Southeast and Southwest photovoltaic experiment stations.

The conference agreement includes $3,950,000 for solar building technology research.

Wind.—The conference agreement includes $40,283,000 for wind programs. The conference agreement does not include prescriptive language specifying allocations as included in the Senate report. The conferees have provided $1,000,000 for the Kotzebue wind project. Of the funding for wind energy systems, not less than $5,000,000 shall be made available for new and ongoing small wind programs, including not less than $2,000,000 for the small wind turbine development project. From within available funds, $100,000 has been provided for a wind turbine and for educational purposes at the Turtle Mountain Community College in North Dakota.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The conference agreement includes $52,000,000 for electric energy systems and storage. The conferees urge the Department to support the university, industry-based partnership at the University of California-Irvine Advanced Power and Energy Program to conduct energy and information related technology demonstrations to accelerate the development and deployment of cost-efficient technologies benefiting all energy consumers affected by a deregulated energy industry.

The conference agreement includes $6,000,000 to accelerate the development and application of high temperature superconductor technologies through joint efforts among DOE laboratories, universities, and industry to be lead by Los Alamos and Oak Ridge National Laboratories.

The conference agreement includes $500,000 for completion of the distributed power demonstration project begun last year at the Nevada Test Site.

Renewable Support and Implementation.—The conference agreement includes $21,600,000 for renewable support and implementation programs.

The Federal Energy Management Program should report to the Committees on Appropriations by December 31, 2001, on the accomplishments of the Departmental energy management program with the fiscal year 2001 appropriations including the number of energy efficiency projects funded, the number of energy savings performance contracts supported, and the total estimated savings.

From within available funds, the conference agreement provides $1,000,000 for the Office of Arctic Energy as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $5,000,000 for the international renewable energy program. Of this amount, $1,000,000 is to be provided to International Utility Efficiency Partnerships, Inc. (IUEP). The IUEP shall competitively award all projects, continuing its leadership role in reducing carbon dioxide emissions using voluntary market-based mechanisms.

The conference agreement includes $4,000,000 for the renewable energy production incentive program.

The conference agreement includes $6,600,000 for renewable Indian energy resources projects as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $4,000,000 for renewable program support, of which $1,000,000 is for an Indoor Air Quality and Energy Conservation Research Planning grant to study and develop technologies to improve air quality within homes and buildings.

Program direction.—The conference agreement includes $18,700,000 for program direction. The conferees have provided additional funding to support implementation of the management reforms identified in the recent National Academy of Public Administration review.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

The conference agreement provides $259,925,000 for nuclear energy activities instead of $231,815,000 as proposed by the House and $262,084,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Advanced radioisotope power systems.—The conference agreement includes $32,200,000, an increase over the budget request of $30,864,000. The additional funds are to maintain the infrastructure to support future national security needs and NASA missions.

Isotope support.—The conference agreement includes a total program level of $27,215,000 for the isotope program. This amount is reduced by offsetting collections of $8,000,000 to be received in fiscal year 2001, resulting in a net appropriation of $19,215,000. The conferees understand that the total estimated cost of Project 99–E–201, the isotope production facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory, has increased significantly due to factors outside the control of the Office of Nuclear Energy and have included $2,500,000 to partially cover these additional costs.

University reactor fuel assistance and support.—The conference agreement includes $12,000,000, the same as the budget request.

Research and development.—The conference agreement provides $47,500,000 for nuclear energy research and development activities.

The conference agreement includes $5,000,000, the same as the budget request, for nuclear energy plant optimization. The conferees direct the Department to ensure that projects are funded jointly with non-Federal partners and that total non-Federal contributions are equal to or in excess of total Department contributions to projects funded in this program.

The conferees have provided $35,000,000 for the nuclear energy research initiative.

The conference agreement includes $7,500,000 for nuclear energy technologies. The Senate had included these activities in the nuclear energy research initiative program. Funding of $4,500,000 is provided to develop a road map for the commercial deployment of a next generation power reactor; $1,000,000 for the preparation of a detailed assessment that analyzes and describes the changes needed to existing advanced light water reactor (ALWR) designs; $1,000,000 for planning and implementation of initiatives in support of an advanced gas reactor; and $1,000,000 to undertake a study to determine the feasibility of deployment of small modular reactors.

Infrastructure.—The conference agreement includes the budget request of $39,150,000 for ANL-West Operations, $9,000,000 for test reactor landlord activities, and $44,010,000 for the Fast Flux Test Facility.

Nuclear facilities management.—The conference agreement adopts the budget structure proposed by the House and provides $34,850,000 for nuclear facilities management activities, the same as the budget request.

The conference agreement provides the full amount of the budget request to complete draining and processing EBR-II primary sodium. The conferees direct the Department to notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations immediately if any issues arise that would delay the Department's scheduled date to complete these activities.

Uranium programs.—The conference agreement transfers the budget request of $53,400,000 for uranium programs to a new appropriation account, Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation.

Program direction.—The conference agreement includes $22,000,000 for program direction. This reduction reflects the transfer of 25 employees in the field and up to 5 employees at Headquarters who managed the uranium programs to the Office of Environmental Management.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The conference agreement includes $35,998,000 for non-defense environment, safety and health activities. The conferees direct that the reduction from the budget request be directed to eliminate lower-priority activities currently funded in this program. The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 to be transferred to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration as proposed by the House. The conferees expect the Department to budget for this activity in fiscal year 2002.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The conference agreement includes $8,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The conference agreement also includes $47,100,000, the same amount as the budget request, for research performed by the Office of Science related to renewable energy technologies, and $2,352,000 proposed as an offset from nuclear energy royalties to be received in fiscal year 2001. A reduction of $16,582,000 reflects the transfer of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The conference agreement provides $277,812,000 for Non-Defense Environmental Management instead of $281,001,000 as proposed by the House and $309,141,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funding of $5,000,000 is

provided to expedite environmental cleanup at the Brookhaven National Laboratory. No funding has been provided for the Atlas site in Moab, Utah, which has not been authorized. The recommendation transfers $1,900,000 from the post–2006 program to the site/project completion program to maintain the schedule for completing cleanup of three Oakland geographic sites.

URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION

The conference agreement provides $393,367,000 for uranium activities instead of $301,400,000 as proposed by the House and $297,778,000 as proposed by the Senate, and adopts the budget structure proposed by the House.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

The conference agreement includes $345,038,000 for the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund. This includes $273,038,000 for cleanup activities and $72,000,000 for uranium and thorium reimbursements. The conferees recognize there are eligible uranium and thorium licensee claims under Title X of the Energy Policy Act that have been approved for reimbursement, but not yet paid in full. Additional funding of $42,000,000 over the budget request of $30,000,000 has been provided for these payments.

URANIUM PROGRAMS

The conference agreement provides $62,400,000 for uranium activities, an increase of $9,000,000 over the budget request of $53,400,000. Additional funding of $9,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, has been provided for activities associated with the depleted uranium hexafluoride (DUF6) management and conversion project.

DOMESTIC URANIUM INDUSTRY

The conferees are very concerned about the front end of the U.S. nuclear fuel cycle. The conferees direct the Secretary to work with the President and other Federal agencies to ensure that current laws with respect to the privatization of USEC and with respect to the implementation of the Russian HEU agreement and their impact on United States domestic capabilities are carried out. In addition, the Secretary is instructed to take timely measures to ensure that conversion capability is not lost in the United States. The conferees expect that any such measures will not interfere with the implementation of the Russian HEU agreement and the important national security goals it is accomplishing.

The conferees direct the Secretary to undertake an evaluation and make specific recommendations on the various options to sustain a domestic uranium enrichment industry in the short and long-term to be delivered to Congress no later than December 31, 2000. The Secretary's evaluation shall include recommendations for dealing with the Portsmouth facility and its role in maintaining a secure and sufficient domestic supply of enriched uranium. Further, this investigation should consider the technological viability and commercial feasibility of all proposed enrichment technologies including various centrifuge options, AVLIS and SILEX technologies, or other emerging technology. The evaluation should also consider the role of the Federal government in developing and supporting the implementation and regulation of these new technologies in order to secure a reliable and competitive source of domestic nuclear fuel.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENT

A reduction of $14,071,000 reflects the transfer of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request.

SCIENCE

The conference agreement provides $3,186,352,000 instead of $2,830,915,000 as proposed by the House and $2,870,112,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement does not include the Senate language earmarking funds for various purposes and limiting funding for the small business innovation research program.

High energy physics.—The conference agreement provides $726,130,000 for high energy physics and reflects the adjustments recommended in the Science budget amendment submitted by the Department. Funding of $230,931,000 has been provided for facility operations at the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory.

Nuclear physics.—The conference agreement provides $369,890,000 for nuclear physics, the same as the original budget request.

Biological and environmental research.—The conference agreement includes $500,260,000 for biological and environmental research. The conferees have included $20,135,000 for the low-dose effects program, an increase of $8,453,000 over the budget request. The conference agreement provides $9,000,000 for molecular nuclear medicine.

The conferees have provided the budget request of $2,500,000 for the Laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics at Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The conference agreement includes $2,000,000 for the Discovery Science Center in Orange County, California; $1,500,000 for the Children's Hospital emergency power plant in San Diego; $1,000,000 for the Center for Science and Education at the University of San Diego; $500,000 for the bone marrow transplant program at Children's Hospital Medical Center Foundation in Oakland, California; $1,000,000 for the North Shore Long Island Jewish Health System in New York; $1,700,000 for the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago; $2,000,000 for the Livingston Digital Millenium Center to be located at Tulane University; and $1,000,000 for the Center for Nuclear Magnetic Resonance at the University of Alabama-Birmingham.

