the work of the House as expeditiously as possible, I encourage my colleagues to support both this rule and the resolution that it makes in order.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order a joint resolution which sets the date for convening of the second session of the 107th Congress as January 23, 2002. This is a totally noncontroversial rule and joint resolution, and I urge adoption of both.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report accompanying H.R. 3338, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3338, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 324, I call up the conference report accompanying the bill (H.R. 3338) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 324, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Wednesday, December 19, 2001.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), my friend, that the House has had a long night this past night. We have very, very extensive discussions that should take place regarding this bill, but we have heard this discussion before. So I am going to pass on those formal remarks, and I hope that my colleagues will read about them very carefully in the RECORD. But in the meantime, there are a couple of items of business that I must attend to.

First, due to a clerical error, language was mistakenly omitted from the Statement of Managers that relates to the FMTV truck program, a very important program to some of the Members of the House.

That language, agreed to by the conferees but inadvertently not included in the statement of managers, is as follows: "The conferees understand that the Army did not request legislative authority to extend the current multi-year contract. The conferees direct the Army to act in the best interest of the Army with respect to the FMTV."

Secondly, I would ask that on behalf of myself and Chairman YOUNG, that I be allowed to insert in the RECORD at the end of my opening remarks a series of tables summarizing the conference agreements, on both the Defense and Supplemental appropriations bills.

Finally, let me mention that our former colleague from the Committee on Appropriations, Larry Coughlin of Pennsylvania, who was a proud Marine by the way, Larry Coughlin was laid to rest at Arlington Cemetery this morning.

H.R. 3338 - Defense Appropriations Act, 2002

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I						
MILITARY PERSONNEL						
Military Personnel, Army	22,175,357	23,626,684	23,336,884	23,446,734	23,752,384	+1,577,027
Military Personnel, Navy	17,772,297	19,606,984	19,574,184	19,465,964	19,551,484	+1,779,187
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	6,833,100	7,365,040	7,343,640	7,335,370	7,345,340	+512,240
Military Personnel, Air Force	18,174,284	20,151,514	19,784,614	20,032,704	19,724,014	+1,549,730
Reserve Personnel, Army	2,473,001	2,604,197	2,629,197	2,670,197	2,670,197	+197,196
Reserve Personnel, Navy	1,576,174	1,643,523	1,644,823	1,650,523	1,654,523	+78,349
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	448,886	463,300	466,800	466,300	471,200	+22,314
Reserve Personnel, Air Force	971,024	1,055,160	1,055,160	1,061,160	1,061,160	+90,136
National Guard Personnel, Army	3,782,536	4,014,135	4,004,335	4,052,695	4,041,695	+259,159
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	1,641,081	1,776,744	1,777,654	1,783,744	1,784,654	+143,573
Total, title I, Military Personnel	75,847,740	82,307,281	81,617,291	81,965,391	82,056,651	+6,208,911
TITLE II						
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						
Operation and Maintenance, Army	19,144,431	21,191,680	21,021,944	22,941,588	22,335,074	+3,190,643
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(50,000)					(-50,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	23,419,360	26,961,382	26,628,075	27,038,067	26,876,636	+3,457,276
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(50,000)					(-50,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,778,758	2,892,314	2,939,434	2,903,863	2,931,934	+153,176
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	22,383,521	26,146,770	25,842,968	26,303,436	26,026,789	+3,643,268
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(50,000)					(-50,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	11,844,480	12,518,631	12,122,590	12,864,644	12,773,270	+928,790
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,562,118	1,787,246	1,788,546	1,771,246	1,771,246	+209,128
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	978,946	1,003,690	1,003,690	1,003,690	1,003,690	+24,744
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	145,959	144,023	144,023	144,023	144,023	-1,936
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,903,659	2,029,866	2,029,866	2,023,866	2,024,866	+121,207
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	3,333,835	3,677,359	3,723,759	3,743,808	3,768,058	+434,223
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	3,474,375	3,867,361	3,972,161	3,998,361	3,988,961	+514,586
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	3,938,777	2,844,226	2,744,226		50,000	-3,888,777
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	8,574	9,096	9,096	9,096	9,096	+522
Environmental Restoration, Army	389,932	389,800	389,800	389,800	389,800	-132
Environmental Restoration, Navy	294,038	257,517	257,517	257,517	257,517	-36,521
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	376,300	385,437	385,437	385,437	385,437	+9,137
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	21,412	23,492	23,492	23,492	23,492	+2,080
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	231,499	190,255	190,255	230,255	222,255	-9,244
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid	55,900	49,700	49,700	44,700	49,700	-6,200
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	443,400	403,000		357,000		-443,400
Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense	160,500					-160,500
Support for International Sporting Competition,Defense		15,800	15,800	15,800	15,800	+15,800
Total, title II, Operation and maintenance	96,889,774	106,788,645	105,282,379	106,449,689	105,047,644	+8,157,870
(By transfer)	(150,000)					(-150,000)
TITLE III						
PROCUREMENT						
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,571,812	1,925,491	1,974,241	1,893,891	1,984,391	+412,579
Missile Procurement, Army	1,320,681	1,859,634	1,057,409	1,774,154	1,079,330	-241,351
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	2,472,524	2,276,746	2,252,669	2,174,546	2,193,746	-278,778
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,220,516	1,193,365	1,211,615	1,171,465	1,200,465	-20,051
Other Procurement, Army	4,497,009	3,961,737	4,103,036	4,160,186	4,183,736	-313,273
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	8,477,138	8,252,543	8,084,543	8,030,043	7,938,143	-538,995
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,461,600	1,433,475	1,429,492	1,478,075	1,429,592	-32,008
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	498,349	457,099	492,599	442,799	461,399	-36,950
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	11,614,633	9,344,121	10,134,883	9,294,211	9,490,039	-2,124,594
Other Procurement, Navy	3,557,380	4,097,576	4,290,776	4,146,338	4,270,976	+713,596
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,233,268	981,724	1,028,662	974,054	995,442	-237,826
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	7,583,345	10,744,458	10,549,798	10,617,332	10,567,038	+2,983,693
Missile Procurement, Air Force	2,863,778	3,233,536	2,918,118	3,657,522	2,989,524	+125,746
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	647,808	865,344	866,844	873,344	866,644	+218,836
Other Procurement, Air Force	7,763,747	8,159,521	7,856,671	8,144,174	8,085,863	+322,116
Procurement, Defense-Wide	2,346,258	1,603,927	1,387,283	1,473,795	2,389,490	+43,232
National Guard and Reserve Equipment	100,000		501,485	560,505	699,130	+599,130
Defense Production Act Purchases	3,000	50,000	50,000	15,000	40,000	+37,000
Total, title III, Procurement	59,232,846	60,440,297	60,190,124	60,881,434	60,864,948	+1,632,102
TITLE IV						
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION						
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army	6,342,552	6,693,920	7,115,438	6,742,123	7,106,074	+763,522
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy	9,494,374	11,123,389	10,896,307	10,742,710	11,498,506	+2,004,132
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force	14,138,244	14,343,982	14,884,058	13,859,401	14,669,931	+531,687
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	11,157,375	15,050,787	6,949,098	14,445,589	15,415,275	+4,257,900
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense	227,060	217,355	245,355	216,855	231,855	+4,795
Total, title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	41,359,605	47,429,433	40,090,256	46,006,678	48,921,641	+7,562,036

H.R. 3338 - Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE V						
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS						
Defense Working Capital Funds	916,276	1,951,986	1,524,986	1,826,986	1,312,986	+396,710
National Defense Sealift Fund:						
Ready Reserve Force	270,500	506,408	412,708	407,408	432,408	+161,908
Acquisition	130,158					-130,158
Subtotal	400,658	506,408	412,708	407,408	432,408	+31,750
National Defense Airlift Fund:						
C-17	2,170,923					-2,170,923
C-17 advance procurement	257,800					-257,800
C-17 ICS	412,200					-412,200
Subtotal	2,840,923					-2,840,923
Total, title V, Revolving and Management Funds	4,157,857	2,458,394	1,937,694	2,234,394	1,745,394	-2,412,463
TITLE VI						
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS						
Defense Health Program:						
Operation and maintenance	11,414,393	17,565,750	17,574,750	17,656,185	17,659,475	+6,245,082
Procurement	290,006	267,915	267,915	267,915	267,915	-22,091
Research and development	413,380	65,304	434,738	452,304	463,804	+50,424
Total, Defense Health Program	12,117,779	17,898,969	18,277,403	18,376,404	18,391,194	+6,273,415
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction, Army: 1/						
Operation and maintenance	600,000	789,020	728,520	739,020	739,020	+139,020
Procurement	105,700	164,158	164,158	164,158	164,158	+58,458
Research, development, test and evaluation	274,400	200,379	200,379	201,379	202,379	-72,021
Total, Chemical Agents	980,100	1,153,557	1,093,057	1,104,557	1,105,557	+125,457
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	869,000	820,381	827,381	865,981	842,581	-26,419
Office of the Inspector General	147,545	152,021	152,021	152,021	152,021	+4,476
Total, title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs	14,114,424	20,024,928	20,349,862	20,498,963	20,491,353	+6,376,929
TITLE VII						
RELATED AGENCIES						
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund	216,000	212,000	212,000	212,000	212,000	-4,000
Intelligence Community Management Account	148,631	152,776	144,929	144,776	160,429	+11,798
Transfer to Department of Justice	(34,100)	(27,000)	(34,100)	(27,000)	(42,752)	(+8,652)
Payment to Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund	60,000	25,000	25,000	75,000	67,500	+7,500
National Security Education Trust Fund	6,950	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	+1,050
Total, title VII, Related agencies	431,581	397,776	389,929	439,776	447,929	+16,348
TITLE VIII						
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Additional transfer authority (Sec. 8005)	(2,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(2,000,000)	
Indian Financing Act incentives (Sec. 8022)	8,000		8,000	8,000	8,000	
FFRDCs (Sec. 8032)				-60,000	-40,000	-40,000
Disposal & lease of DOD real property (Sec. 8038)	24,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	-5,000
Overseas Mil Fac Invest Recovery (Sec. 8041)	3,000	3,362	3,362	3,362	3,362	+362
Rescissions (Sec. 8054)	-546,980		-441,578	-201,317	-531,475	+15,505
Navy Working Capital Fund Cash Balances	-800,000		-245,000			+800,000
Fuel Pricing/Rate Stabilization Adjustment	-705,000		-527,000			+705,000
Excess Foreign Currency Cash Balance (Sec. 8095)	-856,900		-200,000	-140,591	-240,000	+616,900
Travel Cards (Sec. 8103)	5,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	+3,000
Transfer to Department of Transportation	(10,000)					(-10,000)
United Service Organizations (Sec. 8111)	7,500		10,000	10,000	8,500	+1,000
Davis Bacon Act Threshold Increase		-190,000				
Depot Maintenance Utilization Waiver		-140,000				
Government Purchase Card (Sec. 8146)			-330,000		-100,000	-100,000
Performance Based Academic Model	5,000					-5,000
BMDO Support reduction	-14,000					+14,000
Preservation of Democracy	20,000					-20,000
Quarantine benefits	1,000					-1,000
National D-Day Museum (Sec. 8117)	2,100			5,000	4,250	+2,150
Chicago Military Academy	5,000					-5,000

