section on health care spends $88 billion, with $56 billion of that going to basically HMOs that subsidize people who already have health insurance.

I ask: Where are the provisions designed to help the uninsured in America? They are not there. There is no provision, for example, to expand the Children's Health Insurance Program as part of the compromise. You won't find other efforts to help encourage people who are uninsured to get insurance.

As I mentioned and as many other speakers have mentioned, this bill was slapped together in the last couple of days. There are parts of it that almost no one saw before yesterday morning. We have no idea what special interest provisions are in here, and we do not know what mistakes are in it. There are probably going to be a few—again, because it was not written in the sunshine.

I am even told there is a section here that may have accidentally repealed the minimum wage altogether for 6 months. I don't know. It is possible.

Again, good law is not made behind closed doors by a small number of people. It is made by all of us here in the full light of sunshine.

I ask my colleagues to vote against this bill. But, more importantly, when the President vetoes it, let's get together and do something that is balanced for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, we are about ready to conclude the debate on this portion of the omnibus small business.

Let me point out before we go to the votes on District of Columbia/Commerce-State-Justice and adopt the resolution numbered 245, there has been a lot of talk about all of these things not having passed. Ninety percent of the bill has been voted out of the House by a large margin, and parts have come out of the Finance Committee.

I can tell you from the Small Business Committee that we took a bipartisan, broadly supported bill, and we were not able to get all of the things that we in the Senate wanted included. Frankly, one of the key elements I wanted was rejected. I know a provision advocated by the Senator from Minnesota was rejected. But I can assure you that it was over my strong objections, and only at the last was it rejected.

This measure does many things to continue the small business programs and to assure small businesses can provide jobs in areas where there are great needs when there is poverty and unemployment. There are provisions that are recommended by the Women's Business Conference. There are provisions to bring jobs into needy low-income communities. These bills together have many of the things that the President also requested.

I regret to say that the President and some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are pouting because they didn't get it all. I can tell you something. I didn't get all that I wanted in this bill either. I took some things I didn't want, that were wanted by the House and that were wanted by other Members.

But this bill provides significant savings incentives and income-limited savings incentives on IRAs that could do more to help savings.

Medicare give-backs will enable providers to continue to serve needy people.

Those who ran against the HMOs are trying to make HMOs available in States such as New Mexico and rural areas that do not have the tremendous bonanza of the reimbursements that they do in New York State.

There are many good provisions in this bill. An overwhelming number of them have been supported and requested by the President and, at one time or another, supported by the people on the other side of the aisle. Unfortunately, they say: We are just not getting enough. Sixteen billion dollars in school construction, two-thirds of what the President wanted, is not enough. Our friends have never seen a tax cut that they liked nor a tax surplus they didn't want to spend.

This strikes the happy medium. I hope ultimately we will adopt this measure and have it signed by the President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The clerk will report the conference report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate 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 revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes'', having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The report was printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of October 25, 2000.)

FBI'S JEWELRY AND GEM PROGRAM

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam President, I commend my friend and colleague from Hew Hampshire, Senator GREGG, for his effective leadership on this important Commerce, Justice, State appropriations conference report. The Senate version of the fiscal year 2001 Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill included a recommendation of up to $2.2 million for the FBI's Jewelry and Gem Program within funds available for Organized Criminal Enterprises, OCE, to address crimes against jewelry vendors who have proven easy targets for thieves, including organized South American gangs. The House report on the bill encourages the FBI to continue to allocate sufficient resources to disrupting these criminal enterprises. This program is designed to protect small businesses and the lives of employees in this field from violent crime. The conference agreement adopts the House position, but it is my understanding that the FBI decided to commit significant funds to combating these crimes in fiscal year 2000. Therefore, the conference agreement should be understood to recommend the FBI make available sufficient funds for the Jewelry and Gem Program. May I ask my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire, the chairman of our subcommittee and our Senate conferees, if my understanding is correct?

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, my distinguished colleague from Colorado is correct. The conference agreement should be read to recommend that the FBI expend sufficient funds for OCE on combating the crimes addressed by the Jewelry and Gem Program.

FAST PROGRAM

● Mr. BURNS. Madam President, the conference report for the Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary appropriations bill provides that $5 million is appropriated for the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Rural Outreach Program at the Small Business Administration, SBA. Given how this legislation evolved, I believe that clarification is needed as to how the Conferees intend that the SBA spend such money.

Next year, there will be two programs at the SBA that focus on small high-technology business outreach: The Federal and State Technology Partnership (FAST) program and the SBIR Rural Outreach Program. While the FAST program and the Rural Outreach Program share the similar goal of facilitating the development of small high-technology businesses, they are separate programs and the FAST program is much broader in scope than the Rural Outreach Program. The FAST program is a competitive matching-grant program that provides states with wide latitude to develop strategies to assist in the growth of their small business high-technology sectors. In contrast, the Rural Outreach Program is targeted at only those states that receive the fewest SBIR awards and is limited to funding activities to encourage small firms in those states to participate in the SBIR program. My state of Montana has benefitted greatly from the Rural Outreach Program and it is very important that this program be funded.

The FAST program, which has been included in SBIR legislation that has

been separately passed by both the Senate and the House and which I anticipate will be enacted prior to Congress adjourning, was initially appropriated $5 million in the bill reported out of the Senate Appropriations Committee. In the conference report, it appears that the funds appropriated for both the FAST program and the Rural Outreach Program were inadvertently combined under the general heading of funding for the Rural Outreach Program. This is apparent because $5 million is targeted in the conference report for the Rural Outreach Program, while the authorization for that program is only $2 million. I am concerned that without clarification about how the SBA is required to spend such funds, that the SBA will use excess amounts for programs other than the FAST program and the Rural Outreach Program. Accordingly, am I correct in my interpretation that funding for the FAST Program was combined with funding for the Rural Outreach Program in the conference report and that the Conferees intend that the $5 million be used to support both programs?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, the interpretation is correct. Both of these programs provide support for high-technology businesses and, therefore, both have been funded under the general topic of SBIR Rural Outreach. Thank you for bringing to our attention that clarification.

Mr. BURNS. I know that there is substantial support for both of these programs. Can you tell me how the conferees intend that the SBA spend the $5 million on the Rural Outreach Program and the FAST program?

Mr. GREGG. My understanding is that the intent of the conferees is that $1.5 million of the total amount be spent on the Rural Outreach Program and $3.5 million be spent on the FAST program.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the Senator for the clarification.●

GROCERY SLOTTING FEES

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, the conference report that includes fiscal year 2001 Commerce-Justice-State appropriations picks up some Senate report language providing up to $900,000 for completion of a Federal Trade Commission investigation into slotting allowances and fair competition in the retail grocery business.

I understand that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] originally requested that language. I would like to engage the Senator from Missouri and the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. GREGG] in a colloquy simply to clarify the scope and intent of that provision.

Because this language is brief, I wanted to make sure it would not be misread to suggest that we are providing these funds for use in any company-specific investigation.

It is my understanding that committee's intent is for the FTC to use these funds solely to undertake a general study, collecting comprehensive data on the current competitive environment related to such practices, assessing their impact, and reporting back to Congress on appropriate policy considerations.

I am concerned that our current understanding of the practice of slotting fees, as well as the payment of other discounts, fees, and promotional allowances, is still limited. A thorough understanding of industry practices and their effects should inform policymaking.

Mr. BOND. The Senator is correct. The Small Business Committee, which I chair, has invested considerable time and effort working on this issue. While we have made much progress, many of the facts surrounding this practice remain shrouded, and little hard data has been produced to gauge slotting's impact, especially on small businesses and small farmers. For example, at a recent hearing, the General Accounting Office reported it has been unable to collect data needed to prepare a thorough analysis of the practice. The FTC, however, would have the legal authority under Section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission Act to collect the data necessary to continue with a full and complete analysis of these practices and their impacts.

This funding was requested for the purpose of the FTC preparing a comprehensive report to Congress, pursuant to Section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, that outlines the appropriate policy considerations arising from this issue. The report should concentrate on industry-wide practices of retailers that engage in the sale of grocery items with respect to slotting allowances and other similar practices including, without limitation: Their impact on competition and retail prices; their impact on all forms of grocery retailing, including smaller grocery retailers; their impact on manufacturers and suppliers; and their relationship to consolidation in the retail grocery industry.

Mr. GREGG. The Senators are correct. The intent of the committee in originally providing for this funding in the Senate-reported appropriations is as the Senators have described it. The conference report maintains the Senate position. I would also state it is our expectation that the FTC provide this report to Congress no later than sixteen months from the date of enactment of this legislation.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Senator for clarifying the committee's intent.