The conference agreement includes $3,000,000 for the Nanotechnology Engineering Center at the University of Notre Dame in South Bend, Indiana; $2,000,000 for the School of Public Health at the University of South Carolina for modernization upgrades; $2,000,000 for the National Center for Musculoskeletal Research at the Hospital for Special Surgery in New York; and $1,300,000 for the Western States Visibility Assessment Program at New Mexico Tech to trace emissions resulting from energy consumption.

The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for high temperature super conducting research and development at Boston College; $2,500,000 for the positron emission tomography facility at West Virginia University; $1,000,000 for the advanced medical imaging center at Hampton University; $500,000 for the Natural Energy Laboratory in Hawaii; $800,000 for the Child Health Institute of New Brunswick, New Jersey; and $900,000 for the linear accelerator for University Medical Center of Southern Nevada.

The conference agreement also includes $200,000 for the study of biological effects of low level radioactive activity at University of Nevada-Las Vegas; $1,000,000 for the Medical University of South Carolina Oncology Center; $11,000,000 for development of technologies using advanced functional brain imaging methodologies, including magneto-encephalography, for conduct of basic research in mental illness and neurological disorders, and for construction; $2,000,000 for a science and technology facility at New Mexico Highlands University; $2,000,000 for the University of Missouri-Columbia to expand the federal investment in the university's nuclear medicine and cancer research capital program; and $2,000,000 for the Inland Northwest Natural Resources Research Center at Gonzaga University.

Basic energy sciences.—The conference agreement includes $1,013,370,000 for basic energy sciences. The conferees have included $8,000,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR).

Spallation Neutron Source.—The recommendation includes $278,600,000, including $259,500,000 for construction and $19,100,000 for related research and development, the same as the amended budget request, for the Spallation Neutron Source.

Advanced scientific computing research.—The conference agreement includes $170,000,000 for advanced scientific computing research.

Energy research analyses.—The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for energy research analyses, the same amount provided by the House and the Senate.

Multiprogram energy labs—facility support.—The conference agreement includes $33,930,000 for multi-program energy labs-facility support.

Fusion energy sciences.—The conference agreement includes $255,000,000, as proposed by the House, for fusion energy sciences.

Safeguards and security.—Consistent with the Department's amended budget request for safeguards and security, the conference agreement includes $49,818,000 for safeguards and security activities at laboratories and facilities managed by the Office of Science. This is offset by a reduction of $38,244,000 that is to be allocated among the various programs which budgeted for safeguards and security costs in their overhead accounts.

Program Direction.—The conference agreement includes $139,245,000 for program direction. Funding of $4,500,000 has been provided for science education.

Funding adjustments.—A reduction of $38,244,000 reflects the allocation of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request. A general reduction of $34,047,000 has been applied to this account.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

The conference agreement provides $191,074,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal instead of $213,000,000 as proposed by the House and $59,175,000 as proposed by the Senate. Combined with the appropriation of $200,000,000 to the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal account, a total of $391,074,000 will be available for program activities in fiscal year 2001. The funding level reflects a reduction of $39,500,000 from the budget request and the transfer of $6,926,000 in safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request.

In addition, the conferees recommend that $10,000,000 of funds previously appropriated for interim waste storage activities in Public Law 104–46 may be made available upon written certification by the Secretary of Energy to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that the site recommendation report cannot be completed on time without additional funding.

Site recommendation report.—The conferees reiterate the expectation by Congress that the Department submit its site recommendation report in July 2001 according to the current schedule. While the conference agreement does not provide the full funding requested by the Department, the conferees expect the Department to promptly submit a reprogramming request if it becomes apparent that limited funding will delay the site recommendation report beyond July 2001.

The conferees further expect that, if the site is approved, the Department will continue to analyze further design improvements and enhancements between that time

and the submittal of a license application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

State oversight funding.—The conference agreement includes $2,500,000 for the State of Nevada. This funding will be provided to the Department of Energy which will reimburse the State for actual expenditures on appropriate scientific oversight responsibilities conducted pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. These funds are to be provided to the Nevada Division of Emergency Management for program management and execution and may not be used for payment of salaries and expenses for State employees.

Local oversight funding.—The conference agreement includes $6,000,000 for affected units of local government. The conferees expect the Department to provide the full amount of funding allocated to the State and local counties for oversight activities. Any proposed reduction to the amounts identified by Congress for State and local oversight will require prior approval of a reprogramming request by the Committees on Appropriations.

Limitation on the use of funds to promote or advertise public tours.—The conferees direct that none of the funds be used to promote or advertise any public tour of the Yucca Mountain facility, other than public notice that is required by statute or regulation.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement provides $226,107,000 for Departmental Administration instead of $153,527,000 as proposed by the House and $210,128,000 as proposed by the Senate. Additional funding adjustments include a transfer of $25,000,000 from Other Defense Activities; the use of $8,000,000 of prior year balances; and a reduction of $18,000 for safeguards and security costs. Revenues of $151,000,000 are estimated to be received in fiscal year 2001, resulting in a net appropriation of $75,107,000.

The conference agreement provides $5,000,000 for the Office of the Secretary as proposed by the House. All funds for the newly established National Nuclear Security Administration have been provided in the defense portion of this bill.

The conference agreement provides $32,148,000 for the Chief Financial Officer, an increase of $1,400,000 over the budget request of $30,748,000. These additional funds are to support the DOE project management career development program.

Working capital fund.—The conference agreement does not include statutory language proposed by the House prohibiting funding Federal employee salaries and expenses in the working capital fund. However, any proposal by the Department to transfer salaries and expenses to the working capital fund will require prior approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Cost of work for others.—The conference agreement includes a one-time increase of $40,000,000 in the cost of work for others program to accommodate safeguards and security requirements. It is anticipated that this amount will be offset by an estimated $40,000,000 in revenues derived from non-Department of Energy customers for the purpose of funding safeguards and security activities throughout the Department. In fiscal year 2002 and beyond, the conferees expect the Department to submit a safeguards and security budget that includes amounts obtained previously from other agencies or customers.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conference agreement provides $31,500,000 for the Inspector General as proposed by the House instead of $28,988,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement does not include statutory language proposed by the House requiring a study of the economic basis of recent gasoline price levels.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The conferees support the Administrator's efforts to establish and fill critical positions within the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The conferees agree that the Administrator's authority should not be impacted by any action that would otherwise limit or preclude hiring which may occur as a result of a change of administrations, and that the Administrator should to the maximum extent possible under applicable statutes proceed with effecting appointments.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

The conference agreement provides $5,015,186,000 for Weapons Activities instead of $4,579,684,000 as proposed by the House and $4,883,289,000 as proposed by the Senate. Statutory language proposed by the House limiting the funds availability to two years has not been included by the conferees.

Reprogramming.—The conference agreement provides limited reprogramming authority of $5,000,000 or 5 percent, whichever is less, within the Weapons Activities account without submission of a reprogramming to be approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. No individual program account may be increased or decreased by more than this amount during the fiscal year using this reprogramming authority. This should provide the needed flexibility to manage this account.

Congressional notification within 30 days of the use of this reprogramming authority is required. Transfers which would result in increases or decreases in excess of $5,000,000 or 5 percent to an individual program account during the fiscal year require prior notification and approval from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

The Department is directed to submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations by January 15, 2001, that reflects the allocation of the safeguards and security reduction, the use of prior year balances and the application of general reductions, and any proposed accounting adjustments.

Directed stockpile work.—In stockpile research and development, additional funding of $19,000,000 has been provided for life extension development activities and to support additional sub-critical experiments. Additional funding of $10,000,000 has been provided to support activities required to maintain the delivery date for a certified pit. No additional funds are provided for cooperative research on hard and deeply buried targets.

Funding for stockpile maintenance has been increased by $22,000,000 as follows: $13,000,000 for life extension operations and development and engineering activities; $5,000,000 for the Kansas City Plant; and $4,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant.

Funding for stockpile evaluation has been increased by $23,000,000 as follows: $6,000,000 for the elimination of the testing backlog and joint test equipment procurements; $8,000,000 for the Pantex Plant; $6,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant; and $3,000,000 for the Savannah River Plant.

Campaigns.—The conference agreement provides $41,400,000 for pit certification, the same as the budget request. Additional funding of $10,000,000 has been provided for dynamic materials properties to support the maintenance of core scientific capabilities, Liner Demonstration Experiments, and other various multi-campaign supporting physics demonstrations for the Atlas pulsed power facility at the Los Alamos National Laboratory and the Nevada Test Site.

An additional $15,000,000 has been provided to support research, development and preconceptual design studies for an advanced hydrodynamic test facility using protons.

Additional funding of $17,000,000 has been provided for enhanced surveillance activities as follows: $3,000,000 for the Kansas City Plant; $7,000,000 for the Pantex Plant; $4,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant; $1,000,000 for the Savannah River Plant; and $2,000,000 to support accelerated deployment of test and diagnostic equipment.

Funding for pit manufacturing readiness is increased by $17,000,000. An increase of $2,000,000 is provided to initiate conceptual design work on a pit manufacturing facility. Additional funding of $15,000,000 is provided to support the pit production program which is now behind schedule and over cost. The conferees strongly support the Senate language regarding the Department's lack of attention to this critical program and the requirement for a progress report by December 1, 2000, and each quarter thereafter.

An additional $5,000,000 has been provided to the Y–12 Plant for secondary readiness.

Inertial Fusion.—The conference agreement includes $449,600,000 for the inertial fusion program in the budget structure proposed by the House.