H.R. 3338 - Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Ship scrapping initiative	10,000					-10,000
American Red Cross (Sec. 8087)	5,000			5,000	3,500	-1,500
U.S./China Security Review Commission	3,000					-3,000
Gulf War Illness	1,650					-1,650
Oakland military academy	2,000					-2,000
Newmark (Sec. 8142)	10,000		10,000		8,500	-1,500
Brownfield site	2,000					-2,000
Fisher House (Sec. 8119)	2,000		2,000		1,700	-300
Zero emission steam technology demo (Sec. 8121)	2,000		2,000		1,700	-300
CAAS/Contract Growth (Sec. 8123)	-71,367		-955,000	-1,650,000	-1,650,000	-1,578,633
Excess Funded Carryover	-92,700		-797,919			+92,700
Headquarters and Administration	-159,076					+159,076
Overseas Contingency Operation Transfer Fund	-1,100,000					+1,100,000
Utilities (Sec. 8135)			-230,000		-105,000	-105,000
Tethered Aerostat Radar System (Sec. 8144)			3,000		3,000	+3,000
Fairchild Air Force Base (Sec. 8140)			6,000		6,000	+6,000
Army Acquisition Restructuring (Sec. 8149)			-37,200		-5,000	-5,000
USS Alabama Museum Memorial (Sec. 8138)			6,000		4,200	+4,200
Special Needs Learning Center (Sec. 8141)			5,000		3,500	+3,500
Ballistic Missile Defense / Counterterrorism				1,300,000		
Eisenhower Commission (Sec. 8120)				3,000	2,600	+2,600
Travel cost growth (Sec. 8102)				-171,296	-262,000	-262,000
Legislative liaison savings (Sec. 8098)				-50,000	-50,000	-50,000
Reserve Component Incentive and Bonus programs (Sec. 8049)				10,000	10,000	+10,000
Fort Des Moines Memorial Grant (Sec. 8116)				5,000	4,500	+4,500
Clear Radar Upgrade (Sec. 8122)				8,000	8,000	+8,000
Regional Defense Counter-Terrorism Fellowship program (Sec. 8125)				21,000	17,900	+17,900
Padgett Thomas Barracks (Sec. 8158)				15,000	15,000	+15,000
USS Intrepid Museum Memorial (Sec. 8139)			5,000		4,250	+4,250
Pentagon Renovation Cost Adjustment			-333,000			
910th Airlift Wing, Youngstown-Warren			10,000			
Pentagon Reservation Emergency Response			10,000			
C-5 avionics modernization			20,000			
Agile combat support			10,000			
WRAMC equipment			6,000			
Armed Forces Retirement Home (Sec. 8163)					5,200	+5,200
Total, title VIII (net)	-4,227,773	-299,638	-3,953,335	-852,842	-2,832,813	+1,394,960
TITLE IX						
COUNTER-TERRORISM AND DEFENSE AGAINST WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION						
Counter-Terrorism & Operational Response Transfer Fund			1,670,000		478,000	+478,000
Transfer to Department of Justice			(10,000)		(10,000)	(+10,000)
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction			403,000		403,000	+403,000
Ballistic Missile Defense Organization - Procurement			794,557			
Ballistic Missile Defense Organization - RDT&E			7,053,721			
Ballistic Missile Defense Organization - FY 2001 Rescission			-73,800			
Defense Against Chemical & Biological Weapons, Defense-Wide			1,065,940			
Defense Threat Reduction Agency			806,471			
Total, title IX, Counter-terrorism and Defense against Weapons of Mass Destruction (net)			11,719,889		881,000	+881,000
Total for the bill (net)	287,806,054	319,547,116	317,624,089	317,623,483	317,623,747	+29,817,693
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS						
Miscellaneous Appropriations (P.L. 106-554):						
Repair of U.S.S. COLE (emergency funding)	150,000					-150,000
Marine Corps Ground Task Force Training Command	2,000					-2,000
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund (emergency funding)	100,000					-100,000
Defense Imagery and Mapping Agency	2,000					-2,000
Rapid diagnostic and fingerprinting techniques	1,000					-1,000
Fort Irwin National Training Center expansion:						
O & M, Army	2,500					-2,500
BLM, Management of Lands & Resources	2,500					-2,500
Supplemental (P.L. 107-20) (net)	5,457,700					-5,457,700
Emergency Response Fund (P.L. 107-38)	5,460,400					-5,460,400
Across the board cut (0.22%)	-469,000					+469,000
Total, other appropriations	10,709,100					-10,709,100
Net grand total (including other appropriations)	298,515,154	319,547,116	317,624,089	317,623,483	317,623,747	+19,108,593

H.R. 3338 - Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP						
Scorekeeping adjustments:						
Adjustment for unapprop'd balance transfer (Stockpile)	150,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-150,000
Stockpile collections (unappropriated)	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000	.....
O&M, Army transfer to National Park Service:						
Defense function	-5,000	.....	-1,000	.....	.....	+5,000
Nondefense function	5,000	.....	1,000	.....	.....	-5,000
O&M, AF transfer to Dept of Transportation:						
Defense function	-10,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+10,000
Nondefense function	10,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-10,000
Disabled military retiree payments (mandatory)	.....	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	+55,000
Military personnel accounts (discretionary)	.....	-55,000	-55,000	-55,000	-55,000	-55,000
Total adjustments	.....	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000
RECAPITULATION						
Title I - Military Personnel	75,847,740	82,307,281	81,617,291	81,965,391	82,056,651	+6,208,911
Title II - Operation and Maintenance	96,889,774	106,788,645	105,282,379	106,449,689	105,047,644	+8,157,870
(By transfer)	(150,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-150,000)
Title III - Procurement	59,232,846	60,440,297	60,190,124	60,881,434	60,864,948	+1,632,102
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	41,359,605	47,429,433	40,090,256	46,006,678	48,921,641	+7,562,036
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds	4,157,857	2,458,394	1,937,694	2,234,394	1,745,394	-2,412,463
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs	14,114,424	20,024,928	20,349,862	20,498,963	20,491,353	+6,376,929
Title VII - Related agencies	431,581	397,776	389,929	439,776	447,929	+16,348
Title VIII - General provisions (net)	-4,227,773	-299,638	-3,953,335	-852,842	-2,832,813	+1,394,960
Title IX - Counter-terrorism & Defense against Weapons of Mass Destruction (net)	.....	.....	11,719,889	.....	881,000	+881,000
Total, Department of Defense (in this bill)	287,806,054	319,547,116	317,624,089	317,623,483	317,623,747	+29,817,693
Other appropriations	10,709,100	.....	.....	.....	.....	-10,709,100
Total DoD funding available (net)	298,515,154	319,547,116	317,624,089	317,623,483	317,623,747	+19,108,593
Other scorekeeping adjustments	.....	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000
Total mandatory and discretionary	298,515,154	319,397,116	317,474,089	317,473,483	317,473,747	+18,958,593
RECAP BY FUNCTION						
Mandatory	216,000	267,000	267,000	267,000	267,000	+51,000
Discretionary:						
Defense discretionary	298,282,154	319,130,116	317,204,089	317,206,483	317,205,047	+18,922,893
Nondefense discretionary	17,000	.....	3,000	.....	1,700	-15,300
Total discretionary	298,299,154	319,130,116	317,207,089	317,206,483	317,206,747	+18,907,593
Grand total, mandatory and discretionary	298,515,154	319,397,116	317,474,089	317,473,483	317,473,747	+18,958,593

1/ Included in Budget under Procurement title.

