[Roll No. 561]

AYES—392

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
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
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
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
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
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
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
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
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—10

Baird
Barton
Capuano
Costello
DeFazio
Dingell
Kaptur
Miller, George
Stupak
Visclosky

NOT VOTING—30

Blagojevich
Bliley
Brady (PA)
Campbell
Chenoweth-Hage
Crowley
Danner
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Hall (OH)
Hutchinson
Johnson, Sam
Klink
Lazio
Martinez
McCollum
McIntosh
Metcalf
Ney
Packard
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Schaffer
Spratt
Talent
Tauzin
Thompson (MS)
Waters
Waxman
Wise

□ 1750

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4942, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 653, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4942) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 653, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of the legislative day of Wednesday, October 25, 2000, Volume II.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 30 minutes.

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), and ask that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 4942, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill constitutes the conference report on the annual appropriation to the District of Columbia. In addition to that conference report, which I believe has been resolved to the satisfaction of both sides of the aisle, in addition to that, the bill also includes the annual appropriations for the Commerce, Justice and State Departments. The debate on that, Mr. Speaker, will be presented by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and persons through him, as he chairs that particular subcommittee.

But let me address myself first regarding the District of Columbia bill. I believe we have worked out something that is quite satisfactory to all persons concerned, persons in the District, persons on the other side of the aisle, persons on our side of the aisle, and I appreciate the effort that was put forth to bring people together on a bill that some people did not think we were going to be able to do. But we have.

The amount in the bill that is presented in the conference report to the House is higher than the House appropriation number when the bill left here, and lower than the Senate number. It is an appropriation of $445 million. The House had passed $414 million; the Senate passed $448 million.

I should note for the record that the bill is approximately 1.5 percent above what the appropriation was last year, but it would only be one-half of one percent, were it not for the inclusion of $6 million to help defray costs of the Presidential inauguration that will occur in January.

The bill resolves several issues that we had before. It provides full funding for the College Tuition Support Program for high school graduates from the District of Columbia. It has the full requested Federal contribution for the

new and very important New York Avenue Metro Station, which is important not only in the sense of transportation, but also as a focal point of economic development and improvement of job possibilities here in the District of Columbia.

We have appropriated $3.5 million for brownfield remediation to clean up the Poplar Point area, so it can be back to usefulness once more. We continue to have funding for environmental cleanup of the Anacostia River.

We have special appropriations for making sure that character education, values education, are included within the D.C. public schools. We have a provision that we hope will help the District to get a handle on the annual funding problems of D.C. General Hospital. Among other things, it requires the Mayor and the Council and the PBC, the Public Benefits Corporation, to make the tough decisions, that they are willing to make, of significant downsizing of their personnel so that they can get that facility out of the major, major red ink under which it has been operating.

We also have the provisions in this bill to assist in strengthening the charter schools within the District of Columbia, these being public schools, but which are operated under a charter, rather than the normal school operation. I believe the enrollment of public school students in the District of Columbia that are attending charter schools, by choice of their parents, is now up to 13 percent, Mr. Speaker. We want to make sure that they have the proper access to the same resources that other public schools do.

We could talk about other provisions that are in the bill, Mr. Speaker; and, if necessary, we can delve into them, but I recognize the main debate on this legislation is not going to be over the D.C. appropriation, which has been worked out to the satisfaction of all significant parties involved, but is going to be on the Commerce, Justice, State appropriation.

Rather than recounting more about the D.C. bill, Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House today the conference agreement on H.R. 4942, the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for fiscal year 2001. The conferees met on October 11th and resolved the matters in disagreement between the House and Senate bills. The conference report includes the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations Act for FY 2001 and has been filed in the House. I will discuss that part of the conference report that relates to the District of Columbia. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) will discuss the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary items in the report.

For the District of Columbia, the conference agreement we reached with the Senate totals $445 million in Federal funds which is $31 million above the House bill and $3 million below the Senate bill. The $445 million recommended is $8 million or about one and one-half percent above last year's appropriation. Were it not for the appropriation of $6 million for the Presidential inauguration, the increase would be one-half of one percent.

Regarding the major funding issues, the conference agreement includes the requested $17 million in Federal funds for the college tuition assistance program for District residents we started last year as well as the full $25 million in Federal funds for the new Metrorail station on New York Avenue. We are able to retain in conference $112 million for the largest-ever drug testing and treatment program to crack down on the link between drugs and crime, so that DC's streets and neighborhoods will be far safer. For children, we continue the availability of $5 million in Federal funds to provide incentives to move children from foster care to adoption in safe, loving and permanent homes. We also provides $500,000 in Federal funds for the Child Advocacy Center, which cares for the young victims of abuse and neglect, and we include $500,000 for the network of satellite pediatric health clincs for children and families in underserved neighborhoods and communities in the District. We also recommend $1 million to establish a day program and comprehensive case management services for mentally retarded and multiple handicapped adolescents and adults in the District as well as $250,000 for the DC Special Olympics which we all know is a very worthy program.

A major milestone has been achieved by the public charter schools in the District. The conference agreement includes $105 million for 10,000 students for the school year that started last month. Those numbers reflect a significant increase from the $28 million and 7,000 students in public charter schools during the previous school year. This growth in public charter schools is occurring while enrollment in the traditional public schools is declining. Parents, when given the opportunity, are choosing charter schools for their children. Four years ago there were three charter schools and 300 students; this year there are 33 charter schools and 10,000 students. This remarkable growth reflects the desire and recognition by parents that their children need and deserve a better education—and they are finding it in the public charter schools.

We have all read the news stories of the mismanagement by the Public Benefit Corporation that operates D.C. General Hospital. The conference agreement allows internal transfers up to $90 million to restructure the delivery of health services in the District pursuant to a restructuring plan approved by local officials that will reduce personnel by at least 500 full-time equivalent employees without replacement by contract personnel. These problems have been going on for at least 10 years with hollow promises of corrective action by District officials. Those who need health care in the District are being ill served by a bloated and inefficient bureaucracy that local officials have been reluctant to correct. Language in the conference report requires that corrective action to be taken.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the needle exchange program, we were able to reach agreement in conference on language in section 150 of the bill to prohibit any needle exchange program within 1,000 feet of a public or private elementary or secondary school, including public charter schools. the language also requires the Public Housing Police to submit monthly reports on illegal drug activity at or near any public housing site where a needle exchange program is conducted. The District is required to take appropriate action to relocate a needle exchange program if recommended by the housing police or by a significant number of residents of the site.

The conference agreement also includes language from the House bill that prohibits the use of both local and Federal funds for abortions except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape or incest. Another provision prohibits the use of both local and Federal funds to implement the District's ''domestic partners act''. The conference agreement also includes language prohibiting the use of both local and Federal funds for any needle exchange program or to legalize or reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution of marijuana and other controlled substances. Language in section 151 provides $100,000 in Federal funds for the Metropolitan Police Department contingent on the District enacting into law a ban on the possession of tobacco products by minors. The funds are to be used by the police to enforce the ban.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference agreement that will provide significant benefits to the district's citizens while at the same time protecting the Federal interest in our Nation's Capital which we are charged to do by the Constitution.

I will include a table showing the amounts recommended in the conference agreement compared with last year's enacted amount, the budget request, and the House and Senate recommendations. I will also include the fiscal year 2001 Financial Plan which is the starting point for the independent auditor's comparison with actual year-end results as required by section 132 of this bill.

In closing, I want to thank all of our Members for their hard work and their contributions to this bill. The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. MORAN, is the ranking Member and I appreciate his assistance. I especially want to thank our full Committee chairman, the gentlemen from Florida, Mr. YOUNG, for his support and for his sage advice and counsel. The staff has done an outstanding job: John Albaugh, Chris Stanley and Micah Swafford of my staff; and from the Committee staff, Migo Miconi and Mary Porter. They really do a great job. Mary Porter has been doing this for 40 years—hard to imagine. I also want to thank the minority staff—Tom Forhan and Tim Aiken.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report and I urge its adoption.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 2001

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
FEDERAL FUNDS						
Federal payment for Resident Tuition Support	17,000	17,000	14,000	17,000	17,000	.....
Federal Payment to the Chief Financial Office of the District of Columbia	.....	.....	1,500	.....	1,250	+1,250
Federal payment for Incentives for Adoption of Children	5,000	5,000	.....	.....	.....	-5,000
Federal payment for Commercial Revitalization program	.....	.....	.....	1,500	1,500	+1,500
Federal payment to DCPS	.....	.....	.....	500	500	+500
Federal payment for Metropolitan Police Department	1,000	.....	.....	.....	100	-900
Federal payment to the Citizen Complaint Review Board	500	.....	.....	.....	.....	-500
Contribution to Covenant House Washington	250	.....	.....	500	500	+250
Federal payment to the District of Columbia Corrections Trustee Operations	176,000	134,300	134,300	134,200	134,200	-41,800
Federal payment to the District of Columbia Courts	99,714	103,000	99,500	109,080	105,000	+5,286
Defender Services in District of Columbia Courts	33,336	38,387	34,387	38,387	34,387	+1,051
Federal payment to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia	93,800	103,527	115,752	112,527	112,527	+18,727
Federal payment of Washington Interfaith Network	.....	.....	1,000	.....	1,000	+1,000
Federal payment for Plan to Simplify Employee Compensation Systems	.....	.....	250	.....	250	+250
Metrorail construction	.....	25,000	7,100	25,000	25,000	+25,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(17,900)	.....	.....	.....
Federal payment for the National Museum of American Music	.....	3,000	250	.....	.....	.....
Federal payment for Brownfield remediation	.....	10,000	.....	3,450	3,450	+3,450
Presidential Inauguration	.....	6,211	5,961	6,211	5,961	+5,961
Children's National Medical Center	2,500	.....	.....	.....	500	-2,000
Child Advocacy Center	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	+500
St. Coletta of Greater Washington Expansion Project	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000	+1,000
District of Columbia Special Olympics	.....	.....	.....	.....	250	+250
Federal Contribution for Enforcement of Law Banning Possession of Tobacco Products by Minors (Sec. 151)	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	+100
Federal payment to the General Services Administration (Lorton Correctional Complex)	6,700	.....	.....	.....	.....	-6,700
Federal payment to the Georgetown Waterfront Park Fund	1,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,000
Total, Federal funds to the District of Columbia	436,800	445,425	414,000	448,355	444,975	+8,175
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS						
Operating Expenses						
District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority	(3,140)	(6,500)	(3,140)	(6,500)	(3,140)	.....
Governmental direction and support	(167,356)	(197,771)	(194,521)	(194,271)	(195,771)	(+28,415)
Economic development and regulation	(190,335)	(205,638)	(205,638)	(205,638)	(205,638)	(+15,303)
Public safety and justice	(778,770)	(762,346)	(762,346)	(762,346)	(762,546)	(-16,224)
Public education system	(867,411)	(998,418)	(995,418)	(998,918)	(998,918)	(+131,507)
Human support services	(1,526,361)	(1,542,204)	(1,532,204)	(1,532,704)	(1,535,654)	(+9,293)
Public works	(271,395)	(278,242)	(278,242)	(278,242)	(278,242)	(+6,847)
Receivership Programs	(342,077)	(394,528)	(389,528)	(389,528)	(389,528)	(+47,451)
Reserve	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	.....
Repayment of Loans and Interest	(328,417)	(243,238)	(243,238)	(243,238)	(243,238)	(-85,179)
Repayment of General Fund Recovery Debt	(38,286)	(39,300)	(39,300)	(39,300)	(39,300)	(+1,014)
Payment of Interest on Short-Term Borrowing	(9,000)	(1,140)	(1,140)	(1,140)	(1,140)	(-7,860)
Presidential Inauguration	.....	(6,211)	(5,961)	(6,211)	(5,961)	(+5,961)
Certificates of Paticipation	(7,950)	(7,950)	(7,950)	(7,950)	(7,950)	.....
Wilson Building	.....	(8,409)	(8,409)	(8,409)	(8,409)	(+8,409)
Optical and Dental Insurance Payments	(1,295)	(2,675)	(2,675)	(2,675)	(2,675)	(+1,380)
Management Supervisory Services	.....	(13,200)	(13,200)	(13,200)	(13,200)	(+13,200)
Tobacco Settlement Trust Fund Transfer Payment	.....	(61,406)	(61,406)	(61,406)	(61,406)	(+61,406)
Operational Improvements Savings (including Managed Competition)	.....	(-10,000)	(-10,000)	(-10,000)	(-10,000)	(-10,000)
Management Reform Savings	(-7,000)	(-37,000)	(-37,000)	(-37,000)	(-37,000)	(-30,000)
Cafeteria Plan Savings	.....	(-5,000)	(-5,000)	(-5,000)	(-5,000)	(-5,000)
Productivity Bank	(18,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-18,000)
Productivity Savings	(-18,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+18,000)
General Supply Schedule Savings	(-14,457)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+14,457)
Workforce Investments	(8,500)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-8,500)
Buyouts and Management Reforms	(18,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-18,000)
Total, operating expenses, general fund	(4,686,836)	(4,867,176)	(4,842,316)	(4,849,676)	(4,850,716)	(+163,880)
Enterprise Funds						
Water and Sewer Authority and the Washington Aqueduct	(279,608)	(275,705)	(275,705)	(275,705)	(275,705)	(-3,903)
Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board	(234,400)	(223,200)	(223,200)	(223,200)	(223,200)	(-11,200)
Sports and Entertainment Commission	(10,846)	(10,968)	(10,968)	(10,968)	(10,968)	(+122)
Public Benefit Corporation	(89,008)	(78,235)	(78,235)	(78,235)	(78,235)	(-10,773)
D.C. Retirement Board	(9,892)	(11,414)	(11,414)	(11,414)	(11,414)	(+1,522)
Correctional Industries Fund	(1,810)	(1,808)	(1,808)	(1,808)	(1,808)	(-2)
Washington Convention Center	(50,226)	(52,726)	(52,726)	(52,726)	(52,726)	(+2,500)
Total, Enterprise Funds	(675,790)	(654,056)	(654,056)	(654,056)	(654,056)	(-21,734)
Total, operating expenses	(5,362,626)	(5,521,232)	(5,496,372)	(5,503,732)	(5,504,772)	(+142,146)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 2001 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Capital Outlay						
General fund	(1,218,638)	(1,029,975)	(1,022,074)	(1,022,074)	(1,022,074)	(-196,564)
Water and Sewer Fund	(197,169)	(140,725)	(140,725)	(140,725)	(140,725)	(-56,444)
Total, Capital Outlay	(1,415,807)	(1,170,700)	(1,162,799)	(1,162,799)	(1,162,799)	(-253,008)
Total, District of Columbia funds	(6,778,433)	(6,691,932)	(6,659,171)	(6,666,531)	(6,667,571)	(-110,862)
Total:						
Federal Funds to the District of Columbia	436,800	445,425	414,000	448,355	444,975	+8,175
District of Columbia funds	(6,778,433)	(6,691,932)	(6,659,171)	(6,666,531)	(6,667,571)	(-110,862)

FISCAL YEAR 2001 FINANCIAL PLANS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Local funds	Grants and other revenue	Gross funds
Revenue			
Local sources, current authority:			
Property taxes	644,360	0	644,360
Sales taxes	651,230	0	651,230
Income taxes	1,291,179	0	1,291,179
Gross receipts and other taxes	331,659	0	331,659
Licenses, permits	37,095	0	37,095
Fines, forfeitures	67,716	0	67,716
Service charges	61,528	0	61,528
Miscellaneous	71,033	294,066	365,099
Subtotal, local revenues	3,155,800	294,066	3,449,866
Federal sources:			
Federal payment	30,111	0	30,111
Grants	0	1,305,867	1,305,867
Subtotal, Federal sources	30,111	1,305,867	1,335,978
Other financing sources:			
Lottery transfer	69,000	0	69,000
Total, general fund revenues	3,254,911	1,599,933	4,854,844
Expenditures			
Current operating:			
D.C. Financing Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority	0	3,140	3,140
Governmental Direction and Support	162,172	33,599	195,771
Economic Development and Regulation	53,562	152,076	205,638
Public Safety and Justice	591,565	170,981	762,546
Public Education System	824,867	174,051	998,918
Human Support Services	637,347	898,307	1,535,654
Public Works	265,078	13,164	278,242
Receivership Programs	234,913	154,615	389,528
Reserve	150,000	0	150,000
Repayment of Loans and Interest	243,238	0	243,238
Repayment of General Fund Recovery Debt	39,300	0	39,300
Payment of Interest on Short-Term Borrowing	1,140	0	1,140
Presidential Inauguration	5,961	0	5,961
Certificates of Participation	7,950	0	7,950
Wilson Building	8,409	0	8,409
Optical and Dental Insurance Payments	2,675	0	2,675
Management Supervisory Services	13,200	0	13,200
Tobacco Settlement Trust Fund Transfer Payment	61,406	0	61,406
Operational Improvement Savings (Including Managed Competition)	(10,000)	0	(10,000)
Management Reform Savings	(37,000)	0	(37,000)
Cafeteria Plan Savings	(5,000)	0	(5,000)
Total, general fund expenditures	3,250,783	1,599,933	4,850,716
Surplus/(Deficit)	4,128	0	4,128
Enterprise fund data			
Enterprise fund revenues:			
Water and Sewer Authority	0	230,614	230,614
Washington Aqueduct	0	45,091	45,091
D.C. Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board	0	223,200	223,200
D.C. Sports and Entertainment Commission	0	10,968	10,968
District of Columbia Health and Hospital Public Benefit Corporation	0	78,235	78,235
District of Columbia Retirement Board	0	11,414	11,414
Correctional Industries Fund	0	1,808	1,808
Washington Convention Center Authority	0	52,726	52,726
Total, enterprise fund revenues	0	654,056	654,056
Enterprise fund expenditures:			
Water and Sewer Authority	0	230,614	230,614
Washington Aqueduct	0	45,091	45,091
D.C. Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board	0	223,200	223,200
D.C. Sports and Entertainment Commission	0	10,968	10,968
District of Columbia Health and Hospital Public Benefit Corporation	0	78,235	78,235
District of Columbia Retirement Board	0	11,414	11,414
Correctional Industries Fund	0	1,808	1,808
Washington Convention Center Authority	0	52,726	52,726
Total, enterprise expenditures	0	654,056	654,056
Surplus/(Deficit)	0	0	0
Total, operating revenues	3,254,911	2,253,989	5,508,900
Total, operating expenditures	3,250,783	2,253,989	5,504,772
Revenues versus expendtiures	4,128	0	4,128

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma is absolutely correct. We have worked out the D.C. bill. It is done, and I give credit to the gentleman from Oklahoma, to the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle, and in the Senate as well. In fact, I am not even going to mention the topic of any of these issues that have perennially been so divisive on the floor of the House. We have a good bill, a good D.C. bill.

We had, though, a good news-bad news conversation to relate to the democratically elected delegate-representative from the District of Columbia today. The good news was that, finally, after the fiscal year had begun, the District of Columbia bill, the conference agreement, was unanimously agreed to; it was going to go to the President.

□ 1800

Great news. We have been waiting for this for over a year. The bad news is that the D.C. bill is being attached to the Commerce, Justice, State bill, which is going to be vetoed. That is very unfortunate. We feel that D.C. deserves to go on its own accord.