Additional funding of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House has been provided to further development of high average power lasers. The conference agreement includes the budget request of $9,750,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory and the budget request of $32,150,000 for the University of Rochester. The conference agreement reflects the transfer of $40,000,000 from National Ignition Facility (NIF) operations funding to the NIF construction project.

The conference agreement provides $2,500,000 from within available funds to transfer the Petawatt Laser from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory to the University of Nevada-Reno, as proposed by the Senate.

National Ignition Facility.—The conference agreement provides $199,100,000 for continued construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF). The conferees have included a directed reduction of $25,000,000 in the Weapons Activities account which is to be applied to programs under the direction of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

The conferees have included statutory language providing that only $130,000,000 shall be made available for NIF at the beginning of fiscal year 2001 and the remaining $69,100,000 shall be available only upon a certification after March 31, 2001, by the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration that several requirements have been met. These requirements include:

A. A recommendation on an appropriate path forward for the project based on a detailed review of alternative construction options that would (1) focus on first achieving operation of a 48 or 96 beam laser; (2) allow for the full demonstration of a such a system in support of the stockpile stewardship program before proceeding with construction and operation of a larger laser complex; and (3) include a program and funding plan for the possible future upgrade to a full NIF configuration. The recommendation should include identification of available ''off-ramps'' and decision points where the project could be scaled to a smaller system.

B. Certification that project and scientific milestones as established in the revised construction project data sheet for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2000 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2001 have been met on schedule and on cost.

C. Certification that the first and second quarter project reviews in fiscal year 2001 determined the project to be on schedule and

cost and have provided further validation to the proposed path forward.

D. Completion of a study that includes conclusions as to whether the full-scale NIF is required in order to maintain the safety and reliability of the current nuclear weapons stockpile, and whether alternatives to the NIF could achieve the objective of maintaining the safety and reliability of the current nuclear weapons stockpile.

E. Certification that the NIF project has implemented an integrated cost-schedule earned-value project control system by March 1, 2001.

F. A five-year budget plan for the stockpile stewardship program that fully describes how the NNSA intends to pay for NIF over the out years and what the potential for other impacts on the stockpile stewardship program will be.

The conferees remain concerned about the Department's proposed budget increase and schedule delay for the NIF at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). The conferees believe that previously the Department of Energy, and most recently the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), may have failed to examine adequately options for NIF that have fewer than the full 192 beams. For example, a preferred course for NIF may be to complete 48 or 96 beams as soon as possible (although block procurement of infrastructure and glass may be considered), bring the reduced NIF into operation, perform the necessary scientific and technical tests to evaluate whether a full NIF will work and its impact on stockpile stewardship, and then develop a path forward for NIF that balances its scientific importance within the overall needs of the stockpile stewardship program. To move on this path in fiscal year 2001, the conferees recommend that $199,100,000 be appropriated for NIF as follows: $74,100,000 as originally proposed for Project 96–D–111, $40,000,000 from NIF operations funding within the budget request for LLNL, $25,000,000 to be identified within the budget request at LLNL, plus an additional $60,000,000 in new appropriations.

Furthermore, the conferees direct the Administration to prepare a budget request for fiscal year 2002 that fully reflects a balanced set of programs and investments within the stockpile stewardship program, and that the overall budget profile over the next eight years will accommodate a $3.4 billion NIF along with the other critical aspects of the program.

Defense computing and modeling.—The conference agreement provides $786,175,000 for defense computing modeling and the Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative in the budget structure proposed by the House. The recommendation is $10,000,000 less than the budget request, and the reduction should be taken against lower priority activities.

Tritium.—A total of $167,000,000 is provided for continued research and development on a new source of tritium. Funding of $15,000,000 has been provided for design only activities in Project 98–D–126, Accelerator Production of Tritium.

Readiness in technical base and facilities.—The conference agreement includes several funding adjustments transferring funds from this program to individual campaigns.

For operations of facilities, $137,300,000 has been transferred to the inertial fusion program. An additional $36,000,000 has been provided to the production plants for replacement of critical infrastructure and equipment as follows: $12,000,000 for the Kansas City Plant; $12,000,000 for the Pantex Plant; $10,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant; and $2,000,000 for the Savannah River Plant.

Additional funding of $10,000,000 has been provided for the operation of pulsed power facilities; $20,000,000 for microsystems and microelectronics activities at the Sandia National Laboratory; $7,000,000 for a replacement CMR facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory; and $3,100,000 to fund the transition period for the new contractor at the Pantex Plant in Texas.

For program readiness, the conference agreement transfers $7,400,000 to the inertial fusion program and adds $6,100,000 for the TA–18 relocation.

For nuclear weapons incident response, a new program established in readiness technical base and facilities, the conference agreement provides $56,289,000. Funding of $44,205,000 for the nuclear emergency search team and $12,084,000 for the accident response group was transferred from the emergency management program in the Other Defense Activities account.

Special projects are supported at the budget request of $48,297,000. Additional funds have not been provided for AMTEX. From within available funds, $1,000,000 has been provided to support a program in partnership with university systems to meet the needs of the NNSA.

For materials recycling, the conference agreement provides an additional $8,000,000 to maintain restart schedules for hydrogen fluoride and wet chemistry operations at the Y–12 Plant.

For containers, the conference agreement provides an additional $4,000,000 to support the effort to repackage pits which is currently behind schedule at the Pantex Plant due to operational problems.

Funding for advanced simulation and computing has been transferred to the defense computing and modeling campaign.

The conference agreement does not provide additional funding to process uranium-233 as proposed by the Senate, but the conferees expect the Department to act expeditiously to process this material in a manner that would retain and make available isotopes for beneficial use. The Department should provide to the House and Senate Committees a report on the status of this project by March 1, 2001.

Construction projects.—The conference agreement provides $35,500,000 for preliminary project engineering and design. Funding of $20,000,000 is provided for design and supporting infrastructure upgrades for the Microsystems and Engineering Sciences Applications facility at Sandia National Laboratory; $5,000,000 for proof of concept and completion of facility operational capability for the Atlas pulsed power machine at the Nevada Test Site; and $1,000,000 for initiation of design activities for the relocation of the TA–18 nuclear materials handling facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Safeguards and security.—Consistent with the Department's amended budget request for safeguards and security, the conference agreement includes $377,596,000 for safeguards and security activities at laboratories and facilities managed by the Office of Defense Programs. This is offset by a reduction of $310,796,000 to be allocated among the various programs which budgeted for safeguards and security costs in their overhead accounts.

Program direction.—The conference agreement provides $224,071,000 for program direction as proposed by the Senate.

Funding adjustments.—The conference agreement includes the use of $13,647,000 in prior year balances and a reduction of $310,796,000 that reflects the allocation of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request. In addition, the conference agreement includes a general reduction of $35,700,000 of which $25,000,000 is to be taken against programs at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

The conference agreement provides $874,196,000 for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation instead of $861,477,000 as proposed by the House and $908,967,000 as proposed by the Senate. Statutory language proposed by the House limiting the funds availability to two years has not been included by the conferees. Statutory language proposed by the Senate to earmark funding for the Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology has not been included. The conferees have provided a total of $53,000,000 for the long-term Russian initiative within this account.

Limitation on Russian and Newly Independent States' (NIS) program funds.—The conferees are concerned about the amount of funding for Russian and NIS programs which remains in the United States for Department of Energy contractors and laboratories rather than going to the facilities in Russia and the NIS. The conferees direct that not more than the following percentages of funding may be spent in the United States in fiscal year 2001 for these programs: Materials Protection, Control and Accounting, 43%; International Proliferation Prevention Program, 40%; Nuclear Cities Initiative, 49%; Russian Plutonium Disposition, 38%; and International Nuclear Safety, 78%.

The conferees expect the Department to continue to increase the level of funding which is provided to Russia versus the funding which remains in the United States for Department of Energy contractors and laboratories in each subsequent year. The Department is to provide a report to the Committees by January 31, 2001, and each subsequent year on the amount of funding provided to Russia and NIS in each program area. The Department should work with the Committees on the specific information to be included in the report.

Nonproliferation and verification research and development.—The conference agreement provides $252,990,000 for nonproliferation and verification research and development. Funding of $17,000,000 has been provided for the nonproliferation and international security center (NISC) at Los Alamos National Laboratory, and $1,000,000 for the Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology PASSCAL Instrument Center.

Concerns have been raised repeatedly that there should be more opportunity for open competition in certain areas of the nonproliferation and verification research and development program. A recent report by an outside group established by the Department to review the Office of Nonproliferation Research and Engineering included a similar recommendation. The report stated that, ''There should be greater opportunity for the wider U.S. scientific and technical community to contribute to the success of the NN–20 portfolio. This can be done through open competition administered by DOE Headquarters and through partnerships chosen and managed by the DOE national laboratories.'' * * * ''Areas that come to mind as candidates for open competition include seismic verification technologies for very low yield underground nuclear tests and chemical and biological agent detection and identification technologies. Other possible areas might be specialized electronic chip development and certain radio-frequency technologies.''

The conferees expect the Department to act in good faith on the recommendations provided by the external review group, and direct the Department to initiate a free and open competitive process for 25 percent of its research and development activities during fiscal year 2001 for ground-based systems treaty monitoring. The competitive process should be open to all Federal and non-Federal entities.

The conferees direct the Department to report to the Committees on Appropriations on the status of implementing the external review panel's recommendations and the results of the directed open competition by March 30, 2001.