H.R. 3338 DIVISION B - FISCAL YEAR 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

(Amounts in thousands)

	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
CHAPTER 1						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Office of the Secretary (emergency)	45,188	4,582	80,919	80,919	+76,337	.....
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments (emergency)	.....	2,875	.....	.....	-2,875	.....
Agricultural Research Service:						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	.....	5,635	70,000	40,000	+34,365	-30,000
Buildings and facilities (emergency)	.....	.....	73,000	73,000	+73,000	.....
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:						
Research and education (emergency)	.....	.....	50,000	.....	.....	-50,000
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	.....	8,175	95,000	105,000	+96,825	+10,000
Buildings and facilities (emergency)	.....	14,081	14,081	14,081	.....	.....
Food and Safety Inspection Service (emergency)	.....	9,800	15,000	15,000	+5,200	.....
Food and Nutrition Service: Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC) (emergency)	.....	.....	39,000	39,000	+39,000	.....
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Food and Drug Administration: Salaries and expenses (emergency) 1/	.....	104,350	127,000	151,100	+46,750	+24,100
INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
Commodity Futures Trading Commission (emergency)	6,495	6,495	10,000	16,900	+10,405	+6,900
Total, chapter 1	51,683	155,993	574,000	535,000	+379,007	-39,000
CHAPTER 2						
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
USA Patriot Act activities (emergency)	.....	.....	25,000	5,000	+5,000	-20,000
Administrative review and appeals (emergency)	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	.....	.....
Legal Activities						
Salaries and expenses, General legal activities (emergency)	12,500	12,500	21,250	12,500	.....	-8,750
Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys (emergency)	74,600	68,450	74,600	56,370	-12,080	-18,230
United States Marshals Service:						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	11,100	11,100	26,100	10,200	-900	-15,900
Construction (emergency)	.....	.....	35,000	9,125	+9,125	-25,875
Federal Bureau of Investigation						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	538,500	538,500	654,500	745,000	+206,500	+90,500
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
Salaries and expenses, Enforcement and Border Affairs (emergency)	399,400	409,600	449,800	449,800	+40,200	.....
Construction (emergency)	.....	.....	99,600	99,600	+99,600	.....
Office of Justice Programs						
Justice assistance (emergency) 2/	.....	400,000	400,000	400,000	.....	.....
State and local law enforcement assistance (emergency)	4,400	17,100	245,900	251,100	+234,000	+5,200
Crime victims fund (emergency)	68,100	68,100	68,100	68,100	.....	.....
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
International Trade Administration						
Operations and administration (emergency)	1,500	750	1,500	1,000	+250	-500
Export Administration						
Operations and administration (emergency)	1,756	1,756	1,756	1,756	.....	.....
Economic Development Administration						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	335	.....	335	.....	.....	-335
National Telecommunications and Information Administration						
Public telecommunications facilities, planning and construction (emergency)	8,250	8,250	8,250	8,250	.....	.....
United States Patent and Trademark Office						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	3,360	.....	3,360	1,500	+1,500	-1,860
National Institute of Standards and Technology						
Scientific & technical research & services (emergency)	400	.....	10,400	5,000	+5,000	-5,400
Construction of research facilities (emergency)	1,225	.....	1,225	1,225	+1,225	.....
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Operations, research, and facilities (emergency)	2,750	750	2,750	2,750	+2,000	.....
Departmental Management						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	7,276	8,636	881	4,776	-3,860	+3,895
THE JUDICIARY						
Supreme Court of the United States						
Care of the Building and Grounds (emergency)	10,000	10,000	30,000	30,000	+20,000	.....

H.R. 3338 DIVISION B - FISCAL YEAR 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
Court of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)			5,000	5,000	+5,000	
Court security (emergency)	21,500	21,500	57,521	57,521	+36,021	
Administrative Office of the United States Courts: Salaries and expenses (emergency)			2,879	2,879	+2,879	
DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY						
RELATED AGENCY						
Broadcasting Board of Governors						
International broadcasting operations (emergency)		9,200		9,200		+9,200
Broadcasting capital improvements (emergency)		10,000		10,000		+10,000
RELATED AGENCIES						
Department of Transportation						
Maritime Administration						
Operation and training (emergency)			11,000			-11,000
Maritime guaranteed loan (title XI) program account (emergency)			12,000			-12,000
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	1,301	1,301	1,301	1,301		
Securities and Exchange Commission						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	20,705	20,705	20,705	20,705		
Small Business Administration						
Business loans program account, guaranteed loans (emergency)			75,000	75,000	+75,000	
Disaster loans program account (emergency)	150,000	140,000	75,000	75,000	-65,000	
Total, chapter 2	1,342,458	1,761,698	2,424,213	2,423,158	+661,460	-1,055
CHAPTER 3						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
Operation and Maintenance						
Defense Emergency Response Fund (emergency)	7,020,969	7,242,911	1,525,000	3,395,600	-3,847,311	+1,870,600
Transfer to Department of State, Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs		(30,000)			(-30,000)	
Procurement						
Other Procurement, Air Force (emergency)	303,000					
Total, chapter 3	7,323,969	7,242,911	1,525,000	3,395,600	-3,847,311	+1,870,600
CHAPTER 4						
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA						
Federal Funds						
Federal Payment to the District of Columbia for:						
Emergency Response and Planning (emergency)	25,000					
Protective clothing and breathing apparatus (emergency)		12,144	7,144	7,144	-5,000	
Specialized hazardous materials equipment (emergency)		1,032	1,032	1,032		
Chemical and biological weapons preparedness (emergency)		10,355	10,355	10,355		
Pharmaceuticals for responders (emergency)		2,100	2,100	2,100		
Response and communications capability (emergency)			14,960	14,960	+14,960	
Search, rescue and other emergency equipment and support (emergency)			8,850	8,850	+8,850	
Equipment, supplies and vehicles for the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (emergency)			1,780	1,780	+1,780	
Hospital containment facilities for the Department of Health (emergency)			8,000	8,000	+8,000	
The Office of the Chief Technology Officer (emergency)			43,994	45,494	+45,494	+1,500
Emergency traffic management (emergency)			20,700	20,700	+20,700	
Training and planning (emergency)			11,449	9,949	+9,949	-1,500
Increased facility security (emergency)			25,536	25,536	+25,536	
Federal Payment to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (emergency)			39,100	39,100	+39,100	
Federal Payment to the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (emergency)			5,000	5,000	+5,000	
Total, chapter 4	25,000	25,631	200,000	200,000	+174,369	
CHAPTER 5						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
Department of the Army						
Corps of Engineers - Civil						
Operation and Maintenance, General (emergency)	139,000	139,000	139,000	139,000		

H.R. 3338 DIVISION B - FISCAL YEAR 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Reclamation						
Water and related resources (emergency)	30,259	30,259	30,259	30,259	.....	.....
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Atomic Energy Defense Activities						
National Nuclear Security Administration						
Weapons activities (emergency)	106,000	88,000	131,000	131,000	+43,000	.....
Defense nuclear nonproliferation (emergency)	.....	18,000	226,000	226,000	+208,000	.....
Environmental and Other Defense Activities						
Defense environmental restoration and waste management (emergency)	8,200	8,200	8,200	8,200	.....	.....
Other defense activities (emergency)	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	.....	.....
INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
Nuclear Regulatory Commission (emergency)	.....	.....	36,000	36,000	+36,000	.....
Total, chapter 5	286,959	286,959	573,959	573,959	+287,000	.....
CHAPTER 6						
Bilateral Economic Assistance						
Funds Appropriated to the President						
United States Agency for International Development						
Operating expenses (transfer) (emergency)	(50,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
International disaster assistance (emergency)	.....	.....	.....	50,000	+50,000	+50,000
CHAPTER 7						
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
National Park Service						
Operation of the National Park System (emergency)	6,098	10,098	10,098	10,098	.....	.....
United States Park Police (emergency)	25,295	25,295	25,295	25,295	.....	.....
Construction (emergency)	21,624	21,624	21,624	21,624	.....	.....
Departmental Offices						
Departmental Management: Salaries and expenses (emergency)	2,205	2,205	2,205	2,205	.....	.....
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES						
Smithsonian Institution						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	21,707	21,707	21,707	21,707	.....	.....
National Gallery of Art						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	2,148	2,148	2,148	2,148	.....	.....
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts						
Operations and Maintenance (emergency)	4,310	4,310	4,310	4,310	.....	.....
National Capital Planning Commission						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	758	758	758	758	.....	.....
Total, chapter 7	84,145	88,145	88,145	88,145	.....	.....
CHAPTER 8						
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR						
Employment and Training Administration						
Training and employment services (emergency)	2,000,000	.....	32,500	32,500	+32,500	.....
State unemployment insurance and employment service operations (emergency)	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100	.....	.....
Workers compensation programs (emergency)	.....	.....	175,000	175,000	+175,000	.....
Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	.....	.....
Occupational Safety and Health Administration						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	.....	.....
Departmental Management						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	5,880	5,880	5,880	5,880	.....	.....
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention						
Disease control, research, and training (emergency)	.....	.....	12,000	12,000	+12,000	.....
Office of the Secretary						
Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund (emergency) 1/	1,595,000	1,990,600	2,715,000	2,644,314	+653,714	-70,686

H.R. 3338 DIVISION B - FISCAL YEAR 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
School Improvement Programs						
Project SERV (emergency)	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000		
RELATED AGENCIES						
National Labor Relations Board						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	180	180	180	180		
Social Security Administration						
Limitation on administration expenses (emergency)	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500		
Total, chapter 8	3,625,260	2,020,860	2,964,760	2,894,074	+873,214	-70,686
CHAPTER 9						
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH						
Joint Items						
Legislative Branch Emergency Response Fund (emergency)	256,081					
Senate						
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate (emergency)		34,500	34,500	34,500		
House of Representatives						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)		40,712	40,712	41,712	+1,000	+1,000
Capitol Police Board						
General expenses (emergency)		179,869	180,869	31,000	-148,869	-149,869
Capitol Guide Service and Special Services						
Expenses (emergency)				350	+350	+350
Architect of the Capitol						
Capitol Buildings (emergency)				106,304	+106,304	+106,304
Library of Congress						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)				29,615	+29,615	+29,615
Government Printing Office						
GPO revolving fund (emergency)				4,000	+4,000	+4,000
Government Accounting Office						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)				7,600	+7,600	+7,600
United States Capitol Historical Society						
Grant (emergency)		1,000		1,000		+1,000
Total, chapter 9	256,081	256,081	256,081	256,081		
CHAPTER 10						
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
Defense Emergency Response Fund (emergency)	25,000					
Military Construction, Army (emergency)		55,700		20,700	-35,000	+20,700
Military Construction, Navy (emergency)		2,000		2,000		+2,000
Military Construction, Air Force (emergency)		47,700		46,700	-1,000	+46,700
Military construction, Defense-wide (emergency)			475,000	35,000	+35,000	-440,000
Total, chapter 10	25,000	105,400	475,000	104,400	-1,000	-370,600
CHAPTER 11						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Office of the Secretary						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	1,500	458	1,500		-458	-1,500
Transportation security administration (emergency)		15,000		94,800	+79,800	+94,800
Aircraft passenger and baggage screening activities (emergency)		1,250,000			-1,250,000	
Offsetting collections (emergency)		-1,250,000			+1,250,000	
Payments to Air Carriers (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (emergency)			57,000	50,000	+50,000	-7,000
Coast Guard						
Operating Expenses (emergency)	203,000	144,913	285,350	209,150	+64,237	-76,200
Federal Aviation Administration						
Operations (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (emergency)	300,000	291,500	251,000	200,000	-91,500	-51,000
Facilities & equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (emergency)	108,500	175,000		108,500	-66,500	+108,500
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (emergency)			50,000	50,000	+50,000	
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (emergency)			200,000	175,000	+175,000	-25,000
Federal Highway Administration						
Miscellaneous appropriations (Highway Trust Fund) (emergency)	10,000		110,000	100,000	+100,000	-10,000
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund): Emergency relief program (emergency)	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000		