If it was to go to the White House today, it would be signed tonight; done deal; no controversy. But, instead, we are dumping a bill on it whose veto message we are already in possession

of. The President of the United States has told us he is going to veto this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the President has told us that there are a number of reasons why he is going to veto the Commerce, Justice, State bill. He is going to veto it because it prevents the Justice Department from being able to pursue litigation against tobacco companies, tobacco companies whose product has resulted in the loss of billions of dollars to the Medicare and Medicaid program.

Secondly, the President says that it fails to include hate crimes legislation.

Thirdly, it does not address in a meaningful way privacy concerns with regard to Social Security numbers.

Fourthly, it contains a range of antienvironmental, anticompetitive damaging riders.

Lastly, perhaps, most importantly, I think most importantly, it fails to redress several injustices in our immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, there is a Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act, which has been before us for some time. There is a compelling justification for this legislation. These are people who have been working hard, paying taxes, contributing to our community and, particularly, to our economy for over 15 years. They have a deep abiding faith in our system.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) will explain why a labyrinthine legislative process has left them in limbo for too many years. It is unfair to their families. It is unfair to the communities that they are part of it. It needs to be redressed.

We need to take care of it, which should be part of this legislation. That is why we oppose it.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report contains the agreement between the House and Senate on the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations bill.

The agreement we are bringing before the House is the result of a long and arduous process of negotiations with the other body and the administration. It is a sound compromise that represents the interests of both bodies, and we think the administration—and I hope the House will endorse it by its vote today.

Before explaining this agreement, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of the members of the subcommittee for their hard work, their contributions, their patience, as we have moved this bill through the House and then negotiated with the other body and the White House.

I also want to thank our full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), for his steadfast support and leadership and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking minority member of our full committee, for his cooperation and assistance on a number of issues that required long and repeated negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), my ranking member, who has done an excellent job and whose friendship I appreciate greatly.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I want to thank the tireless work of our staff on both sides of the aisle without whom this product would not be before us now. They put in enormously long hours. They were here all night, Mr. Speaker, and into this morning; and they have done an excellent job. On the majority side, Gail DelBalzo, Jennifer Miller, Mike Ringler, Christine Ryan, John Martens, Kevin Fromer, Greg Laux, and our committee staff director, Jim Dyer. On the minority side, Sally Chadbourne, Lucy Hand, Pat Schlueter, Nadine Berg, and Scott Lilly.

Mr. Speaker, this conference agreement provides a total of $37.5 billion for the agencies and programs in our jurisdiction. That is below the President's request for this year, and it is below last year's level.

At the same time, we have provided for the critical needs of law enforcement, diplomatic security, trade and export promotion, small business assistance and other very important programs.

For law enforcement, we were able to reverse a number of very significant reductions made by the other body in its version of the bill, restoring critical funding for the FBI, the DEA, the U.S. attorneys and the INS.

The agreement also provides new program increases for a number of high-priority law enforcement initiatives for the FBI and U.S. attorneys. The bill provides additional resources for the prosecution of violations of gun laws, cybercrime and terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, we provide new funding for DEA to address the war on drugs.

We beef up programs to address the threat of domestic terrorism, including a $69 million increase to train and equip State and local first responders so they are prepared for incidents, if, and when, they should occur.

At the INS, we provided increases totalling over $500 million for additional border patrol agents, increased the detention space to hold criminal aliens, and for Interior enforcement personnel.

This includes over $1 billion for the processing of immigration benefit applications. That is a 16 percent increase over last year and $70 million for this purpose, more than the President, himself, requested.

This bill in an unprecedented way will help solve the backlog and applications for citizenship and other immigration benefits at the INS.

To help your State and local police and sheriffs fight the war on crime, we were able to maintain the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant and Juvenile Accountability Block Grant, the Byrne Formula Grant Program and the Truth In Sentencing State Prison Grant programs.

Mr. Speaker, for the COPS program, the agreement provides $1.03 billion, a major increase from the $595 million in the House bill. Funds are included to continue established programs such as the COPS hiring program, law enforcement technologies, bulletproof vests, and methamphetamine lab cleanup.

Within the COPS program, we have also included money for new initiatives to prosecute cases involving violent crimes committed with guns and violations of gun statutes in cases involving drug trafficking and gang-related crime.

We establish offender reentry programs and provide funds to support police integrity training.

All in all, this agreement goes beyond the call of duty in making sure that Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies have every penny needed to battle crime, drugs, illegal immigration and the wave of emerging threats to our domestic national security.

Mr. Speaker, for the Department of Commerce, we preserve the critical functions of the National Weather Service, provide increases for our national trade protection and promotion programs, and we fund the completion of the decennial census.

Within NOAA, the agreement continues important coastal ocean and fish habitat protection programs, including implementation of the Pacific Salmon Treaty and grants to the affected States. After long negotiations, we include a total of $618 million for a number of programs related to the CARA agreement on the Interior appropriations bill.

For our Federal courts system, we provide necessary funding to address its ever-increasing caseload. The agreement authorizes, consistent with past practices, cost-of-living adjustments for judges and provides a new increase in the hourly rate we pay court-appointed panel attorneys who represent indigent defendants.

For the State Department, we provided funding above the requested level to ensure the safety and security of our people overseas, including monies needed to replace our most vulnerable embassies.

Finally, we provide ample support for the work of a number of independent agencies: the FCC, Securities and Exchange Commission, FTC, Legal Services Corporation, SBA, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, we were faced with major differences between the House and Senate bills, and we spent an enormous amount of time in trying to craft a compromise that is fair, fiscally responsible and responsive to the needs of our Members and the people they represent back home.

We have come a long way. We have an agreement that can and should be adopted, in my judgment, by the two

bodies and signed into law. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the conference report.

The conference report contains a provision (Section 629) which clarifies that the Interstate Horseracing Act permits the continued merging of any wagering pools and wagering activities conducted between individuals and state-licensed and regulated off-track betting systems located in one or more states, whether such wagers are conducted in person, via telephone or other electronic media, provided such wagers are placed on a closed-loop subscriber-based service, which would include an effective customer and age verification process to ensure that all federal and state requirements and appropriate data security standards are met to prevent unauthorized use by a minor or non-subscriber. The amendment clarifies that the Interstate Horseracing Act permits wagers made by telephone or other electronic media to be accepted by an off-track betting system in another state provided that such types of wagers are lawful in each state involved and meet the requirements, if any, established by the legislature or appropriate regulatory body in the state where the person originating the wager resides.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4690)

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
Salaries and expenses	79,328	91,553	84,177	83,713	88,713	+9,385
Joint automated booking system	1,800	1,800	1,800	15,915	15,915	+14,115
Public key infrastructure	.....	4,376	.....	.....	.....	.....
Narrowband communications	10,625	188,000	95,445	205,000	205,000	+194,375
(By transfer)	(92,545)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-92,545)
Counterterrorism fund	10,000	10,000	10,000	5,000	5,000	-5,000
Telecommunications carrier compliance fund	7,000	105,000	136,771	.....	100,710	+93,710
Defense function	8,000	.....	141,250	.....	100,710	+92,710
Administrative review and appeals:						
Direct appropriation	98,136	164,549	159,570	112,814	161,062	+62,926
Crime trust fund	50,363	.....	.....	.....	.....	-50,363
Total, Administrative review and appeals	148,499	164,549	159,570	112,814	161,062	+12,563
Detention trustee	.....	26,000	1,000	.....	1,000	+1,000
Office of Inspector General	40,275	42,192	41,825	42,192	41,575	+1,300
Total, General administration	305,527	633,470	671,838	464,634	719,685	+414,158
Appropriations	(255,164)	(633,470)	(671,838)	(464,634)	(719,685)	(+464,521)
Crime trust fund	(50,363)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-50,363)
United States Parole Commission						
Salaries and expenses	8,527	9,183	8,855	7,380	8,855	+328
Legal Activities						
General legal activities:						
Direct appropriation	357,016	553,235	523,228	494,310	535,771	+178,755
Crime trust fund	147,929	.....	.....	.....	.....	-147,929
Total, General legal activities	504,945	553,235	523,228	494,310	535,771	+30,826
Vaccine injury compensation trust fund (permanent)	4,028	4,028	4,028	4,028	4,028	.....
Antitrust Division	110,000	134,000	113,269	120,838	120,838	+10,838
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-28,150	-29,034	-36,098	-25,000	-25,000	+3,150
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-81,850	-104,966	-77,171	-95,838	-95,838	-13,988
Direct appropriation	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
United States Attorneys:						
Direct appropriation	1,161,957	1,292,633	1,247,416	1,159,014	1,250,382	+88,425
United States Trustee System Fund:						
Current year fee funding	106,775	127,202	126,242	127,212	125,997	+19,222
Fees and interest (legislative proposal)	6,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-6,000
Total, United States trustee system fund	112,775	127,202	126,242	127,212	125,997	+13,222
Offsetting fee collections	-106,775	-121,202	-120,242	-121,212	-119,997	-13,222
Offsetting fee collections - legis. proposal	-6,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+6,000
Interest on U.S. securities	.....	-6,000	-6,000	-6,000	-6,000	-6,000
Total, US trustee offsetting fee collections	-112,775	-127,202	-126,242	-127,212	-125,997	-13,222
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	1,175	1,214	1,000	1,214	1,107	-68
United States Marshals Service:						
Direct appropriation	333,745	586,469	560,438	550,472	572,695	+238,950
Crime trust fund	209,620	.....	.....	.....	.....	-209,620
Construction	6,000	6,378	6,000	25,100	18,128	+12,128
Justice prisoner and alien transportation system fund	.....	.....	.....	97,855	13,500	+13,500
Total, United States Marshals Service	549,365	592,847	566,438	673,427	604,323	+54,958
Federal prisoner detention	525,000	597,402	597,402	539,022	597,402	+72,402
Fees and expenses of witnesses	95,000	156,145	95,000	156,145	125,573	+30,573
Community Relations Service	7,199	9,829	7,479	8,475	8,475	+1,276
Assets forfeiture fund	23,000	23,000	.....	23,000	23,000	.....
Total, Legal activities	2,871,669	3,230,333	3,041,991	3,058,635	3,150,061	+278,392
Appropriations	(2,514,120)	(3,230,333)	(3,041,991)	(3,058,635)	(3,150,061)	(+635,941)
Crime trust fund	(357,549)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-357,549)
Radiation Exposure Compensation						
Administrative expenses	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	.....
Payment to radiation exposure compensation trust fund	3,200	13,727	3,200	14,400	10,800	+7,600
Total, Radiation Exposure Compensation	5,200	15,727	5,200	16,400	12,800	+7,600

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4690) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Interagency Law Enforcement						
Interagency crime and drug enforcement	316,792	328,898	328,898	316,792	325,898	+9,106
Federal Bureau of Investigation						
Salaries and expenses	2,044,542	2,977,089	3,070,282	2,676,931	2,797,950	+753,408
Counterintelligence and national security	292,473	326,779	159,223	400,650	437,650	+145,177
Direct appropriation	2,337,015	3,303,868	3,229,505	3,077,581	3,235,600	+898,585
Crime trust fund	752,853	.....	.....	.....	.....	-752,853
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	3,089,868	3,303,868	3,229,505	3,077,581	3,235,600	+145,732
Construction	1,287	3,187	1,287	42,687	16,687	+15,400
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation	3,091,155	3,307,055	3,230,792	3,120,268	3,252,287	+161,132
Appropriations	(2,338,302)	(3,307,055)	(3,230,792)	(3,120,268)	(3,252,287)	(+913,985)
Crime trust fund	(752,853)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-752,853)
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Salaries and expenses	1,013,330	1,451,309	1,445,852	1,429,198	1,446,852	+433,522
Diversion control fund	-80,330	-83,543	-83,543	-83,543	-83,543	-3,213
Direct appropriation	933,000	1,367,766	1,362,309	1,345,655	1,363,309	+430,309
Crime trust fund	343,250	.....	.....	.....	.....	-343,250
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	1,276,250	1,367,766	1,362,309	1,345,655	1,363,309	+87,059
Construction	5,500	5,500	5,500	.....	.....	-5,500
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration	1,281,750	1,373,266	1,367,809	1,345,655	1,363,309	+81,559
Appropriations	(938,500)	(1,373,266)	(1,367,809)	(1,345,655)	(1,363,309)	(+424,809)
Crime trust fund	(343,250)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-343,250)
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
Salaries and expenses	1,642,440	3,159,138	3,121,213	2,895,397	3,125,876	+1,483,436
Enforcement and border affairs	(1,107,429)	(2,619,748)	(2,547,899)	.....	(2,547,057)	(+1,439,628)
Citizenship and benefits, immigration support and program direction	(535,011)	(539,390)	(573,314)	.....	(578,819)	(+43,808)
Crime trust fund	1,267,225	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,267,225
Subtotal, Direct and crime trust fund	2,909,665	3,159,138	3,121,213	2,895,397	3,125,876	+216,211
Fee accounts:						
Immigration user fee	(446,151)	(529,103)	(478,879)	(494,384)	(494,384)	(+48,233)
Land border inspection fund	(1,548)	(1,641)	(1,641)	(1,670)	(1,670)	(+122)
Immigration examinations fund	(708,500)	(899,817)	(874,717)	(891,017)	(969,851)	(+261,351)
Breached bond fund	(110,423)	(110,134)	(80,600)	(130,634)	(80,600)	(-29,823)
Immigration enforcement fines	(1,850)	(1,850)	(1,850)	(5,593)	(1,850)	.....
H-1b Visa fees	(1,125)	(1,125)	(1,125)	(1,473)	(1,125)	.....
Subtotal, Fee accounts	(1,269,597)	(1,543,670)	(1,438,812)	(1,524,771)	(1,549,480)	(+279,883)
Construction	99,664	111,135	110,664	133,302	133,302	+33,638
Immigration services capital investment	.....	34,800	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Immigration and Naturalization Service	(4,278,926)	(4,848,743)	(4,670,689)	(4,553,470)	(4,808,658)	(+529,732)
Appropriations	(1,742,104)	(3,305,073)	(3,231,877)	(3,028,699)	(3,259,178)	(+1,517,074)
Crime trust fund	(1,267,225)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-1,267,225)
(Fee accounts)	(1,269,597)	(1,543,670)	(1,438,812)	(1,524,771)	(1,549,480)	(+279,883)
Federal Prison System						
Salaries and expenses	3,179,110	3,545,769	3,500,596	3,573,729	3,507,889	+328,779
Prior year carryover	-90,000	.....	-70,000	.....	-31,000	+59,000
Direct appropriation	3,089,110	3,545,769	3,430,596	3,573,729	3,476,889	+387,779
Crime trust fund	22,524	.....	.....	.....	.....	-22,524
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	3,111,634	3,545,769	3,430,596	3,573,729	3,476,889	+365,255
Buildings and facilities	556,791	835,660	835,660	724,389	835,660	+278,869
Advance appropriations, FY 2002 - 2003	.....	1,326,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses)	3,429	3,429	3,429	3,429	3,429	.....
Total, Federal Prison System	3,671,854	5,710,858	4,269,685	4,301,547	4,315,978	+644,124
Appropriations	(3,649,330)	(4,384,858)	(4,269,685)	(4,301,547)	(4,315,978)	(+666,648)
Advance appropriations	.....	(1,326,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4690) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Office of Justice Programs						
Justice assistance	307,611	371,260	307,611	426,403	418,219	+110,608
(By transfer)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	.....
State and local law enforcement assistance:						
Direct appropriations:						
Local law enforcement block grant	523,000	.....	523,000	400,000	523,000	.....
Boys and Girls clubs (earmark)	(50,000)	.....	(50,000)	(70,000)	(60,000)	(+10,000)
State prison grants	686,500	75,000	686,500	76,000	686,500	.....
State criminal alien assistance program	420,000	600,000	420,000	50,000	400,000	-20,000
Indian tribal courts program	5,000	15,000	.....	5,000	8,000	+3,000
Drug interdiction	.....	75,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Indian grants	.....	21,000	.....	.....	5,000	+5,000
Byrne grants (formula)	.....	400,000	500,000	400,000	500,000	+500,000
Byrne grants (discretionary)	.....	59,500	52,000	52,000	69,050	+69,050
Juvenile crime block grant	.....	.....	250,000	100,000	250,000	+250,000
Drug courts	.....	50,000	40,000	40,000	50,000	+50,000
Violence Against Women grants	.....	296,000	283,750	284,854	288,679	+288,679
State prison drug treatment	.....	65,000	63,000	63,000	63,000	+63,000
Other crime control programs	.....	5,700	5,700	4,400	5,700	+5,700
Subtotal, Direct appropriations	1,634,500	1,662,200	2,823,950	1,475,254	2,848,929	+1,214,429
Crime trust fund:						
Byrne grants (formula)	500,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-500,000
Byrne grants (discretionary)	52,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-52,000
Juvenile crime block grant	250,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-250,000
Drug courts	40,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-40,000
Violence Against Women grants	283,750	.....	.....	.....	.....	-283,750
State prison drug treatment	63,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-63,000
Other crime control programs	5,700	.....	.....	.....	.....	-5,700
Subtotal, Crime trust fund	1,194,450	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,194,450
Total, State and local law enforcement	2,828,950	1,662,200	2,823,950	1,475,254	2,848,929	+19,979
Weed and seed program fund	33,500	42,000	33,500	40,000	34,000	+500
Community oriented policing services:						
Direct appropriations:						
Public safety and community policing grants	344,500	614,000	389,500	510,500	535,000	+190,500
Management administration	29,825	36,000	29,825	29,825	31,825	+2,000
Crime identification technology	130,000	350,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	.....
Safe schools initiative	(15,000)	.....	.....	(15,000)	(17,500)	(+2,500)
Upgrade criminal history records	(35,000)	(70,000)	.....	(33,000)	(35,000)	.....
DNA identification/crime lab	(30,000)	(50,000)	.....	(30,000)	(30,000)	.....
Methamphetamine	35,675	.....	45,675	41,700	48,500	+12,825
Community prosecutors	10,000	200,000	.....	.....	100,000	+90,000
Crime prevention	.....	135,000	.....	.....	47,000	+47,000
COPS technology	.....	.....	.....	100,000	140,000	+140,000
Subtotal, Direct appropriations	550,000	1,335,000	595,000	812,025	1,032,325	+482,325
Crime trust fund:						
Hiring program	45,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-45,000
Total, Community oriented policing services	595,000	1,335,000	595,000	812,025	1,032,325	+437,325
Juvenile justice programs	287,097	289,000	287,097	279,697	298,597	+11,500
Public safety officers benefits program:						
Death benefits	32,541	33,224	33,224	33,224	33,224	+683
Federal law enforcement dependents assistance	.....	4,800	.....	.....	.....	.....
Disability benefits	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,400	+2,400
Total, Public safety officers benefits program	32,541	38,024	33,224	33,224	35,624	+3,083
Total, Office of Justice Programs	4,084,699	3,737,484	4,080,382	3,066,603	4,667,694	+582,995
Appropriations	(2,845,249)	(3,737,484)	(4,080,382)	(3,066,603)	(4,667,694)	(+1,822,445)
Crime trust fund	(1,239,450)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-1,239,450)
Total, title I, Department of Justice	18,646,502	21,651,347	20,237,327	18,726,613	21,075,745	+2,429,243
Appropriations	(14,613,288)	(20,325,347)	(20,237,327)	(18,726,613)	(21,075,745)	(+6,462,457)
Crime trust fund	(4,033,214)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-4,033,214)
Advance appropriations	.....	(1,326,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
(By transfer)	(99,545)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(-92,545)