I want to add my personally strong feeling that it would be inappropriate for the FTC to launch individualized investigations and enforcement actions on the basis of notions about industry practices that are not-fully-informed, before it can sort out what appropriate law and policy should be. Unfocused, premature, or ad hoc actions could be counterproductive, possibly disrupting markets and chilling some positive industry practices that actually benefit consumers. It is important now for the FTC to focus on resolving uncertainties and acquiring a better understanding the facts, law, market practices, and impacts related to these issues.

MEDICAL CORRECTIONS OPTIONS PROGRAM

Mr. MACK. Madam President, last year the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations Subcommittee included funding for the Southern Florida Medical Corrections Options Program, which began operations this spring. Working with the Broward County Mental Health Court and the Broward County Sheriff's office it has had tremendous success in treating mentally ill misdemeanants and preventing recidivism. My colleague from Hawaii shares my interest in the program because Hawaii faces many of the same challenges as Florida in treating mentally ill misdemeanants.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, my colleague from Florida is correct. Together, we are seeking to expand the South Florida Medical Corrections Options Program to initiate a Hawaii program that will enhance our knowledge in this field. We are also seeking to provide much needed data for the eventual expansion of the national mental health court program.

Mr. MACK. The Fiscal Year 2001 Commerce, State, Justice and the Judiciary Appropriations Committee Report includes a number of programs that the committee has encouraged the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to examine and fund, if possible, under the Edward Byrne Memorial Discretionary Grants Program. I am hopeful that the BJA will consider funding for the joint Hawaii/Florida demonstration project to develop a national model for future mental health courts.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank my colleague for his support in expanding this important project into the State of Hawaii, and would appreciate the agreement of the Chairman to support this project for funding consideration.

Mr. GREGG. I thank my colleagues from Florida and Hawaii and would like to clarify that the BJA should consider funding under the Edward Byrne Memorial Discretionary Grants Program for this joint Hawaii/Florida demonstration project.

Mr. MACK. I thank the Chairman for his comments.

LAND ACQUISITION

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I would like to inquire of the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Related Agencies, Senator HOLLINGS, about a particular provision of the conference report.

The conference report to the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001 specified that $1 million is available for land acquisition in Raritan, New Jersey under the National Estuarine Research Reserve system.

Mr. HOLLINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. As I understand it, the intent of this language is to allow for the purchase of specific parcels of wetland habitat in the Raritan

Bay region of New Jersey. The Raritan Bay area in Monmouth County, New Jersey, is the area of focus of this provision, not Raritan Borough in Somerset County, New Jersey nor Raritan Township which is located in Hunterdon County. In addition, the intent of this provision is for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Estuarine Research System to work cooperatively with the State of New Jersey to coordinate the acquisition and management of these lands.

Mr. HOLLINGS. The Senator is again, correct on both points. As the Senator from New Jersey has stated, the intent of this provision is to allow NOAA to work with the State of New Jersey to acquire lands along the Raritan Bay for inclusion in the National Estuarine Research Reserve System.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the ranking member for clarifying the meaning of this provision.

CARA

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I have a question about a last minute change in language of the appropriations measure establishing a Coastal Impact Assistance program as section 31 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. The Coastal Impact Assistance program, with relatively few changes, is identical to language referred to and reported by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources as part of H.R. 701, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 2000, commonly referred to as CARA. The last minute change I am concerned about places the Secretary of Commerce in charge of the Coastal Impact Assistance program rather than the Secretary of the Interior. Both the House of Representatives, when it passed CARA, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, when it reported CARA to the Senate, placed responsibility for Coastal Impact Assistance with the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior has the overall responsibility under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act for the leasing program that creates the impact on our coastal communities that Coastal Impact assistance seeks to address and is also the source of revenues to fund not only such assistance but also various conservation programs that were included under CARA. I do not understand why the change was made, but I want to make certain that the change has no effect on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources over the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and especially exclusive jurisdiction over the Coastal Impact Assistance program established under section 31 of that act.

Mr. LOTT. I can assure the Senator that the change has absolutely no effect on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources over that program. As the Senator knows, at one time there were discussions about adding the entire CARA package to the Interior appropriation bill. The allocation of funding required us to add this portion, which includes Coastal Impact Assistance, to the Commerce appropriation. The change made in what Secretary disburses the funds does not alter in any manner the nature of the program, the purposes of the program, or the exclusive jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources over the program.

Mr. DASCHLE. I fully agree with the response from the majority leader. Whether the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce or the Secretary of the Treasury makes the disbursements has absolutely no effect on the exclusive jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources over this program. The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has jurisdiction over the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and was the committee that originally reported the Coastal Impact Assistance program as part of the CARA legislation. The fact that we have funded the first year through the Department of Commerce has absolutely no effect on the exclusive jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources over the Coastal Impact Assistance program, including oversight and any future changes.

Mr. STEVENS. Let me add as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that we were not in any manner attempting to alter the jurisdiction of the authorizing committees over any programs. As a result of the agreement made on the Interior appropriations bill, we were forced to fund the Coastal Impact Assistance program on the Commerce appropriations measure. To do that, we needed to include authorizing language. We took the language that had been reported by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources with only minor alterations. There was a last minute change to insert a definition of ''Secretary'' for the purposes of the new section 31 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to be the Secretary of Commerce. All that change does, is alter who will disburse the funding to the coastal States. I can assure all my colleagues that there was no intent to alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources over the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act or its exclusive jurisdiction over the Coastal Impact Assistance program that is established as a new section 31 of that act.

Mr. BYRD. I also agree with these comments. The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has jurisdiction over ''Extraction of minerals from oceans and Outer Continental Shelf lands'' under Rule XXV(g)(1)6. of the Standing Rules of the Senate. Pursuant to that authority, it has jurisdiction over the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation continues to have jurisdiction under Rule XXV(f)(1) over ''Transportation and commerce aspects of Outer Continental Shelf lands''. The Coastal Impact Assistance program, which will now be section 31 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, is an important and necessary component of our leasing program on the Outer Continental Shelf and is certainly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. How we choose to route the funding for this program is incidental and has nothing to do with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. As the minority leader noted, it is immaterial whether the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce or some other officer is responsible, the program remains exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

• Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I want to thank the managers of this bill for their hard work in putting forth annual legislation which provides federal funding for numerous vital programs.

This bill provides funding for fighting crime, enhancing drug enforcement, and responding to threats of terrorism. It further funds the operation of the District of Columbia, addresses some of the shortcomings of the immigration process, funds the operation of the judicial system, facilitates commerce throughout the United States, and fulfills the needs of the State Department and various other agencies.

Unfortunately, for the second time in a month, I must express my dismay over the process whereby the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act (LIFA) has been considered by this Congress. Like many Americans who believe policies that reflect compassion and family values should apply to immigrants and U.S. citizens alike, I welcome inclusion of the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act in this bill. But I had hoped that this legislation would supplement, rather than substitute for, the Fairness bill, which is far broader. I am disappointed that members of my party refused to include LIFA in this bill. As a consequence, hundreds of thousands of hard-working, tax-paying members of our society will be denied the amnesty, parity, and family-unification protections of LIFA. I will continue to work for passage of the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act and trust that, next year, we can pass it on the Senate floor.

Regretfully, I must oppose this measure.

There are hundreds of millions of dollars in pork-barrel spending and the legislative riders that are riddled throughout this bill. The multitude of unrequested earmarks buried in this measure will undoubtedly further burden the American taxpayers. While the amounts associated with each individual earmark may not seem extravagant, taken together, they represent a serious diversion of taxpayers' hard-earned dollars at the expense of numerous programs that have undergone the appropriate merit-based selection process.

For example, under funding for the Department of Justice, some examples

of earmarks include: $130,000 to Jackson City, Mississippi, for public safety and automated technologies related to law enforcement; $2 million for the Alaska Native Justice Center; $15 million for an education and development initiative to promote criminal justice excellence at Eastern Kentucky University in conjunction with the University of Kentucky; and $4 million for the West Virginia University Forensic Identification program.

Under funding for the Department of Commerce, some of the earmarks include: $500,000 for the International Pacific Research Center at the University of Hawaii; $855,000 for weather radio transmitters in Kentucky; $2.5 million for the Center for Spatial Data Research at Jackson State University; $500,000 for the South Carolina Geodetic Survey; and $500,000 for the California Ozone Study.

And the list of questionable spending goes on with even more funding for the 2002 Winter Olympic Games in Salt Lake City, Utah. For example: $3 million for the Utah Olympic Public Safety Command to implement the public safety master plan for the Olympics; $5 million for the Utah Communication Agency Network for enhancements and upgrades of security and communication infrastructure to assist with law enforcement needs of the Olympics; and $590,000 for the NOAA Cooperative Institute for Regional Prediction at the University of Utah to implement data collection and automated weather station installation in preparation for the Olympics.