Arms control.—The conference agreement provides $152,014,000 for arms control activities including $24,500,000 for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention and $27,500,000 for the Nuclear Cities Initiative. In addition to the $10,000,000 added to the Nuclear Cities Initiative, the conferees have provided another $19,000,000 for the long-term Russian initiative in the arms control program to be distributed as follows: $15,000,000 for spent fuel dry storage; $500,000 for the plutonium registry at Mayak; $2,500,000 for geologic repository cooperation research and planning; and $1,000,000 for research reactor spent fuel acceptance.

International materials protection, control and accounting (MPC&A).—The conference agreement includes $173,856,000 for the MPC&A program including $24,000,000 for the long-term Russian initiative. The conferees have provided $5,000,000 for plutonium storage at Mayak and $19,000,000 for expanded MPC&A activities at Russian naval sites.

HEU transparency implementation.—The conference agreement provides $15,190,000, the same as the budget request.

International nuclear safety.—The conference agreement provides $20,000,000, the same as the budget request, for the international nuclear safety program. This funding is to be used only for activities in support of completing the upgrades to Soviet-designed nuclear reactors. From within available funds, the conference agreement provides $1,000,000 for a cooperative effort between the United States and Russia to address intergranular stress corrosion cracking and restore the structural integrity of Russian nuclear plants until decommissioning.

Fissile materials disposition.—The conference agreement provides $249,449,000 for fissile materials disposition. Funding of $139,517,000, as proposed by the House, has been provided for the U.S. surplus materials disposition program. The conference agreement provides $26,000,000 for Project 99–D–143, the MOX fuel fabrication facility.

Program direction.—The conference agreement provides $51,468,000 for the program direction account as proposed by the House. The conferees are aware that the Department does not have enough qualified Federal employees available to manage the nonproliferation and national security programs, particularly the Russian programs. The conferees will favorably consider a reprogramming of funds from program areas to the program direction account as Federal employees are hired to replace the contractor employees who currently oversee these programs.

Funding adjustment.—The conference agreement includes a reduction of $40,245,000 that reflects the transfer of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request.

NAVAL REACTORS

The conference agreement provides $690,163,000 for Naval Reactors instead of $694,600,000 as proposed by the Senate and $677,600,000 as proposed by the House. Additional funding of $17,000,000 is provided to optimize the program to shutdown prototype reactors and complete all major inactivation work by fiscal year 2002.

Funding adjustment.—The conference agreement includes a reduction of $4,437,000 that reflects the transfer of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

The conference agreement provides $10,000,000 for this new account as proposed by the Senate. These funds are provided to the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration for the costs associated with hiring new employees and establishing the office.

OTHER DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

The conference agreement provides $4,974,476,000 for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management instead of $4,522,707,000 as proposed by the House and $4,635,763,000 as proposed by the Senate. Additional funding of $1,082,714,000 is contained in the Defense Facilities Closure Projects account and $65,000,000 in the Defense Environmental Management Privatization account for a total of $6,122,190,000 provided for all defense environmental management activities.

The conference agreement does not include statutory language proposed by the House pertaining to the use of funds for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant or language proposed by the Senate earmarking funds for programs to be managed by the Carlsbad office of the Department of Energy.

The conference agreement limits the number of motor vehicles that can be purchased in fiscal year 2001 to not more than 30 for replacement only. The conferees have included an additional reporting requirement on the entire Department and have specified that sport utility vehicles are to be counted within this ceiling.

National monument designation.—The conferees agree that no funds spent by the Department for the coordination, integration, or implementation of a management plan related to the Hanford Reach National Monument shall result in the reduction or delay of cleanup at the Hanford site.

Site/Project Completion.—The conference agreement provides an additional $11,000,000 for F and H-area stabilization activities at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina as proposed by the House, and $19,000,000 to address funding shortfalls at the Hanford site in Richland, Washington, as proposed by the Senate. Funding of $12,308,000 has been transferred to other accounts as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement supports the budget request of $2,500,000 for the cooperative agreement with WERC and provides $25,000 for an independent evaluation of the mixed-waste landfill at Sandia National Laboratories in New Mexico.

For construction, the conference agreement provides $17,300,000 for Project 01–D–414, preliminary project engineering and design (PE&D). Project 01–D–415, 235–F packaging and stabilization, at the Savannah River Site has been funded at $4,000,000. Funding of $500,000 requested for Project 01–D–402, INTEC cathodic protection system expansion project, at Idaho Falls has been transferred to the new PE&D project. Funding of $27,932,000 for the Highly Enriched Blend Down Facility has been transferred to the fissile materials disposition program.

Post 2006 Completion.—The conference agreement includes an additional $10,000,000 to maintain schedules required by revised compliance agreements with the State of Washington as proposed by the Senate, and $6,000,000 to support transuranic and low-level waste activities at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina as proposed by the House. Funding of $10,000,000 for the Four Mile Branch project and $18,000,000 for the Consolidated Incinerator Facility at the Savannah River Site has not been provided as proposed by the House. Funding of $18,692,000 has been transferred to the Science and Technology program.

The conference agreement provides $400,000 to begin design activities for a subsurface geosciences laboratory at Idaho.

From within available funds for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, $1,000,000 has been provided for a transparency demonstration project.

A total of $3,000,000 has been provided to support a program with the United States-Mexico Border Health Commission to demonstrate technologies to reduce hazardous waste streams and to support the Materials Corridor Partnership Initiative.

Funding of $1,300,000 for Project 01–D–403, immobilized high level waste interim storage facility, at Richland, Washington, has been transferred to the PE&D project in site/project completion account.

Office of River Protection.—The conference agreement provides $757,839,000 for the Office of River Protection at the Hanford site in Washington. The conference agreement provides $377,000,000 for Project 01–D–416, Tank Waste Remediation System, at Richland, Washington, to vitrify the high-level waste in underground tanks. Funding to vitrify waste at the Hanford site was requested in the Defense Environmental Management Privatization account in fiscal year 2001. However, due to the failure of the contractor to provide a viable cost estimate under the concept of a ''privatized'' contract, the contract will now be structured as a cost plus incentive fee contract and will be funded in the regular appropriation account.

Science and technology development.—The conference agreement provides $256,898,000 for the science and technology development program. Funding of $21,000,000 has been transferred to this account for the Idaho validation and verification program. This transfer is not intended to reduce the environmental management base program in Idaho. The Department is directed to provide $10,000,000 for the next round of new and innovative research grants in the environmental management science program in fiscal year 2001, and $10,000,000 for technology deployment activities.

The conference agreement provides $4,000,000 for the international agreement with AEA Technology; $4,500,000 for the Diagnostic Instrumentation and Analysis Laboratory; $4,350,000 for the university robotics research program; an additional $1,000,000 for the D&D focus area; and up to $4,000,000 to continue evaluation, development and demonstration of the Advanced Vitrification System upon successful completion of supplemental testing. The conferees have provided $2,000,000 to the National Energy Technology Laboratory to be used for the continuation of the Mid-Atlantic Recycling Center for End-of-Life Electronics initiative (MARCEE) in cooperation with the Polymer Alliance Zone.

The conference agreement includes $4,000,000 for the long-term stewardship program to be administered at Headquarters and $4,000,000 for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory. No funds are provided for the low dose radiation effects program, as the entire Senate recommended amount is provided within the Office of Science.

Safeguards and security.—Consistent with the Department's amended budget request for safeguards and security, the conference agreement includes $203,748,000 for safeguards and security activities at laboratories and facilities managed by the Office of Defense Programs. This is offset by a reduction of $193,217,000 to be allocated among the various programs which budgeted for safeguards and security costs in their overhead accounts.

Program direction.—The conferees have provided $363,988,000 for the program direction account. This funding level reflects the transfer of the uranium programs from the office of nuclear energy to the office of environmental management. Funding of

$4,100,000 has been provided to allow for the transfer of up to 5 employees from Headquarters and 25 employees at Oak Ridge who manage the uranium programs.

Funding adjustments.—The conference agreement includes the use of $34,317,000 of prior year balances and $50,000,000 in pension refunds, the same as the budget request. The conference agreement includes a reduction of $193,217,000 that reflects the allocation of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request. A general reduction of $10,700,000 has also been included.

DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS

The conference agreement appropriates $1,082,714,000 the same as the amended budget request. The conferees expect the Department to request adequate funds to keep each of these projects on a schedule for closure by 2006 or earlier.

Any savings resulting from safeguards and security costs are to be retained and used for cleanup activities at the closure sites.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

The conference agreement provides $65,000,000 for the defense environmental management privatization program instead of $259,000,000 as proposed by the House and $324,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides no funds for the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) project at Hanford. Funding for this project, which had previously been considered as a privatization contract, has been transferred to the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriation account.

The conference agreement also includes a rescission of $97,000,000 of funds previously appropriated for the TWRS project in the Defense Environmental Management Privatization appropriation account.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The conference agreement appropriates $585,755,000 for Other Defense Activities instead of $592,235,000 as proposed by the House and $579,463,000 as proposed by the Senate. Details of the conference agreement are provided below.

SECURITY AND EMERGENCY OPERATIONS

For nuclear safeguards and security, the conference agreement provides $116,409,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have provided $3,000,000 for the critical infrastructure protection program, an increase of $600,000 over fiscal year 2000. The conference agreement also provides $2,000,000 to procure safety locks to meet Federal specifications.

The conference agreement provides $33,000,000 for security investigations, the same as the budget request.

The conference agreement includes $33,711,000 for emergency management. Funding of $3,600,000 was transferred to the program direction account to reflect the conversion of contractor employees to Federal employees at a substantial cost savings. Funding of $44,205,000 for the nuclear emergency search team and $12,084,000 for the accident response group was transferred to the Weapons Activities account.

Program direction.—The conference agreement provides $92,967,000 for the program direction account as proposed by the House. This reflects the transfer of $3,600,000 from the emergency management program.