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4690) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES						
TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT						
Office of the United States Trade Representative						
Salaries and expenses	25,635	29,600	29,433	29,600	29,517	+3,882
International Trade Commission						
Salaries and expenses	44,495	49,100	46,995	49,100	48,100	+3,605
Total, Related agencies	70,130	78,700	76,428	78,700	77,617	+7,487
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
International Trade Administration						
Operations and administration	311,503	355,147	321,448	318,686	337,444	+25,941
Offsetting fee collections	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	.....
Direct appropriation	308,503	352,147	318,448	315,686	334,444	+25,941
Export Administration						
Operations and administration	52,161	66,416	51,963	56,787	57,604	+5,443
CWC enforcement	1,877	5,138	1,870	4,250	7,250	+5,373
Total, Export Administration	54,038	71,554	53,833	61,037	64,854	+10,816
Economic Development Administration						
Economic development assistance programs	361,879	407,750	361,879	218,000	411,879	+50,000
Salaries and expenses	26,500	29,188	26,499	31,542	28,000	+1,500
Total, Economic Development Administration	388,379	436,938	388,378	249,542	439,879	+51,500
Minority Business Development Agency						
Minority business development	27,314	28,156	27,314	27,000	27,314	.....
Total, Trade and Infrastructure Development	848,364	967,495	864,401	731,965	944,108	+95,744
ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE						
Economic and Statistical Analysis						
Salaries and expenses	49,499	54,713	49,499	53,992	53,745	+4,246
Bureau of the Census						
Salaries and expenses	140,000	173,826	140,000	158,386	157,227	+17,227
Periodic censuses and programs	142,320	545,379	530,867	535,224	276,406	+134,086
Emergency appropriations	4,476,253	.....	.....	.....	.....	-4,476,253
Total, Bureau of the Census	4,758,573	719,205	670,867	693,610	433,633	-4,324,940
National Telecommunications and Information Administration						
Salaries and expenses	10,975	20,315	10,975	11,437	11,437	+462
Public telecommunications facilities, planning and construction	26,500	110,075	31,000	50,000	43,500	+17,000
Advance appropriations, FY 2002 - 2003	.....	197,500	.....	.....	.....	.....
Information infrastructure grants	15,500	45,119	15,500	15,500	45,500	+30,000
Home internet access	.....	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration	52,975	423,009	57,475	76,937	100,437	+47,462
Appropriations	(52,975)	(225,509)	(57,475)	(76,937)	(100,437)	(+47,462)
Advance appropriations	.....	(197,500)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Patent and Trademark Office						
Current year fee funding	755,000	783,843	650,035	783,843	783,843	+28,843
(Prior year carryover)	(116,000)	(254,889)	(254,889)	(254,889)	(254,889)	(+138,889)
Total, Patent and Trademark Office	(871,000)	(1,038,732)	(904,924)	(1,038,732)	(1,038,732)	(+167,732)
Offsetting fee collections	-785,976	-783,843	-650,035	-783,843	-783,843	+2,133
Total, Economic and Information Infrastructure	4,830,071	1,196,927	777,841	824,539	587,815	-4,242,256
Appropriations	(353,818)	(999,427)	(777,841)	(824,539)	(587,815)	(+233,997)
Advance appropriations	.....	(197,500)	.....	.....	.....	.....

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4690) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY						
Technology Administration						
Under Secretary for Technology/ Office of Technology Policy						
Salaries and expenses	7,972	8,716	7,945	8,216	8,080	+108
National Institute of Standards and Technology						
Scientific and technical research and services	283,132	337,508	292,056	305,003	312,617	+29,485
Industrial technology services	247,436	339,604	104,836	262,737	250,837	+3,401
Construction of research facilities	108,414	35,879	26,000	28,879	34,879	-73,535
Working capital fund (by transfer)	.....	(6,300)	.....	(6,200)	.....	.....
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology	638,982	712,991	422,892	596,619	598,333	-40,649
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Operations, research, and facilities	1,688,189	1,882,189	1,608,125	1,958,046	1,869,170	+180,981
Offsetting collections (fisheries) (proposed)	.....	-20,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Offsetting collections (navigations) (proposed)	.....	-14,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Direct appropriation	1,688,189	1,848,189	1,608,125	1,958,046	1,869,170	+180,981
(By transfer from Promote and Develop Fund)	(68,000)	(68,000)	(68,000)	(72,828)	(68,000)	.....
(By transfer from Coastal zone management)	.....	3,200	.....	3,200	3,200	+3,200
Total, Operations, research and facilities	1,688,189	1,851,389	1,608,125	1,961,246	1,872,370	+184,181
Procurement, acquisition and construction	596,067	635,222	563,456	669,542	682,899	+86,832
Advance appropriations, FY 2002 - 2019	.....	6,417,495	.....	.....	.....	.....
Coastal and ocean activities	.....	.....	.....	.....	420,000	+420,000
Pacific coastal salmon recovery	58,000	160,000	58,000	58,000	74,000	+16,000
Fisheries assistance	.....	10,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Coastal impact assistance	.....	100,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Coastal zone management fund	4,000	.....	4,000	.....	.....	-4,000
Mandatory offset	-4,000	-3,200	-4,000	-3,200	-3,200	+800
Fishermen's contingency fund	953	951	951	953	952	-1
Foreign fishing observer fund	189	191	189	191	191	+2
Fisheries finance program account	338	6,628	238	338	288	-50
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	2,343,736	9,178,676	2,230,959	2,687,070	3,047,500	+703,764
Appropriations	(2,343,736)	(2,761,181)	(2,230,959)	(2,687,070)	(3,047,500)	(+703,764)
Advance appropriations	.....	(6,417,495)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Science and Technology	2,990,690	9,900,383	2,661,796	3,291,905	3,653,913	+663,223
Departmental Management						
Salaries and expenses	31,500	32,340	28,392	32,340	35,920	+4,420
Digital department	.....	5,800	.....	5,800	.....	.....
Security	.....	13,268	.....	10,000	.....	.....
Office of Inspector General	20,000	22,726	21,000	19,000	20,000	.....
Total, Departmental management	51,500	74,134	49,392	67,140	55,920	+4,420
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Fisheries promotional fund (rescission)	-1,187	.....	.....	.....	.....	+1,187
Total, Department of Commerce	8,649,308	12,060,239	4,277,002	4,836,849	5,164,139	-3,485,169
Appropriations	(4,174,242)	(5,445,244)	(4,277,002)	(4,836,849)	(5,164,139)	(+989,897)
Emergency appropriations	(4,476,253)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-4,476,253)
Rescissions	(-1,187)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+1,187)
Advance appropriations	.....	(6,614,995)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, title II, Department of Commerce and related agencies	8,719,438	12,138,939	4,353,430	4,915,549	5,241,756	-3,477,682
Appropriations	(4,244,372)	(5,523,944)	(4,353,430)	(4,915,549)	(5,241,756)	(+997,384)
Emergency appropriations	(4,476,253)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-4,476,253)
Rescissions	(-1,187)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+1,187)
Advance appropriations	.....	(6,614,995)	.....	.....	.....	.....
(By transfer)	(68,000)	(74,300)	(68,000)	(79,028)	(68,000)	.....
TITLE III - THE JUDICIARY						
Supreme Court of the United States						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of justices	1,698	1,698	1,698	1,698	1,698	.....
Other salaries and expenses	33,794	36,047	35,084	35,893	35,893	+2,099
Total, Salaries and expenses	35,492	37,745	36,782	37,591	37,591	+2,099

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4690) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Care of the building and grounds	8,002	7,530	7,530	7,530	7,530	-472
Total, Supreme Court of the United States	43,494	45,275	44,312	45,121	45,121	+1,627
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges	1,945	2,021	2,021	2,021	2,021	+76
Other salaries and expenses	14,852	17,512	15,825	15,909	15,909	+1,057
Total, Salaries and expenses	16,797	19,533	17,846	17,930	17,930	+1,133
United States Court of International Trade						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges	1,525	1,525	1,525	1,525	1,525	.....
Other salaries and expenses	10,432	10,981	10,774	10,931	10,931	+499
Total, Salaries and expenses	11,957	12,506	12,299	12,456	12,456	+499
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges	240,375	248,000	248,000	248,000	248,000	+7,625
Other salaries and expenses	2,717,763	3,250,694	3,080,778	3,111,725	3,111,725	+393,962
Direct appropriation	2,958,138	3,498,694	3,328,778	3,359,725	3,359,725	+401,587
Crime trust fund	156,539	.....	.....	.....	.....	-156,539
Total, Salaries and expenses	3,114,677	3,498,694	3,328,778	3,359,725	3,359,725	+245,048
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	2,515	2,602	2,600	2,602	2,602	+87
Defender services	358,848	440,351	420,338	416,368	435,000	+76,152
Crime trust fund	26,247	.....	.....	.....	.....	-26,247
Fees of jurors and commissioners	60,918	60,821	60,821	59,567	59,567	-1,351
Court security	193,028	215,353	198,265	199,575	199,575	+6,547
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services	3,756,233	4,217,821	4,010,802	4,037,837	4,056,469	+300,236
Administrative Office of the United States Courts						
Salaries and expenses	55,000	61,215	58,340	50,000	58,340	+3,340
Federal Judicial Center						
Salaries and expenses	18,000	19,337	18,777	19,215	18,777	+777
Judicial Retirement Funds						
Payment to Judiciary Trust Funds	39,700	35,700	35,700	35,700	35,700	-4,000
United States Sentencing Commission						
Salaries and expenses	8,500	10,600	9,615	9,931	9,931	+1,431
General Provisions						
Judges pay raise (sec. 309)	9,611	.....	.....	8,801	8,801	-810
Total, title III, the Judiciary	3,959,292	4,421,987	4,207,691	4,236,991	4,263,525	+304,233
Appropriations	(3,776,506)	(4,421,987)	(4,207,691)	(4,236,991)	(4,263,525)	(+487,019)
Crime trust fund	(182,786)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-182,786)
TITLE IV - DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Diplomatic and consular programs	2,569,825	2,694,325	2,679,325	2,875,758	2,758,725	+188,900
Worldwide security upgrade	254,000	410,000	410,000	272,736	410,000	+156,000
Total, Diplomatic and consular programs	2,823,825	3,104,325	3,089,325	3,148,494	3,168,725	+344,900
Capital investment fund	80,000	97,000	79,670	104,000	97,000	+17,000
Office of Inspector General	27,495	29,502	28,490	29,395	28,490	+995
Educational and cultural exchange programs	205,000	225,000	213,771	225,000	231,587	+26,587
Representation allowances	5,850	5,973	5,826	6,773	6,499	+649
Protection of foreign missions and officials	8,100	10,490	8,067	10,490	15,467	+7,367
Embassy security, construction and maintenance	428,561	431,178	416,976	417,104	416,976	-11,585
Worldwide security upgrade	313,617	648,000	648,000	364,900	663,000	+349,383
Advance appropriations, FY 2002 - 2005	.....	3,350,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	5,500	11,000	5,477	11,000	5,477	-23
(By transfer)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	.....
Commission on Holocaust Assets in U.S. (by transfer)	(1,162)	(1,162)	.....	.....	(1,400)	(+238)

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4690) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Repatriation Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy	593	593	591	593	591	-2
Administrative expenses	607	607	604	607	604	-3
(By transfer)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	.....
Total, Repatriation loans program account	1,200	1,200	1,195	1,200	1,195	-5
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan	15,375	16,345	16,345	16,345	16,345	+970
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	128,541	131,224	131,224	131,224	131,224	+2,683
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs	4,043,064	8,061,237	4,644,366	4,465,925	4,781,985	+738,921
Appropriations	(4,043,064)	(4,711,237)	(4,644,366)	(4,465,925)	(4,781,985)	(+738,921)
Advance appropriations	.....	(3,350,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
International Organizations and Conferences						
Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment	885,203	946,060	880,505	879,144	870,833	-14,370
New NATO headquarters	.....	.....	.....	64,800	.....	.....
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year	500,000	738,666	498,100	500,000	846,000	+346,000
Arrearage payments	351,000	.....	.....	102,000	.....	-351,000
Total, International Organizations and Conferences	1,736,203	1,684,726	1,378,605	1,545,944	1,716,833	-19,370
International Commissions						
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:						
Salaries and expenses	19,551	7,142	19,470	7,142	7,142	-12,409
Construction	5,939	26,747	6,415	26,747	22,950	+17,011
American sections, international commissions	5,733	8,891	5,710	6,741	6,741	+1,008
International fisheries commissions	15,549	19,392	15,485	19,392	19,392	+3,843
Total, International commissions	46,772	62,172	47,080	60,022	56,225	+9,453
Other						
Payment to the Asia Foundation	8,250	10,000	8,216	.....	9,250	+1,000
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program, trust fund	465	500	500	500	500	+35
Israeli Arab scholarship program	340	375	375	375	375	+35
East-West Center	12,500	12,500	.....	13,500	13,500	+1,000
North/South Center	1,750	1,750	.....	.....	.....	-1,750
National Endowment for Democracy	31,000	32,000	30,872	30,999	30,999	-1
Total, Department of State	5,880,344	9,865,260	6,110,014	6,117,265	6,609,667	+729,323
Appropriations	(5,880,344)	(6,515,260)	(6,110,014)	(6,117,265)	(6,609,667)	(+729,323)
Advance appropriations	.....	(3,350,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
RELATED AGENCY						
Broadcasting Board of Governors						
International Broadcasting Operations	388,421	405,056	419,777	388,421	398,971	+10,550
Broadcasting to Cuba	22,095	23,456	.....	22,095	22,095	.....
Broadcasting capital improvements	11,258	19,760	18,358	29,060	20,358	+9,100
Worldwide security upgrade	.....	.....	.....	2,015	.....	.....
Total, Broadcasting Board of Governors	421,774	448,272	438,135	441,591	441,424	+19,650
Total, title IV, Department of State	6,302,118	10,313,532	6,548,149	6,558,856	7,051,091	+748,973
Appropriations	(6,302,118)	(6,963,532)	(6,548,149)	(6,558,856)	(7,051,091)	(+748,973)
Advance appropriations	.....	(3,350,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
(By transfer)	(6,162)	(6,162)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(6,400)	(+238)
TITLE V - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Maritime Administration						
Maritime Security Program	96,200	98,700	98,700	98,700	98,700	+2,500
Operations and training	72,073	80,240	84,799	80,240	86,910	+14,837
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:						
Guaranteed loans subsidy	6,000	2,000	10,621	20,221	30,000	+24,000
Administrative expenses	3,809	4,179	3,795	4,179	3,987	+178
Total, Maritime guaranteed loan program account	9,809	6,179	14,416	24,400	33,987	+24,178
Total, Maritime Administration	178,082	185,119	197,915	203,340	219,597	+41,515
Census Monitoring Board						
Salaries and expenses	.....	4,000	.....	.....	.....	.....

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4690) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad						
Salaries and expenses	490	390	390	490	490	.....
Commission on Civil Rights						
Salaries and expenses	8,900	11,000	8,866	8,900	8,900	.....
Commission on Electronic Commerce						
Salaries and expenses	1,400	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,400
Commission on Ocean Policy						
Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	.....	1,000	1,000	+1,000
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe						
Salaries and expenses	1,182	1,370	1,182	1,370	1,370	+188
Congressional/Executive Commission on China						
Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	+500
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission						
Salaries and expenses	282,000	322,000	290,928	294,800	303,864	+21,864
Federal Communications Commission						
Salaries and expenses	210,000	237,188	207,909	237,188	230,000	+20,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-185,754	-200,146	-200,146	-200,146	-200,146	-14,392
Direct appropriation	24,246	37,042	7,763	37,042	29,854	+5,608
Federal Maritime Commission						
Salaries and expenses	14,150	16,222	14,097	16,222	15,500	+1,350
Federal Trade Commission						
Salaries and expenses	125,024	164,600	134,807	159,500	147,154	+22,130
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-21,000	-7,000	-13,709	-1,900	-1,900	+19,100
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-104,024	-157,600	-121,098	-157,600	-145,254	-41,230
Direct appropriation	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Legal Services Corporation						
Payment to the Legal Services Corporation	305,000	340,000	275,000	300,000	330,000	+25,000
Marine Mammal Commission						
Salaries and expenses	1,270	1,400	1,700	1,700	1,700	+430
Securities and Exchange Commission						
Current year fees	173,800	282,800	252,624	194,652	127,800	-46,000
1998 fees	194,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-194,000
1999 fees	.....	140,000	140,000	295,000	295,000	+295,000
Direct appropriation	367,800	422,800	392,624	489,652	422,800	+55,000
Small Business Administration						
Salaries and expenses	292,800	163,000	304,094	143,475	368,635	+75,835
Non-credit business assistance programs	.....	256,050	.....	153,690	.....	.....
Office of Inspector General	11,000	14,315	10,905	13,000	11,953	+953
Business Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy	.....	5,370	2,500	2,600	2,250	+2,250
Guaranteed loans subsidy	137,800	190,460	137,800	162,800	163,160	+25,360
Administrative expenses	129,000	132,525	129,000	130,800	129,000	.....
Total, Business loans program account	266,800	328,355	269,300	296,200	294,410	+27,610
Disaster Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy	140,400	142,100	140,400	142,100	76,140	-64,260
Administrative expenses	136,000	154,000	136,000	139,000	108,354	-27,646
Total, Disaster loans program account	276,400	296,100	276,400	281,100	184,494	-91,906
Total, Small Business Administration	847,000	1,057,820	860,699	887,465	859,492	+12,492
State Justice Institute						
Salaries and expenses 1/	6,850	15,000	4,500	6,850	6,850	.....
(By transfer)	.....	.....	.....	(8,000)	.....	.....