H.R. 3338 DIVISION B - FISCAL YEAR 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
Federal Railroad Administration						
Safety and operations (emergency)	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	.....	.....
Capital grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (emergency)	.....	.....	100,000	100,000	+100,000	.....
Federal Transit Administration						
Formula grants (emergency)	23,500	23,500	23,500	23,500	.....	.....
Capital investment grants (emergency)	.....	.....	100,000	100,000	+100,000	.....
Research and Special Programs Administration						
Research and special programs (emergency)	6,000	2,500	6,000	2,500	.....	-3,500
Office of Inspector General						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	.....	.....	2,000	1,300	+1,300	-700
RELATED AGENCY						
National Transportation Safety Board						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	836	465	836	650	+185	-186
Total appropriations	734,336	1,984,336	1,268,186	1,296,400	-687,936	+28,214
Offsetting collections	.....	-1,250,000	.....	.....	+1,250,000	.....
Total, chapter 11	734,336	734,336	1,268,186	1,296,400	+562,064	+28,214
CHAPTER 12						
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
Departmental Offices						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	9,400	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (emergency)	2,032	2,032	2,032	2,032	.....	.....
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (emergency)	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	.....	.....
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	13,846	23,231	22,846	23,000	-231	+154
Acquisition, construction, improvements and related expenses (emergency)	.....	8,500	.....	8,500	.....	+8,500
Financial Management Service						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	600	.....	600	.....	.....	-600
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	31,431	31,431	31,431	31,431	.....	.....
United States Customs Service						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	107,500	301,759	292,603	392,603	+90,844	+100,000
Operation, Maintenance and Procurement, Air and Marine Interdiction Programs (emergency)	6,700	6,700	6,700	6,700	.....	.....
Internal Revenue Service						
Processing, Assistance, and Management (emergency)	16,658	.....	16,658	12,990	+12,990	-3,668
Tax Law Enforcement (emergency)	4,544	4,544	4,544	4,544	.....	.....
Information Systems (emergency)	15,991	.....	15,991	15,991	+15,991	.....
United States Secret Service						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	104,769	104,769	104,769	104,769	.....	.....
POSTAL SERVICE						
Payment to the Postal Service Fund (emergency)	.....	.....	600,000	500,000	+500,000	-100,000
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT						
Office of Administration (emergency)	50,040	.....	50,040	50,040	+50,040	.....
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
General Services Administration						
Real Property Activities						
Federal Buildings Fund (emergency)	200,500	87,360	126,500	126,512	+39,152	+12
National Archives and Records Administration						
Operating Expenses (emergency)	4,818	.....	4,818	1,600	+1,600	-3,218
Repairs and Restoration (emergency)	2,180	.....	2,180	1,000	+1,000	-1,180
Total, chapter 12	572,709	572,026	1,283,412	1,283,412	+711,386	.....
CHAPTER 13						
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS						
Departmental Administration						
General operating expenses (emergency)	.....	2,000	.....	2,000	.....	+2,000
Construction, Major Projects (emergency)	2,000	.....	2,000	.....	.....	-2,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Community Planning and Development						
Community development fund (emergency)	.....	.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	+2,000,000	.....

H.R. 3338 DIVISION B - FISCAL YEAR 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
Management and Administration						
Office of Inspector General (emergency)	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000		
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Department of Health and Human Services						
National Institutes of Health						
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (emergency)		10,500	10,500	10,500		
Environmental Protection Agency						
Science and Technology (emergency)	40,040	10,000	41,514	90,308	+80,308	+48,794
Environmental Programs and Management (emergency)	25,170	140,360	38,194	39,000	-101,360	+806
Hazardous Substance Superfund (emergency)	5,790	5,800	41,292	41,292	+35,492	
State and Tribal Assistance Grants (emergency)	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000		
Federal Emergency Management Agency						
Disaster relief (emergency)	4,900,000	4,345,000	5,824,344	4,356,871	+11,871	-1,467,473
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	20,000	30,000	20,000	25,000	-5,000	+5,000
Emergency Management Planning and Assistance (emergency) 2/	580,000	35,000	290,000	220,000	+185,000	-70,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
Human space flight (emergency)	64,500	81,000	64,500	76,000	-5,000	+11,500
Science, Aeronautics and Technology (emergency)	28,600	36,500	28,600	32,500	-4,000	+3,900
Office of Inspector General (emergency)		3,000			-3,000	
National Science Foundation						
Research and Related Activities (emergency)	300	300	300	300		
Total, chapter 13	5,672,400	4,705,460	8,367,244	6,899,771	+2,194,311	-1,467,473
CHAPTER 14						
ADDITIONAL EMERGENCY RELIEF AND RECOVERY PROVISIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention						
Disease control, research, and training (emergency)		12,000			-12,000	
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Community Planning and Development						
Community development fund (emergency)		1,825,000			-1,825,000	
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR						
Employment and Training Administration						
Training and employment services (emergency)		32,500			-32,500	
State Unemployment Security Office						
Workers compensation programs (emergency)		175,000			-175,000	
Total, chapter 14		2,044,500			-2,044,500	
Grand total	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000		
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP						
Scorekeeping adjustments:						
Defense Cooperation Account (emergency)	1,000	1,000			-1,000	
Total discretionary	20,001,000	20,001,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	-1,000	

1/ FDA appropriation of $104.35 million was originally requested by the President as part of the HHS Public health and social services emergency fund account.

2/ Amounts for counterterrorism assistance to State and local governments were requested by the President as part of FEMA.

3/ National Park Service relocation costs were originally requested by the President as part of the GSA Federal buildings fund account.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time. We did the best we could with the little bit of money we had.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for a very brief colloquy.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Defense Appropriations bill. Chairman LEWIS and Ranking Member MURTHA have done excellent work in balancing very difficult and demanding priorities. Most of all, I am very pleased that the conferees agreed to accept a Senate provision which allows the Air Force to lease new aircraft to replace the oldest of our KC–135 tankers. The issue of replacing the Air Force's tanker refueling aircraft is, in fact, very simple despite the cloud of confusion being created by its opponents. In their frenzy to condemn what they see as a special deal, they have totally lost sight of the facts. The truth is this provision is a good deal—a good deal for our armed forces and a good deal for taxpayers.

First, it is important to understand that every credible defense and aviation observer agrees that it is time to replace the aging KC–135–E tanker aircraft fleet with new tankers based on the 767 aircraft. Both of the large tanker refueling aircraft now in use were built by the Boeing Company—current aircraft are based on the 707 and DC–10 airliners—and Air Force analyses have shown that the 767 due to its size, range, and carrying capacity is uniquely suited to this role. The proof of this is already evident in the commercial marketplace. The Italian Government has already signed a deal for 767 tankers for its Air Force, Japan recently did the same, and several other European governments are likely to be close behind. The 136 KC–135 E model aircraft the Air Force is seeking to replace average 43 years of age. They exhibit severe corrosion and structural damage due to age and spend on average well over a year in depot in an attempt to patch up this damage. The Air Force has two choices, either spend billions to attempt to repair and partially modernize these aircraft, or make the transition to a new airframe with much greater capability and lower cost of operation. The decision is not hard. The Air Force must replace its KC–135 Es and it must begin its program now.

The war in Afghanistan has shown just how vital our tanker capability is. Navy aircraft flying from aircraft carriers are being refueled at least 2 and sometimes 3 or 4 times on each mission. Bombers from Diego Garcia, and even those coming all the way from the United States, are being refueled, some up to as much as 6 times on one mission. Simply put, we could not fight a war in Afghanistan without these tankers, and what we've discovered is that our current fleet is too old to do the job for long in high intensity situations like the current one. The only question then is how do we pay to replace these tankers? Again, for the Air Force the choice is relatively simple. It needs 100 aircraft delivered as quickly as possible. The Air Force calculates that phasing out the KC–135 Es on an aggressive schedule will save at least $5.9 billion. But the Air Force's procurement budget was held flat this year by the new administration, and for now there doesn't appear to be any help for procurement in sight. The Air Force bears the responsibility of paying not only for the nation's tanker aircraft, but also for all of the nation's airlift, most of our space assets, and our Air superiority capability. So the right answer is to lease tanker aircraft, which allows the Air Force to spread the cost over up to 10 years, and buy down the value of these aircraft to the point where at the end of the lease, the Air Force can easily buy or release these aircraft for their residual value. This is the same principle on which a car lease operates, an arrangement understood and exercised by millions of Americans. And the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has determined that "the lease price quoted is a very good price." How can the taxpayer be sure that Boeing will not turn around at the end of the lease and sell these aircraft to somebody else? Boeing can sell or lease these aircraft only with US government approval under export control laws.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the next six lines of the colloquy be inserted in the record.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Absolutely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman that colloquies may not be inserted in the record.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman read this very brief colloquy to me, and I will try to respond.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this bill grants approval for the Air Force to enter into a lease for new tanker aircraft to be delivered as general purpose aircraft in commercial configuration. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, it is also my understanding that Italy and Japan have selected the 767 tanker for their air forces. Italy intends to buy at least four of the tankers, and Japan intends to procure at least one. Further, I believe that the same tanker configuration is being offered commercially to other countries to meet their in-flight refueling requirements. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

□ 1030

Mr. LEWIS of California. Yes, it is.