There are many more projects on the list that I have compiled, which will be available on my Senate Website.

I also want to address the legislative riders in this bill. In particular, I want to express my disappointment that legislation restricting low-power FM services has been added behind closed doors to this appropriations conference report. The addition of this rider illustrates, once again, how the special interests of a few are allowed to dominate the voices of the many in the back-door dealings of the appropriations process.

Low-power FM radio service provides community-based organizations, churches and other non-profit groups with a new, affordable opportunity to reach out to the public, helping to promote a greater awareness within our communities. Low-power FM is supported by the U.S. conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the Consumers' Union and many religious organizations, including the U.S. Catholic Conference and the United Church of Christ. These institutions support low-power FM because they see what low-power FM's opponents also know to be true—that these stations will make more programming available to the public, and provide outlets for news and perspectives not currently featured on local radio stations.

But, the special interests opposed to low-power FM—most notably the National Association of Broadcasters and National Public Radio—have mounted a vigorous behind-the-scenes campaign against this service. Their stated objection to this service is potential interference, of course, not potential competition. They claim that a 10 or 100 watt low power station that can only broadcast a few miles will ''bleed into'' and overpower the signal of nearby 100,000 watt full-power radio stations that broadcast about 70 miles. Interestingly, the FCC, the expert government agency that evaluates such radio interference claims, does not share this claimed concern. To the contrary, after developing an extensive record and evaluating these alleged technical concerns, the FCC proceeded with licensing and established procedures to address any interference issues that actually arose.

Moreover, competitors' speculations about potential interference from low-power stations were given a fair hearing not only in the FCC, but also in this Congress. Earlier this year, Senator KERRY and I introduced the Low Power FM Radio Act of 2000, which would have struck a fair balance between allowing low-power radio stations to go forward while at the same time protecting existing full-power stations from actual interference. Under our bill, low-power stations causing interference would be required to stop causing interference—or be shut down—but non-interfering low power FM stations would be allowed to operate without further delay. The opponents of low-power FM did not support this bill because they want low-power FM to be dead rather than functional.

Congress should not permit the appropriations process to circumvent the normal legislative process. Every time we do this, the American people lose more faith in us. And in this context, they will become even more cynical when they learn that special interests like the NAB were able to use the appropriations process to highjack and overturn the sound technical decisions by the government radio experts that would have authorized new outlets for religious and political speech—and new outlets for their local churches and community groups.

Low-power FM is an opportunity for minorities, churches and others to have a new voice in radio broadcasting. In the Commerce Committee, we constantly lament the fact that minorities, community-based organizations, and religious organizations do not have adequate opportunities to communicate their views. Over the years, I have often heard many members of both the Committee and this Senate lament the enormous consolidation that has occurred in the telecommunications sector as a whole and the radio industry specifically. Here, we had a chance to get out of the way, and allow non-interfering low-power radio stations to go forward to combat these concerns. Instead, we let special interests hide their competitive fears behind the smokescreen of hypothetical interference to severely wound—if not kill—this service in the dead of night.

This report also contains legislation establishing a rural loan guarantee program intended to help bring broadcast signals to the most remote areas in this country. While I support this legislation, and I commend my friend, Senator BURNS, for his leadership in this area, there is one aspect of this legislation that still causes me concern.

This legislation would let incumbent cable monopolies qualify for U.S. taxpayer subsidized loans in the name of ''technology neutrality.'' Unfortunately, this approach will fail to achieve any real ''technology neutrality'' while simultaneously expanding a limited loan guaranty program into an unnecessary corporate welfare program.

In a perfect world, a loan guaranty program would be equally available to every competing industry segment because this would ensure that no industry segment would benefit from a government-sanctioned advantage in the marketplace.

Unfortunately, telecommunications law has already departed so significantly from principles of ''technology neutrality'' that ''neutrality'' in the narrow field of taxpayer-subsidized loan guaranties will only increase the cost of the program for the benefit of previously favored technologies. Indeed, my experience has shown that in telecommunications technological neutrality has been sacrificed by a misplaced focus on protecting competitors at the expense of competition and the American consumer. For example, the broadcast industry has been given 70 billion dollars of free spectrum, yet the wireless industry must compete for spectrum at auction. And certain industry sectors, such as cable, have been given government-franchised monopolies. In the telecommunications world, some are already more equal than others.

It is against this reality that any claims of ''technological neutrality'' must be evaluated. In the real world, cable companies not only have a government-sanctioned advantage—they have a government-franchised monopoly. Monopolists, almost by definition, need no more government protection against competition. Perhaps it is just a coincidence, and not due to a lack of competition, but cable companies have been able to raise their rates approximately three times the rate of inflation (for about a 30 percent total increase) since the 1996 Telecommunications Act. This scenario hardly requires the helping hand of the U.S. taxpayer.

''Technology neutrality'' is a fine phrase, but not if it means that the American taxpayers must further subsidize industries that have already received undue and unnecessary market advantages sanctioned by the government.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to curb our habit of directing hard-earned taxpayer dollars to locality-specific special interests and our inclusion of legislative riders which thwart the very process that is needed to ensure our laws address the concerns and interests of all Americans, not just a few who seek special protection or advantage.●

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, one of my priorities in this bill was to make sure that Washington seniors continue to have access to their Medicare+Choice program and to expand choices for other seniors who have been dropped from the program due to low payment rates in Washington state. We need to make sure Medicare+Choice is a stable option in the Medicare program for our seniors.

I am concerned, however that the new requirements on the submission of adjusted community rate ACR proposals for 2001 may interfere with my goal of ensuring the stability of this program for seniors in my state. Under this bill, plans that have ensured seniors have consistent access to the Medicare+Choice program cannot use the increased funds to stabilize the benefits they already provide or to ensure adequate payments to providers such as doctors and hospitals—even if they are losing money on providing those benefits right now.

In Washington State we have plans that are operating at a deficit every year but they continue to stick with this program and offer health care to our seniors. They need this money simply to stabilize and maintain current benefits. Without these funds, there will be no basic programs for seniors at all. Plans cannot offer enhanced benefits or lower premiums if there is no program in existence, in Washington state, that is what we are facing—the possibility of no Medicare+Choice programs at all.

I don't disagree with the intent of the provision to ensure that seniors benefit from this new funding in the form of reduced premiums or increased benefits. My point is that there are more ways to help out seniors and one way is to ensure that their plan will not only be there this year, but the next year and into the future. One way to do that is to simply add a provision to the current language that allows plans to stabilize or enhance patients access to providers such as doctors and hospitals.

You can spend millions of dollars on the fixtures of a new house, on antique furniture, on expensive paintings, and the like but if there is no foundation the house will fall to the ground and no one will benefit. Our first priority should be to ensure that the Medicare+Choice program is stabilized that at a minimum seniors continue to have the choice we promised them.

● Mr. BURNS. Madam President, I support the passage of the Commerce-Justice-State conference report, which includes a bill of critical importance to rural America, the ''Local TV Act.'' The Local TV Act will create a $1.25 billion loan guarantee program that will bring local TV signals to Montana and other rural states, over satellites or other technologies, in a fiscally responsible way.

I want to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Banking Committee and the Majority Leaders in both the Senate and the House for helping to reach completion on this issue. I should add that Senator LEAHY, Senator HOLLINGS, Senator THOMAS and Senator GRAMS have worked tirelessly on this matter. I would also like to thank my colleagues in the House for their efforts. Representative GOODLATTE was involved in every stage of the complex negotiations that took place on this bill, as were House Commerce Committee Chairman BLILEY, House Telecommunications Subcommittee Chairman TAUZIN, House Agriculture Committee Chairman COMBEST and Representative BOUCHER. I thank them all for helping to reach such a positive result, which was only possible through an extraordinary, bipartisan effort.

Providing access to local television signals is crucial to rural states. With over-the-air broadcast signals and cable delivery limited by the geography of my own state of Montana, satellite television has been a staple of our so-called ''video marketplace'' for many years. In fact, Montana has the highest penetration level of satellite television in the country at over 35 percent.

I initially proposed legislation in this area because I was concerned that without it, only the largest television markets in America would receive local-into-local service authorized by the Satellite Home Viewer Improvement Act. These are the profitable cities like New York and Los Angeles with millions of television households. Currently, only the 20 largest television markets are being offered local TV signals via satellite. The two largest direct broadcaster satellite providers have announced plans to offer service to an additional 20 or 30 large markets over the next few years.

What about the other TV markets? There are 16 states—including my own—that do not have a single city among the top seventy markets. Because of the ''Local TV Act,'' they will now no longer be left out of the information age just because they are smaller.

The ability to receive local television signals is more than just having access to local sports or entertainment programming. It is a critical and immediate way to receive important local news, weather and community information. Access to local signals is particularly critical in Montana, where we experienced severe flooding last fall and sudden blizzards are always a possibility.