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4690) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
United States Commission on International Religious Freedom						
Salaries and expenses		3,000				
Total, title V, Related agencies	2,038,370	2,417,163	2,055,664	2,248,831	2,201,917	+163,547
TITLE VI - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Section 604				23,000		
TITLE VII - RESCISSIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
Working capital fund (rescission)		-10,000		-76,698		
Legal Activities						
Assets forfeiture fund (rescission)				-96,383		
Federal Bureau of Investigation						
Information sharing initiative (rescission)				-40,000		
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Drug diversion fund (rescission)	-35,000			-8,000	-8,000	+27,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
Immigration emergency fund (rescission)	-1,137					+1,137
DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
International Organizations and Conferences						
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year (rescission)				-212,744		
Broadcasting Board of Governors						
International broadcasting operations (rescission)	-15,516					+15,516
RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Maritime Administration						
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:						
Guaranteed loans subsidy (rescission)			-7,644		-7,644	-7,644
Small Business Administration						
Business Loans Program Account:						
Guaranteed loans subsidy (rescission)	-13,100					+13,100
Total, title VII, Rescissions	-64,753	-10,000	-7,644	-433,825	-15,644	+49,109
TITLE VIII - SOUTHWEST BORDER INITIATIVE						
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
Legal Activities						
United States Marshals Service:						
Direct appropriation (contingent emergency appropriations)				5,268		
Construction (contingent emergency appropriations)				5,625		
Justice prisoner and alien transportation system fund (contingent emergency appropriations)				52,000		
Total, United States Marshals Service				62,893		
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency appropriations)				22,500		
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency appropriations)				67,585		
Construction (contingent emergency appropriations)				254,008		
Total, Immigration and Naturalization Service				321,593		

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4690) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
THE JUDICIARY						
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
Other salaries and expenses (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	4,392	.....	.....
Court security (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	2,562	.....	.....
Total, The Judiciary	.....	.....	.....	6,954	.....	.....
Total, title VIII:						
New budget (obligational) authority	.....	.....	.....	413,940	.....	.....
TITLE IX						
Wildlife conservation and restoration planning	.....	.....	.....	.....	50,000	+50,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority	39,600,967	50,932,968	37,394,617	36,689,955	39,868,390	+267,423
Appropriations	(30,974,654)	(39,651,973)	(37,402,261)	(36,709,840)	(39,884,034)	(+8,909,380)
Emergency appropriations	(4,476,253)	.....	.....	(413,940)	.....	(-4,476,253)
Advance appropriations	.....	(11,290,995)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Rescissions	(-65,940)	(-10,000)	(-7,644)	(-433,825)	(-15,644)	(+50,296)
Crime trust fund	(4,216,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-4,216,000)
(By transfer)	(173,707)	(87,462)	(80,000)	(99,028)	(81,400)	(-92,307)

1/ The President's budget proposed $6.85 million for State Justice Institute.

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

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), a good friend, colleague, and the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me first say that it is for me unfortunate that this is the last time the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) will lead on this bill. Six years ago, the Republican Conference imposed term limits on its Chairs, which now removes the most experienced and knowledgeable member of our subcommittee from its Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman will provide invaluable advice and counsel to his successor, whatever party that may be, and the gentleman may be able to bring his considerable leadership skills to another subcommittee, I am hoping, because the gentleman has been a true friend, a colleague; and the gentleman knows I have the utmost respect for him.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure also to work with the gentleman's staff, our staff; and because time is limited, let me just say to all the staff that I value your advice, your counsel, the work you have done on this bill. I will personally make phone calls to your relatives to tell them why you have not been at home most weekends and most evenings.

I initially supported, Mr. Speaker, this bill, because I felt it was a bill that could get better. This bill is a mixture of good and bad news as we discuss it right now; and I am specifically speaking about the Commerce, Justice, State bill, which I am involved with.

The bill grew and the bill got much better in many areas, where most of us felt it was necessary to do so.

In the Civil Rights division, in the EEOC, in the COPS program, it grew up to a billion dollars; $100 million provided for community prosecutors, $75 million for prosecuting gun crimes, $17 million on the COPS and police integrity grants to support increasing local professionalism, something that we are all very much involved with.

The peacekeeping mission has been fully funded. Trying to bring this bill to where the House and the Senate could agree was not an easy task, but both parties, both sides of the aisle on the issue of numbers were willing to do so; and that is why jointly with the White House we were able to increase funding in so many areas.

The digital divide was addressed.

NOAA will receive substantially more than in the House bill. Now NOAA will receive funding provided for minority-serving institutions.

All of the work that we wanted to put forth on this bill, Mr. Speaker, has been met in the area of numbers. However, and this is a major however, we had a great opportunity to do something through the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act, LIFA. It is language that would, in fact, take care of a disparity that we have in our immigration policy, something that we did before that we could have included other people. It is language that would be fair and humane in dealing with a major problem; and last, but not least, it is language that is so vital to this bill, because without it this bill becomes a veto strategy, rather than a getting-a-bill-signed-into-law strategy.

I would hope that as that veto comes back, and I will vote to sustain that veto, that we can continue to work with my support to make sure that this bill can, in fact, be what it has to be.

First, this is the last time Chairman ROGERS will lead on this bill. Six years ago, the Republican Conference imposed term limits on its Chairs, which now removes the most experienced and knowledgeable Member of our Subcommittee from its chair. I know HAL will provide invaluable advice and counsel to his successor, whatever his party, and he may be able to bring his considerable leadership skills to another Subcommittee. Still, this is an unnecessary change.

It has been a pleasure to work with Chairman ROGERS and the other Members of the Subcommittee, each of whom has contributed so much to developing this legislation.

I also want to congratulate and thank the staff for their dedication and professionalism, and for the many nights and weekends they put in on this conference agreement. The Committee staff, Democratic and Republican alike, and staff in Mr. ROGERS' and my offices have all contributed to this moment. We owe them—and their families, who haven't seen much of them lately—a great deal.

I supported initial House passage of H.R. 4690 because I believed we should keep the bill moving toward the improvements that would surely happen before it could ever become law. I rise now to state that the bill has been substantially improved.

I want to compliment our Chairman on bringing us to this conclusion. The differences between House and Senate were enormous because the priorities were so very different. Just getting to where the House considered Justice funding adequate or the Senate considered Commerce funding adequate took a great deal of work. And that was before the Administration weighed in with its priorities.

Programs I earlier pointed to as underfunded are now in substantially better shape.

Funding has been added for the Civil Rights Division, the EEOC, and the Legal Services Corporation, which will receive an appropriation of $330 million.

The COPS program has gone from a freeze at last year's level to just over $1 billion, and $100 million is provided for community prosecutors, $75 million for prosecuting gun crimes.

I am particularly pleased at the inclusion of $17 million under COPS for police integrity grants to support increasing local police professionalism. This is an area of great interest to me, and I am working with Chairman HYDE to establish a national commission to study police recruitment, hiring, training, oversight, and use of force policies and make recommendations to Congress.

The Administration's requests for trade enforcement have been fully funded and the Department's ability to collect the vital statistical data on which our economy depends has been strengthened. Funds are now provided to help bridge the ''digital divide'' between the information age's ''haves'' and ''have nots''.

And NOAA will receive substantially more than in the House bill for its critical work on weather, the health of our air and water, our coasts and oceans, and so much more. Moreover, funding has been provided for NOAA's Minority Serving Institutions initiative, to create a pool of minority scientists in the scientific disciplines NOAA needs.

The peacekeeping request is fully funded, and restrictions on payment of our U.N. dues are modified to reduce the harm they would have caused.

In addition, every effort was made to accommodate as many Member requests as possible out of the thousands received.

There remain problems, of course, including serious language issues that threaten this entire package with a veto.

Failure to include the provisions of the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act (LIFA), despite the President's intention, repeated yesterday, to veto the bill if those issues are not resolved is simply a waste of time. All it will do is add a couple of days to the time we must remain in Washington trying to finish our work for the year.

I am also deeply distressed by the provision that interferes with the FCC's low-power FM initiative, which would be of such value to schools, churches, and community groups in areas such as the South Bronx. In addition, language added in the dark of night that is supposed to improve rural television service abandons a bipartisan agreement reached just this week and gives the advantage to existing cable monopolists.

The bill includes new appropriations of $420 million for coastal impact assistance and other ocean and coastal conservation programs, built on what the Interior bill contained. These additional funds are intended to increase resources for protection, conservation, and restoration of fragile coastal habitat areas, but the other body skewed the distribution away from strengthening national conservation programs and toward funding numerous parochial projects.

While restrictions on the Justice Department's ability to move funds around to pursue its tobacco litigation have been modified, none of the $23 million for the lawsuit is provided directly.

Finally, the ''Amy Boyer'' provisions, far from protecting our Social Security Numbers from display or sale on the Internet, make them far more widely available to commercial concerns.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at how far we have come in improving the base bill, and I am confident that the language issues will be worked out, although a negotiating strategy would be far preferable to a veto strategy. If the President does veto the bill, as expected, I will vote to sustain his veto. In any case, I look forward to the eventual enactment of the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa

(Mr. LATHAM), a distinguished member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary.

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

□ 1815

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I just wanted to take a minute, first of all, to thank our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) who has had extraordinary wisdom and knowledge and leadership on this bill, and there is no one in the House that I have more admiration for, and I appreciate his very kind consideration and leadership on the committee. It is truly appreciated not only by myself, but by people in my district and in the State of Iowa.

Also, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) is a very dear friend, and I have the greatest respect for the ranking member and I want to thank him for all his help. If the staff here looks a little sleepy, it is because they probably have not gotten any sleep the last couple of evenings.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very good bill with a lot of work in it. I am, in particular, very appreciative of the fact that we were able to increase funding for the methamphetamine training center in Sioux City, Iowa, to be able to expand that program that has been of vital assistance to local law enforcement throughout the four-State region. It is extremely important, and that great work is going to continue because of this bill. The local law enforcement block grant, which has helped so many of our small communities, which are fighting the battle, in particular in the upper Midwest with methamphetamines today, it is very, very important. The cleanup funds that are in this bill, as far as the labs out there, are extraordinarily important.

So I just wanted to thank the chairman and the ranking member, and all of the staff on both sides. I think this is a very, very good bill; and I hope everyone will pull together and pass the bill.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the President's veto message, he said, regrettably, this bill does not include needed protections against the inappropriate sale and display of individual citizen's Social Security numbers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) to explain the President's objection in this regard to this bill.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Let me begin by complimenting the Republicans in the House on their work on protecting Social Security numbers so that they are not trafficked in American commerce. Unfortunately, I cannot say the same thing for the United States Senate; and they have attached a rider to the legislation which, unfortunately, makes it possible for us to move this kind of Social Security information into national commerce.

Now, the Committee on Ways and Means, led by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), has been doing a fabulous job in ensuring that the Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives in the House, where the liberal left meets the libertarian right, we are all going to do something to deal with the issue of Amy Boyer whose name was purchased for $45 by a stalker; created a Web site, this stalker; and then ultimately killed Amy Boyer using the Social Security which he purchased for $45.

Now, I say to my colleagues, what are we talking about in this amendment that has come over from the Senate? We are talking about taking this concern and riddling it with loopholes.

Now, every one of us gets a Social Security number when we are 16, when we are 17, in the United States, and this Social Security number increasingly has become our personal identifier. Now, what does it say on the back of the Social Security card? It says, ''Improper use of this card and/or number by the number-holder or any other person is punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both.'' Or both.

Now, what does the bill before us do? It says it is going to help the problem about Amy Boyer. What does it do? It takes this protection which we have always had and it amends it. It amends it by doing this. It puts right here the word ''not.'' That is, it is not punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both. It riddles it with exemptions. It says this: If you are a credit reporting agency, you are exempted from the restrictions of the bill. If you are a big bank, if you are a life insurance company or a Wall Street brokerage firm, you are exempt from the provisions. If you are a professional or commercial user, you can sell it to other businesses, but not to the general public. If you are a company engaged in any activity which the banking regulators have determined to be complementary to a financial activity, such as running a travel agency, you are exempt. You can sell the Social Security information. If you obtain someone's Social Security number from a public record, a driver's license, a court filing, a real estate document, you can sell it to anyone you want.

What is left, I ask my colleagues? What protections will Americans have if we allow this kind of codification of basically trafficking in Social Security numbers in our country?

Mr. Speaker, I regret that this bill is coming to the House floor today with a number of unrelated legislative ''riders'' attached to it. This is not the way Congress should conduct its business.

Chief among these unrelated provisions are two problematic measures which have not gone through the normal legislative process. These two measures are those addressing low power FM radio as well as a measure establishing a program of loan guarantees for local television distribution for rural areas.

The language addressing the rural loan guarantee program was developed solely by Republicans. I would have hoped that we could have developed a sound compromise—just as we did when the House originally passed this rural loan bill earlier this year. Unfortunately, the Republican majority has decided not to work with concerned Democrats to develop a more consensus bill.

This is especially unfortunate because as I just mentioned the original version of the bill that passed the House back in April at least had been developed with both Republicans and Democrats at the table. From a procedural standpoint therefore the loan guarantee bill's appearance as a rider on the appropriations bill today on the House floor highly objectionable. The House had a bipartisan agreement on this measure the last time it was considered and the House Republicans seem willing to disrupt the compromise that had already been established—a provision which had both industry and consumer support.

As for the substance of this new bill it departs from the original House bill and guts key provisions that were adopted in the Commerce Committee that instilled a preference for competition. This bill will not only run the risk of subsidizing large media companies who do not need taxpayer subsidies, it has now been changed so that incumbent cable companies who already provide local TV stations can get a taxpayer subsidy as well. This makes no sense as a public policy.

Why on earth should incumbent cable companies get a subsidy to do that which they should be doing anyway—or that they already have plans to do with private capital?

The legislative effort underway stems from the debate we had in the previous session of Congress on amendments to the Satellite Home Viewer Act which spurred the deployment of local-to-local service from direct to home satellite providers. Satellite-delivered local-to-local service promises to extend to millions of consumers much needed competition in the multichannel video marketplace.

When Congress was considering legislation last year, it was clear that the two existing DBS companies would not be providing local-to-local service beyond the top markets in the most populated areas of the country. The legislation before us today was prompted by a desire to extend the local-to-local service that urban America was going to receive to rural communities as well. The effort to do so is built upon America's experience in extending electricity and phone service to rural towns and hamlets.

I have long supported the universal service concept that ensures that the poor as well as rural Americans do not fall behind and that they can receive the basic essential services that more affluent, urban Americans do at affordable prices.

The problem with this new version of the bill however is that it would permit taxpayer backed loans to go to incumbent companies. If people can already get local TV stations from a cable operator, then the government doesn't need to get involved to extend service to that area in the same way that we extended

electricity and phone service to areas that otherwise wouldn't get it. The cable guy is already there.

Consumers in that area, however, may understandably want an alternative to the cable operator, perhaps one they can use in conjunction with their satellite dish. If we are proposing to extend loan guarantees to provide *alternatives* to the local TV service rural consumers already receive from an incumbent, it makes zero sense in my view to permit the very same incumbents to be eligible for loans.

If the incumbent monopoly already provides local TV stations to a community, then rural consumers in that community are choosing not to subscribe to that service for some reason. That reason is most likely price. Why would Congress ask these rural citizens for their taxpayer dollars to subsidize the only choice in town they don't want anyway?

To do so would stand competitive telecommunications policy on its head—rather than addressing the lack of competition or lingering concern about affordable cable rates, we're proposing to allow the sole multichannel provider in a rural area a chance to solidify their position with help from the Federal government—and I might add without any obligation from the loan recipient to price the subsidized monopoly service to consumers affordably.

I wish this loan guarantee provision had been handled differently. I wish we would have named conferees and worked out our disagreements with the Senate. We had all summer long to do so. We could have done it on a bipartisan basis.

Instead, Democrats have not been fully included in the negotiations leading to this version of the bill and the provisions is a far worse measure than what passed the House previously.

Here's the problem with the language in the current version of the bill. The language in the bill says: ''that no loan guarantee under this Act may be granted or used to provide funds for a project that extends, upgrades, or enhances the services provided over any cable system to an area that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is covered by a cable franchise agreement that expressly obligates a cable system operator to serve such area.''

The original House bill did not require franchising authorities to have provisions in franchise agreements that ''expressly'' regulated able buildout schedules to serve all of the geographic areas of a franchise. This may significantly undercut the applicability of the prohibition on subsidizing incumbent companies because many franchise agreements may not have explicit build-out requirements.

More importantly, the new version applies only to franchise agreements in effect as of the date of enactment of the Act.

In other words, when the franchise agreement expires next month, or six months from now, or a year from now, an incumbent cable operator is eligible for taxpayer-backed loans under any ''new'' franchise—because it's not the one in effect on the date of enactment. It's a loophole.

Tying the prohibition only to existing franchise agreements—which are of limited duration—essentially guts the prohibition for every expired or newly re-negotiated franchise agreement. Again, the House-passed version kept a preference for competition, had the acceptance of affected small cable operators in the industry, had the support of consumer groups, and established a broad consensus throughout the House. Today, the Senate-crafted language achieves none of those benefits. It's bad for competition, bad for consumers, and unfair to taxpayers.

The Commerce, Justice, State bill also includes a provision delaying low power FM radio. This was a very controversial measure when the House considered it and I don't believe it is appropriate to attach it as a rider to this appropriations measure.

We need to first keep in context that this new low power FM service comes in the aftermath of the rapid, and in my view, unhealthy consolidation of radio properties across this nation. Before the Telecommunications Act of 1996, the maximum number of radio stations that an individual could own in a local market was 2 FM and 2 AM stations, and nationally, a person could own up to 40 radio stations. Right now the top 4 radio groups own 512 stations, 443 stations, 248 stations, and 163 stations respectively, and assuming its pending merger gets approved, Clear Channel will own over 800 radio stations nationally. The low power FM bill is a modest effort to bring new voices into our media mix, in a community-oriented, non-commercial service.

The Federal Communications Commission is always at its best when it takes the public's airwave resources and works to make more efficient use of that spectrum for the public. The effort underway is to supplement what already exists, not supplant or interfere in any harmful way with existing services.

The stated reason for bringing this bill to the floor today is fear of harmful interference. We're not talking about interference on home stereo systems, nor about interference concerns for car radios, where there is consensus that there will be little to no harm . . . . but rather, potentially harmful interference—within a small area—perhaps for clock radios or portable walkman-style radios.

Usually when there are disputes about frequency interference we defer to the FCC. This is the job, after all, that the FCC has been doing, and doing well, for decades. The Commission is in the process of addressing many of the concerns raised about interference and has announced plans to receive applications for the service initially in 10 States. As low power FM is deployed we will know whether there is harmful interference because consumers will let us know.

Since the late 1960s, some 300 radio stations around the country have operated within the 3rd adjacent channel proposed for low power FM. These ''close proximity'' stations were grandfathered in 1997 by the FCC. We didn't have any hearings about it, we didn't hear a peep from a single broadcaster about interference issues, and I don't remember a single Member of Congress or a consumer raising concerns about interference issues from any of those stations—which, as opposed to the proposed service, are full power radio stations.

In short, I don't think we need legislation in this area at all, either to stop the program or to belabor FCC engineers to study over and over again a technology that is the oldest and most familiar service to them. This isn't rocket science or some new whiz-bang technologically-sophisticated service or a hitherto unutilized frequency allocation . . . . it's just radio.

If people have concerns, the FCC can continue to look into resolving them. If serious problems do in fact arise from the new service, there are already existing remedies at the Commission to address interference issues. I would prefer that the House put this legislation on the back burner, let the Commission do its job, and return to this legislative proposal at a later date, when and if it's necessary. I urge members to vote ''no'' on this bill.

There are some 300 stations around the country—high power radio stations—that were grandfathered in 1997 and have operated many of them since the late 1960s within the 2nd and 3rd adjacent channel limits.

Who complains about those stations? No one has ever come up to me to complain about harmful interference on WBCN Boston, WMJX Boston or any of the 15 stations in Massachusetts that operate within these limits on HIGH POWER stations. It's inconceivable that low power stations really pose a threat here.