Mr. DICKS. Then the gentleman would say that a commercial market exists for general purpose, commercially configured aerial refueling tanker aircraft?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Yes, very well said.

Mr. DICKS. Would the gentleman agree a general purpose aircraft that will meet the general requirements of many customers; that can operate as a passenger aircraft, a freighter, a passenger/freighter "combination" aircraft, or as an aerial refueling tanker; and is available to either government or private customers, meets the definition of a general purpose, commercially configured aircraft?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Absolutely.

Mr. DICKS. The gentleman would agree with that assessment?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Of course. Of course.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill, and I think we will pass it expeditiously here this morning, but I want to remind the Members that it does include the $20 billion emergency supplemental, which is divided into three basic sections; which is national defense, or military, homeland defense, and the recovery effort for after the terrible September 11 attack.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for being a good partner on the minority side, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who has been a tremendous partner as we went through this process. And, of course, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) is an outstanding chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that this is the 15th, let me repeat, the 15th appropriation bill that we have done this year. We have not lumped any of them together. Each bill has had its own identity. This is something we have been striving to do for years, and this year we finally accomplished it.

Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering a very important piece of legislation, our last appropriations bill—H.R. 3338, the Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002. Included in this bill is not only critical funding for the Defense Department and the Intelligence Community, but also an allocation of the $20 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations enacted as part of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States.

I commend Chairman LEWIS, working closely with his partner, the ranking Member of the subcommittee, JACK MURTHA—as well as all of the members of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, on the cooperation that has produced a truly bipartisan Defense portion of this bill that shares broad-based support. This was not only because of the way this bill was put together, but because of what it does. It is a bill which provides strong support for our troops—both in the immediate

circumstances they find themselves, as well as the longer term security challenges confronting our Nation.

You may know that the Defense Subcommittee was actually beginning its subcommittee mark-up of this bill on the very morning of September 11th—when our country suffered the horrific attacks on New York and Washington. As we all know, those attacks have changed so many, many things—and I can report that this Defense Appropriations bill was re-worked by the committee following the attacks as well as the onset of our military operations overseas, to reflect the new demands of the war on terrorism as well as the other challenges we confront around the world. The bill addresses new threats of this new century—ranging from areas such as Ballistic Missile Defense, to force protection measures for our troops in the field, and new equipment and technologies such as aerial refueling aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicles. It also fully funds the President's initiatives in the area of military pay and quality of life programs—such as the largest military pay raise in 15 years, and more than a 50 percent increase in funding for the medical programs supporting our troops and their families. And it includes a new title to deal with counter-terrorism—ranging from more funding for intelligence, to providing additional resources in the area of so-called ''cyber war'' (computer network protection) and improved equipment and research to counter the threats of chemical and biological weapons.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL

With regard to Emergency supplemental portion of the bill—Division B—I believe we have struck an appropriate balance between funding to address our homeland security, recovery efforts and humanitarian assistance, and defense requirements. We expect that this is only the first bill that will provide funding to support our war against terrorism and the needs of this country to respond and recover from the attacks of September 11th.

The conference report before you today includes $20 billion to address the immediate requirements.

RECOVERY

The bill provides approximately $8.2 billion to help impacted areas recover from the terrorist attacks. This brings the total provided for recovery at $11.2 billion when $3 billion in previously released funds are added. Included is: $2 billion for the Community Development Block Grant for economic recovery assistance in New York City; $4.357 billion for FEMA disaster relief $300 million in additional transportation assistance and security enhancements, including funds for Amtrak, subways and ferries; and $140 million in reimbursement to hospitals impacted by the terrorist attacks.

HOMELAND SECURITY

The bill provides approximately $8.3 billion to improve our homeland defense and to assist communities in their emergency preparedness, including: $399.7 million for the Customs Service for increased border and seaport inspections, $285.5 million more than the request; $209 million for the Coast Guard, $6 million above the President's request; $2.5 billion for Public Health and Bioterrorism activities, $1 billion above the request; Aviation security initiatives through the Federal Aviation Administration receive $200 million which includes $100 million for cockpit door modifications and $65 million for the hiring of additional Sky marshals. An additional $108.5 million is provided to the FAA for the purchase and installation of explosive detection systems; $93 million for grants to U.S. seaports for security assessments and enhancements; $745 million for the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a variety of counterterrorism efforts, $206 million above the request; $256 million for Legislative branch security and the U.S. Capitol Police are authorized to hire an additional 195 FTEs; $226 million for Nuclear Nonproliferation, including $120 million to secure nuclear materials at sites in Russia and the Newly Independent States.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The bill provides $3.5 billion for the Department of Defense for increased operational costs, Pentagon reconstruction and classified activities. This brings the total for defense spending in the counter-terror supplemental to $17.2 billion. Also provides authority for agencies to reimburse the National Guard.

I am asking that we move this important legislation forward so we can get it to the President for his signature. Critical funding for our military during a time of war and for homeland security and recovery efforts is at stake.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our national security. During most of the last decade, the United States military has been consistently asked to make do with inadequate budgets. By adding more than $19 billion over the funding made available last year, this bill marks a turn for the better in defense funding.

Our nation has recently suffered a devastating blow from a new and faceless enemy. Terror was brought to our door on September 11th—masterminded by an enemy as devious as he is evasive.

As we witness the day-by-day actions of our military response to Operation Enduring Freedom, the importance of our readiness to dominate the conflict is a constant reminder. If we expect to control the battlefield, we must be prepared to fight quickly and with decisive force. We must allocate enough resources to support our troops at the highest level of readiness.

By appropriating $317.5 billion, H.R. 3338 will give our fighting forces the funding levels needed to succeed in protecting our national security interests.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this conference report and give our expectional military personnel the support and equipment they need to achieve current goals and those of the future.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the leaders of the House, our colleagues in the Senate and the president and his administration for following through today on a commitment made to Colorado to construct a new facility in Fort Collins, Colorado to replace the aging Center for Disease Control building there which houses the Division of Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases (DVBID). The first, and most important step, in fulfilling this commitment is contained in the resolution before us now, H.R. 3338—the Department of Defense Appropriations Act conference report and its supplemental appropriations for bio-terrorism.

As you know, the safety and security of the Division of Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases in Fort Collins has been of the utmost importance to me, to Colorado and to the nation. It is a high complement to the outstanding professional staff and administrators of the Fort Collins CDC facility to know that they will finally be getting a new facility commensurate with the world-class researchers who daily accomplish there important mission in the spirit of devoted public service.

The DVBID employs a number of epidemiologists, entomologists, molecular biologists, laboratory technicians, and behavioral scientists along with the other members of their prestigious staff. The DVBID performs critical functions for the country including conducting epidemiological studies to monitor disease spread, identification of risk factors associated with transmission and measuring public health impact, studying pathogens and developing new and more effective integrated, community-based prevention and control strategies, including vaccine development programs.

The facility deals with such deadly pathogens as Lyme disease, Dengue, Hemorrhagic Fever, Arboviral Encephalitides, Plague and Aedes albopictus that can be transmitted through hosts such as insects, mammals, and rodents. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the work done by the DVBID entails life-saving research affecting not only Colorado and the United States, but also the entire world. The new facility initiated by this bill will lend another helping hand as the DVBID continues to fight these diseases.

Mr. Speaker, the working conditions at the existing facility are not conducive to allowing the doctors and researchers of the DVBID to do their jobs as well as they otherwise would be able. As many in this House know, the Inspector General will soon be issuing a report citing approximately $100 million as the possible cost for completing this new facility. Due to the dramatic state of disrepair of the facility and the more urgent shortcomings in security as documented in the report, expediting the construction becomes even more critical. When the laboratory was first constructed in the 1960s, it was only designed to accommodate 50 employees. Through the years, new personnel have been added and now the facility contains more than 150 scientists, researchers, and other workers. Clearly, the number of people working in this building have tested its capacity and created an extremely cramped working environment. The security needs of the facility are well documented in the IG's report and are self-explanatory. Because of the sensitivity of the report's recommendations, I will not restate them herein but will insist the report's findings receive expedient attention.

In addition to the confining workspace, the facility's airflow system has been a chronic problem. In most government offices, such a ventilation problem would only be a minor inconvenience (my office in the U.S. House of Representatives suffers from a similar problem). However, proper airflow and ventilation become much larger issues when placed within the context of laboratory conducting research on some of the world's most volatile viruses.

Mr. Speaker, while I worked hard to make sure the new building would be constructed,

this was certainly not a one-man effort. The Senator from Colorado Mr. ALLARD, and gentle lady from Colorado Ms. DEGETTE were instrumental in helping me elevate the needs of the Fort Collins lab to a state of national concern. In fact, Ms. DEGETTE traveled to Fort Collins and toured the facility with me. Together we observed first hand the clear and convincing conditions of the facility, which fully warrant replacement of the lab. Fort Collins Mayor Ray Martinez also joined me on a separate tour of the facility. His observations and subsequent leadership likewise proved crucial in conveying to this Congress the urgency of this project.

The gentlemen from Texas, Mr. DELAY took personal interest in the facility as well and played the pivotal role in inserting the necessary language to effectuate the facility replacement into the legislation under our immediate consideration. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I thank President George W. Bush whose staff helped set this victory in motion. By pledging its word and its honor early on, the White House has assured me and Colorado that the new facility will be completed in a speedy and timely fashion, and through his representatives, the president has given me his commitment to place the goal of completion of the Fort Collins facility among his administration's highest priorities.