The ''Local TV Act'' reflects the belief that the loan guarantee program should not favor one technology over another and it should not pose a burden to the taxpayer. The ''Local TV Act'' is a win for consumers and for taxpayers. Earlier this year, the bill passed the Senate 97–0, a similar version passed the House by an overwhelming margin and I again thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for reaching agreement on this critical matter.●

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I would like to take a moment and join my subcommittee chairman and colleague, Senator GREGG, in commenting on the fiscal year 2001 Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and related agencies appropriations portion of the conference report before the Senate today. Once, again, I would like to commend Chairman GREGG for his outstanding efforts and bipartisan approach in bring an appropriations bill to the floor that is good and balanced.

Putting together the conference report is always a tremendous challenge, and this year has proven to be no different. We face the challenge of adequately funding a host of varying missions, This bill funds efforts to fight crime and drugs on our streets. This bill funds initiatives that enhance business opportunities for small and large companies at home and abroad. This bill funds agencies like the FTC and the SEC that protect consumers from fraud. This bill provides funding for scientific research needed for better fisheries management. This bill provides free and accurate weather forecasting to farmers who rely on it day by day for tending their crops and to families who live in areas where timely and accurate forecasts can save their lives from violent tornadoes, torrential rains, floods, and hurricanes. While the missions funded through this bill may vary, one point remains constant: The funding provided in this bill seeks to improve the daily lives and safety of all American at home and abroad.

In total, the conference report provides $38.0 billion in budget authority which is about $1.7 billion less in total budget authority than the fiscal year 2000 levels. The bill is $12.9 billion less than the President's request level; however, his request level, as in past years, included advanced appropriations, which the CJS Subcommittee traditionally does not provide.

Senator GREGG has mentioned many of the funding specifics in this bill, so I will not repeat the details; however, I would like to point out to our colleagues some of the highlights of this bill:

JUSTICE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

The conference report provides $21.1 billion for the Department of Justice, including $3.3 billion for the FBI, $1.3 billion for the DEA, $4.8 billion for INS, $4.3 billion for BOP, and $4.6 billion for the Office of Justice Programs. This conference report funds both block grant programs—such as Byrne, local law enforcement, and juvenile justice—and the COPS Program—such as the universal hiring and technology components. Our colleagues in the Senate

only need to review the FBI's preliminary annual uniform crime report released this past May to appreciate how well all these programs are working. According to the FBI's report, in 1999, serious crime dropped for an eighth consecutive year, down seven-percent from the year before. This is the longest running crime decline on record. The successful reduction in crime in no small way must be attributed to the bipartisan efforts to fund DOJ's crime fighting initiatives during the past ten years.

In an effort to continue the decline in serious crime, we continue to fund many of the programs that are working. Not only are we funding cops on the beat, we also continue the safe schools initiative which Senator GREGG and I started two years ago. This bill provides $227.5 million for this initiative. Madam President, we cannot allow violence or the threat of violence to turn our schools into a hostile setting that prevents our students from obtaining the education they deserve. The bill before the Senate provides increased funding from last year's levels, through the Office of Justice programs, to continue the hiring of school resource officers, and the implementation of community-based planning and prevention activities. This initiative is working but there is much more that has to be done, and this increased funding will continue our efforts to return our schools to a safe place for children to learn.

I am pleased to see in this year's conference report $1.3 billion funding for the DEA, which is a $69.45 million increase from last year's level. This funding is aimed at combating the latest battle in the war on drugs—methamphetamines. Included in the DEA fundings is $25.9 million for personnel and operations to combat the production and use of methamphetamines. Also included in the bill is $28.5 million for State and local law enforcement to combat methamphetamine production and $2.5 million for equipment. Another $20.0 million will be transferred from the COPS Hot Spots Program to reimburse the agency for the costs associated with assisting State and local law enforcement in meth lab cleanup.

The conference report also includes $288.7 million for the violence against women program, which includes $31.6 million for civil legal assistance, $25 million for rural domestic violence programs, $11.5 million for court appointed special advocates, and $11.0 million for college campus programs.

There is one issue within the Department of Justice for which I am disappointed we did not provide funding—the Justice Department's Lawsuit against the Tobacco industry. I appreciate Senator GREGG's effort to reach a middle ground between those members who want to prevent DOJ from bringing a lawsuit, and those who want to provide DOJ with adequate resources to do their job. It is the U.S. court's responsibility to weigh the evidence and decide whether the tobacco companies have broken the law, not Congress's responsibility. In fact, just recently, the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia rules that DOJ does have standing to bring a suit against the tobacco companies under the RICO (racketeering, influence, and corrupt organizations) Act. It is Congress's responsibility to provide the Justice Department with the tools and adequate resources it needs to do its job. This conference report does not do that.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The conference report provides $4.7 billion for the Commerce Department, an increase of $460 million above last year's funding level. We provide $337.4 million for ITA, and while we could not fully fund all of the President's request for this important administration, we did provide funding for the trade compliance initiatives. I also appreciate Senator GREGG's support for language requiring the USTR to assist the Import Administration with office space in Geneva given the importance of the Import Administration's responsibilities relating to antidumping and countervailing duties.

While we did not fully fund the administration's new internet access initiatives for NTIA, we did provide more than $100 million in funding for the NTIA to continue its core missions—funding for digital conversion, and funding for infrastructure grants.

Regarding technology, the bill includes $312.6 million for NIST scientific and technical research and services. Under NIST, the Advanced Technology Program (ATP) is funded at a program level of $190.7 million, and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) Program is funded at $105.1 million.

The conference report also provides $3.1 billion for NOAA, more than $700 million above last year's level, and $850 million above the House level for FY 2001. I appreciate Chairman GREGG's support and efforts to insure that we maintain a focus on our oceans and coast. I have made it clear this year that I am disappointed in the administration's request for NOAA. Most of the funding increases requested this year were for community assistance type programs—making NOAA a mini-EDA—and not the science and research missions that have been NOAA's trademark during the past three decades. The budget request was particularly disappointing given the one hundred plus lawsuits currently pending against NOAA due to a lack of scientific data.

Madam President, at present, we generate more than 30% of our gross domestic product from coastal areas, and nearly one out of every six jobs is marine-related. By the end of this decade, about 60% of Americans will live along our coasts. We cannot ignore the stress and strain of this growth on our coastal environment, and we must continue to strive for better management of our marine resources. Of course, these efforts are nothing new. Three decades ago, our nation roared into space, investing tens of billions of dollars in that effort. During that golden era of science, some of us also recognized the importance of exploring the seas and protecting the coasts on our own planet. In 1966, Congress enacted the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act in order to define national objectives and programs with respect to the oceans. One of the central elements of the 1966 act was establishment of a Presidential commission, called the Stratton Commission, to develop a plan for national action in the oceans and atmosphere. The Stratton Commission laid the foundation for U.S. ocean and coastal policy and programs and has guided their development for three decades. Their report led to the creation of NOAA and laid the groundwork for science and research and for management regimes that are the cornerstone of our efforts to properly manage our fisheries, and protect our coasts today. This conference report fully funds all of NOAA's base science and research missions.

FY 2001 funding for NOAA also includes additional funds for coastal conservation reflecting this year's coastal funding proposals in Congress (''CARA'') and the administration's budget (''lands legacy''). The $420 million in increased funding includes $135 million for specific conservation projects and $135 million to strengthen NOAA's efforts to conserve and protect our coral reefs, national marine sanctuaries and reserves, as well as fisheries and coastal habitats. This $135 million infusion of funding in the coming year will greatly benefit NOAA's important coastal stewardship programs throughout the Nation. The increased coastal funding also includes $150 million to assist those States whose coastal areas are adversely affected by offshore oil development.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The conference report includes a total of $7.1 billion for the Department of State and related agencies, an increase of $1.3 billion above last year's funding level of $5.8 billion. Within the State Department account, $1.1 billion has been provided for worldwide security upgrades of State Department facilities. Additionally, the bill provides $846 million to continue our Nation's international peacekeeping activities.

SUMMARY

In closing let me say again that except for a one or two major policy issues this is a decent bill. Many—but not all—of the administration's priorities were addressed to some extent. Likewise many—but not all—of the priorities of our colleagues were addressed to some extent. It is with regret that I cannot support this bill at this time. I cannot support an effort that starts down the slippery slope of the U.S. Congress telling the Department of Justice who they can and cannot sue. It is my hope that this issue will be corrected should this conference report pass the Senate and be vetoed by the President.