Around the country there are other stations operating in these limits without provoking consumer reaction—such as: KCBS in Los Angeles; KLAX in Long Beach California; KBCD in Newport Beach California; KYCY in San Francisco. . . . Or any of the 50 high power radio stations in California, or The 24 stations in Illinois, or The 25 radio stations in North Carolina, or The 28 radio stations in Ohio, or The 24 in New York and 17 in New Jersey and so on that today operate within the so-called 3rd adjacent channel.

There aren't any complaints. If there's a concern about interference from low power stations—shouldn't the legislation also analyze the logically more apparent interference from these high power stations? The bill doesn't ask the Commission to look at those stations however. Why? Because they are incumbents. They already got theirs.

This legislation is unnecessary and again, if harmful interference does arise in a particular area, the Commission has a long history with radio and a long history of mitigating interference affects.

There are other problems in this bill.

I have spent considerable time talking about how this bill would strip the American people of their privacy protections. Well the appropriators didn't stop there. They decided to see what protections they could strip from our national parks as well.

Tucked way down in this bill is an exemption for Cuyahoga Valley National Park. The exemption would keep this national park from being afforded the highest possible clean air standards allowed under the Clean Air Act. Let me remind you, we just designated this area as a national park in the Interior Bill we passed a few weeks ago. So this Congress thinks the best way to protect our natural resources is to designate a national park one week and strip away its protections the next.

That's like buying a brand new car that has all the latest safety features: an airbag, motion detection systems, and the best seatbelts. Then just before you let your son drive it, you drain all the brake fluid. That's not the way to make your car safe. But that's how this Congress wants to protect your national parks.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), one of the more studious Members of this body.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me

this time and for his leadership on this. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) for raising the issue of the Social Security numbers in that provision of this bill.

Let me tell the gentleman from Massachusetts that I agree with his concern that this is a poorly drafted provision that could do more harm than good, and this is a Senate provision that was added. But I think we have to put this in perspective. Even though I have strong reservations about that, there are such extraordinary good parts, important parts to this bill that it deserves supporting. I have had the assurance of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the subcommittee, that this will be remedied when it comes back, or in the next Congress, and to me, that is good enough. We are going to come back, we are going to correct this problem, we are aware of this problem, but do not vote against the bill because of this one problem that the Senate added.

The reason is that because we have an increase in the DEA funding, the FBI funding, U.S. Attorneys for fighting violent crime and drugs. The methamphetamine provisions are critically important, the Violence Against Women Act provisions, the civil assistance provisions are critically important. We will remedy the privacy problem. Please support this bill.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the indefatigable, irrefutable and indomitalbe Democratic leader of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is getting pretty deep in here.

Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken once on this bill earlier today, and I would simply make three points again for reinforcement purposes.

The first problem with this bill is that it does not treat human beings equally with respect to immigration. In my view, it continues a vicious discrimination between the way we treat groups from one country versus another country in this hemisphere. That alone is reason enough to defeat the bill.

The second reason is that this Congress, it can deny it all it wants, but this Congress has, in my view, for the past 15 years systematically chipped away at the right of privacy for each and every American. I remember when Barry Goldwater, Jr. was on the floor and with myself, we were pushing for legislation to preserve the integrity of the Social Security number so that it would not be used in the beginning steps as an identifier. The last time I looked, Barry Goldwater, Jr. was not a radical, left-wing socialist. We had an agreement between conservatives and progressives and liberals and moderates that that number should remain private and inviolate. This Congress this session has taken several actions that weaken that right; and this bill takes another action today, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has indicated, and for that reason alone, this bill ought to be defeated.

Thirdly, this bill started out to provide protection for our coastal lands, our precious coastal lands. Instead, because of its refusal to add one sentence to the bill, one critical sentence, it now guarantees that projects, construction projects in our precious coastal areas will be able to be built even if they do not meet environmental standards. So a bill which started out to protect our coastal areas is now becoming a bill that will degrade our coastal areas.

Lastly, we have taken the most important remaining water pollution problem before us, nonpoint source pollution, and instead of giving the States the help they need to work up plans to deal with that problem, this bill provides a piddly $10 million out of a multibillion dollars bill. That is not enough for any State to do the work that needs to be done in order to protect our precious natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I urge, for those reasons, defeat of this bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), a hard-working member of our subcommittee.

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

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

I rise in support of this bill. There are a number of very good features in it. It provides State and local law enforcement officials the necessary resources to bring down the level of crime.

Secondly, it funds the international trade functions of the government at the necessary levels to open foreign export markets to U.S. goods, and, at the same time, protecting domestic industry against unfair foreign trading practices.

Thirdly, it protects our interests at home and abroad by funding counterterrorism measures and embassy security measures at increased levels. I think, in view of the events in the last several weeks, that becomes even more important.

Fourthly, it funds the JASON project, which is the cutting edge in long-distance learning. It is a tremendous tool, and I think we will find that more and more of our schools will use the facilities of JASON.

I also want to thank the chairman for including report language for the Census Bureau that makes the expedited steel import monitoring program more effective. The early warning system allows domestic manufacturers to have information on steel imports on a more timely basis.

Lastly, I noticed a typographical error, alloy steel should say alloy tool steel.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the District of Columbia Appropriations for fiscal year 2001, which also includes the agreement for funding the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill. As a member of the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Subcommittee, I would like to commend the Chairman for putting together a bill which:

(1) provides our state and local law enforcement officials the necessary resources to continue to bring down the level of crime in this nation, (2) funds the international trade functions of the government at the necessary levels to open foreign export markets to U.S. goods, but also to protect domestic industry against unfair foreign trading practices; and (3) protects our interests at home and abroad by funding counter-terrorism measures and embassy security measures at increased levels.

I thank the Chairman for continuing the important partnership between the JASON project and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) that encourages middle school students to pursue their education in the sciences. The JASON project is a state-of-the-art education program that brings scientists into classrooms through advanced interactive telecommunications technology.

Last spring one of the sites of the electronic field trip for students was NOAA's Aquarius Underwater Laboratory off of the Florida Keys. Our students need an effective science education in order for the U.S. to keep its competitive edge in the global marketplace. I also want the thank the Chairman for including report language for the Census Bureau that makes the expedited steel import monitoring program more effective. This early warning system allows domestic manufacturers to have information on steel imports on a more timely basis. It is critical that this program provides the necessary trade statistics as we once again face near-record levels of steel imports this year. I noticed that there was a typographical error in the report language. The two new specialty steel categories are: alloy tool steel and silicon electrical steel. The word "tool" was inadvertently left out of the report.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Resources, to discuss the anti-environmental riders in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin raised the issue of the coastal zone and the inadequate funding in this legislation so that those States on our coast will have the ability to put in place the programs that they have now developed over many, many years, expending a lot of money to protect the coastal zone and to make sure that that coastal zone, which is of great importance to 50 percent of the population in this Nation and to the jobs that are related to marine coastal zone, the commercial and recreational fishing activities that take place there, and the economy that is driven by the economy of that area can properly be protected.

One of the major assaults on the coastal zone and on the economy and on the use of the coastal resources is nonpoint source pollution. This legislation just completely inadequately deals with that problem. Polluted runoff closes shellfish beds and increases harmful algae blooms and dead zones; it closes beaches and causes fish contamination advisories and much more that we now have to put up on a weekly and daily basis in the coastal zones on the East Coast and the Gulf Coast and on the West Coast of the United States. It is the single biggest problem dealing with water quality, whether it is in the Chesapeake Bay or whether it is in Puget Sound or San Francisco Bay or Santa Monica Bay. We now have dead zones that extend off of the Gulf of Mexico that are thousands and thousands of square miles that are creating dead zones in the area, killing off the fish, killing off any kind of economic activity that can take place there.

In my own State of California, officials in California closed beaches 3,273 times in the State of California. Certainly, last summer's economic disaster in Huntington Beach, California, which was a direct result of beach closure due to water contamination from polluted runoff, underscores the kinds of problems that we were hoping that this legislation would, in fact, deal with; the continued problems of runoff from logging areas from the interior parts of our States and other States throughout the coastal zone in California.

We were poised to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act and the Federal statute that regulates these activities and provides for the States to develop the plans. The States, many of them, have been fully qualified, as is the State of California, to now go forward with these plans, and yet this legislation is so meager on its resources for those activities that we will be unable to do so.

□ 1830

This is a huge, huge segment of the environment of the United States. In just the State of California, we have over 1,600 miles of shoreline and 645,000 acres of estuaries, harbors, and bays.

We have industries that are totally dependent upon this situation: the recreation, the tourism industry. We now have beaches that have been closed for 6 to 12 weeks and a number of beaches that have been closed permanently.

This legislation is inadequate. It ought to be rejected. We ought to turn this legislation down and go back and get the kinds of funds that are necessary to protect the coastal zones of the United States of America.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. I want to commend the two subcommittee chairmen for reporting the bill under the budget caps. If it were a clean bill, I would support it. Unfortunately, there was a rider that has been attached from the other body dealing with privacy that is an almost total rollback of privacy protection for our Social Security numbers.

The Gregg amendment, as amended in the Senate, which was added to this legislation last Thursday night in the dead of night, with no public debate that I can find, creates four new exceptions for the use of Social Security numbers for commercial uses.

These four exceptions are so large that one can literally drive a truck through them. I do not think we need to be adding more ability to use our Social Security numbers under the guise of trying to protect the use of Social Security numbers.

For that reason, I am very, very much against this bill, and I ask Members to vote against the bill.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining for each party controlling?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I will speak to one provision of the bill that I am very concerned about and I wish it had not been placed in the bill, which is a bill that I, even despite this provision, intend to vote for. However, I am very concerned about this particular provision, and that is the one that we have heard the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) just speak about it.

The provision that was put in this bill gives some legitimacy for the use of Social Security numbers other than the intended use, and that is by the Internal Revenue Service and by the Social Security Administration.

Right now, there is a commerce in this country on selling Social Security numbers. One can go to the Net, and one can buy Social Security numbers. This is a personal thing.

We know of the terrible crime regarding Amy Boyer. She was killed in New Hampshire by a stalker. I know that the Senator who placed this in the bill had her in mind by putting the provisions in there, but the provisions just simply do not address that question and actually gives legitimacy where it is not deserved.

As I understand, the stalker there bought her Social Security number off of the Internet for $45 and then was able to locate them.

We have a bipartisan solution. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) and I have filed this bill. It has been through the Committee on Ways and Means. That is H.R. 4857, the Social Security Number Privacy and Identity Theft Prevention Act of 2000. This bill restricts the sale and public display of Social Security numbers in both the public and the private sectors. It enhances the privacy rules that apply to Social Security numbers contained in credit reports so that they are less accessible to the public.

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

Mr. SHAW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, let me assure the gentleman that we will work with him and others to improve the language in the bill. I assure the gentleman that his interest will be protected.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for saying that because there is widespread jurisdiction of this particular bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), who spoke earlier before the Committee on Commerce, he and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) have expressed great interest in this. In fact, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) has been working on this thing for some time.

Banking also has a piece of it. So it is not as simple as just getting it through the Committee on Ways and Means. It does have this multiple jurisdiction.

It is my intention at the beginning of the next Congress to file this bill again. I will be again looking across the aisle to get cosponsors and get assistance on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, he can count me as one of the original sponsors of the bill.

Mr. SHAW. The gentleman from Kentucky is on it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the very distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill because it misses an opportunity to have fairness in our immigration policy.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), the distinguished chairperson of the Hispanic Caucus in the Congress, who will explain specifically why we so strongly object to not including the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act in the bill.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, first of all, as a member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary, I would like to associate myself with the comments that

were made by other members of the committee and thank the chairman for his fairness and his friendship. That is one reason that I regretfully rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4942.

Well, there are numerous problems with this bill, and I think the previous speakers have highlighted many of them. I will address one specifically glaring failure.

H.R. 4942 does not include key provisions that would bring fairness and justice to thousands of immigrant families wronged by changes in our immigration laws in the 1990s, changes that have caused families to live in a state of limbo for far too long.

The Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act, or LIFA as it is known, is designed to help families stay together. The importance of including the provisions of LIFA in this bill, I believe, is highlighted best in the story of Sarah Marie Caro, a young woman from Southern California.

Sarah Marie Caro was born in Mexico and was adopted by her U.S.-citizen parents when she was 4 years old. She grew up as an American believing in the values of this country. She learned English, was an honor role student at her public high school and participated in the marching band. She is now 19 years old and is currently studying at a community college to become a teacher.

Last year, while preparing for a family vacation, she applied for a U.S. passport. That is when her world began to fall apart. Sarah Marie was notified that she was ineligible for a U.S. passport because she was an illegal immigrant. Her parents who are U.S. citizens mistakenly thought that Sarah would automatically become a citizen through her court adoption; and, therefore, they never applied to adjust her immigration status.

Sarah has the legal right to her green card as the child of U.S. citizens. But without the protections provided by LIFA, this 19-year-old tragically is left with only two options: one, to remain in the United States illegally and to be part of a permanent underground population; or, two, to leave her family and all she has known for most of her life and go to a strange country for as long as 10 years.

Sarah's plight, and the plight of many deserving immigrants in this country, must be addressed. We must honor our Nation's values of keeping families together, not tearing them apart.

To address the crisis facing families like Sarah Marie, and there are many, it is critical that this bill include the provisions of LIFA, such as 245(i), which was originally in the Senate version of the Commerce, Justice bill and dropped in conference.

Until then, I regretfully must ask my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 4942.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for being sure that legislation that I introduced, along with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), is included in this legislation.

This is legislation that millions of Americans have been waiting a long time to see, and that is legislation to make sure that satellite owners, millions of satellite dish owners, have the opportunity to have on their satellite dish their local news, weather, sports, emergency information, community affairs information, and end the frustration that they have had, that the satellite dish companies have had, and the local television stations have had of trying to find a way to accommodate people who want to be able to receive their major broadcast networks, NBC, CBS, ABC, Fox, in some instances public television.

They cannot get it right now because only in major metropolitan areas are the local television stations signals being put up on satellite. This legislation is going to enable every single television station in all 211 television markets in the country to have that local station put up on satellite so that folks can get not only their major network programming but also their local news, weather, sports, and other information.

This will encompass more than 170 television markets that are not going to be put up under the current legislative authority that they now have. The major markets like New York and Chicago and Los Angeles, here in Washington, D.C., they get it now; but for millions and millions of American families, they will not.

But I thank the gentleman. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, which includes the launching of our Communities Access to Local Television Act of 2000.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), our very distinguished leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this combined District of Columbia and Commerce, Justice, State appropriations conference report, a conference report the Republicans decided to put together in a partisan way in the middle of the night last night.

The provisions on the District of Columbia are fine, and we could have supported them. But the other side insisted on putting forward a Commerce, Justice bill without the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act and without the bipartisan hate crimes legislation that both Houses and Congress have supported.

This is a bill without fairness and without justice, and that is a shame. This could have been a good bill and could have gotten strong bipartisan support, a bill that could have lifted up millions of people in this country.

Instead, this legislation does not include the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act, the only act that would fix several unfair provisions in our immigration laws. LIFA would have afforded Central American and other immigrants the same treatment Nicaraguans and Cubans previously received. It would have let people stay here with their families, while applying for an adjustment in their status. It would have updated our laws so immigrants who came here before 1986 could stay.

But Republicans inserted watered-down language that denies parity to Central American and other immigrants who have not had the same opportunities to become citizens given to Nicaraguans and Cubans.

□ 1845

It does not do enough to allow people to pay a fee and stay in the United States with their families while applying for an adjustment in their immigration status, and it does not let people apply for citizenship who arrived here before 1986.

This conference report could have made an important advance in civil rights. Instead, a small group of lawmakers decided once again to thwart the bipartisan will of this Congress and the will of a majority of the American people by refusing to include hate crimes legislation. Law enforcement officers would have had the enhanced tools they need to investigate and prosecute these awful crimes. We could have sent a strong message that crimes committed against people simply because of their race, gender, ability, or sexual orientation are evil and offensive. We could have strengthened the values we as a people hold dear: human respect, tolerance, and understanding.

Further, this conference report denies the Justice Department the funding it needs to pursue tobacco companies in court, and it provides inadequate language that does little to protect the privacy of Social Security numbers and prevent them from being bought and sold. Amy Boyer was stalked and killed by a man who purchased her Social Security number over the Internet, and there is no reason why we cannot stop another similar tragedy with tougher protections.

So this bill is an insult to the legislative process. The Republicans have made no effort to address issues that would have secured Democratic support and the President's approval. The President has said he will veto this conference report. I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation. Let us go back to work in a bipartisan way to resolve these important issues. That is what the American people expect us to do, and we should not let them down.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am not the chairman of the authorizing committee that writes the laws for immigration or naturalization. One would think that this bill, from the comments of the last speaker, is the committee that writes authorizing legislation. We are not that. We are the committee that appropriates the funds for the various agencies that we cover.

If we were the authorizing committee, we could entertain all sorts of authorizing legislation such as the gentleman has just mentioned. But we have an authorizing committee, and the chairman of that subcommittee will speak momentarily, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH). He does not like the fact that this bill, the appropriation bill, sometimes tries to authorize in his jurisdiction.

The minority leader has just made a great case that he needs to present to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the Committee on the Judiciary where those issues belong. We are the appropriators. We are not the authorizers. Give us a break.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to clarify that amendments to section 424 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act are not intended to limit the authority granted to the District of Columbia's Water and Sewer Authority in the District of Columbia to maintain and otherwise independently manage the Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund, create separate District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority benefits, payroll, financial, and budgetary systems, or to implement and manage a separate procurement system. Is that the chairman's understanding?

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. The gentleman from Virginia is correct, that is my understanding.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. I thank the chairman for his support and cooperation.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to make a telling point.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished subcommittee chairman, after we have seen the majority try to attach literally dozens and dozens of authorization provisions, he now says, oh, we could not act on the immigration problem because it is an authorizing issue. This committee has been willing to authorize to shred privacy, but it is not willing to authorize in order to protect human dignity. I think that is a telling difference.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), the sponsor of the three provisions of the Latino and Immigrant Fairness proposal.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the aisle they continue to claim that the Democrats' Latino and Immigrant Fairness proposal is dangerous, radical, unprecedented. It is an amnesty, they say.

Well, where have they been? Clearly, they have forgotten American history, the history of a Nation built by and defended by immigrants. What is surprising is they do not even remember their own recent Republican record.

In 1997, this Republican-led Congress did the right thing and granted amnesty to tens of thousands of Nicaraguan and Cuban refugees authored by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH). That is the same relief we seek today for refugees who entered the U.S. from the same region for the same reasons at the same period of time. Why can we not give to Hondurans, Guatamalans, Salvadorans, and, yes, Haitians, the same protections we were able to give, led by this Republican-controlled Congress? They forget their history.

Where were they, those who claim today that this is unprecedented, when this House voted in 1997 to instruct the conferees to extend 245(i)? I am sure the chairman remembers when we won that vote. Why did he have that vote? Because the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), both my friends, demanded a vote. And they lost the vote, big time. Why did they lose the vote? Because Republicans and Democrats joined together to say immigrant families should stay together. And then a closed-door back-room deal killed it after we won it right here on the House floor.

And where were they when President Ronald Reagan signed a broad 1986 legalization bill? Did they protest? Did they claim he was coddling criminal aliens? No, they honored Reagan and idolized him, even today naming a post office for him. Not only are Latino and immigrant fairness proposals consistent with American values, they are consistent with policies when they serve the GOP that they have wholeheartedly supported.