Once again the Colorado delegation to this Congress has proved that working together across party lines for the greater good of Colorado and all our constituents yields productive results in Congress for America. I am deeply grateful for the support and assistance of my Colorado colleagues. Absent their devoted attention to this important matter, it is most likely the new DVBID facility would remain an elusive dream.

Mr. Speaker as I have stated, I am proud to announce the new DVBID facility to be housed at Colorado State University. I congratulate the employees of the facility, especially the director, Dr. Duane Gubler. I applaud the efforts of the DVBID and look forward to being at the groundbreaking ceremony.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, while we all want to support our military, our fight against terrorism, and efforts to rebuild areas affected by the terrorist attacks of September 11, I find I must once again express my strong objection to the continued disregard for existing law and the House Rules shown by the Appropriations Committee. While the conference report has only been available for a few hours, there clearly are several objectionable provisions. While too numerous to specify all of them, I will highlight just a few.

When the House considered H.R. 3338 on November 28, several points of order were made striking provisions that funded certain aviation and highway spending from the Aviation and Highway Trust Funds. The points of order were upheld because language directing that the funding be from the trust funds was determined to be a violation of the House Rules because this funding from the Trust Funds was not authorized. The $40 billion emergency response supplemental passed after September 11 did not provide for funding from the Trust Funds. This spending should come from the general fund. Perhaps it is no surprise to find that this conference report inserts the Trust Fund provisions again, in violation of the House Rules.

It is shocking that just a few days after the FY2002 Department of Transportation Appropriations Act was signed into law, the Appropriators have seen a need to make ''technical corrections'' to the Act and continue their practice of Revenue Aligned Budget Authority diversion which negatively impacts state formula funds. The Transportation Appropriations Act diverted roughly $1 billion of RABA (which under TEA 21 is to be distributed proportionately to states and among allocated programs) into a few programs to increase their earmarking opportunities. One of the programs which had its share of RABA funds zeroed out was the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, which under TEA 21 should have received $29.9 million in RABA funds this year. Now, I am no fan of the vast amounts of federal highway funds going toward this project, but that is the project's fair share under TEA 21. H.R. 3338 restores $29.9 million to the Wilson Bridge. But the Bridge's good fortune is more bad news for the States. In order to make room for the additional funding for the Bridge, all the States will receive another cut from their TEA 21 formula funds to pay for the $29.5 million. This is on top of the $423 million cut in formula funds as a result of the first raid on the States included in the DOT Appropriations Act.

Inexplicably, the Appropriators cut RABA funds for the National Scenic Byway Program, a program that seeks to preserve some of the great driving roads across our nation and that should receive $3.4 million in RABA funds.

The Appropriators found time to do a little more earmarking, though in a less objectionable fashion. Two more projects for Mississippi and Washington are included, but funded from general funds and added to the $144 million of projects funded in sec. 330 of the original DOT Act and then earmarked. While unauthorized, we should at least be thankful that, unlike the Senate bill, the conference report does not fund these two projects from the Trust Fund programs that were the beneficiaries of the raid on the RABA funds from the states and other programs.

On December 11, less than 10 days ago, the House passed by voice vote H.R. 3441. This bill, requested by the Administration, creates the positions of Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy and Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs. When the House considered this bill on the Floor, not one member of the Appropriations Committee expressed any concerns. In fact, not one word of opposition was uttered on the Floor. And again, it was passed by voice vote. Yet, section 1107 of this conference report prohibits the use of any funds for these two positions. Why? No explanation is given.

Section 1102 provides that no appropriated funds or revenues generated by Amtrak may be used to implement section 204(c)(2) of Amtrak's current authorization law until Congress has enacted an Amtrak authorization law. Section 204(c)(2) requires Amtrak to prepare a liquidation plan within 90 days of the Amtrak Reform Council determining that Amtrak will not reach operational self-sufficiency by December, 2002. It also requires the Council to submit a plan to restructure Amtrak within 90 days of that finding. The Council made such a finding last month.

This prohibition on developing such plans will impede Congress' consideration of the future of Amtrak. The liquidation and restructuring plans would help educate Members and provide vital information during reauthorization of Amtrak. It is sad that the Appropriators saw fit to eliminate this statutory requirement. And, since it prohibits use of appropriations and revenues generated by Amtrak, I would argue that this is legislating on an appropriations bill in violation of the House Rules.

Chapter 11 of this conference report is replete with legislative provisions affecting programs under the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. This practice of usurping the jurisdiction of authorizing committees must stop. And it is getting worse with each passing year. Thankfully, we have completed all action on appropriations bills for FY 2002, but next year we must not continue to proceed down this path. I urge all Members, particularly those on authorizing committees, to stand together against this continuing assault on the jurisdiction of the authorizing committees.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the Defense Appropriations bill for 2002 (H.R. 3338) includes important language to solve a critical problem with funding deficiencies in a technical assistance program under the Multifamily Assisted Housing and Assistance Restructuring Act (MAHRA). The Office of Multifamily Housing and Assistance Restructuring (OHMAR) was charged with the administration of this program, which offers grants to non-profit groups for outreach and rehabilitation of housing. OMHAR mistakenly exceeded an annual $10 million restriction in two of the last four fiscal years. HUD has subsequently frozen all funds for the program. Over 100 non-profit and tenant organizations with written, signed contracts have incurred expenses on the assumption that the contracts would be honored. Even though these organizations have completed work according to the terms of their contracts, they are now forced to lay off staff because invoices for reimbursement have not been paid. The solution included in the defense appropriations bill does not require the appropriation of new money. Rather, it includes a technical correction to appropriate money that already exists within the HUD budget.

While I strongly support this technical correction as a necessary and critical step to ensure that 100's of non-profit organizations around the country are properly compensated, there remains one area of concern. The language embodies requirements for additional audits and reviews of the office responsible as well as other elements of the program. While a full and ongoing investigation of the reasons for OMHAR's financial errors is absolutely necessary, these steps can and should be taken without further delaying the reimbursement of non-profit organizations associated with the program. Any additional requirements for financial reviews and audits should balance the need for continued accountability with the need to meet our current and future obligations to these important non-profit organizations.

I urge my colleagues to work with their local non-profit housing organizations to ensure that any additional requirements posed by this legislation do not serve to stymie their efforts to provide quality housing in our nation's communities.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3338, the Fiscal Year 2002 Defense Appropriations Conference Report and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend by remarks.

As a member of the Defense Subcommittee, let me first thank our Chairman JERRY LEWIS

and our ranking member, Congressman MURTHA, as well as our full Committee Chairman BILL YOUNG.

Our subcommittee was first scheduled to begin work on this bill on the morning of September 11 at the very hour that terrorists attacked our county, killing thousands of our fellow Americans and forever changing the course of our nation's history.

America is now at war and our young men and women in the military have been called on to defend our citizens and our nation. The course of our nation's history *will not* be written by the terrorists *but by* the bravery and success of our troops now serving on the frontlines of this war against terrorism. And our history will be written, in part, *by the actions we take here today.*

Today, there is no more important task before this Congress than to provide our military with the tools and resources they need to defend our citizens and fight for our freedom. Our military needs to know that this Congress *not only* supports their mission in theory *but in substance;* that we are prepared to take all the necessary steps and provide all the necessary means for their safety and their success in battle. With this Conference Report, we go a long way in doing just that.

With this bill, we help meet the immediate needs of our troops and their families, to keep our military at the ready, and to invest in all the many, diverse capabilities we need to protect our citizens from all potential threats.

Overall, we provide $317.5 billion for the Department of Defense and with those dollars, we do the following:

First and foremost, we give our troops better pay.

We add much needed dollars for troop readiness, training, supplies, and mobility that allow our Commander in Chief to send our Armed Forces into battle anywhere and at a moment's notice.

We add support for our National Guard and reserves, so many of whom have now been called to duty.

We provide for modernizing major weapon systems that allow us to better combat our enemies in the air, on the ground and at sea.

We continue to support critical long-term investments in research and development so we have the most lethal and effective weapons now and in the future.

We add significant resources to strengthen classified intelligence programs, and accelerate and enhance U.S. military intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities.

And we also add critical funds for our homeland defense to better protect our citizens from all potential threats.

And with the release of $20 billion in emergency appropriations, we are also helping to meet the very real needs of those communities and states most directly impacted by the attacks of September 11 and to strengthen our homeland defense.

As my colleagues know, New Jersey was on the frontlines of the attacks of September 11 our people suffered greatly as so many lives were lost and our state and local law enforcement where there to answer the call to help our neighbors in New York. And it's important that we all work to help rebuild lower Manhattan and most important, work together to help our fellow citizens who suffered to rebuild their lives.

I want to thank the House for agreeing to requests to help New Jersey directly by including $30 million to replace our state police communications system which sat atop the World Trade Center and was destroyed in the attack. And as a result of the destruction of the PATH station, thousands of New Jersey commuters are struggling every day to get to work. Our commuters need help and this bill provides relief for our commuters by providing $100 million for increased mass transit and $100 million for increased ferry service. We also provide $100 million critical safety improvements for the tunnels that take millions of people to and from Manhattan and New Jersey every day.

Finally, let us also be clear that the commitments we make in this bill to our military do not meet every need. As more will be required of our troops, more will be required of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as those of us who have served in the military know only too well, wars are fought by the young. We know, too, that freedom never has, nor will it be this time, free. At no time in our nation's history has the sacrifice and service of our young men and women been more important to the defense of our country and the security of our future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass the fiscal year 2002 Defense Appropriations Conference Report and to do so unanimously.