I would like to take a moment before closing to acknowledge and thank Senator GREGG's staff—Jim Morhard, Kevin Linskey, Paddy Link, Dana Quam, Clayton Heil, and Katherine Hennesey—and my staff—Lila Helms and Sonia King—for their hard work and diligence in bringing together a bill that does everything I have just mentioned and more. They have worked nonstop in a straightforward and bipartisan manner, to deliver the bill that is before the Senate today. This bill could not have come together without their efforts and I thank them for all of their hard work.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I want to speak about the appropriations agreement for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2001. This bill is part of the D.C. Appropriations bill and I thank the Senator from Texas for her help on this matter and everyone else on the subcommittee.

I cannot tell you how hard we have tried to work with OMB and the White House on this bill. I find it hard to believe that they want to veto the bill based on what is in here. The main issue they have difficulty with is on immigration and it was never requested by the President and is not an appropriations matter.

This bill does include $38.0 billion for these agencies. I believe the funding levels in this bill will allow the departments and agencies funded by it to fulfill their mandates.

The first title in this bill is the Department of Justice. We provide $21 billion, an increase over last year's level. Within Justice, there are a number of issues that stand out.

This bill provides comprehensive counter drug funding. It is our goal to provide the resources to protect our communities from the violence associated with illegal drugs. One of the most prevalent concerns in this area is the production of methamphetamine. The Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) has reported an increase in clandestine lab seizures nationwide. In 1997, 3,327 labs were seized by Federal, State, and local law enforcement. By 1999, that number had escalated to 7,060.

Although the number of clandestine methamphetamine labs has almost doubled since 1997, the President included no funding to combat methamphetamine production, trafficking, and use in his FY 2001 budget request. We remedy that mistake here.

Our recommendation includes a total of $76.9 million for methamphetamine initiatives. We provide $25.9 million for investigations and day to day operations on methamphetamine cases, including maintaining a database of labs around the country.

Since the bi-products from methamphetamine production are hazardous, explosions or fires often result and specially equipped teams are sent in to clean-up the lab sites. We provide $20 million to the DEA through the COPS Methamphetamine Drug Hot Spots Program for clean-up activities. We have also made available for State and local law enforcement agencies $28.5 million for their methamphetamine enforcement and cleanup efforts.

Of course, methamphetamines are not the only problem. We provide $28.8 million to DEA for its heroin-related efforts. Because drug traffickers are highly adaptive, we must have the ability to respond where ''hot spots'' arise. The bill provides $24.2 million for Regional Drug Enforcement Teams and $53.9 million for Mobile Enforcement Teams.

To aid those communities that have suffered because of the presence of drug dealers, we provide $34.0 million in direct funding for the Weed and Seed program. This program distributes grant funding to qualified neighborhoods so that they can weed out criminals in their communities while seeding new prevention and intervention services to help revitalize the neighborhood.

The drug problem in the United States is so pervasive that over 480 drug courts have evolved to handle these particular cases. This bill includes $50.0 million through the Office of Justice Programs for drug courts; additional funding can be obtained through the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants or the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants.

Moving on to another important program in this bill, we continue the Safe Schools Initiative. This initiative was one the Ranking Member and I sponsored in 1999 just after the Columbine massacre. For fiscal year 2001, we provide a total of $227.5 million for State school programs with $180.0 million for school resource officers and $15.0 million for school technology. This program gives school administrators resources to enhance safety measures. It grants them the flexibility to implement decisions on how best to maintain a safe learning environment without impacting funding for educational programs.

The final agreement contains funding for after-school youth programs. A leader in this category is the Boys and Girls Clubs of America. For this reason, $60.0 million is available for their programs.

Additionally, Juvenile Mentoring Programs, JUMP, receive $16.0 million. These programs, including Big Brothers/Big Sisters, foster healthy relationships between at risk youth and responsible adults.

The next item is of particular interest to me. The Missing Children program is one that continues to show positive results, and is funded at a level of $23.0 million. Within this amount, $6.5 million is provided for investigative cyber units for State and local law enforcement agencies and $11.4 million for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

One of the Center's most valuable resources is the Cyber TipLine, which allows individuals to report information about missing children on-line. Information reported to the Center is compiled and made accessible to law enforcement officers all over the continent. The Center dedicates significant resources to preventing and responding to incidents of cyber stalking. Overall, this bill includes more than $830.0 million for juvenile programs through the Office of Justice programs, the juvenile justice budget, and the COPS program.

Our dedication to communities and families is also captured in our support of the Violence Against Women Act programs, which address domestic violence and its effects. For fiscal year 2001, we fund the program at $288.7 million. This includes funding for legal assistance, rural domestic violence initiatives, and court-appointed-special advocates.

At my request, this bill also recommends $11.0 million for grants to address violence on college campuses. Grantees use these funds to expand defense classes; to make capital improvements, such as installing emergency phones and improving lighting on campuses; and to train campus administrators and students on how to deal with violence and its after effects.

On a related topic, the conference agreement directs the Center for Sex Offender Management to develop a system through which local law enforcement can notify communities when a sex offender has been released and is living nearby.

Law enforcement is Justice's primary mission, and there are several key components. The U.S. Marshals are responsible for protecting our Federal judges and courthouses, for serving legal papers in Federal cases, and for recapturing fugitives. The $604.3 million recommended for the Marshals provides funds for new initiatives to apprehend the most dangerous fugitives; outfit and man new courthouses; and reduce the backlog of security upgrades at old courthouses.

The recommendation provides $4.6 billion for the Immigration & Naturalization Service, INS; $1.5 billion of this is derived from fees. The amount provided improves our posture on the border, expands efforts to apprehend illegal aliens in the interior, increases resources for naturalization backlog reduction, and begins to tackle the nationwide backlog on INS construction, maintenance, and repair.

An appropriation of $3.2 billion is dedicated to the FBI. This includes $67.5 million for the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, NICS, used by gun dealers to prevent the sale of weapons to individuals who are prohibited from owning a gun. We have reiterated the Senate recommendation that no fees be charged to conduct these checks.

The FBI Crime Lab is famous for its forensic capabilities, and many States rely on its scientific expertise. The bill provides $137.3 million for forensic services within the Bureau.

DNA testing is just one example of an important emerging forensic science. The FBI reported a 15 percent increase in the number of cases aided this year by having DNA profiles available in a national database. Our recommendation includes $1.4 million for the National Offender Database, which stores the DNA profiles of convicted criminals.

The Internet has created numerous social and economic benefits in the United States and around the world. Unfortunately, it is also an efficient medium by which crimes can be committed.

The conference agreement includes an increase to $3.9 million for the FBI's Computer Analysis and Response Teams and $30.5 million for its digital storm program. In addition, we continue funding levels for the Field Computer Crime Intrusion Squads, which are highly trained computer experts available on demand to field offices. Finally, $5.5 million is recommended for the Special Technologies Applications Unit of the National Infrastructure Protection Center, a clearinghouse for Federal cases dealing with cyber crime.

We aggressively fund State and local law enforcement assistance, providing $2.8 billion.

COPS is funded at $1.03 billion. A large portion of this amount is for hiring initiatives. This high level of funding also allows law enforcement agencies to upgrade technology. For programs funded under the Crime Identification Technology Act, $130.0 million is available. There is an additional $140.0 million for non-CITA technology needs.

In order to get this bill passed without a veto, we have also provided $25.0 million for community prosecutors and $75.0 million for gun prosecutions. The agreement limited these funds to prosecutions of individuals who committed crimes with firearms.

Separate from COPS funding we provide funding for the programs that Congress traditionally supports. There is $523.0 million available for the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants, $569.0 million for the Edward Byrne Grants, and $686.5 million for State Prison Grants.

The last item I want to talk about in the Justice section of this bill is my proposal on how to prevent misuse of Social Security numbers.

We have incorporated language that will protect people from the improper use of Social Security numbers. We must protect individuals when access to an individual's most personal information is wrongly obtained.

A recent example of the gross misuse of a Social Security number happened in Nashua, New Hampshire, just one year ago. Amy Boyer was murdered by a stalker who was able to purchase her Social Security number on the Internet. The social security number gave him access to information so that he was able to track her down and kill her.

We have named the incorporated provision after Amy because its goal is to ensure that no more stalkers can easily use Social Security numbers for their nefarious acts. Amy Boyer's Law prohibits the display or sale to the public of any person's Social Security number without that individual's consent. It imposes civil and criminal penalties on those who violate this law.

This legislation, while banning improper or fraudulent uses of social security numbers, does preserve the legitimate uses of Social Security numbers by such groups as the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America, and the Association for Children for the Enforcement of Support, ACES, as well as banks, insurance companies, and others who use these numbers to prevent fraud. I am confident that this legislation is crafted in such a way as to balance the many concerns surrounding the use of Social Security numbers. I believe that passing Amy Boyer's Law is one of the most important things that Congress can accomplish this year.