Let us do the right thing. My colleagues have done it before; let us do it again. Name the post office for Ronald Reagan and follow the law he signed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would prefer that Members remain within the time constraints on debate yielded to them.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection in the House.

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the subcommittee Chairs and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for their work on this effort.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is perhaps the most notable for what is not in the bill than perhaps what is. One of the measures that is not in it contained a Senate provision that, under the guise of spending restrictions, would have changed governing law and abrogated U.S. commitments to open worldwide telecommunications markets, and it was wisely kept out of this bill.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials of the Committee on Commerce, the absence of any legislative riders pertaining to our Nation's securities laws was also most appreciated. This is going to have to wait until the next legislative session, when I hope I can work together with the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, on this issue.

There are two significant matters pertaining to this bill that have actually been considered under regular order and passed by the Committee on Commerce and House in overwhelming margins. The first is the Local TV Act that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) had talked about. This measure also includes a provision that I advocated, along with the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), requiring an independent test of interference caused by terrestrial video services sharing the DBS band. It is very important to determine once and for all whether that interference causes problems with satellite television.

Finally, the bill includes the provisions of my measure, H.R. 3439, the Radio Broadcasting Preservation Act. For all those reasons and more, I strongly support this legislation.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the District of Columbia and Commerce, Justice, State conference report for some very parochial reasons. Specifically, I rise in support of the $1.25 billion Federal loan guarantee that this report provides for companies who wish to provide local satellite and cable services to our rural areas.

Earlier this year, my district received direct hits from a series of tornadoes. More than a dozen people were killed and hundreds were left homeless as a result of the tragedy. It has been reported that these tornadoes were perhaps the worst in Georgia history. The outcome of these tornadoes may not have been so devastating if my constituents could have accessed our local weather service.

The passage of last year's Satellite Home Viewer Act did eliminate a legal obstacle, but there are still some financial hurdles. As we know, the satellite companies claim that they are unable to provide local service to all 210 markets.

Mr. Speaker, the people in my district need to be able to access their local channels in order to be aware of any emergencies. Today's report will perhaps put an end to those financial hurdles that prevent that and open up the satellite market to the majority of Americans and make satellite and cable TV available for the local people in my area, particularly in areas like those that were hit by the tornado in Mitchell and Grady Counties earlier this year on February 14.

Mr. Speaker, I would like you to understand that my district is one of the many districts that cannot receive its local broadcasting. This issue is of vital importance to my district. After the storm, I have received numerous complaints from my constituents stating that they were unaware of the dangerous storm and unable to properly prepare for its arrival. If they were able to view their local stations, perhaps some lives might have been saved.

In fact, they only plan to provide local broadcast service to the top 30 to 60 markets. The two viewing areas, of Thomasville and Albany, located in my district are ranked 114 and 148 in the market, respectively. Given this, my district would not receive their local broadcasting via satellites.

Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate passage of this Conference Report.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, let us find out how much time each side has, and perhaps the Chair might share with me who has the right to close as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) has 6½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) has 1 minute remaining, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) has the right to close.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and myself, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the chairman.

We understand the chairman placed $.5 million for the Congressional-Executive Commission on China. As the gentleman knows, it will not be operating for much of the year because we need to staff it up. I understand the gentleman has looked at it and considers this is not a benchmark for fiscal year 2002, but that perhaps the gentleman's staff is in agreement that it would take approximately $1.3 million for the upcoming fiscal year 2002.

Is my understanding correct on that matter?

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from southwest Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER).

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

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I also rise in support of this conference agreement, primarily because it contains the Local Signal Act and is the only opportunity by which the residents of rural America and the small- and medium-sized cities around the Nation will have the opportunity to receive by their satellite dishes the new local-into-local television service.

I introduced the original version of this measure with my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE). It serves a very urgent local need for rural Americans, and because this conference agreement contains that provision, I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

□ 1900

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I sit on the Committee on the Judiciary. I would like to respond to the issue of the Latino Immigration Fairness Act and the authorizing committee.

We made every effort to respond to this issue in the authorizing committee, but we were denied by the Republican majority. I would like to support this legislation. It is an important piece of legislation. But I think it is important to reunite families, the same as we did for Eastern European families a few years ago.

This legislation now is the only vehicle to be able to answer the concerns of Haitians, Hondurans and Guatemalans and others who were left out. We need parity.

In addition, this is the only vehicle that we can support the Hate Crimes legislation that has been denied to many States in this country. I think James Byrd, Jr.'s, heinous murderous deceased condition obviously warrants us passing both the Hate Crimes legislation and, as well, this legislation with the Immigration Fairness Act included.

I ask for my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my outrage that this House has brought forth the important Commerce-Justice-State Conference Report to be voted on; yet the Republican leadership has not felt the need or importance to include language to address the dreadful acts of hate crimes. This move by the Republican leadership is a slap in the face to the many people here in the United States who have historically been subjected to hateful acts resulting in death, bodily harm, as well as mental and physical anguish, only due to a person's race, ethnicity, gender, age or sexual orientation.

How can we as elected representatives for the American people ignore our duty to ensure that all people are treated equally? How can we ignore our moral oath to protect people from hateful acts that arise because of a person' race, ethnicity, gender, age or sexual orientation? How can we allow hateful skeleton's of this country's past to be revived and allowed to infect our society today. Mr. Speaker, this chambers' silence on the need for hate crimes legislation would do just that, and the absence of hate crimes language in the CJS Conference Report sends the message that this country's stance on crimes of hate is not a top priority.

This issue is very dear to me and I am ashamed that after two years from the date of James Bryd Junior's vicious murder on a paved road in my home State of Texas, that a Bipartisan Hate Crimes Prevention Act has not become law.

Time and time again, I have come to the floor and asked the Republican leadership to support meaningful hate crimes legislation. I have introduced my own hate crimes legislation and have supported legislation and resolutions introduced by my colleagues in both the House and the Senate. Yet, I find myself coming before the American people once again to compel the Republican leadership to include hate crimes language in the CJS Conference Report in order to increase penalties on perpetrators of hate crimes before the 106th Congress comes to a close.

Mr. Speaker, the same tactics that have been used in the Texas State legislature to run out the time in the legislative session to defeat the passage of hate crimes legislation have been used here in the United States Congress as well. When the James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Act was introduced in my home State of Texas in January 1999, it was hastily defeated in the State Senate. And when state Democrats attempted to negotiate with Republicans in the State Senate and the Governor's administration to get a bipartisan hate crimes bill passed, political games were played to extend the process until the end of the state legislative session.

As I have stated, this political ploy was not only used in my home State of Texas, but it has been used here in both chambers of the United States Congress as well. We have attempted to negotiate with members of the Republican party to get hate crimes legislation passed within the 106th Congress, however, political games and wizardry have been used to delay the process until the congressional session comes to an end.

I therefore, call on the Republican leadership, with the American People as my witnesses, to once again ask for the passage of hate crimes legislation to address senseless killings and crimes of hate and to make a statement that the United States will no longer tolerate these Acts.

Since James Byrd Junior's death our nation has experienced an alarming increase in hate violence directed at men, women and even children of all races, creeds, and colors.

Ronald Taylor traveled to the eastside of Pittsburgh, in what has been characterized, as an act of hate violence to kill three and wound two in a fast food restaurant. Eight weeks later, in Pittsburgh Richard Baumhammers, armed with a .357-caliber pistol, traveled 20 miles across the West Side of Pittsburgh where he killed five people. His shooting victims included a Jewish women, an Indian, ''Vietnamese,'' Chinese and several black men.

The decade of the 1990s saw an unprecedented rise in the number of hate groups preaching violence and intolerance, with more than 50,000 hate crimes reported during the years 1991 through 1997. The summer of 1999 was dubbed ''the summer of hate'' as each month brought forth another appalling incident, commencing with a three-day shooting spree aimed at minorities in the Midwest and culminating with an attack on mere children in California. From 1995 through 1999, there has been 206 different arson or bomb attacks on churches and synagogues throughout the United States—an average of one house of worship attacked every week.

Like the rest of the nation, some in Congress have been tempted to dismiss these atrocities as the anomalous acts of lunatics, but news accounts of this homicidal fringe are merely the tip of the iceberg. The beliefs they act on are held by a far larger, though less visible, segment of our society. These atrocities illustrate the need for continued vigilance and the passage of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

It is long past the time for Congress to pass a comprehensive law banning such atrocities. It is a federal crime to hijack an automobile or to possess cocaine, and it ought to be a federal crime to drag a man to death because of his race or to hang a person because of his or her sexual orientation. These are crimes that shock and shame our national conscience and they should be subject to federal law enforcement assistance and prosecution.

Therefore, I would urge my fellow members of the United States Congress and the American people to be counted among those who will stand for justice in this country for all Americans and nothing else. We must address the problem of hate crimes before the 106th Congress convenes its legislative business.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished minority ranking member.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, just one other point on this bill. I find it ironic that the only dollar item in this bill over which there is a dispute is the provision which prevents funding for the Government to proceed with a suit against the tobacco companies for past losses to the Federal Treasury due to the use of tobacco.

I find that ironic because that small amount of money that the President had asked for could have the potential of bringing billions of dollars into the Treasury to help us pay for the cost of veterans' medical care and to help us pay for the cost of Medicare in general. It just seems to me that is an incredibly short-sighted decision to make.

All I would say, in summary, is that the main reason to oppose this bill is that it should not have been brought to the floor in the first place in the shape it is in today. We are trying to resolve our differences and end this session. Instead, this bill exacerbates our differences and extends the session.

I do not see how that is constructive. I do not see how that gets our work done. This is a dead-end bill. It is going nowhere. If the Senate passes it, which I doubt, the President most certainly will veto it. All it means is that we have together with what the House has done on the tax bill wasted a full day that could have been used to reconcile differences rather than further emphasize them.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, the D.C. bill is a good bill. It should be going to the White House tonight to get it signed.

I applaud the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) for the compromise that has brought us to this point on the D.C. bill. I regret that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) cannot be here to express the same sentiment.

The problem is it has been attached with the Commerce-State-Justice bill, of which many provisions are terrific. It could be a very good bill. But as the President has said in his veto message, there are some things that could and should have been changed.

One of them, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has said, would allow the Justice Department to pursue litigation to recover billions of dollars that have been lost to the Medicare-Medicaid program particularly through tobacco-related illness.

Another is hate crimes legislation. Another is the anti-environmental rider that the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has spoken to.

Another is a very troubling concern with regard to privacy protection of Social Security numbers. That language, I think, when it was revealed by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), shocked many Members that that kind of language could be in this bill. But what we have spoken about primarily is the fact that the Latino Immigrant Fairness Act is not included in this bill. This is the last appropriate vehicle for this legislation to be included.

The problem is that there are hundreds of thousands of families who this country has discriminated against unfairly that need this legislation. I say discriminated against because all we had to do was to treat all Central and South American refugees in the same way we treated Cuban refugees and Nicaraguan refugees. It does not matter whether they are escaping from a right-wing dictatorship or a left-wing dictatorship. If they need refuge in this country, we ought to treat them all the same. But instead, the language in this bill would perpetuate the current patchwork of contradictory and discriminatory policies enacted by this Congress.

In fact, we have enacted a mean-spirited law that vacated Federal lawsuits on behalf of those wrongfully denied legalization in the 1980s.

What we are talking about are families who have been here for more than 15 years who have been working hard, who have been paying taxes, who have been contributing to their community. Very few are on any form of welfare. They, in fact, are contributing so much to our economy, doing the kind of labor that a whole lot of Americans would not want to do and certainly not the wages that they have been getting, that if they were deported, it would cripple our economy in many parts of this Nation.

I know in my own district, if we deported these people that have been contributing so much to our economy, it would cripple many sectors of our industries. The fact is they are building our buildings. They are helping to repair our streets. Many are cleaning homes. They are doing anything they have to do to work hard to be able to provide for their families. They are Americans.

And who are we to say? There is not a Native American here among the Congress. We are all immigrants. This is a Nation of immigrants. We are talking about people who have come to this country because they believe in the American dream. They have been working hard. They have been paying taxes. They have been contributing to our economy and our society. They are people of faith, faith in their God, faith in this country, and faith that we will not discriminate against them.

So this is our last opportunity. That is why we made such a big deal about including this legislation. It should have been included. Because it was not, we have to urge a no vote on this bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) chairman of Subcommittee on Immigration Claims of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I also yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5½ minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank my two friends, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the immigration provisions in this bill unite immigrant families and reward those who play by the rules. This policy is pro-family and pro-immigrant. The bill speeds up the admission of immigrant spouses and minor children of legal permanent residents so they can join their husbands and wives and mothers and fathers who are already in the United States. Their wait now can be up to 6 years, and we want to shorten that.

Another provision responds to one group seeking amnesty who deserves our help, those who met the conditions set out for amnesty under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 and who may have wrongly been denied legal status by the INS. This bill would allow those aliens to apply again.

Mr. Speaker, the White House wants to give amnesty to people who came to the United States illegally, who promised to return to their home countries, and failed to do so. We learned from the 1986 amnesty that amnesty does not end our illegal immigration problem. It actually precipitates even more illegal immigration, as individuals are encouraged in the belief that if they can just elude the Border Patrol and stand underground for a few years, they will eventually get amnesty themselves. It is no surprise illegal immigration doubled after the 1986 amnesty.

As for the White House proposal, let us do talk about fairness. Central Americans already have received what they demanded in 1997. After the 1996 law changed the requirements of suspension of deportation, Salvadorans and Guatemalans asked that they be able to pursue suspension of deportation using the pre-1996 standards. That is exactly what we gave them in 1997.

In addition, Honduras did not even have a civil war but has had a democratically elected government since 1982. Some Hondurans are currently in the United States with temporary protected status due to Hurricane Mitch in 1998. Their temporary status should not become permanent. Otherwise Congress might as well turn the temporary protective status into a permanent amnesty program.

I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), who mentioned my name a few minutes ago, that, number one, I was not in Congress in 1986 or I would have opposed the 1986 amnesty. And second, that there is a big difference between those who suffered under a communist totalitarian regime the U.S. government opposed, such as in Cuba and Nicaragua and fled the country, and those who left the country whether it was a government we supported, such as in El Salvador and Guatemala.

The administration wants to include a provision that allows illegal aliens to legalize their status by paying a fine of $1,000. This is clearly an incentive for illegal immigration. Allowing illegal aliens to adjust status in the U.S. would reward them for violating the law and would serve as an open invitation for those waiting in line to enter the U.S. illegally.

Hispanics across America agree with us. A recent poll by the ''San Jose Mercury News'' found that three times as many Hispanic voters feel the Government is not doing enough about illegal immigration as think the Government is doing too much.

Mr. Speaker, the White House wants to reward law-breakers, which increases illegal immigration. They would give amnesty to as many as 2.5 million people, including dependents, who entered the United States illegally as recently as 1995.

Mr. Speaker, let us unite families, reward those who play by the rules, and give those who are wrongly denied legal status in 1996 an opportunity to reply. Supporting this bill does just that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying that I was reminded by the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), a few minutes ago that if anyone is in doubt about whether to support this bill, they should give their case worker back home in their district office a call who works on immigration matters and they will tell the Member just how beneficial this bill is.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my intention to vote for this agreement, despite a significant shortcoming. I will support it because this legislation contains important funding for embassy security, counterterrorism activities, gun law enforcement, additional border patrol agents, and the COPS Program. I am the author of legislation to reauthorize the COPS Program, and the conference report provides $1 billion for the program in Fiscal Year 2001, a $437 million increase over last year. Included in this funding is an additional $75 million for gun crimes prosecutions in high violence areas, as well as $140 million for a new COPS technology initiative.

However, I do have serious concerns about provisions in this package that could weaken protections regarding the sale of Social Security numbers over the Internet. I am the cosponsor of bipartisan legislation, H.R. 4857, the Privacy and Identity Protection Act of 2000, that addresses the fraudulent misuse of Social Security numbers. This type of corrective language is what should be a part of this package. President Clinton has threatened to veto this legislation because of this deficiency, and if he follows through on that action, we should take that opportunity to strike these provisions from the conference report.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, I have recently become even more sensitized to the needs and operations of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The Immigration and Naturalization Service is underfunded and in many areas there is mismanagement and chaos.

I have also had the opportunity to speak with Members of Congress about the INS and have listened to their concerns. The concerns that I hear over and over again from my constituents and from other Members of Congress is that something must be done about the backlog of casework within the INS districts offices.

I am gratified that $4.8 billion was allocated for Enforcement and Border Affairs for the INS, which is 13% more than FY 2000 funding which will allow for the hiring of additional border patrol agents.

As this body well knows, the 1996 Immigration Law authorized a total of five thousand additional Border Patrol agents, to be added at the rate of one thousand per fiscal year from 1997 to 2001. INS did not request any additional agents in its proposed budget for FY 2000. This is greatly due to the lucrative job market and the low unemployment rate. The average salary for a starting Border Patrol Agent is at a GS–5 level which is $22,000 per year.

Last year, Congressman REYES and I introduced H.R. 1881, the Border Patrol Retention and Recruitment Act. The Border Patrol is not able to recruit enough agents to meet this authorizing level. When the appropriators keep allocating each year an additional $100 million each year for the INS to hire 1000 additional agents, and the INS is unable to recruit these agents, then what the Congress is doing is leading the horse to the water but not helping him drink. In the CJS bill last year language was added that raised the staring salary level from GS–5 level to GS–7 level, to slightly over $30,000 and that was very good.

Lastly, the Congress needs to continue to fund the INS with the necessary monies for them to decrease their citizenship and adjudication backlogs. There is not sufficient money in this Conference bill to do so.

I am also very disappointed that the $20 million for the PowerUp program is not in the bill. The PowerUp empowers the Attorney General to make grants to the Boys and Girls Clubs of America for the purpose of funding effective after-school technology programs, such as PowerUp, in order to bridge the digital divide in our nation's communities.

The Boys and Girls Clubs of America have 2,300 clubs throughout all 50 states and building technology centers and providing integrated content and full-time staffing at those centers in the Boys and Girls Clubs of America nationwide will help foster education, job training, and alternative to crime for at-risk youth.

Bringing PowerUp into the Boys and Girls Clubs of America will be an effective way to ensure that our youth have a safe, crime-free environment in which to learn the technological skills they need to close the divide between young people who have access to computer-based information and technology-related skills and those who do not.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 4942, the D.C./Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill for FY 2001.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report takes great strides to assist our law enforcement officers in the battle against illegal drugs. This bill will provide millions of dollars in assistance to local law enforcement organizations across our nation as they fight to eliminate drugs from our communities. One of the drugs that has become an increasing threat to all of our communities is methamphetamine. This drug is a danger not only to those who use it, but also to those who reside near areas where it is produced. The production of methamphetamine produces highly toxic fumes that can be lethal if inhaled.

In my home state of Oklahoma, the Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation has been combating this drug at every step. Meth lab eradication and cleanup is dangerous to our law enforcement officers and to the surrounding community, and expensive to enforce. Mr. Speaker this fine piece of legislation will provide the Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation with the resources to win this battle against a truly devastating drug.