INTELLIGENCE

The conference agreement includes $38,059,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate to support the Department's intelligence program.

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

The conference agreement includes $45,200,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate to support the Department's counterintelligence program.

ADVANCED ACCELERATOR APPLICATIONS

The conference agreement provides $34,000,000 to establish a new program for advanced accelerator applications, including $3,000,000 for research and development of technologies for economic and environmentally sound refinement of spent nuclear fuel at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas.

The Department is directed to prepare a program plan for managing and executing this program using the extensive expertise of the Office of Science and the Office of Defense Programs in accelerator research, design, and applications, and the expertise of the Office of Nuclear Energy in transmutation of nuclear waste. This program plan should be submitted to the Committees by March 1, 2001.

The conferees make no recommendation as to how the Department should manage the advanced accelerator application program.

INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The conference agreement provides $14,937,000, the same as the budget request for the office of independent oversight and performance assurance.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The conference agreement provides $125,567,000 for defense-related environment, safety and health activities. The conferees have provided $3,000,000 to establish a program at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas for Department-wide management of electronic records; $1,750,000 for the University of Louisville and the University of Kentucky to undertake epidemiological studies of workers; $880,000 to provide medical screening for workers employed at the Amchitka nuclear weapons test site; and $500,000 for the State of Nevada to address deficiencies in the Cancer Registry, Vital Statistics, and Birth Defects Registry activities.

The conference agreement includes $17,000,000 for the Department's administrative costs associated with the proposed Energy Employees Compensation Initiative. These funds are not available until the program is authorized by law.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

The conference agreement provides $24,500,000 for the worker and community transition program, including $2,100,000 for infrastructure improvements at the former Pinellas plant. The conferees expect that communities denied funds in fiscal year 2000 will be granted priority status in fiscal year 2001.

The conference agreement provides that no funds may be used to augment the $24,500,000 made available for obligation for severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants unless the Department of Energy submits a reprogramming request subject to approval by the appropriate Congressional committees.

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The conference agreement provides $25,000,000 for national security programs administrative support instead of $51,000,000 as proposed by the House and no funding as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

The conference agreement provides $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

A reduction of $595,000 and the elimination of the $20,000,000 offset to user organizations for security investigations reflects the allocation of the safeguards and security amended budget request.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

The conference agreement provides $200,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $292,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The conferees have included the statutory language extending Bonneville's voluntary separation incentive program until January 1, 2003.

During fiscal year 2001, Bonneville plans to pay the Treasury $620,000,000 of which $163,000,000 is to repay principal on the Federal investment in these facilities.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement includes $3,900,000, the same as the budget request, for the Southeastern Power Administration.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement includes $28,100,000, the same as the budget request, for the Southwestern Power Administration.

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement provides $165,830,000, instead of $164,916,000 as proposed by the Senate and $160,930,000 as proposed by the House. The conference agreement increases the amount of purchase power and wheeling to $65,224,000 and increases offsetting collections by the same amount. Funding of $5,950,000 is provided for the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account.

FALCON AND AMISTAD FUND

The conference agreement includes $2,670,000, the same as the budget request, for the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

The conference agreement includes $175,200,000, the same as the budget request for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

RESCISSIONS

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

The conference agreement includes language rescinding $75,000,000 from funds previously appropriated for interim waste storage activities for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal in Public Law 104–46, the fiscal year 1996 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

The conference agreement includes language rescinding $97,000,000 from the Defense Environmental Management Privatization account. Funds were appropriated in this account in prior years for the Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System Project. This project is no longer being considered for a privatization contract. It has been transferred to the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriation account and will be funded there in future appropriation acts.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Sec. 301. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House that none of the funds may be used to award a management and operating contract unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures, or the Secretary of Energy grants a waiver to allow for such a deviation. Section 301 does not preclude extension of a contract awarded using competitive procedures.

Sec. 302. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House and Senate that none of the funds may be used to prepare or implement workforce restructuring plans or provide enhanced severance

payments and other benefits and community assistance grants for Federal employees of the Department of Energy under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484.

Sec. 303. The conference agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House that none of the funds may be used to augment the $24,500,000 made available for obligation for severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants unless the Department of Energy submits a reprogramming request subject to approval by the appropriate Congressional committees.

Sec. 304. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House and Senate that none of the funds may be used to prepare or initiate Requests for Proposals for a program if the program has not been funded by Congress in the current fiscal year. This provision precludes the Department from initiating activities for new programs which have been proposed in the budget request, but which have not yet been funded by Congress.

Sec. 305. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House and Senate that permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill.

Sec. 306. The conference agreement includes language providing that not to exceed 6 percent of funds shall be available for Laboratory Directed Research and Development.

Sec. 307. The conference agreement includes language limiting to $185,000,000 the funds available for reimbursement of management and operating contractor travel expenses. Of the $185,000,000, $175,000,000 is available for contractor travel and $10,000,000 is to be held in reserve by the Department's Chief Financial Officer for emergency travel requirements. The language also requires the Department of Energy to reimburse contractors for travel consistent with regulations applicable to Federal employees and specifies that the travel ceiling does not apply to travel funded from Laboratory Directed Research and Development funds.

Sec. 308. The conference agreement includes language prohibiting the Bonneville Power Administration from performing energy efficiency services outside the legally defined Bonneville service territory.

Sec. 309. The conference agreement includes language limiting the types of waste that can be disposed of in the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico. None of the funds may be used to dispose of transuranic waste in excess of 20 percent plutonium by weight for the aggregate of any material category. At the Rocky Flats site, this provision includes ash residues; salt residues; wet residues; direct repackage residues; and scrub alloy as referenced in the ''Final Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Certain Plutonium Residues and Scrub Alloy Stored at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site''.

Sec. 310. The conference agreement includes language allowing the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to authorize certain nuclear weapons production plants to use not more than 2 percent of available funds for research, development and demonstration activities.

Sec. 311. The conference agreement includes language allowing each Federal power marketing administration to engage in activities relating to the formation and operation of a regional transmission organization.

Sec. 312. The conference agreement includes language that would permit the Secretary of Energy to use $10,000,000 of funds previously appropriated for interim waste storage activities for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal upon receipt of written certification that the site recommendation report cannot be completed on time without additional funding.

Sec. 313. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate that would provide a three year term of office for the first person appointed to the position of the Under Secretary of Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy.

Sec. 314. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate limiting the authority of the Secretary of Energy to modify the organization of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Sec. 315. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the pay of personnel engaged in concurrent service or duties inside and outside the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Report on impacts of limits on on-site storage.—The conference agreement does not include statutory language proposed by the Senate, but the conferees direct that not later than 90 days after enactment of the fiscal year 2001 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to Congress a report containing a description of all alternatives that are available to the Northern States Power Company and the Federal government to allow the company to continue to operate the Prairie Island nuclear generating plant until the end of the term of the license issued to the company by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, in view of a law of the State of Minnesota that limits the quantity of spent nuclear fuel that may be stored at the plant, assuming that the existing Federal and State laws remain unchanged.

Report on electricity prices.—The conferees note that California is currently experiencing an energy crisis. Wholesale electricity prices have soared, resulting in electrical bills that have increased by as much as 300 percent in the San Diego area. Conferees understand that the staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is currently investigating the crisis. The Commission is directed to submit to Congress a report on the results of the investigation no later than December 1, 2000. The report shall include identification of the causes of the San Diego price increases, a determination whether California wholesale electricity markets are competitive, a recommendation whether a regional price cap should be set in the Western States, a determination whether manipulation of prices has occurred at the wholesale level, and a determination of remedies, including legislation or regulations, that are necessary to correct the problem and prevent similar incidents in California and elsewhere in the United States.

Provisions not adopted by the conferees.—The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House and Senate prohibiting the use of funds for contracts modified in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate allowing the Secretary of Energy to enter into multiyear contracts without obligating the estimated costs.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring the Department of Energy's laboratories to provide an annual funding plan to the Department.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House prohibiting the payment of Federal salaries in the working capital fund.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the expenditure of funds to establish or maintain independent centers at Department of Energy laboratories or facilities. The conference agreement includes report language requiring the Department to identify these centers in the budget request.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House requiring a report on activities of the executive branch to address high gasoline prices and develop an overall national energy strategy.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the expenditure of funds to restart the High Flux Beam Reactor.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate limiting the inclusion of costs of protecting fish and wildlife within the rates charged by the Bonneville Power Administration.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate limiting the cost of construction of the National Ignition Facility.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring an evaluation of innovative technologies for demilitarization of weapons components and treatment of hazardous waste.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring a report on national energy policy.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate noting concern with the House provision on limiting funds for worker and community transition. The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring a report on the impact of State-imposed limits on spent nuclear fuel storage. This requirement has been included in report language.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate limiting the use of funds to promote or advertise public tours at Yucca Mountain. This requirement has been included in report language.

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS

The conference agreement's detailed funding recommendations for programs in title III are contained in the following table.