The next title in the bill is the Department of Commerce and its related agencies. Title II is funded at a level of $4.7 billion.

One of the primary functions of Commerce is to generate a comprehensive international trade policy for our country. Many agencies play a part in this effort. For the agency that has the lead on negotiating trade agreements, we provide $29.5 million for the United States Trade Representative, USTR.

To one of its supporting agencies, the International Trade Commission, we provide $48.1 million. Their statutory mandate also includes enforcing dumping and counterveiling duty actions in accordance with the World Trade Organization and General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The International Trade Administration is responsible for promoting exports and provides information on Federal Government export assistance to individuals and businesses. We provide $337.4 million. This level includes additional funding to increase trade enforcement and compliance activities, in concert with USTR. Of particular importance are the funds included in this bill for compliance activities with respect to China, Japan, and the European Union. The bill also continues funding for the core programs within the agency.

The bill includes $64.9 million for the Bureau of Export Administration which is an increase of roughly $10.8 million over the fiscal year 2000 appropriation. The Committee increases funding for export cooperation for the implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Also, increased funds are provided to assist in export enforcement in the area of counterterrorism and computer export verification to ensure that high technology exports are being used for peaceful purposes and not for proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

We are providing significantly less money this year for the census because most of the activities supporting the decennial census have been concluded. The Committee provides $433.6 million to conclude Census 2000 and maintain normal operations for fiscal year 2001.

The conference agreement provides funding to permit the initiation of an effort to include a measurement of electronic business in the fiscal year 2002 economic census. The Committee's funding level should also permit the Bureau to continue issuing key reports on manufacturing, general economic, and foreign trade statistics which are so important to the U.S. business community.

Moving on to the scientific side of the Commerce Department, this bill includes $100.4 million for the National Telecommunications and Information Administration. From within this funding, $43.5 million is for the public telecommunications grant program and $45.5 million is for information infrastructure grants.

The President believes solving the digital divide is a government obligation. He requested $50.0 million to provide new Home Internet Access grants. Neither the House nor Senate bills included funding for this program. However, the President made this a priority and raised it in discussions with us, so we have directed $30.0 million into the Information Infrastructure Grants as a compromise position.

However, I note that in an earlier age, public libraries were created to give those without the resources to maintain a personal book collection access to information. The Schools and Libraries program was created in 1996 to provide access to the Internet for every American visiting a library and to school children.

Just as Enoch Pratt and Andrew Carnegie endowed public libraries throughout the country, the high tech industry has the ability and the wealth to create an endowment for addressing the so-called digital divide. Every person in America who has a phone contributes to the Universal Service fund, which provides funds for the Schools and Libraries program. I do not believe that asking Americans to contribute additional funds to bring Internet access to homes is the way to solve the so-called digital divide.

One of the agencies whose goals is to stimulate economic competition and innovation is the National Institute for Standards and Technology, NIST. This agency provides industry with assistance to leverage their efforts in technological advances and infrastructure enhancements that benefit all of us by keeping U.S. companies on the cutting edge.

NIST's funding level is $598.3 million for fiscal year 2001. Of this amount, $312.6 million is for scientific and technical research and services programs; $155.0 million and carryover funding

are available for the Advanced Technology Program (ATP), and $105.1 million for the Manufacturing Extension Program (MEP).

Also, $10 million is provided to develop new measurements, test methods, and guidelines to better protect the information technology elements of the Nation's critical infrastructure, of which our cyber infrastructure is a key component. NIST's research results are made publicly available so that all may benefit from its findings and suggestions.

Another agency within the Department with scientific expertise is the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The bill before you includes $2.6 billion for NOAA, and the five major line offices within NOAA are funded as follows: the National Ocean Service at a level of $290.0 million; the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) at $517.0 million; the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research at $323.0 million; the National Weather Service at $630.0 million; and, the National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service at a level of $125.0 million.

Within the National Ocean Service, $28.25 million for the National Estuarine Research Reserve program. We continue the efforts to reduce the backlog of NOAA mapping and charting as well as to map shorelines. The bill supports the Coastal Zone Management grants at a level of $52.0 million and the Great Lakes Environmental Research Lab at the Senate level of $7.0 million.

Under the National Marine Fisheries Service, we assist the collecting of scientific data on healthy fisheries as well as those that are threatened. Protection for threatened and endangered species continues. For NMFS Information, Collection, and Analysis programs, the bill provides $120 million.

The funding levels included in the bill for the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research support several important programs of interest to the Senate. The Sea Grant College program continues at a level of $62.25 million and $15.8 million for the National Undersea Research Program.

Climate and Air Quality research is funded at $68.5 million. A new climate initiative was requested for fiscal year 2001, and while the conference could not support the total request of $24.0 million, there is a recommendation of $9.25 million for initiating the ocean observations component of the proposal.

The National Weather Service touches all of our lives, and provides the warnings to protect life and property. The Committee funds Weather Service Operations and Research and systems acquisitions at $630.8 million.

NOAA's National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service operates the satellites which provide data used by the Weather Service to track hurricanes and to provide guidance for forecasts and warnings. Funding of $125.0 million is provided for this office within NOAA in fiscal year 2001. In addition, funding is provided elsewhere in the bill for the acquisition of both geostationary and polar-orbiting satellites.

The next title in our bill covers the Judiciary. For the third branch of government we provide an increase to $4.25 billion. We provide conditional funding for the cost of living adjustment for the justices and judges. However, the Senate Committee language ending the ban on honoraria for judges was not incorporated into this final agreement.

Now, for the last department in this bill, we provide $6.6 billion to the State Department. This is an increase over the fiscal year 2000 level for the department.

After the Dar Es Salaam and Nairobi bombings, we poured funding into State Department security, but we emphasized the need for a cohesive plan that had the capability of being effective. The past performance of the Department and resulting plans have not allayed the misgivings we have about their handling of the billions of dollars we appropriate to them.

We are disturbed by the security breaches. The State Department was not just lax with security overseas, but that it has been less than stellar at its headquarters here in Washington. From losing 16 laptop computers and letting press agents roam unattended through its corridors, the State Department's security plans remain of grave concern. We are providing the funding but are not seeing improvements.

This bill gives the State Department substantial resources to address its requirements. The funding levels include $410 million for worldwide security under Diplomatic and Consular Programs. We also provide $663.0 million in security-related construction under the Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance account.

The agreement includes a sizeable increase over last year's levels for Cultural and Educational Exchange Programs, providing $231.6 million—an amount above the President's original request and the Senate and House levels. The funding is used to bring individuals together, professionally and culturally, to share experiences to foster peace and understanding among multiple countries and the United States. My colleagues may be familiar with the Fulbright, International Visitors, and English Teaching Fellows programs that are included in this account.

Lastly in State, we provide $299 million to cover our country's regular dues to the United Nations and $846 million for U.N. peacekeeping.

We remain concerned that the United Nations continues to levy peacekeeping payments against us based on a percentage system setup during the 1970s connected to estimates on what member countries could afford to pay for such ventures at that time. The United States contests millions of dollars in payments to the United Nations because their billing procedure is outdated and does not reflect the fiscal capacities of the current member states.

For decades, the United States has been levied to pay roughly one-third of peacekeeping efforts even though it is an obligation of all 188 United Nations members. We will continue to encourage other members who have rebuilt and financially recovered from the ravages of the Twentieth Century's wars. They must step up and take over a more proportionate share of the financial burden of current peacekeeping endeavors.

This bill contains a handful of related agencies that act independently of the departments within this bill, and comprise $2.2 billion of the total of this bill.

The first of these agencies is the Maritime Administration which is responsible for administering several programs for the maritime industry relating to U.S. foreign and domestic commerce and our national defense. The bill includes a total of $219.6 million for its efforts. Within this level, the Maritime Security Program receives $98.7 million. The Maritime Guaranteed Loan Program (Title XI) is funded at $34.0 million. In addition, $10.0 million in carryover balances from prior fiscal years are available for this purpose.

The final bill before you includes an increase over last year's funding level for the Federal Communications Commission to $230.0 million.

The Small Business Administration (SBA) is one of the larger independent agencies in this bill. We provide $837.0 million for the SBA. Within this amount, $88 million is appropriated for the Small Business Development Centers; $15.0 million for PRIME; $3.8 million for SCORE; and, $4.0 million for the Veteran's Outreach program.

For SBA's business loan program account, the bill provides a total of $294 million in fiscal year 2001. This funding level provides a program level of $10.4 billion for 7(a) loans.

For the SBA disaster loan program, a total of $186.5 million is included to cover loans and the administration of the program.

The last two agencies I want to mention are the Federal Trade Commission, FTC, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC. We have given both these agencies increases this year, funding the FTC at a level of $147.2 million and the SEC at a level of $422.8 million. The Internet has caused a fundamental change to both these agencies as they try to put in place mechanisms to prevent fraud in the electronic market place.