Mr. Speaker I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4942, the D.C./Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Conference Report.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this important bill. In particular, this legislation includes important language that will extend the benefits of a bill passed nearly a year ago to all Americans, instead of those in our most populated urban

centers. That bill, the Satellite Home Viewer Act, was designed to address a problem experienced by thousands of Americans who are frustrated that they either could not receive their local network signal or had to receive a poor quality local network signal through a rooftop antenna rather than receive a network signal through their satellite provider. The bill addressed this by allowing direct broadcast satellite providers to immediately begin retransmitting local television broadcast signals into the broadcast station's area.

Consumers across the country expressed their support for this legislation and the availability of 'local-into-local' technology. I know my office received thousands of letters and calls from constituents concerned about this issue. This new law allows satellite providers to become more effective competitors to cable operators who have been able to provide local over-the-air broadcast stations to their subscribers for years. It will also benefit American consumers in markets where local TV via satellite is made available by offering them full service digital television at an affordable price.

More importantly, these consumers will benefit from local news, weather reports, information such as natural disasters or community emergencies, local sports, politics and election information as well as other information that is vital to the integrity of communities across the country. Local TV via satellite is already available to satellite subscribers in America's 20 largest television markets. In these markets, DirecTV and Echostar, the existing satellite platform providers, have begun retransmission of affiliates of the ABC, CBS, NBC, and Fox broadcast networks. DirecTV and Echostar have also announced their intention to begin retransmission of local TV stations in an additional 20 or 30 television markets over the next few years.

Ultimately, the two existing satellite platform providers will provide local TV via satellite to households in most if not all of the 50 largest television markets in the United States. However, there are 211 television markets in the United States, and in excess of 100 million U.S. TV households.

Unfortunately, if matters are left solely to the initiative of the existing satellite platform providers, more than 50 percent of existing satellite subscribers, over 6 million households, will continue to be deprived of their local TV stations; more than 60 percent of existing commercial television stations, over 1,000, will not be available via satellite; and more than 30 million U.S. TV households will remain beyond the reach of local TV via satellite. Put another way, local TV via satellite will not be available in 27 States.

So while the law enacted last fall has eliminated the legal barriers to delivery of local TV via satellite, it alone will not assure delivery of local TV via satellite to the majority of local TV stations and satellite subscribers. For that reason I have joined with my colleagues in the House to introduce legislation that will assure that all Americans, not just those in the most profitable urban markets, can receive their local TV signals in a way that provides local information in a competitive environment for consumers.

This legislation we are considering today represents a carefully negotiated compromise between versions passed by the House and the Senate earlier this year. I want to express my appreciation to members of both bodies and from both parties for their willingness to work together to reach this agreement. Like the original House bill, the substitute authorizes the administrator of the Rural Utilities Service, with the input of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, to administer loan guarantees not exceeding $1.25 billion for providing local broadcast TV signals in unserved and underserved markets.

The loan guarantees will be approved by a board consisting of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Treasury, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. This is a change from the House-passed bill, which did not include the Federal Reserve Chairman on the board. Like the House-passed bill, the loan guarantee may not exceed 80 percent of a loan, and the board may not approve a loan guarantee for a project that is primarily designed to serve one or more of the to 40 markets. The bill also retains House-passed restrictions on which lending institutions can qualify for loan guarantees. In addition, the bill retains a House-passed prohibition on the use of the loan guarantee for the acquisition of spectrum. Finally, like the House bill, the board is directed to give priority consideration first to unserved areas, then to underserved areas.

Unserved areas are defined as areas outside Grade B where there is no access to local signals from a for-profit multichannel video provider. Underserved areas are defined as those areas outside Grade A where there is no more than one for-profit multichannel video provider. The priority language has been modified slightly to clarify that the board must seek a balance in approving projects that serve both unserved and underserved areas.

The bill includes language from the Senate-passed version that encourages the delivery of Internet and weather service signals, but it has been clarified to ensure that the primary purpose of the bill is the delivery of local broadcast signals. The bill also deletes language in the House bill allowing the RUS Administrator (rather than the board) to approve and administer guarantees for loans of less than $20 million. The bill retains limitations on the use of the loan guarantees by cable provides in their franchise areas, but modifies the language to ensure that in areas where the incumbent cable provider is not required to provide service, the bill remains technology neutral. The bill also includes two technical changes to the credit risk premium and administrative fee language. Finally, the bill removes two unrelated provisions included in the House-passed bill related to translator services and copyright must-carry laws.

In addition, this compromise incorporates several suggestions made by the Administration and the Office of Management and Budget. These changes include: (1) the elimination of language allowing the loans to be split, which would allowed the unguaranteed portion to be sold in the market; (2) the elimination of language allowing the guaranteed loan to be less than fully collateralized; (3) several technical corrections related to the Federal Credit Reform Act; and (4) the inclusion of language requiring that the board adhere to the Administrative Procedures Act. All of these changes will strengthen the protection of taxpayer interests and prevent unwarranted increases in the cost of the program to the Federal government.

Mr. Speaker, legislation similar to this bill passed the House by a vote of 375–37 and passed the Senate by a vote 97–0 earlier this year. While we were unable to convene a formal conference, this agreement we are considering today is a bipartisan compromise that we can all be proud of. In particular, I want to thank Senator GRAMM and Senator BURNS for their help on reaching this agreement. Senator BURNS represents the State of Montana, a rural area that is vitally impacted by this legislation. Both he and Senator GRAMM are to be commended for their leadership in getting this legislation passed through the United States Senate. Senator LOTT, Senator STEVENS, Senator ASHCROFT, Senator GRAMS, Senator THOMAS, Senator HATCH, Senator LEAHY, Senator HOLLINGS, and Minority Leader DASCHLE are also to be commended for their hard work in negotiating this agreement.

The bill is crucial for Americans in rural and smaller markets who rely on their local television stations for news, politics, weather, sports, and emergency information. Local television is often the only lifeline folks have in cases of natural disasters such as hurricanes, tornadoes, blizzards, earthquakes, or flooding. The bill's language to encourage the delivery of local television signals to these constituents in America will not only benefit consumers, it will save lives.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank several individuals in the House, most importantly my colleague from my adjoining district in Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, whose leadership has been absolutely vital. He too has a district like mine that badly needs this legislation, but he too recognizes the importance of this to all of America. Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. SHIMKUS have also been strong supporters of this bill.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. TAUZIN, the chairman of the telecommunications subcommittee, who has also worked tirelessly to see that this legislation becomes law this year. I also want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HYDE, from the committee on the Judiciary. I especially want to thank the Majority Leader, Mr. ARMEY, for his dedicated work in forging this compromise. Finally, from the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. COMBEST, the gentlelady from North Carolina, Mrs. CLAYTON, and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, have all provided valuable support for this legislation. I thank them all.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the combined D.C./Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations Conference Report.

Attaching the DC appropriations to the larger Commerce—Justice—State bill once again does a great disservice to the people of the District. The DC portion of the conference report is a great improvement over the version passed earlier by the House. It includes provisions that increase funding for two projects that I have strongly supported: $25 million for the New York Avenue Metro Station, and $3 million for environmental clean-up of Popular Point along the Anacostia River. Both projects are top priorities for residents and the City to help spur new economics development activity for the District. Combining it with the larger Commerce-Justice-State bill, which contains provisions wholly unacceptable to the President, means that once again the District is

being held hostage to Congressional tactics. It is unnecessary and it is wrong!

This bill fails to include critical provisions that would bring fairness and justice to our nation's immigration laws. Last month, I joined 154 other House Democrats in sending a letter to President Clinton promising to sustain a veto of this bill should the Republican majority fail the Hispanic community yet again. While Republicans speak of compassion, their actions tear families apart and support inequalities in our laws. The Latino and Immigrant Fairness act (LIFA) provisions are critically-needed pieces of legislation that would bring fairness to families and individuals who call America home, and who have made significant social, economic, and political contributions to our nation.

I am cosponsoring legislation calling for all three of LIFA's provision: to allow those who qualify for permanent residency to complete the final stages of their application in the U.S. rather than returning to their country of origin; to provide Central American and Caribbean immigrants who have been here since 1995 the right to apply for permanent residency (as is the case for Cubans and Nicaraguans); and to update the ''registry date'' which would allow immigrants here since 1986 to apply for permanent residency. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership will not permit a vote on our legislation and attaching it to appropriations legislation is the only way this Congress can provide justice to these families.

I am also disappointed about the failure of this conference report to include the hate crimes enhancement law as the Administration had requested. Along with more than 190 Members of the House from both parties, I cosponsored the legislation to extend current federal hate crimes law to cover violence motivated by prejudice against the victim's sexual orientation, gender or liability. It will not become law this year because Republican leaders have shown once again that they are opposed to passing the legislation in any form. We have a long way to go on to ensure the safety on all citizens. I will continue to support efforts to fight hate crimes and discrimination.

This legislation also does a disservice to the environment. Section 636 of the bill would prevent the Cuyahoga Valley National Park from gaining stronger clean air protections. Provisions in the bill also allow Coastal Impact Assistant funds to be used for environmentally damaging projects and activities, making a mockery of ongoing efforts to restore our endangered coastal areas.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Section 1012 of the Launching Our Communities Access to Local Television Act of 2000, Title X of the Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and related agencies appropriations conference report. Section 1012 provides for independent testing of terrestrial technologies in the 12 GHz band. My support for this section is conditioned on the understanding that this provision will not add any delay to any current FCC proceeding.

The Satellite Home Viewer's Improvement Act (''SHVIA''), which we passed a year ago, required the FCC to act on applications to provide local television service in unserved and underserved areas. We gave the FCC one year to make its determinations regarding these applications, which at that time had already been pending before the FCC for nearly one year. I am highly aware of the need for local television and broadband services that can be provided by new terrestrial wireless technologies. The deadline for FCC action under SHVIA is fast approaching and I expect the FCC to act on the applications by November 29, 2000 as required. The residents of my rural district have waited too long for service that matches that which is available in our nation's more populated areas.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Commerce, Justice, State and District of Columbia Appropriations conference report.

In particular, this bill blatantly fails to address our nation's outstanding immigration issues.

During the Reagan years, we supported wars in many Latin American countries.

Thousands fled this violence.

While many people have found sanctuary in the United States, America has not lived up to its commitment to provide resident status to these refugees. We made promises that we have not fulfilled.

In fact, there are over 100,000 immigration cases that remain unresolved from the Reagan-Bush era.

These cases are nearly 20 years old and have left many immigrants in legal limbo.

They have been denied expedited status because they did not come from the ''right'' countries.

It is past time to correct the unfair and unequal treatment among Central American, Latin American, Carribean and African refugees.

Individuals and families who now have deeply imbedded roots in the United States must be given residency status.

We are not, as some have charged, giving blanket amnesty to hundreds of thousands of illegal immigrants.

Those people have played by the rules and they deserve fairness and justice.

Immigrants are hardworking and have helped our country propser. They exemplify ''family values''.

In my district and throughout America, the immigrant community has made significant contributions from which we all benefit.

We must not shut our doors on them.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this conference report.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed in what the Republican leadership brought to floor in the form and guise of the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations. As Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, I am mostly concerned about the Latino Immigration Fairness Act. (LIFA) The phrase ''compassionate conservatism'', has very hollow meaning, if you just talk the talk and not walk the walk. This LIFA proposal is the modern day civil rights issue of our time, and just 12 days to election day, the Republicans are thumbing their noses at immigrants who have contributed to our society and are trying to play by the rules. I say not deal to this proposal, and I urge a no vote.

This involves amnesty for immigrants who have paid their dues and have been in this country since 1986, parity for Liberians, Guatemanlans, Haitains, and Hondurans, and restoring Section 245(i), which allows immigrants to adjust their illegal status, pay a fee, and remain in this country with their spouses and children. These are reasonable proposals, and the Republican leadership has a blind eye for fairness, for justice, and equity.

The Republican proposal to provide relief to only 400,000 immigrants who were unable to take advantage of the 1986 law for those entering the country before 1982 is unacceptable. It is unacceptable because it leaves and locks too many people out. This is a proposal that is thinly veiled as an open door, but it really is a feeble attempt to play up to the Hispanic vote during the political season.

The Republican legislation is a piecemeal correction of the flawed implementation of the 1986 legalization program. Basically, those individuals who sought the counsel of a specific lawyer and filed suit with him are protected, while countless others are left out. Of those people who are covered in the flawed proposal, less than 40% are expected to prevail. If the GOP acknowledges that the 1986 law was not implemented correctly, they should try to right the wrong entirely, not pick some winners and losers based on what law firm they signed up to represent them.

Also, it is important to understand that this ''amnesty program'' in fact is just a long overdue update in the registry provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The registry provision gives immigrants who have been here without proper documents an opportunity to adjust to permanent status if they have been here for a long enough time and have nothing in their background that would disqualify them from immigrant status. The legislation would just update the cutoff date for registry which is now set at 1972.

Then there is Juan Gonzalez who has been working for a construction company in Houston, Texas for more than 13 years. Recently he lost his job because he was not able to present his employer a renewed Employment Authorization. Since then his family is living a nightmare. Juan and his wife Luisa are having problems and close to a divorce. They lost their home and rented a 2-bedroom apartment. Unfortunately, their children are paying the consequences.

We also need to remain ever vigilant on NACARA parity. This would address an injustice in the provisions of the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act of 1997 (''NACARA''). NACARA currently provides qualified Cubans and Nicaraguans an opportunity to become lawful permanent residents of the United States. The proposed legislation would extend the same benefits to eligible nationals of Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti. The bill that the Republicans have brought to the floor has completely left NACARA parity out. I say no deal, and a no vote.

Like Nicaraguans and Cubans, many Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Hondurans, and Haitians fled human rights abuses or unstable political and economic conditions in the 1980s and 1990s. The United States has a strong foreign policy interest in providing the same treatment to these similarly situated people. In addition, returning migrants to these countries would place significant demands on their fragile economic and political systems.

Like Senator JACK REED, I have worked very hard to ensure that the 10,000 Liberian nationals who have been living in the United States since the mid-1980's and have significantly contributed to the American economy are not deported. This legislation should also include these Liberian nations.

If the Latino Immigrant Fairness Act is not enacted, hundreds of thousands of people will be forced to abandon their homes, will have to separate from their families, and return to countries where they no longer have ties.

The inclusion of the Latino Immigrant Fairness provisions would evidence our commitment to fair and even-handed treatment of nations from these countries and to the strengthening of democracy and economic stability among important neighbors.

The Republican proposal creates a ''V'' visa for people waiting in the family backlogs, but not all, including US citizens. This counterproposal treats the family members of some legal permanent residents better than US citizens. The GOP proposal leaves out US citizens applying for their children over the age of 21. Ironically, the GOP fails to help even United States citizens seeking to reunite with their spouses and children if the spouse of the child fell out of status for six months or more. In contrast, the Latino Immigrant Fairness Act 245(i) proposal would cover all people in the pipeline to becoming legal equally. I say no deal and a no vote.

The Republicans are failing to correct their flawed legislation of 1997 and 1998. It was the Republicans who passed piecemeal programs in 1997 and 1998 for some refugees. These flaws failed to correct years of uneven treatment to legitimate refugees from Central America, Haiti, and does nothing for Liberian nationals. It is baffling why today the Republicans are now turning their backs on the LIFA proposal for long time refugees, that have been in the U.S. for years, worked hard and paid their taxes when a few short years ago they advanced these same proposals.

In conclusion, there is not compassion here, Mr. Speaker. Congress should stop trying to trade some deserving immigrant groups for others, and move to help all deserving immigrants willing to play by the rules, pay taxes, and work hard in the United States.

I say no deal and a not vote. Send this bill to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and the President will send it right back.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr.Speaker, I rise to join my Democratic colleagues to express my outrage at the ommission of immigration fairness from the Commerce—Justice Appropriation Bill.

I am a Caribbean American and I am calling on my colleagues to vote against this bill because it fails to right the wrongs that are being perpetrated against Haitians and other people from our region, Central Americans, Liberians and others.

I also think that it is shameful that once again the people of the District of Columbia, the nation's capital and our home away from home, have their budget bogged down with this bill that includes a poison pill that ought to kill it here, but which certainly will be vetoed at the White House. Why can't we do the right thing on this?

People of color across the country and around the world cannot seem to get fairness under this Republican Congress. District residents, Caribbean people, Central Americans, Liberians and others deserve fairness just like you and I.

Do the right thing. Vote no on this until we get justice in the Commerce, Justice and Appropriations bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my compliments to Chairman ISTOOK for the time and energy he and his staff have once again devoted to reviewing the D.C. budget and bringing this bill to the floor.

Just a few years ago, the D.C. government faced a financial crisis of epic proportions. The situation was dire: the District could not deliver basic services, and there was very real concern that it would run out of cash to pay its debt service and meet its payroll. Today, the city's population is stabilizing, the real estate market is up, suburban residents are making more leisure trips into the city, and jobs have increased dramatically.

Next year the Control Board will go into a dormant state, as anticipated in legislation we passed in 1995. The city has balanced its budget for a fourth straight year and its leaders are showing, with only a handful of exceptions, that they are focused on fostering economic growth and delivering basic services. With the guidance of this Congress, D.C.'s elected officials implemented tax cuts and backed the procurement and regulatory reforms that have spawned the renaissance at the Nation's Capital. As an editorial in The Washington Times said just a few weeks ago, the face of D.C. is, indeed, changing.

This budget goes a long way toward continuing the tremendous strides made in the Nation's Capitol over the past six years. It funds a wide number of programs that will greatly enhance the quality of life for D.C. residents and those who visit and work in this wonderful city—from enhanced resources for foster care, drug treatment and public education to money to clean up the Anacostia River. This legislation provides full and vital federal funding to construct a Metrorail station on New York Avenue. There are funds for a number of programs to bolster opportunities for the city's youth population, including $500,000 for character education and $250,000 for youth mentoring programs.

And there's much more: $1 million for the Washington Interfaith Network for affordable housing in low-income neighborhoods and another $250,000 for new initiatives to battle homelessness. $6 million to cover the city's costs associated with the 2001 Presidential Inauguration. $250,000 for Mayor Williams to simplify personnel practices, money that will allow the city to build on the many improvements already underway in the area of management reform.

I am very pleased that the conference report fully funds the D.C. College Access Program—a program created by legislation I authored that levels the playing field for D.C. students by allowing them to attend state colleges and universities at in-state rates. This funding ensures that the program will continue to grow, so no students are denied the opportunity offered to those who attend high school in each of the 50 states.

And finally, I am overjoyed that there is language in this conference report that transfers two school sites in Lorton to Fairfax County, at no charge, to address the critical need for new schools there. The legislation includes important language that facilitates the land transfer.

I commend Chairman ISTOOK for this forward-looking spending plan, a budget that ensures the District's 'rebirth' will continue. I am proud to have played a part in this city's turnaround these past six years, and I want to thank the fellow members of my subcommittee, both Republicans and Democrats, for the work they have done to get the District back on its feet. I wish Mayor Williams and the City Council the best of luck in the future. This city is on the right track, and it's in good hands.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to providing the most minimal help to people of color and immigrants, the Republicans have shown themselves to be colder than ice.