[From Daily Record, Dec. 20, 2001]

FRELINGHUYSEN DISAPPOINTED WITH FUNDING FOR N.J. MILITARY

(By Matt Manochio)

U.S. Rep. Rodney Frelinghuysen said Wednesday he's disappointed with the funding provided by the U.S. Senate for New Jersey's military installations, but the state's two Democratic senators say they are steadfast in their support of those bases.

Frelinghuysen, R-Harding, released a statement with details of the Department of Defense budget that soon will land on President' Bush's desk.

At Picatinny Arsenal in Rockaway Township, $447 million is slated for research and development for the arsenal's Crusader self-propelled howitzer program. All totaled, more than $600 million is earmarked for Picatinny projects in the 2002 budget.

Frelinghuysen's statement compared House and Senate funding requests, along with the amounts that actually made it into the budget.

The House asked for $98 million for the Crusader's ''Common Engine'' program, compared to $43 million requested by the Senate. The final amount budgeted was $98 million.

The release listed various projects at Picatinny and other bases, showing the Senate budgeted no money for them while the House set aside between $1.5 million and $40 million.

The state's two Democratic senators strongly disagreed with Frelinghuysen's suggestion that the Senate has failed to adequately support the military, according to their spokespeople.

''Basically, we're surprised about it,'' said David Wald, a spokesman for Sen. Jon Corzine. ''We know that the bulk of the ($300 million) for Homeland Defense that impacts on New Jersey started on the Senate side.''

Likewise, Sen. Robert G. Torricelli's spokeswoman, Debra DeShong, took exception to the Frelinghuysen document.

New Jersey military bases have no bigger advocate than Sen. Torricelli,'' she said, adding that the senator was ''disappointed that Congressman Frelinghuysen has chosen to politicize our state's defense projects and our efforts to protect our priorities.''

Frelinghuysen's spokesman, Mark Broadhurst, said that the congressman wasn't trying to politicize anything.

''To say that he was disappointed with the final numbers this year, that would be an accurate statement,'' Broadhurst said.

''But in no way is the congressman trying to point any fingers,'' he said, adding that Frelinghuysen is telling the Senate ''we have to do better.''

Picatinny Arsenal spokesman Pete Rowland said he was pleased with the congressman's efforts.

''I think that it goes without saying (Frelinghuysen) has displayed a real strong support for military installations not only in his district but in the state of New Jersey and military services at large,'' he said. ''And this is another example of his personal support, as well as that of the other members of the New Jersey congressional delegation.''

Picatinny Arsenal covers about 6,500 acres with 1,000 buildings. It employs approximately 3,500 people designing new weapons and munitions for the military.

[From the Star Ledger, Dec. 20, 2001]

MILLIONS EXPECTED FOR AREA'S TRANSIT AND SECURITY

(By J. Scott Orr)

WASHINGTON.—House and Senate negotiators have agreed on a Pentagon spending bill that includes hundreds of million of dollars for law enforcement and transportation aid to New Jersey in the aftermath of the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks.

Included is close to $300 million to improve commuter access to New York City from New Jersey and more than $50 million for the State Police and the Newark and Jersey City police departments to help tighten security.

''These important security and transportation initiatives are critical to the safety and well-being of New Jersey residents,'' said Rep. Rodney Frelinghuysen (R–11th Dist.), the state's senior member of the House Appropriations Committee.

''Through no choice of its own, New Jersey has become one of the front lines in the war on terrorism, and it is absolutely crucial that the state receives the resources it needs to provide the strongest security possible,'' added Sen. Robert Torricelli (D–N.J.), who fought for the New Jersey money in the Senate.

While they joined in applauding the transportation and security funding, Frelinghuysen and Torricelli were divided over another part of the bill that sets funding levels for New Jersey's military installations, including Picatinny Arsenal, Fort Monmouth, McGuire Air Force Base and Fort Dix. The bases would receive more than $650 million under the bill.

Without mentioning Torricelli or Sen. Jon Corzine (D–N.J.), Frelinghuysen charged that the Senate failed to support more than $25 million in additional funding for programs at the bases, including more than $20 million at Picatinny.

Frelinghuysen had complained privately that the money for the transportation and security projects, championed in the Senate by Torricelli and Corzine, could jeopardize funding levels for other military programs in the state.

Speaking through a spokesperson, Torricelli said he was ''disappointed'' that Frelinghuysen would blame the Senate for ''shortcomings that resulted from the work of the committee on which he serves.''

The transportation and security funding is part of $20 billion in anti-terror and reconstruction funding included in the appropriations bill for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year that began Oct. 1.

The agreement still requires final approval by the House and the Senate, but its backers said there is little doubt it will be approved quickly, possibly today.

The transportation funding includes:

$100 million to expand ferry service for PATH commuters between New Jersey and Manhattan.

$100 million in capital investment funding to accelerate improvements under way by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey to improve PATH and NJ Transit systems.

$100 million for Amtrak to enhance safety and security of its rail tunnels under the East and Hudson rivers.

$93.3 million to improve security at all U.S. seaports, including the Port of New York and New Jersey, and along the Delaware River in New Jersey.

''The enhancement of the metropolitan area's transportation infrastructure is central to the region's ability to recover economically from both the attacks on the World Trade Center and the economic situation we are currently facing,'' Torricelli said.

The transportation funding—usually not included in an appropriations package for the Department of Defense—was put in to help New Jersey and New York recover from the destruction of the World Trade Center, which sat atop a vital PATH station.

The loss of the World Trade Center station forced some 67,000 daily commuters to seek alternative routes to Manhattan. The station is expected to be out of service at least until mid-2003.

The aging Amtrak Hudson River rail tunnels are slated for a $1 billion rehabilitation in addition to the $100 million in the Pentagon bill, which will go for immediate improvements to protect them against terrorist attack.

For police, the bill would provide:

$30 million to replace the New Jersey State Police Radio System tower, lost in the attacks on the World Trade Center.

$10.7 million for modernization of the Jersey City Police Department's communications system.

$10 million for law enforcement purposes and security equipment updates in Newark.

''This funding will help ensure that our men and women of the State Police continue to have the tools and resources necessary to protect our state and its citizens,'' Frelinghuysen said.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the appropriators on reporting our a fine defense bill overall. However, I need to put in the record my objections to the inclusions of a provision related to the Homestake mine in South Dakota. I made the same comments when the language passed as a free-standing measure, S. 1389.

I'm afraid I must oppose the Homestake language, despite the strenuous efforts made to improve it by both Mr. THUNE and the House leadership. As a Member of Congress, I'm afraid that this language could still unnecessary saddle taxpayers with costly and unprecedented environmental responsibilities. And as Chairman of the House Science Committee, I'm concerned that it may distort the priorities of the National Science Foundation for years to come.

This provision sets up dangerous and unprecedented situation in which the federal government will be financially responsible for activities it did not undertake at a piece of property it does not control. That flies in the face of common sense and fiduciary responsibility.

Under this language, the federal government will be responsible for any environmental liability connected with the portions of the Homestake mine that are conveyed to South Dakota—even if they originated while the mine was privately operated. And while the mine will be owned by South Dakota, the state will have no financial responsibility for it; that will rest solely with the federal taxpayer. It's lucky that South Dakota doesn't have any bridges to sell us.

In S. 1389 as originally introduced the federal government did not even have any real ability to have problems at the mine cleaned up before it was transferred. Thanks to the efforts of Mr. THUNE, that situation has been improved.

I would urge the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which will hire a contractor to review the mine, not to accept any contractor with which it is not completely satisfied. The unfortunate fact that the contractor must be selected ''jointly'' by Homestake, South Dakota and EPA should not be allowed to pressure EPA into hiring a contractor that will not fully protect the federal taxpayer. And the requirement that EPA consult with Homestake and the State over the nature of the contract with the independent entity'' must not be interpreted to give Homestake or the State any veto over the content of that contract.

But EPA should consult with the National Science Foundation (NSF) throughout the environmental review process, as NSF is the federal agency that will have continuing responsibility if a laboratory is established at the mine.

Importantly, the bill now allows the EPA Administrator to reject the final report of he contractor if it identifies conditions that would make the federal assumption of liability ''contrary to the public interest.'' I believe this allow the federal government to reject the transfer of the mine if it would cost too much to remedy existing environmental problems. This is vital since Homestake's contribution to pre-transfer remediation could well turn out to be nothing, given the language in this bill.

The bill says nothing about which federal agency would be responsible for overseeing or financing any pre-transfer remediation. This is a major, conspicuous, and I assume, purposeful gap in the legislation.

I certainly would hope that these costs—which should not have been federalized in the first place—are not borne by the National Science Foundation, a small agency with important tasks that do not include environmental remediation.

But this bill raises many other concerns related to the National Science Foundation. All the activities under this bill are contingent on NSF approval of an underground laboratory at the Homestake mine.

While such a laboratory certainly has scientific merit, it may not be a high priority compared to other NSF programs and projects, especially given that construction of other neutrino detectors is either under consideration or underway.

This bill must not be used to pressure NSF to change or circumvent its traditional, careful selection procedures. Normally, a project of this magnitude would require several years of review. NSF would have to determine its relative priority among other Major Research Equipment proposals. And NSF would have to ensure that proper management is in place. Those procedures must be followed in this case. Indeed, this is even more important in the case of Homestake because any mismanagement could result in both environmental harm and substantial liability for the federal government.

I would also urge the National Science Foundation (NSF) not to make a decision on whether to award a grant to the underground laboratory until the report to EPA has been prepared. This is essential even though NSF will have to have an Environmental Impact Statement prepared about the conversion of the mine into a laboratory.

NSF should not be committing federal resources to a project until it knows how much the project will cost the federal taxpayer and which agencies will be responsible for shouldering that burden.

The federal assumption of liability will already pose unfortunate costs for NSF. The laboratory is to pay into an Environment and Project Trust Fund, and some if not all of that money will come from NSF.