The FTC has brought 100 cases against 300 companies and individuals for Internet fraud. As Internet access expands and more Internet businesses come on-line, the need for these agencies to have a strong presence in the market increases. There is a need to

protect consumers, and particularly elderly consumers who are prone to attacks, from ever varying fraudulent schemes. In 1999, consumers were estimated to have spent $20.2 billion on line, and the expectation is that this number will grow almost exponentially over the next 4 years.

We are providing additional funding for investigators and prosecutors within both the SEC and FTC to grow with the impending surge of activity. We provide funding to expand Consumer Sentinel so that international law enforcement officers will have access to it.

The strong presence we promote throughout this bill in the cyber-world is not one derived from statutory and regulatory restrictions, but achieved instead through the presence of enforcers of existing laws that will aggressively seek out those who abuse the Internet. I have made a point of mentioning throughout this summation the key Internet initiatives within the agencies and departments because it is such a critical issue for all of us.

Its importance will continue to grow. We have bolstered Federal agencies' efforts to stay on top of Internet advancements and maintain functionality in the technological world.

This bill effectively uses our resources to provide adequate funding for the agencies under our jurisdiction. It addresses the most pressing needs that were brought to our attention by the Administration and by my colleagues. Chairman ROGERS, the Ranking Members, and I have worked together with the members of the Committee to craft a bipartisan bill to recommend to both our houses. I do want to thank my colleague from South Carolina for his efforts in creating this bill. He remains a leader on many of the issues we address. I urge my colleagues to adopt this funding agreement.

Madam President, I would also like to acknowledge today the dedication of one of the staffers who drafted portions of this effort who has retired from Federal service.

Paddy Link served on the Committee for 4 years dealing with the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, the Commerce Department, the Small Business Administration, and many other agencies. She was an expert in FCC and NOAA. Her astute evaluation and handling of technical concepts made her a valued part of the Committee. She has in-depth knowledge of the people and issues in the areas she worked on which gave her much appreciated insight on the issues the Committee had to tackle.

She provided decades of Federal service, starting as staff in the House of Representatives, moving to the Department of Commerce as a congressional liaison officer and then to be the director of the office of legislative affairs for the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration. Most recently before her time with Appropriations, Paddy was the staff director of the Senate Commerce Committee under former Chairman Larry Pressler and had a critical role in writing and passing the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

We miss her political acumen as well as her sense of humor. We wish her the best of luck in the future.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the Broadwave affiliates of Northpoint Technology proposes to share the spectrum currently being used by the Direct Broadcast Satellite (DBS) services in the 12.2–12.7 GHz frequency bands. Through the use of its technology in the 12.2–12.7 GHz band, Northpoint has the potential to provide much needed competition to cable by offering low cost multichannel video services and high-speed Internet access.

A provision, however, addressing sharing issues in the 12.2–12.7 GHz band has been added to the ''Launching Our Communities' Access to Local Television Act of 2000'' (also referred to as the Rural Loan Guarantee bill). Section 12 of this Act imposes three general requirements. First, it requires that a terrestrial wireless applicant proposing to use the 12.2–12.7 GHz band have its technology subjected to an independent demonstration or have its technical showings subjected to an independent analysis to determine whether the technology will cause harmful interference to DBS operators. Second, the Federal Communications Commission is required to select an independent engineering firm recommended by the IEEE or other similar body to analyze the technologies proposed in the pending wireless terrestrial applications. Third, the demonstration or analysis must be concluded within 60 days of enactment of the Rural Loan Guarantee bill and the comment cycle cannot exceed an additional 30 days. Lastly, I want to note that enactment of this provision by Congress does not release the FCC from its obligations under section 2002 of SHIVA.

In my home state of South Carolina, there are Broadwave affiliates awaiting regulatory approval so that they can begin to provide service. Therefore, I expect that the testing required under the Rural Loan Guarantee legislation will constitute the final interference analysis needed to evaluate sharing requirements between terrestrial applicants with pending applications and existing DBS service providers. Moving this proceeding forward is important, because if Northpoint is able to obtain the necessary regulatory authorizations, it will not only be able to provide competition to cable, but through its affiliate structure, it also will afford small businesses an opportunity to participate in a vibrant segment of the communications marketplace.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, in 1992, Congress enacted legislation regulating the cable industry because of the lack of competition and the resulting high rates. In 1996, Congress anticipating that competition would replace regulation in restraining prices, passed legislation terminating the FCC's right to regulate the price of basic cable in March 1999. Unfortunately, competition has not emerged as fully as I would have liked. According to the FCC's latest report only 157 communities out of 33,000 communities across America have ''effective competition.'' In fact, in many communities in Hawaii, consumers have no cable service at all.

Northpoint Technology and its Broadwave affiliates want to provide low cost multi-channel video and data services in every television market in the United States. Therefore, it is critical that Congress and the FCC take the actions necessary to resolve sharing and other technical and policy issues quickly with respect to the applications of the Broadwave affiliates. Furthermore, these applications are subject to a Congressional mandate (Section 2002 of S. 1948, the Satellite Home Viewer Improvement Act) that requires the FCC by November 29, 2000 to grant or deny applications such as those of the Broadwave affiliates, that can provide television service in rural areas. The technical sharing analysis required by the ''Launching Our Communities' Access to Local Television Act of 2000'' does not obviate the legislative obligation imposed by S. 1948. Therefore, the FCC should do whatever is necessary to meet its November 29, 2000 obligations.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the controversy surrounding Section 12 of this bill, Section 1012 of Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary Appropriations conference report, has been resolved. Although I believe the new provision is unnecessary, I hope that requiring a technical demonstration to resolve harmful interference questions in the 12.2 GHz band will put this issue to rest. However, let me be clear that I support Section 12 with the understanding that it does not supercede or otherwise impact relevant provisions in the Satellite Home Viewers Improvement Act (Public Law 106–113, 113 Stat 1501)) which require the FCC to complete by November 29, 2000, the processing of applications and other authorizations for local facilities that can provide local television and broadband services to rural and underserved areas.

Northpoint Technology and its 69 Broadwave affiliates applied on January 8, 1999, to provide lower cost multichannel video and data services in every television market in the United States. Northpoint's technology is particularly innovative and accomplishes something that is unique in telecommunications history. Using Northpoint's patented system, the Broadwave affiliates will be able to reuse the 12.2–12.7 band without the need to relocate existing users DirecTV and Echostar.

Northpoint Technology through its Broadwave affiliates will offer consumers in Boston and several other markets the benefits of true competition in the marketplace for multichannel video programming and data services. In the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Congress established March 1999 as the sunset on the FCC's authority to regulate the price of basic cable service. Congress took this action with the anticipation that competition would replace regulation in restraining prices and improving quality in the video programming marketplace. The rapid introduction of Broadwave service to communities across America will go a long way toward achieving the goals of the 1996 Act and ensuring that consumers enjoy the fruits of competition including greater choice, lower prices and quality service.

Mr. KOHL. Madam President, I rise today in support of the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act reform included in the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations Bill. Our provision updates the law, which hadn't been adjusted for inflation since it was enacted in 1976, and makes several improvements to the merger review process undertaken by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. It is a bipartisan measure, authored by Senators HATCH, LEAHY, DEWINE and myself and Representatives HYDE and CONYERS, and it deserves our support.

The Hart-Scott-Rodino Act is crucial to the enforcement of competition policy in today's economy—it ensures that the antitrust agencies have sufficient time to review mergers and acquisitions prior to their completion. The statute requires that, prior to consummating a merger or acquisition of a certain minimum size, the companies involved must formally notify the antitrust agencies and must provide certain information regarding the proposed transaction. For those transactions covered by the Act, the parties to a merger or acquisition may not close their transaction until the expiration of a waiting period after making their Hart-Scott-Rodino Act filing. It also authorizes the government to subpoena additional information from merging parties so that the government has sufficient information to complete its merger analysis.

While this statute has a very laudable purpose, especially with the tremendous numbers of mergers and acquisitions taking place in recent years, some of its provisions are in need of revision. Most importantly, while inflation has caused the value of a dollar to drop by more than a half in the past 25 years, the monetary test that subjects a transaction to the provisions of the statute has not been revised since the law's enactment in 1976. As a result, many transactions that are of a relatively small size and pose little antitrust concerns are nevertheless swept into the ambit of the Hart-Scott-Rodino review process. This legislation updates this statute to better fit into today's economy by raising the minimum size of transaction covered by the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act from $15 million to $50 million. This will both lessen the agencies' burden of reviewing small transactions unlikely to seriously affect competition and enable the agencies to allocate their resources to properly focus on those transactions most worthy of scrutiny.