Twice the House and Senate have passed hate crime prevention legislation to ensure that crimes committed based on race and bigotry are fully investigated and prosecuted. But when it comes to basic fairness for people of color or different sexual orientation, Republicans are not compassionate conservatives and they are not inclusive.

Similarly, thousands of immigrants from El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Haiti and Liberia fled their war ravaged countries in the 1980s and early 1990s. In 1997, the Republicans decided to give amnesty to Cubans and Nicaraguan refugees who had the right political influence at the time. Despite any objective basis for distinguishing their situation, the Republicans refused to help refugees from Central America and Haiti. It is time we provide legal parity for these refugees who are hard working, tax paying, important members of our communities.

The Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act is a straight forward bill to keep families together, stabilize those who have been here for over a decade and make our immigration polices simple and fair. Yet, it is not in this bill.

The GOP wants to give people of color and immigrants crumbs from the table. This bill exposes the Republicans' true colors.

I have news for you—the President will not let the congress leave without a Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act. He will veto this bill, and Mr. President, the Democrats have the votes to sustain it.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the House today not only adds insult to the injury that the District's budget has to go to someone else to be passed. The House today penalizes the District in the bond market and adds costs of incalculable dollars in delay and duplication.

From the start of the fiscal year, this bill is now four weeks overdue. More than two weeks ago, we finished a very difficult process. The Mayor and the City Council members had been asking me, ''Is it over? How soon?'' And I replied, ''soon.'' ERNEST ISTOOK and I then negotiated our way through the last stages of the process and shook hands on an agreement. Both of us felt a sense of accomplishment. Then there was only silence. I want to thank Chairman ERNEST ISTOOK for his service, for always working hard and for working with me. I want to thank Ranking Member JIM MORAN for his hard work on this bill. Both deserve better than this. District residents certainly deserve better.

I understand that the D.C. conference report was held for a purpose, to carry another bill. Today we see that the conference report was held for no good purpose, because the bill it will carry will be vetoed. I am told that the Senate has problems with the Commerce, Justice, State bill on tobacco and gun control. Other controversial provisions include a census privacy violation and an objectionable immigration provision.

However, this body needs to understand what damage the delay in passing the D.C.

appropriation does to the District. New money for public schools, including new textbooks and teacher pay raises—cannot begin. New money for in-home care for seniors and the disabled—cannot begin. Funding increases for Foster Care and Child and Family Services, which will reduce caseloads by hiring more social workers—cannot begin. In addition, 175 new police officers in this high-crime city cannot be hired; 88 new firefighters cannot be hired; five new charter schools, what the Congress most wanted, cannot be funded; and $4.5 million for school recreation centers, to get our kids off the streets during the high crime hours between 3 and 6, is on hold.

Thhis is what this House is doing to the District of Columbia today.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise opposed to the Commerce-Justice-State conference report. I am opposed to this conference report because it fails to include the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act, also known as LIFA. I am greatly disappointed that the Republican leadership has failed to support Latino issues as they once claimed they would.

In 1996, the immigration reform law unfairly separated families and created additional obstacles for hardworking immigrants whose dream was to become productive American citizens. These provisions imposed under the Republican leadership of this House, forced many immigrants into a state of limbo.

Prospective immigrants already in the United States, in the process of obtaining their green cards were and still are forced to leave the country and separate from their families, many for as long as ten years before being allowed to return to the United States. These individuals have been wrongly denied the legal status they rightfully deserved since the 1980's.

The goal of immigration law in this country should be to keep families together and allow productive citizens who work hard and play by the rules to keep their current jobs, keep living in their current neighborhoods and keep paying their paying their taxes by allowing them as opportunity to become United States citizens.

The lives of real people are at stake. Throughout this election cycle, the Republican Party has made claims that they are obviously not truly committed to. The Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act is an important piece of legislation because it effects the lives of our neighbors, our friends, and in essence the people that help this great nation function each day.

Today, I join over 150 of my colleagues in opposition of the exclusion of the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act and who are also committed to supporting the President's proposed veto of the C–J–S conference report. We can no longer continue to ignore these unjust and biased immigration laws.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of conflict diamonds. Section 406 of this bill seeks to eliminate the problem. Though I support this provision, I regret that an alternative that I negotiated and all sides agreed would be preferable was not included in the conference report.

As our colleagues know, many Members of this House are gravely concerned about the role diamonds—a symbol of love and commitment to many Americans—are playing in some of the wars in Africa. Just this week, the Catholic church reported rebel attacks on diamond fields in Angola that left scores of innocent civilians dead or injured.

In Sierra Leone, Angola, the Demorcratic Republic of Congo, and until recently in Liberia, rebels are waging war not for ethnic or religious or political reasons—but solely for greed. Rag-tag gangs transformed themselves into well-equipped armies by seizing diamond-rich land, driving people living there out of their homes or killing them, and then selling the gems they stole to an industry that couldn't be bothered to do anything about a trade they knew was devastating. In all, more than two million people have dies in these diamond wars.

Today, the industry is playing catch-up and has come up with a solution to this problem. For years it has ignored rebels' role in overthrowing a democratic government; in committing rape, murder, and mutilation on an unprecedented scale; and in violating United Nations embargoes on both diamonds from one of these countries, and arms to all of them. Over the same period, the diamond industry has raked in phenomenal profits: last year alone, the industry leader posted in 89 percent increase in profits. Meanwhile, it has contributed only minimally and to just a few of the African countries whose resources provide these profits. With economies ruined by war and few investments in peace, these countries' young citizens have few alternatives to careers that begin as child soldiers.

Last year, Congressman FRANK WOLF and I visited Sierra Leone. We met hundreds of victims of that diamond war in Freetown's amputee camp, people who lost a hand, or a leg, or both arms, or an ear to rebel's machete. We heard of the sick ''games'' rebels played:

Determining whether to leave a victim with ''short sleeves'' or ''long sleeves,'' depending on what slip of paper he or she drew from a bag.

Betting on the sex of a fetus, and then cutting open the pregnant mother to see who won.

We met a young teenager made pregnant by rape and left to care for a rebel's child with two stumps where her arms once hung. We spoke with a man whose right hand was cut off because he was a student, and another who lost both hands because he was a driver. We saw an adorable toddler whose arm was chopped off when she was just two-and-half, and dozens of school-aged children who suffered a similar fate.

We heard again and again that this butchery was rebels' way of punishing innocent civilians for voting in Sierra Leone's first election—a psychopathic retort to the winner's slogan, ''given us a hand.'' We left the country sick at heart and determined to do anything we could to help.

Sierra Leone is a country founded in hope by escaped slaves. It is blessed with good soil, wonderful people and abundant natural resources. But it is cursed by diamonds and consistently rated the poorest and most miserable in the world. I cannot imagine how the amputees will survive in a subsistence economy. I can't even begin to imagine the horrific moments that brought them there.

But what haunts me most is the fact that we—American consumers—are paying for these atrocities. Today, rebels will earn $37 million from this blood trade, and two-thirds of that will come from Americans. Tomorrow, they'll earn another $37 million. And the next day, and the one after that.

Now, I know the young men and women shopping for engagement rings, the couples celebrating wedding anniversaries, and other Americans have no idea of this blood trade. They don't know they are keeping these butchers supplied with weapons, with drugs for their child soldiers, with everything they need to keep fighting. They don't know that diamonds symbolize misery to many Africans.

I know something else: when American consumers—American taxpayers—figure this out, there is going to be Hell to pay. Mr. Speaker, you and I and ever member of this House knows how kind-hearted our fellow Americans are. They would never knowingly underwrite this kind of violence: just look at consumers' attitudes toward fur once they learned how much blood was on that industry's hands.

We also know that most Americans don't begrudge foreign aid—if it's going to help solve real problems. In the past decade, our country has sent $2 billion in aid to the four countries plagued by conflict diamonds. But over the same period, rebels have smuggled $10 billion worth of conflict diamonds out of these countries, and used them to create the need for ever more humanitarian assistance. That adds up to nothing but more suffering for the people caught in the middle of these wars over diamonds.

Until now, Congress has demonstrated shockingly little leadership on this issue, and we have failed as a steward of taxpayers' funds. There have been some shinning exceptions to this: Mr. WOLF, Chairman ED ROYCE of the Africa Subcommittee, and Representative CYNTHIA MCKINNEY have done superb work in highlighting these problems. I also appreciate the support of other Members who have co-sponsored my CARAT Act, which forced the industry to address this problem. Any I particularly want to thank Holly Burkhalter, a human-rights advocate with Physicians for Human Rights whose dedication to peace and justice has been constant for decades, and who has been creative and tireless in her efforts to end this blood trade.

In the Senate, JUDD GREGG has been a lone voice against U.S. complicity in the atrocities associated with conflict diamonds. He was able to include a provision in this bill that marks the first Congressional action on this matter. It is not an ideal solution, but I am pleased to support its embargo of diamonds from some of these blood-soaked countries and hope to continue to work with him to enact a strong alternative.

I had hoped that a substitute agreed to by American jewelers and a human-rights coalition of more than 70 respected organizations (led by Physicians for Human Rights, Amnesty International, and World Vision) would win final passage. Unfortunately, our joint efforts only won the Administration's acceptance of that provision late last night, too late to be included in the bill before us today. It still is not too late for Congress to approve this provision. My understanding is that this bill will be vetoed by the President. Should the bill be returned to Congress, I urge may colleagues to include the provision in the revised bill.

I submit for the RECORD an editorial that recently appeared in the Washington Post that explains the status of this compromise. Our colleagues all know of this Administration's many initiatives to reach out to Africa—and its

many failures. Early in 1999, the United States was a leader in efforts to end the trade in conflict diamonds. I am grateful that, late last night, the Administration agreed to accept this compromise, but I am sorely disappointed that it ran out the clock. My hope now is that the threatened veto of this bill will let us change this provision before this becomes law.

If that doesn't happen and the Gregg provision becomes law, there is still hope for U.S. pressure to end the trade in blood diamonds. However, reports that the Administration is saying it will not enforce this provisions are deeply troubling, as is the industry's attempt to renege on its compromise with the coalition because of assurances it has received from U.S. officials that they have no intention of enforcing it.

I will not accept the argument that this cannot be enforced; the Constitution demands otherwise, and two U.N. resolutions require specific steps against two of the countries named in this provision. It would be tragic if this provision were to close U.S. borders to diamond imports, as the Administration initially suggested it would. If that happens, I will be ready to help remedy this situation legislatively when the 107th Congress convenes. But the possibility that this could happen ought to have encouraged the Administration to agree to the alternative compromise while there was still time for Congress to act.

The tradegy of this outcome would not be any loss to American consumers or jewelers—because the standard practice is to keep a year's supply of diamonds on hand. Nor would it be anything but a blessing to the people of conflict-diamond countries. No, the real hardship would fall on stable democracies like South Africa whose economy depends on the legitimate trade in diamonds.

The diamond industry and—until just hours ago this Administration—have been far too cavalier about responding to this problem before consumers begin to boycott diamonds. Diamonds do tremendous good where governments and the industry work together; an effective boycott would devastate the economy of Bostwana—once the poorest nation in Africa, and now one of its success stories—and do similar harm to few other poor countries.

A consumer action is very likely, and I am looking forward to participating in a responsible one that stops short of boycotting all diamonds. On Fifth Avenue in New York recently, outside of a swank store with some of Sierra Leon's amputees and others who share our concerns. I urged consumers to go to the jewelry stores in their neighborhood and ask three simple questions:

Where was this diamond mined?

Am I contributing to the bloodshed in Africa?

What are you doing to stop this blood trade?

Untill these questions start sounding familiar to American jewelers and until the diamond industry, the U.S. Government, and the United Nations feel pressure from consumers to do the right thing—whole nations will continue to be a battleground.

I urge my colleagues to join in efforts to end this blood trade. I urge you to raise these questions with the jewelers in your district. And I urge all Americans to stand up to the war criminals in Africa and the corporations that fuel their war machine, and to demand accountability and justice.

[From the Washington Post Oct. 19, 2000]

A CHANCE TO CONTROL KILLERS

This time last year, the State Department convened an international conference on the role played by diamonds in Africa's grisly civil wars. In Angola, Congo and Sierra Leone, the rebel bands that killed and maimed civilians are driven or sustained by diamond revenues: They fight less for political reasons than to gain access to the gems that will make their commanders rich. One year since that conference, the movement to control ''conflict diamonds'' has progressed remarkably rapidly. And yet in the final days of Congress, the administration may miss a chance to press its advantage fully.

The chance presents itself in an amendment sponsored by Rep. Troy Hall (D–Ohio), which would give the diamond industry one year to implement a scheme to track gems from their country of origin to the handful of centers that cut and finish them. After they are minded, the diamonds would be wrapped in tamper-proof, numbered package and logged into a database; each time a package crossed a border, that would be logged tool. The idea is that the cutting centers could then refuse to take diamonds from countries where they are known to be mined by murderous rebels. Jewelers could buy from responsible cutting centers with a clear conscience; and the whole industry would avoid a consumer boycott like the one that undermined the fur business.

This scheme would not foolproof. Some conflict diamonds might be smuggled into nearby countries and packaged there. But the monitoring regime would at least limit that problem, because it would be accompanied by rules capping each country's exports at the estimated level of its mining capacity. Recently Liberia has been exporting many times more diamonds that it produces, because its government is close to the limb-chopping rebels who control Sierra Leone's diamond fields. A certification scheme would stop such overt financing of, and profiting from, butchery.

Almost nobody opposes monitoring. The diamond industry itself designed the scheme in conjunction with nongovernmental critics; most diamond-producing governments favor it as well. Rep. Hall wants to build on that consensus by allowing one year to implement the monitoring scheme, then imposing sanctions on countries that fail to comply. The World Diamond Council, which speaks for the industry, has endorsed the idea of a deadline. But the administration is wary, pleading that congressional deadlines trample on its prerogatives, and that a hard deadline is unwise. The danger is that, without a deadline, the momentum of reform may dissipate. The administration should embrace this change to control the killing gems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 198, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No 562]

YEAS—206

Abercrombie
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stearns
Sununu
Sweeney
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—198

Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Collins
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)

Lipinski	Olver	Sherman
Lofgren	Ortiz	Skelton
Lowey	Owens	Smith (WA)
Luther	Pallone	Snyder
Maloney (CT)	Pascrell	Stark
Maloney (NY)	Pastor	Stenholm
Markey	Paul	Strickland
Mascara	Pelosi	Stupak
Matsui	Phelps	Tancredo
McCarthy (MO)	Pickett	Tanner
McCarthy (NY)	Pomeroy	Tauscher
McDermott	Price (NC)	Taylor (MS)
McGovern	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
McKinney	Rangel	Thurman
McNulty	Reyes	Tierney
Meehan	Riley	Toomey
Meek (FL)	Rivers	Towns
Meeks (NY)	Rodriguez	Turner
Menendez	Roemer	Udall (CO)
Millender-McDonald	Rothman	Udall (NM)
Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Velazquez
Minge	Royce	Visclosky
Mink	Sabo	Waters
Moakley	Salmon	Watt (NC)
Moore	Sanchez	Weiner
Moran (VA)	Sanders	Weldon (FL)
Morella	Sandlin	Wexler
Nadler	Sanford	Weygand
Napolitano	Sawyer	Wolf
Neal	Schaffer	Woolsey
Oberstar	Schakowsky	Wu
Obey	Scott	Wynn
	Shadegg	

NOT VOTING—29

Ackerman	Franks (NJ)	Peterson (PA)
Bilbray	Johnson, Sam	Shuster
Blagojevich	Klink	Spratt
Bliley	Lazio	Stump
Brady (PA)	Martinez	Talent
Campbell	McCollum	Tauzin
Chenoweth-Hage	McIntosh	Thompson (MS)
Crowley	Metcalf	Waxman
Danner	Packard	Wise
Fowler	Payne	

□ 1937

Messrs. DELAHUNT, COLLINS, and SHADEGG changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. BUYER, COX, and KASICH changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further 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. 782. An Act to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend authorizations of appropriations for programs under the Act, to modernize programs and services for older individuals, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 116. Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

PERIODIC REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-305)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 26, 2000.*

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow, Friday, October 27, 2000.

INTERNATIONAL MALARIA CONTROL ACT OF 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2943) to authorize additional assistance for international malaria control, and to provide for coordination and consultation in providing assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 with respect to malaria, HIV and tuberculosis, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2943

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

TITLE I—ASSISTANCE FOR INTERNATIONAL MALARIA CONTROL

SECTION 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''International Malaria Control Act of 2000''.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The World Health Organization estimates that there are 300,000,000 to 500,000,000 cases of malaria each year.

(2) According to the World Health Organization, more than 1,000,000 persons are estimated to die due to malaria each year.

(3) According to the National Institutes of Health, about 40 percent of the world's population is at risk of becoming infected.

(4) About half of those who die each year from malaria are children under 9 years of age.

(5) Malaria kills one child each 30 seconds.

(6) Although malaria is a public health problem in more than 90 countries, more than 90 percent of all malaria cases are in sub-Saharan Africa.

(7) In addition to Africa, large areas of Central and South America, Haiti and the Dominican Republic, the Indian subcontinent, Southeast Asia, and the Middle East are high risk malaria areas.

(8) These high risk areas represent many of the world's poorest nations.

(9) Malaria is particularly dangerous during pregnancy. The disease causes severe anemia and is a major factor contributing to maternal deaths in malaria endemic regions.

(10) ''Airport malaria'', the importing of malaria by international aircraft and other conveyances, is becoming more common, and the United Kingdom reported 2,364 cases of malaria in 1997, all of them imported by travelers.

(11) In the United States, of the 1,400 cases of malaria reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in 1998, the vast majority were imported.

(12) Between 1970 and 1997, the malaria infection rate in the United States increased by about 40 percent.

(13) Malaria is caused by a single-cell parasite that is spread to humans by mosquitoes.

(14) No vaccine is available and treatment is hampered by development of drug-resistant parasites and insecticide-resistant mosquitoes.

SEC. 103. ASSISTANCE FOR MALARIA PREVENTION, TREATMENT, CONTROL, AND ELIMINATION.

(a) ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in coordination with the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies and nongovernmental organizations, shall provide assistance for the establishment and conduct of activities designed to prevent, treat, control, and eliminate malaria in countries with a high percentage of malaria cases.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF INTERACTION AMONG EPIDEMICS.—In providing assistance pursuant to paragraph (1), the Administrator should consider the interaction among the epidemics of HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis.

(3) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION REQUIREMENT.—Activities referred to in paragraph (1) shall include the dissemination of information relating to the development of vaccines and therapeutic agents for the prevention of malaria (including information relating to participation in, and the results of, clinical trials for such vaccines and agents conducted by United States Government agencies) to appropriate officials in such countries.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (a) $50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under paragraph (1) are authorized to remain available until expended.

TITLE II—POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO MACAU

SECTION 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''United States-Macau Policy Act of 2000''.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS; SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.—The Congress makes the following findings and declarations:

(1) The continued economic prosperity of Macau furthers United States interests in the People's Republic of China and Asia.

(2) Support for democratization is a fundamental principle of United States foreign policy, and as such, that principle naturally applies to United States policy toward Macau.

(3) The human rights of the people of Macau are of great importance to the United States and are directly relevant to United States interests in Macau.