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
ENERGY SUPPLY		
RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES		
Renewable energy technologies		
Biomass/biofuels energy systems		
Power systems	47,830	40,000
Transportation	54,110	46,160
Subtotal, Biomass/biofuels energy systems	101,940	86,160
Biomass/biofuels energy research	26,740	26,740
Subtotal, Biomass	128,680	112,900
Geothermal technology development	26,970	27,000
Hydrogen research	22,940	27,000
Hydrogen energy research	2,970	2,970
Subtotal, Hydrogen	25,910	29,970
Hydropower	5,000	5,000
Solar energy		
Concentrating solar power	14,940	13,800
Photovoltaic energy systems	81,450	75,775
Photovoltaic energy research	2,847	2,847
Subtotal, Photovoltaic	84,297	78,622
Solar building technology research	4,470	3,950
Solar photoconversion energy research	14,260	14,260
Subtotal, Solar energy	117,967	110,632
Wind energy systems	50,140	40,000
Wind energy research	283	283
Subtotal, Wind	50,423	40,283
Total, Renewable energy technologies	354,950	325,785

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Electric energy systems and storage		
High temperature superconducting R&D	31,900	37,000
Energy storage systems	5,000	6,000
Transmission reliability	10,960	9,000
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	47,860	52,000
Renewable support and implementation		
Departmental energy management	4,988	2,000
International renewable energy program	11,460	5,000
Renewable energy production incentive program	4,000	4,000
Renewable Indian energy resources	5,000	6,600
Renewable program support	6,500	4,000
Total, Renewable support and implementation	31,948	21,600
National renewable energy laboratory	1,900	4,000
Program direction	18,159	18,700
TOTAL, RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES	454,817	422,085

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
NUCLEAR ENERGY		
Advanced radioisotope power system	30,864	32,200
Isotopes		
Isotope support and production	16,218	24,715
Construction		
99-E-201 Isotope production facility (LANL)	500	2,500
Subtotal, Isotope support and production	16,718	27,215
Offsetting collections	---	-8,000
Total, Isotopes	16,718	19,215
University reactor fuel assistance and support	12,000	12,000
Research and development		
Nuclear energy plant optimization	5,000	5,000
Nuclear energy research initiative	34,903	35,000
Nuclear energy technologies	---	7,500
Total, Research and development	39,903	47,500
Infrastructure		
ANL-West operations	---	39,150
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)	38,524	44,010
Test reactor area landlord	7,415	7,575
Construction		
99-E-200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	879	925
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	458	500
Subtotal, Construction	1,337	1,425
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	8,752	9,000
Total, Infrastructure	47,276	92,160

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Nuclear facilities management	66,126	---
Nuclear facilities management		
EBR-II shutdown	---	8,800
Disposition of spent fuel and legacy materials	---	16,200
Disposition technology activities	---	9,850
Total, Nuclear facilities management	---	34,850
Uranium programs	47,779	---
Program direction	27,620	22,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	288,286	259,925
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH		
Environment, safety and health	19,906	16,000
Program direction	19,998	19,998
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	39,904	35,998
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES		
Technical information management program	1,802	1,600
Program direction	7,335	7,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	9,137	8,600
Subtotal, Energy supply	792,144	726,608
Renewable energy research program	-47,100	-47,100
Transfer from Geothermal and USEC	-12,000	---
Offset from nuclear energy royalties	-2,352	-2,352
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-16,582
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY	730,692	660,574

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT		
Site closure	81,248	81,636
Site/project completion	63,798	61,621
Post 2006 completion	137,766	137,744
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-3,189
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	282,812	277,812
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND		
Decontamination and decommissioning	264,588	---
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	30,000	---
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING	294,588	---
URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION		
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund		
Decontamination and decommissioning	---	273,038
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	---	72,000
Total, Uranium enrichment D&D fund	---	345,038
Other Uranium Activities		
Maintenance of facilities and inventories	---	29,193
Pre-existing liabilities	---	11,330
Depleted UF6 conversion project	---	21,877
Total, Other uranium activities	---	62,400
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-14,071
TOTAL, URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION	---	393,367

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
SCIENCE		
High energy physics		
Research and technology	236,000	234,720
Facility operations	440,872	459,010
Construction		
00-G-307 SLAC office building	5,200	5,200
99-G-306 Wilson hall safety improvements, Fermilab	4,200	4,200
98-G-304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	23,000	23,000
Subtotal, Construction	32,400	32,400
Subtotal, Facility operations	473,272	491,410
Total, High energy physics	709,272	726,130
Nuclear physics	365,069	369,890
Biological and environmental research	435,954	497,760
Construction		
01-E-300 Laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics, ORNL	2,500	2,500
Total, Biological and environmental research	438,454	500,260

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Basic energy sciences		
Materials sciences	448,964	456,111
Chemical sciences	219,090	223,229
Engineering and geosciences	40,304	40,816
Energy biosciences	33,662	33,714
Construction		
99-E-334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	261,900	259,500
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,003,920	1,013,370
Advanced scientific computing research	179,817	170,000
Energy research analyses	988	1,000
Multiprogram energy labs - facility support		
Infrastructure support	1,023	1,160
Oak Ridge landlord	7,475	10,711
Construction		
MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	22,059	22,059
Total, Multiprogram energy labs - fac. support	30,557	33,930
Fusion energy sciences program	243,907	255,000
Safeguards and security	49,818	49,818
Program direction		
Field offices	82,929	83,307
Headquarters	51,408	51,438
Science education	6,500	4,500
Total, Program direction	140,837	139,245
Subtotal, Science	3,162,639	3,258,643
General reduction	---	-34,047
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-38,244
TOTAL, SCIENCE	3,162,639	3,186,352

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL		
Repository program	255,034	135,200
Program direction	63,540	62,800
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-6,926
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	318,574	191,074
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION		
Administrative operations		
Salaries and expenses		
Office of the Secretary	6,648	5,000
Board of contract appeals	878	878
Chief financial officer	30,748	32,148
Contract reform	2,500	2,500
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	5,146	5,000
Economic impact and diversity	5,126	5,126
General counsel	22,724	22,724
International affairs	9,400	8,500
Management and administration	78,882	77,800
Policy office	6,688	6,600
Public affairs	4,150	3,900
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	172,890	170,176
Program support		
Minority economic impact	1,498	1,500
Policy analysis and system studies	406	422
Environmental policy studies	1,600	1,000
Corporate management information program	12,000	12,000
Subtotal, Program support	15,504	14,922
Total, Administrative operations	188,394	185,098
Cost of work for others	34,027	74,027
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	222,421	259,125
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	-8,000	-8,000
Transfer from other defense activities	---	-25,000
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-18
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	214,421	226,107
Miscellaneous revenues	-128,762	-151,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	85,659	75,107

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL		
Office of Inspector General	33,000	31,500
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION		
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES		
Stewardship operation and maintenance		
Directed stockpile work		
Stockpile research and development	243,300	272,300
Stockpile maintenance	257,994	279,994
Stockpile evaluation	151,710	174,710
Dismantlement/disposal	29,260	29,260
Production support	149,939	149,939
Field engineering, training and manuals	4,400	4,400
Reduction for safeguards and security	-17,427	---
Subtotal, Directed stockpile work	819,176	910,603
Campaigns		
Primary certification	41,400	41,400
Dynamic materials properties	64,408	74,408
Advanced radiography	43,000	58,000
Construction		
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	35,232	35,232
Subtotal, Advanced radiography	78,232	93,232
Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins	52,964	52,964
Enhanced surety	40,600	40,600
Weapons system engineering certification	16,300	16,300
Certification in hostile environments	15,400	15,400
Enhanced surveillance	89,651	106,651
Advanced design and production technologies	75,735	75,735
Inertial confinement fusion	120,800	250,500
Construction		
96-D-111 National ignition facility, LLNL	73,469	199,100
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	194,269	449,600

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Defense computing and modeling	249,100	716,175
Construction		
01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA	2,300	2,300
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	4,900	5,000
00-D-105 Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	56,000	56,000
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	6,700	6,700
Subtotal, Construction	69,900	70,000
Subtotal, Defense computing and modeling	319,000	786,175
Pit manufacturing readiness	108,038	125,038
Secondary readiness	15,000	20,000
Materials readiness	40,511	40,511
Tritium readiness	77,000	77,000
Construction		
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	75,000	75,000
98-D-126 Accelerator production of Tritium, various locations	---	15,000
Subtotal, Construction	75,000	90,000
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	152,000	167,000
Reduction for safeguards and security	-52,204	---
Subtotal, Campaigns	1,251,304	2,105,014

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Readiness in technical base and facilities		
Operations of facilities	1,313,432	1,252,232
Program readiness	75,800	74,500
Nuclear weapons incident response	---	56,289
Special projects	48,297	48,297
Material recycle and recovery	22,018	30,018
Containers	7,876	11,876
Storage	9,075	9,075
Advanced simulation and computing	477,075	---
Reduction for safeguards and security	-220,867	---
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac.	1,732,706	1,482,287
Construction		
01-D-103 Preliminary project engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	14,500	35,500
01-D-124 HEU storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	17,749	17,800
01-D-126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,000	3,000
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	4,975	5,000
99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,786	2,800
99-D-106 Model validation & system certification center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	5,200	5,200
99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	1,874	2,000
99-D-125 Replace boilers and controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	13,000	13,000
99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	23,566	23,765
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX	4,998	4,998
98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	30,767	30,767
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	2,864	2,918

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project (LANL)	13,337	13,337
Subtotal, Construction	138,616	160,085
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	1,871,322	1,642,372
Total, Stewardship operation and maintenance	3,941,802	4,657,989
Transportation safeguards division		
Operations and equipment	79,357	79,357
Program direction	36,316	36,316
Total, Transportation safeguards division	115,673	115,673
Safeguards and security	356,840	356,840
Construction		
99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	18,043	18,043
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	2,713	2,713
Subtotal, Construction	20,756	20,756
Total, Safeguards and security	377,596	377,596
Program direction	204,154	224,071
Subtotal, Weapons activities	4,639,225	5,375,329
Use of prior year balances	---	-13,647
General reduction	---	-35,700
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-310,796
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	4,639,225	5,015,186