Further, exempting smaller transactions from the Hart-Scott-Rodino process will significantly lessen regulatory burdens and expenses imposed on small businesses. The parties to these smaller transactions will no longer need to pay the $45,000 filing fee—or face the often even more onerous legal fees and other expenses typically incurred in preparing a Hart-Scott-Rodino filing—for mergers and acquisitions that usually don't pose any competitive concerns.

In exempting this class of transactions from Hart-Scott-Rodino review, however, it is important that we not cause the antitrust agencies to lose the funding they need to carry out their increasingly demanding mission of enforcing the nation's antitrust laws. This bill will reduce the number of Hart-Scott-Rodino filings and therefore reduce the revenues generated by these filings if the filing fees were kept at their present level. Of course, in a perfect world, we wouldn't finance the Antitrust Division and the FTC on the backs of these filing fees. But because they are a fact of life, the antitrust agencies should not be penalized by these reforms by suffering such a reduction in revenues. As a result, in order to assure that this reform is revenue neutral, we have worked with the Appropriations Committee to ensure that this bill raises the filing fees for the largest transactions. Consequently, filing fees are to be increased for transactions valued at over $100,000,000, which makes sense because these transactions require more scrutiny.

This legislation makes other changes designed to enhance the efficiency of the pre-merger review process. The waiting period has been extended from twenty to thirty days after the parties' compliance with the government's request for additional information, a more realistic waiting period in this era of increasingly complex mergers generating enormous amounts of relevant information and documents. And, as in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, when a deadline for governmental action occurs on a weekend or holiday, the deadline is extended to the next business day. This simple provision will eliminate gamesmanship by parties who currently may time their compliance so that the waiting period ends on a weekend or holiday, effectively shortening the waiting period to the previous business day.

Finally, in recent years many have expressed concerns regarding the difficulties and expense imposed on business in complying with allegedly overly burdensome or duplicative government requests for additional information. So our legislation also contains carefully crafted provisions to ensure that business is not faced with unduly burdensome or overbroad requests for information, while assuring that the antitrust agencies' ability to obtain the information necessary to carry out a merger investigation is not hampered. Specifically, our legislation mandates that the FTC and Antitrust Division designate a senior official who does not have direct authority for the review of any enforcement recommendation to be designated to hear appeals to the appropriateness of the government's information requests the so called ''Second Requests''. The bill also sets forth the specific standards that this senior official is to utilize when considering such an appeal and mandates that these appeals be heard in an expedited manner.

In sum, I believe this legislation to be a reasonable and well balanced reform of our government's vital merger review procedures. It will make long overdue adjustments in the filing thresholds—ensuring review of those mergers in most need of governmental scrutiny while reducing the burden and expense on government and private parties by exempting smaller transactions from often expensive and time consuming pre-merger filings. It will also significantly reform the merger review process to ensure that the government has sufficient time to analyze increasing complex merger transactions, while also adding protections so that private parties do not face unduly burdensome or duplicative information requests. I urge swift passage of this measure.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, today we are considering the Conference report for the District of Columbia. This conference report also includes the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations act.

We crafted a good bill in conference.

We have fully funded the D.C. tuition program—which allows D.C. high school students greater educational choices beyond the border of this City.

We have fully funded the new metro station in the New York Avenue corridor, which I know is important to the economic development of the City.

We have $3 million in funding for the Poplar Point environmental clean up.

We have increased funding for the Courts. The salaries of Court employees are 19 percent below the level of federal court employees—thus—it is becoming increasingly difficult to keep a quality workforce.

Our bill also increases the budget for offender services so that we continue the program of drug testing and treatment for offenders who are on probation or awaiting trial.

Much as been said in the past about ''riders'' to the District budget. This year, we have eliminated over 30 of last year's riders.

The bill will authorize the District's planned tobacco securitization program—the proceeds of which will be used to reduce debt or build reserves.

With respect to the District's reserves, we have restructured the reserve funds of the District so they can function more efficiently. This is probably the most important reform in this bill.

The District is supposed to hold a $150 million reserve now—and a budget surplus of 4 percent of revenues.

But we found last year that the District wanted to dip into the emergency reserve funds for things that are considered ordinary expenses. We also found that the reserves were really hollow—entirely dependent on how much cash flow the District had on any given day.

I didn't think this was good enough for this City. The bond markets want and need reassurance that the District's financial turnaround is sound.

We have restructured the District's reserves so that they will have both an emergency reserve and a contingency reserve. This is modeled on the practices of other cities. And, most importantly, when established, these reserves will be in cash and will be held in separate accounts, earning interest.

The contingency reserve, which will be 3 percent of their budget, is for unanticipated expenses, like court orders, new federal mandates or extremely bad weather. It will be more flexible.

The emergency reserve, which will be 4 percent of their budget, is for extraordinary needs, like natural disasters. It will be the backing for the financial soundness we seek.

In consultation with the CFO and the Mayor, we allow the District a seven year glide path to establish these reserves, but both have assured me the tobacco securitization program will be used to fund this emergency requirement now. There could be no better use than this and debt reduction.

The District has had a dramatic financial recovery. I consider this the last leg of the financial plan. This will serve as a true ''rainy day'' fund—one that is ready and able to be tapped in those circumstances.

To conclude, although the President has indicated he has reservations about the CJS bill—he has indicated that the D.C. portion of the conference report is a bill he would sign.

Madam President, let me now turn to the Commerce, Justice, State provisions.

I want to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for their work on this bill. They have worked very hard to put more federal resources on our border, though we still have a long way to go.

These are not resources just for Texas. The drugs that come into the United States along the Southwest border will find their way into every city in the United States. The Southwest border is ground zero in the war against drugs.

Making our border more secure—makes every American city more secure from the scourge of drugs.

The Conference report provides for the hiring of over 400 new border agents. I would have preferred a higher number—but the Administration has dragged its feet on higher agents in the past—so we know this is a realistic goal for next year.

It provides $15 million in equipment upgrades for the border patrol.

It provides greater funding for DEA, with emphasis on helping drug threats at the State and local level.

The Conference report also addresses the ''upstream'' effect of more law enforcement on the border.

What has happened is this: as we have increased our law enforcement presence on the border—a strain has been felt on our judiciary system.

This bill provides for 13 new U.S. Attorneys along the Southwest border—where they are desperately needed. The five U.S. courts along the border are the busiest courts in the Nation—handling 26 percent of all the criminal cases in the United States. These new positions are desperately needed.

The bill also provides for two new Federal judges one in the Southern and one in the Western judicial district in Texas. I sponsored the bill to create 13 new judgeships along the border. I would have preferred the full number of judgeships, but I am pleased the Committee has accommodated the need for new judges in my State.

The bill does not provide badly needed salary increases for border patrol agents, which the Senate has passed and fought to produce. I will continue to press to bring our Border Patrol in line with all other border government salary schedules.

It is regrettable that the President has threatened to veto this bill, particularly over the immigration provision. I believe we have struck a balanced approach on this issue in this bill.

President Clinton's plan would grant broad amnesty to immigrants that arrived between 1982 and 1986. Our Border Patrol Officers have said ''a new amnesty would encourage innumerable others to break our laws in the future.'' I couldn't agree more.

Our proposal would provide greater due process to those who believe they were wrongly denied amnesty. We also shorten the waiting period for spouses and children to join their relatives in the United States. These relatives will likely be able to immigrate legally soon, but we allow them to come to the U.S. while their petitions are awaiting action. This is a reasonable proposal the President should accept.

Madam President, I will yield the floor and urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would each vote ''yea.''

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) would vote ''no.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 289 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Abraham	Fitzgerald	Miller
Baucus	Frist	Murkowski
Bennett	Gorton	Nickles
Bond	Gramm	Roberts
Breaux	Gregg	Santorum
Brownback	Hagel	Smith (NH)
Bunning	Hatch	Smith (OR)
Byrd	Hutchinson	Snowe
Campbell	Hutchison	Specter
Chafee, L.	Inhofe	Stevens
Cochran	Jeffords	Thomas
Collins	Kyl	Thompson
Craig	Lincoln	Thurmond
Crapo	Lott	Voinovich
DeWine	Lugar	Warner
Domenici	Mack	
Enzi	McConnell	

NAYS—42

Akaka	Graham	Mikulski
Allard	Grassley	Moynihan
Bayh	Harkin	Murray
Biden	Hollings	Reed
Bingaman	Inouye	Reid
Boxer	Johnson	Robb
Bryan	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kerry	Schumer
Daschle	Kohl	Sessions
Dodd	Landrieu	Shelby
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Edwards	Leahy	Wellstone
Feingold	Levin	Wyden

NOT VOTING—9

Ashcroft	Feinstein	Lieberman
Burns	Grams	McCain
Durbin	Helms	Roth

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GREGG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.