NSF must be an active participant in determining how much needs to be contributed to the trust fund, especially since it may end up being the only contributor to that fund. And NSF must have a role in determining the final disposition of the fund. The bill is silent on what is to become of the fund if a laboratory is started and then closed. All that is clear is that the federal government gets saddled with the costs of closing the mine. But which agency is responsible for that undertaking? And what will happen to any leftover funds? NSF should have an active role in deciding that.

The Homestake language bill poses enormous, unnecessary and unprecedented risks for the federal taxpayer. It is, in a phrase, a sweetheart deal for the Canadian company that owns Homestake and for the State of South Dakota. It could threaten the stability of the National Science Foundation, a premier science agency whose processes have been viewed as a model of objectivity and careful review.

I should point out that the federal government is already paying Homestake $10 million in this fiscal year to keep the mine open because it might become a laboratory. If that continues through the period of NSF decision-making the federal government could easily sink as much as $50 million into a mine that it may never use.

I will work to ensure that NSF itself is not saddled with those unnecessary costs, which could be spent on worthy grants to researchers.

The Science Committee will be following this matter extremely closely to ensure that the environmental review is rigorous and protects the public interest. We will watch closely to ensure that the laboratory is being reviewed in the same manner as every other NSF project and does not distort the agency's processes or priorities or weigh it down with unsustainable costs. The risks of proceeding with this bill are clear; we will work to see that they are never realized.

Mr. Speaker, I am attaching an exchange of letters with the National Science Foundation that will further highlight the risks inherent in proceeding in this unorthodox manner.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC.

Dr. RITA COLWELL,
Director, National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA.

DEAR DR. COLWELL: As you know, the Senate recently passed S. 1389, the ''Homestake Conveyance Act of 2001.'' This bill has serious implications for the National Science Foundation (NSF).

With that in mind, we want to be sure that NSF is considering the likely consequences should S. 1389 be enacted. Therefore, I am writing to request that you submit to the House Science Committee the following items by no later than December 15:

(1) A plan for how NSF would absorb the expected costs of an underground laboratory at Homestake beginning in Fiscal Year 2003, with special attention to the impact on other projects in the Major Research Equipment account.

(2) A plan for how NSF would ensure that the laboratory was properly managed, even if a project were awarded in calendar 2002.

(3) A plan for how NSF would interact with the Environmental Protection Agency and the State of South Dakota to ensure that the mine is in proper condition for the establishment of a laboratory and to determine amounts NSF grantees would have to pay into the Environment and Project Trust Fund established under the bill.

The enactment of S. 1389 could complicate NSF's situation for years to come both directly and through the precedents the bill may set. We want to work together with you, starting immediately, to limit any problems this measure may cause.

Sincerely,

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT,
Chairman.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
Arlington, VA December 14, 2001.

Hon. SHERWOOD BOEHLERT,
Chairman, Committee on Science, House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you for your letter regarding S. 1389, the ''Homestake Conveyance Act of 2001' and its possible implications for the National Science Foundation (NSF).

The following responds to your requests:

(1) A plan for how NSF would absorb the expected costs of an underground laboratory at Homestake beginning in Fiscal Year 2003, with special attention to the impact on other projects in the Major Research Equipment account.

NSF has not identified funds to support the conversion of the Homestake mine into an underground research laboratory. Unless the President requests and Congress appropriates additional monies for the lab, its establishment would force us to reconsider the priorities within the Research and Related Activities appropriation or reevaluate the funding profiles and timelines of existing MRE projects.

(1) A plan for how NSF would ensure that the laboratory was properly managed, even if a project were awarded in calendar 2002.

An applicant for a grant of this magnitude must submit a management plan for NSF's review prior to any funding decision by the Foundation. That plan must cover all phases of the project including the planning process, construction or acquisition, integration and test, commissioning, and maintenance and operations. The management plan sets forth the management structure and designates the key personnel who are to be responsible for implementing the award. This proposed management plan then becomes the basis for NSF's review of the adequacy of management for the project.

The technical and managerial complexity of the proposed lab suggests that NSF would utilize a Cooperative Agreement as the funding instrument. The particular terms of a Cooperative Agreement covering the lab would be established prior to NSF's funding of the proposal. That Cooperative Agreement would specify the extent to which NSF would advise, review, approve or otherwise be involved with project activities. To the extent NSF does not reserve or share responsibility for certain aspects of the project, all such responsibilities remain with the recipient.

(3) A plan for how NSF would interact with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the State of South Dakota to ensure that the mine is in proper condition for the establishment of a laboratory and to determine amounts NSF grantees would have to pay into the Environment and Project Trust Fund established under the bill.

NSF would interact in good faith with the EPA and the State of South Dakota to ensure that the mine is in satisfactory condition for the establishment of a laboratory. Additionally, assessment of the proposal before us will presumably require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The findings of that EIS would very much inform our evaluation of the proposal.

We share your concern about the mandatory contribution to the Fund required of each project conducted in the lab. Our review of each proposal for science in the lab would include a careful analysis of (1) the projected costs of removing from the mine or laboratory equipment or other materials related to a proposed project, and (2) the projected cost of claims that could arise out of or in connection with a proposed project. Meaningful analysis of both factors would require close cooperation with the lab's Scientific Advisory Board, the State of South Dakota, and the EPA. These costs will factor into our evaluation of each proposal.

I appreciate the opportunity to work with you in assessing the possible impact of this legislation on the National Science Foundation.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the President's program.

Sincerely,

RITA R. COLWELL,
Director.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for the extraordinary job they have done in bringing this Conference Report to the Floor. Never before in most of our lifetimes has the security of our Nation been more paramount than it is at this moment. All the Members in this body, indeed, every American, owe a great debt of gratitude to Chairman LEWIS of California and the Ranking Member, Congressman MURTHA of Pennsylvania along with their hard working staff. They have ensured that the men and women in uniform receive the pay increases that they deserve and the modern equipment that they need to defend our homeland and other freedom-loving people in harm's way.

I was pleased to see in the Committee Report an initiative to accelerate and enhance the United States' intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities through a program called the Multi-Sensor Command and Control Aircraft or MC2A, a concept strongly advocated by the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. Such an aircraft will advance the capabilities of AWACS and Joint STARS air and ground surveillance radars and will serve as the airborne integrator for a large variety of battlefield information systems. This aircraft will be the cornerstone of our military's transformation to network centric warfare.

However, due to overall budget constraints, the MC2A program was not funded. While this is a disappointment to the Air Force and to the warfighters that would readily benefit from this revolutionary capability, I strongly encourage the Air Force, along with their industry partners, to continue to find ways to bring this program forward. I look forward to working with this Committee next year to accelerate the MC2A program providing our forces dominance over the information battlefield.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, sections 901 and 903 of the division B of the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2002, give the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives identical authority to acquire buildings and facilities in order to respond to emergencies. The phrase ''notwithstanding any other provision of law'' was included in these sections to clarify that provisions of law which would otherwise prohibit these individuals from acquiring buildings and facilities, such as section 3736 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 14), would not interfere with this authority. It was not the intent of the conferees or the Congress for this phrase to be construed more broadly to waive the application of other provisions of law which may apply to these kind of activities, such as the Anti-Deficiency Act.

Indeed, subsection (d) of each of these sections permits any portion of the costs incurred by the Sergeant at Arms or Chief Administrative Officer in acquiring buildings and facilities under this authority during a fiscal year to be covered by funds which are appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol during the fiscal year and transferred to the Sergeant at Arms or Chief Administrative Officer. It would be unnecessary for Congress to permit this kind of transfer if the Sergeant at Arms and Chief Administrative Officer were permitted to carry out the underlying acquisitions without using appropriated funds, since that would eliminate the need for these costs to be covered with other appropriated funds in the first place.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 6, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 510]

YEAS—408

Abercrombie	Biggert	Buyer
Ackerman	Bilirakis	Callahan
Aderholt	Bishop	Calvert
Akin	Blagojevich	Camp
Allen	Blumenauer	Cannon
Andrews	Blunt	Cantor
Armey	Boehlert	Capito
Baca	Boehner	Capps
Bachus	Bonilla	Capuano
Baird	Bonior	Cardin
Baldacci	Bono	Carson (IN)
Baldwin	Boozman	Carson (OK)
Ballenger	Borski	Castle
Barr	Boswell	Chabot
Barrett	Boucher	Chambliss
Bartlett	Boyd	Clayton
Barton	Brady (PA)	Clyburn
Bass	Brady (TX)	Coble
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Collins
Bentsen	Brown (OH)	Combest
Bereuter	Brown (SC)	Condit
Berkley	Bryant	Cooksey
Berman	Burr	Costello
Berry	Burton	Cox

Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—6

Conyers
Filner
Jackson (IL)
Lee
Paul
Petri

NOT VOTING—20

Baker
Barcia
Clay
Clement
Cubin
Cummings
Dingell
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Luther
Markey
Meek (FL)
Spratt
Stark
Waters
Waxman
Wexler
Young (AK)

□ 1056

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. OBERSTAR changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I was late arriving this morning, and I missed rollcall vote 510, final passage of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently missed the vote on H.R. 3338 Defense Appropriations Conference Report. Had I been present I would have voted ''yea.''

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 79, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 323, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 79 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 79

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 107–44 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 107(c) and inserting in lieu thereof ''January 10, 2002''; and by striking the date specified in section 123 and inserting in lieu thereof ''January 1, 2002''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 323, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

□ 1100

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

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution merely extends the date of the previous continuing resolution until the 10th of January. We do this not because we need the extra time in the Congress, but the President does need some additional time to review these last bills that we have sent to him.

I hope that we can pass this expeditiously and everybody get home for a very merry Christmas or a happy Hanukkah or whatever celebration that we all enjoy.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman entertain a unanimous-consent request to change the January 10, 2002 date to January 10, 2003?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That would make our life a lot easier, but we probably could not get that kind of unanimous consent.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 323, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE OF BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 295) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 295

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, December 20, 2001, or Friday, December 21,