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION		
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	216,550	235,990
Construction		
00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL	7,000	17,000
Total, Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	223,550	252,990
Arms control	119,915	152,014
International materials protection, control, and accounting	146,081	173,856
Long-term nonproliferation program for Russia	100,000	---
HEU transparency implementation	15,166	15,190
International nuclear safety	18,902	20,000
Fissile materials disposition		
U.S. surplus materials disposition	117,912	139,517
Russian surplus materials disposition	34,803	40,000
Program direction - MD	9,878	---
Construction		
01-D-407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend down, Savannah River, SC	---	20,932
01-D-142 Immobilization and associated processing facility, various locations	3,000	3,000
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, various locations	20,000	20,000
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility various locations	15,000	26,000
Subtotal, Construction	38,000	69,932
Total, Fissile materials disposition	200,593	249,449
Program direction	41,383	51,468
Use of prior year balances	---	-526
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-40,245
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	865,590	874,196

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
NAVAL REACTORS		
Naval reactors development	623,063	644,500
Construction		
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	11,400	11,400
01-D-200 Major office replacement building, Schenectady, NY	1,300	1,300
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	16,000	16,000
Subtotal, Construction	28,700	28,700
Total, Naval reactors development	651,763	673,200
Program direction	21,320	21,400
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-4,437
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	673,083	690,163
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR		
Office of the Administrator	---	10,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	6,177,898	6,589,545

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.		
Site/project completion		
Operation and maintenance	856,812	919,167
Construction		
01-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Idaho Falls, ID	481	---
01-D-407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend down, Savannah River, SC	27,932	---
01-D-414 Preliminary project, engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	---	17,300
01-D-415 235-F packaging and stabilization project, Savannah River, SC	---	4,000
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	7,714	7,714
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory (INEL), ID	4,277	4,300
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	1,690	1,690
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay laboratory, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	3,949	3,949
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	12,512	12,512
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Savannah River, SC	8,879	8,879
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility (LLNL), Livermore, CA	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Construction	69,434	62,344
Total, Site/project completion	926,246	981,511

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Post 2006 completion		
Operation and maintenance	2,453,735	2,251,514
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	420,000	420,000
Construction		
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	27,212	27,212
Office of River Protection		
Operation and maintenance	---	309,619
Construction		
01-D-403 Immobilized high level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA	1,300	---
01-D-416 Tank waste remediation system, Richland, WA	---	377,000
99-D-403 Infrastructure support, Richland, WA	7,812	7,812
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	46,023	46,023
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	17,385	17,385
Subtotal, Construction	72,520	448,220
Subtotal, Office of River Protection	72,520	757,839
Total, Post 2006 completion	2,973,467	3,456,565

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Science and technology	195,032	256,898
Safeguards and security	203,748	203,748
Program direction	347,881	363,988
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	4,646,374	5,262,710
Use of prior year balances	-34,317	-34,317
Pension refund	-50,000	-50,000
General reduction	---	-10,700
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-193,217
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	4,562,057	4,974,476
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS		
Site closure	1,027,942	1,027,942
Safeguards and security	54,772	54,772
TOTAL, DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS	1,082,714	1,082,714
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION		
Privatization initiatives, various locations	539,976	90,092
Use of prior year balances	-25,092	-25,092
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MGMT. PRIVATIZATION	514,884	65,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	6,159,655	6,122,190

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
Other national security programs		
Security and emergency operations		
Nuclear safeguards	123,566	116,409
Security investigations	38,597	33,000
Emergency management	91,773	33,711
Program direction	89,367	92,967
Subtotal, Security and emergency operations	343,303	276,087
Intelligence	35,010	36,059
Construction		
01-D-800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	1,975	2,000
Subtotal, Intelligence	36,985	38,059
Counterintelligence	44,328	45,200
Advanced accelerator applications	---	34,000
Independent oversight and performance assurance		
Program direction	14,937	14,937
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	85,963	102,963
Program direction - EH	22,604	22,604
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	108,567	125,567
Worker and community transition	21,497	21,500
Program direction - WT	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	24,497	24,500
National Security programs administrative support	---	25,000
Office of hearings and appeals	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Other defense activities	575,617	586,350
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-595
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	575,617	585,755

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL		
Defense nuclear waste disposal	112,000	200,000
ENERGY EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION INITIATIVE		
Energy employees beryllium compensation fund	12,800	---
Energy employees pilot project	2,000	---
Paducah employees exposure compensation fund	2,200	---
TOTAL, ENERGY EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION INITIATIVE	17,000	---
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	13,042,170	13,497,490
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS		
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance		
Purchase power and wheeling	34,463	34,463
Program direction	5,000	5,000
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	39,463	39,463
Offsetting collections	-34,463	-34,463
Use of prior year balances	-1,100	-1,100
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	3,900	3,900
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance		
Operating expenses	3,795	3,795
Purchase power and wheeling	288	288
Program direction	18,388	18,388
Construction	6,817	6,817
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	29,288	29,288
Offsetting collections	-288	-288
Use of prior year balances	-900	-900
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	28,100	28,100

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance		
Construction and rehabilitation	23,115	23,115
System operation and maintenance	36,104	36,104
Purchase power and wheeling	35,500	65,224
Program direction	106,644	106,644
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,036	5,950
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	206,399	237,037
Offsetting collections	-35,500	-65,224
Use of prior year balances	-5,983	-5,983
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	164,916	165,830
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND		
Operation and maintenance	2,670	2,670
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	199,586	200,500
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION		
Federal energy regulatory commission	175,200	175,200
FERC revenues	-175,200	-175,200
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	---	---
Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission)	-85,000	-75,000
Defense environmental privatization (rescission)	---	-97,000
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	18,064,720	18,341,776

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

The conference agreement includes $66,400,000 for the Appalachian Regional Commission as proposed by the Senate instead of $63,000,000 as proposed by the House.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

The conference agreement includes $18,500,000 for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board as proposed by the Senate instead of $17,000,000 as proposed by the House.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

The conference agreement includes $20,000,000 for the Delta Regional Authority as proposed by the Senate.

DENALI COMMISSION

The conference agreement includes $30,000,000 for the Denali Commission as proposed by the Senate.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $481,900,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate, to be offset by revenues of $447,958,000, for a net appropriation of $33,942,000. This reflects the statutory language adopted by the conference to reduce the revenues collected in fiscal year 2001 by 2 percent.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conference agreement includes $5,500,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate, to be offset by revenues of $5,390,000, for a net appropriation of $110,000. This reflects the statutory language adopted by the conference to reduce the revenues collected in fiscal year 2001 by 2 percent.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

The conference agreement provides $2,900,000 instead of $2,700,000 as proposed by House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate establishing a Presidential Energy Commission.

TITLE V

FISCAL YEAR 2001 EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

CERRO GRANDE FIRE ACTIVITIES

The conference agreement includes an emergency appropriation of $203,460,000 as proposed by the Senate for Cerro Grande Fire Activities at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico.

The recommendation includes $46,860,000 for repair and risk mitigation associated with physical damage and destruction; $25,400,000 for restoring services; $18,000,000 for emergency response; and $15,000,000 for resuming laboratory operations.

In addition, funding is provided for the following construction projects: $6,100,000 for Project 97–D–102, Dual-Axis Radiographic Hydrotest Facility (DAHRT); $25,000,000 for Project 01–D–701, Site-wide Fire Alarm System Replacement; $20,000,000 for Project 01–D–702, Emergency Operations Center Replacement and Relocation; $29,100,000 for Project 01–D–703, TA–54 Waste Management Mitigation; $10,000,000 for Project 01–D–704, Office Building Replacement Program for Vulnerable Facilities; and $8,000,000 for Project 01–D–705, Multi-channel Communications System. The Department is directed to include construction project data sheets for these projects in the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

The conference agreement includes an emergency appropriation of $11,000,000 for the Appalachian Regional Commission.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 601. The conference agreement includes language directing that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in section 1913 of title 18, United States Code.

Sec. 602. The conference agreement includes language regarding the purchase of American-made equipment and products, and prohibiting contracts with persons falsely labeling products as made in America.

Sec. 603. The conference agreement includes language providing that no funds may be used to determine the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit of the Central Valley Project until certain conditions are met. The language also provides that the costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program shall be classified as reimbursable or non-reimbursable by the Secretary of the Interior and that any future obligation of funds for drainage service or drainage studies for the San Luis Unit shall be fully reimbursable by San Luis Unit beneficiaries pursuant to Reclamation law.

Sec. 604. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate limiting the use of funds to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementing the Kyoto Protocol. The conferees do not concur with the report language proposed by the House.

Sec. 605. The conference agreement includes language prohibiting the use of funds to pay an individual who simultaneously holds positions within the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Energy.

Sec. 606. The conference agreement includes language extending the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act.

Sec. 607. The conference agreement includes language redesignating the Interstate Sanitation Commission as the Interstate Environmental Commission.

Provisions not adopted—The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House amending the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House limiting the use of funds to pay salaries of employees of the Department of Energy who refused to take polygraph examinations.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate repealing sections of Public Law 106–246.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring the Tennessee Valley Authority to complete an environmental impact statement before proceeding with the sale of mineral rights.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring a report to Congress on electricity prices. This requirement has been included in report language.

TITLE VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

GIFTS TO THE UNITED STATES FOR REDUCTION OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

The conference agreement includes language providing funds to reduce the public debt.

TITLE VIII

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

The conference agreement includes language extending the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) authority to assess license and annual fees through fiscal year 2005. This extension is necessary to provide the resources needed to fund the activities of the Commission. The conferees have also provided authority to reduce the fee recovery requirement from 100 percent to 98 percent in fiscal year 2001, and further decrease the fee incrementally until the fee recovery requirement is reduced to 90 percent in 2005. This will address fairness and equity concerns relating to charging NRC licensees for agency expenses which do not provide a direct benefit to them.

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	$21,647,047
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2001	23,146,559
House bill, fiscal year 2001	22,204,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 2001	23,131,901
Conference agreement, fiscal year 2001	24,066,880
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2000	+2,419,833
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2001	+920,321
House bill, fiscal year 2001	+1,862,880
Senate bill, fiscal year 2001	+934,979

RON PACKARD,
HAROLD ROGERS,
JOE KNOLLENBERG,
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN,
SONNY CALLAHAN,
TOM LATHAM,
ROGER F. WICKER,
C.W. BILL YOUNG,
PETER VISCLOSKY,
CHET EDWARDS,
ED PASTOR,
MICHAEL P. FORBES

Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE V. DOMENICI,
THAD COCHRAN,
SLADE GORTON,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
ROBERT F. BENNETT,
CONRAD BURNS,
LARRY E. CRAIG,
TED STEVENS,
HARRY REID,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
PATTY MURRAY,
HERB KOHL,
DANIEL INOUYE

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

2321

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 11 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4733, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–908) on the resolution (H. Res. 598) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4733) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 1:30 p.m. on account of official business.

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. NCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. STABENOW, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OSE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HERGER, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1658. An act to authorize the construction of a Reconciliation Place in Fort Pierre, South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1865. An act to provide grants to establish demonstration mental health courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1929. An act to amend the Native Hawaiian Health Care Improvement Act to revise and extend such Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 2272. An act to improve the administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts and for other purposes consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On Wednesday, September 26, 2000:

H.R. 2909. To provide for implementation by the United States of the Hague Convention on Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4919. To amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions under those Acts, to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes.

H.R. 940. To designate the Lackawanna Valley and the Schuylkill River National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 28, 2000, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

10312. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—RUS Form 397, Special Equipment Contract (Including Installation) (RIN: 0572–AB35) received September 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10313. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dimethyl silicone polymer with silica; silane, dichloromethyl-reaction product with silica; hexamethyldisilizane, reaction product with silica; Tolerance Exemption [OPP–301055; FRL–6745–1] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10314. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bifenthrin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301047; FRL–6744–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10315. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301069; FRL–6749–1] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10316. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting The Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Environmental Technology Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

10317. A letter from the Chief, Compliance Division, Office of Civil Rights, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance—received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

10318. A letter from the Office of Civil Rights, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance—September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

10319. A letter from the Senior Attorney, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards [Docket No. NHTSA–98–4515; Notice 2] (RIN: 2127–AF43) received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10320. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York State Implementation Plan Revision [Region 2 Docket No. NY43a-212, FRL–6873–2] received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10321. 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 and Deletions—received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

10322. 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 September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

10323. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Acquisition Regulation [FRL–6874–5] received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

10324. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic MACKerel, Squid and Butterfish Fisheries; Inseason Adjustment Procedures [Docket No. 000907254–0254–01; I.D. 082400A] received September 25, 20000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10325. 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 off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Coastal Pelagic Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No. 000831250–0250–01; 071400E] (RIN: 0648–AN74) received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10326. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Pella, IA [Airspace Docket No. 00–ACE–26] received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10327. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; McPherson, KS [Airspace Docket No. 00–ACE–17] received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10328. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Hugoton, KS [Airspace Docket No. 00–ACE–18] received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10329. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB–135 and EMB–145 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–301–AD; Amendment 39–11904; AD 2000–19–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10330. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBARER) Model EMB–135 and EMB–145 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–300–AD; Amendment 39–11903; AD 2000–19–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10331. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Beech Models 1900C, 1900C (C–21J), and 1900D Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–CE–02–AD; Amendment 39–11905; AD 2000–19–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10332. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Capital Gains, Partnership, Subchapter S, and Trust Provisions (RIN: 1545–AW22) received September 25,2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5266. A bill for the relief of Saeed Rezai (Rept. 106–905). Referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 302. An Act for the relief of Kerantha Poole-Christian (Rept. 106–906). Referred to the Private Calendar.

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. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.S. 3575. A bill to prohibit high school and college sports gambling in all States including States where such gambling was permitted prior to 1991 (Rept. 106–903). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 604. A bill to amend the charter of the AMVETS organization; with an amendment (Rept. 106–904). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 598. A resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4733) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–908). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PACKARD: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 4733. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–907). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 5311. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve programs for homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. MICA, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 5312. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to protect children from drug traffickers; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, 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 Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 5313. A bill to enhance competition for prescription drugs by increasing the ability of the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission to enforce existing antitrust laws regarding brand name drugs and generic drugs; referred to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 5314. A bill to require their immediate termination of the Department of Defense practice of euthanizing military working dogs at the end of their useful working life and to facilitate the adoption of retired military working dogs by law enforcement agencies, former handlers of these dogs, and other persons capable of caring for these dogs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TANNER (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BOYD, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Ms. DANNER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SMITH, of Washington, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. JOHN Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 5315. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce estate and gift tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 5316. A bill to protect the energy security of the United States and decrease America's dependency on foreign oil sources to 50 percent by the year 2010 by enhancing the use of renewable energy resources, conserving energy resources, improving energy efficiencies, and increasing domestic energy supplies, mitigating the effect of increases in energy prices on the American consumer, including the poor and elderly, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, and Ways and Means, 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 Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5317. A bill to increase accountability for Government spending and to reduce wasteful Government spending; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, Armed Services, Science, Resources, Banking and Financial Services, International Relations, Veterans' Affairs, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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 Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 5318. A bill to prohibit the exploration of Alaskan North Slope crude oil; referred to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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 Mr. INSLEE:

H.R. 5319. A bill to expand the teacher loan forgiveness programs under the guaranteed and direct student loan programs, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mr. KOLBE:

H.R. 5320. A bill to amend part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise and improve the Medicare+Choice Program, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition

to the Committee on Commerce, 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 Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 5321. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to clarify that judgments in actions brought under the Act are enforceable in any court of competent jurisdiction; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. LEWIS of California (for himself, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 5322. A bill to provide to the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe a permanent land base within its aboriginal homeland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. COSTELLO):

H.R. 5323. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to require automatic external defibrillators in terminals at certain airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PICKETT, Ms. WATERS, Mr. REYES, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. MCNULTY):

H.R. 5324. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make corrections and refinements in the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP health insurance programs, as revised by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, and the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Rules, and Education and the Workforce, 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 Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5325. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to ensure that acts of torture, as proscribed by the Torture Convention, as also recognized as criminal if committed in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5326. A bill to introduce common sense to America's policy regarding controlled substances; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, 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 Mr. WELDON of Florida:

H.R. 5327. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WU (for himself and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 5328. A bill to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for inclusion in the Fort Clatsop National Memorial in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 5329. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore child's insurance benefits in the case of students attending postsecondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H. Con. Res. 411. Concurrent resolution relating to the reestablishment of representative government in Afghanistan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. BASS):

H. Con. Res. 412. Concurrent resolution promoting a national dialog on long-term care financing reform; referred to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, 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 Mr. RADANOVICH:

H. Res. 596. Resolution calling upon the President to ensure that the foreign policy of the United States reflects appropriate understanding and sensitivity concerning issues related to human rights, ethnic cleansing, and genocide documented in the United States record relating to the Armenian Genocide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE:

H. Res. 597. Resolution reaffirming the proclamation signed by President Abraham Lincoln on March 30, 1863, in which President Lincoln called for national humility, fasting, and prayer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 44: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 65: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 207: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 254: Mr. WU.
H.R. 284: Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 303: Mr. NUSSLE.
H.R. 488: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 525: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 632: Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 828: Mr. BEREUTER.
H.R. 1177: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1285: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1303: Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1413: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1525: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1595: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1657: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1793: Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 1885: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 2087: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 2308: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2631: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 2710: Mr. ROGERS.
H.R. 2722: Mr. SCOTT.
H.R. 2774: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 2780: Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2790: Mr. TOOMEY.
H.R. 2802: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 2814: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2900: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3492: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 3514: Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. METCALF.
H.R. 4025: Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 4106: Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. GEJDENSON.
H.R. 4215: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
H.R. 4277: Mr. LARSON, and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 4281: Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 4388: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 4393: Mr. STARK, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 4483: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4493: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 4536: Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 4543: Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 4594: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 4624: Mr. WEINER and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
H.R. 4649: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SWEENEY, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 4740: Mr. WYNN, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4841: Mr. COOKSEY.
H.R. 4879: Mr. WEINER, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 4915: Ms. CARSON and Mr. HOEFFEL.
H.R. 4926: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4949: Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. MOORE.
H.R. 4953: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. LEACH.
H.R. 4968: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 5005: Ms. PELOSI and Ms. DUNN.
H.R. 5018: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 5035: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 5065: Mr. FROST, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 5114: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 5116: Mr. EVANS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 5126: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FORD, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. LEE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 5152: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 5157: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. DIXON.
H.R. 5158: Ms. CARSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 5164: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 5178: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. LARSON, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 5212: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 5247: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 5262: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5265: Mr. BAKER, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 5277: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FROST, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 5288: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 5309: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 337: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H. Con. Res. 340: Mr. ROGAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BACA, and Mr. MATSUI.

H. Con. Res. 370: Mr. BACA, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. ROGAN.

H. Res. 51: Mr. BORSKI.

H. Res. 309: Mr. PORTER.

H. Res. 347: Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Res. 420: Mr. STUMP.

H. Res. 576: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. COYNE.

H. Res. 577: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.