

this Congress's policy of fiscal discipline, yet provide sufficient funding for agencies within the bill's jurisdiction to carry out those important statutory responsibilities.

Americans who have experienced frustration with the Internal Revenue Service will be pleased to know that this legislation also appropriates funds necessary to carry out the IRS reforms that were passed by the last Congress and stand to benefit taxpayers all across America.

This legislation was crafted in a bipartisan manner. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, along with the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) deserve accolades for not only their hard work, but also for working together. This rule and conference report deserve bipartisan support today.

It is understandable that some Members may not feel this is the perfect appropriations legislation, but this legislation does represent a consensus, bipartisan agreement. Members should be reminded that the legislation maintains the fiscal restraints mandated in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary half-hour.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleagues, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for their hard work in bringing this bill to the floor. It has certainly had its ups and downs, and I am very happy to lend my full support to the bill that is before us today. The conferees that brought the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill back from the grave, and they are to be congratulated.

Once upon a time, Mr. Speaker, this bill contained some cuts that would have made it very hard for some of our major agencies to function. It was so bad, Mr. Speaker, that it passed the House by only one vote. But today, those cuts have been reversed. Today, this bill funds the Treasury Department at \$12 billion; it includes funding for the new law enforcement agencies; it funds the office of national drug control policy to the tune of \$460 million. Mr. Speaker, this bill also allows government agencies to use appropriated money to provide child care for lower-income Federal employees, which will help them make sure their children are well taken care of when they work.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill makes sure that the Federal employees re-

ceive a 4.8 percent COLA, equal to that of the military. Mr. Speaker, these people work hard for a living, and at the very least their salaries should keep up with inflation.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for their hard work, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

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

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

What we see is that it is another example of bipartisan support of people who are working together in Washington, D.C., the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), myself, we are trying to work together on these important issues that are important not only to people, but people who anticipate and expect that Republicans and Democrats alike are able to craft our business in a way that we can be successful.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both the rule and the bill because I appreciate the work that Chairman KOLBE and ranking member HOYER have done. I do want to note for the record my objections to one very unfortunate decision the conference made with respect to the issue of children's sleepwear.

In 1972, the Consumer Product Safety Commission adopted a rule which required clear understandable labeling for children's sleepwear, so before you put your infant to bed, you would have to know if the sleepwear was flame retardant or not. That is a standard that was lauded by emergency room physicians, nurses, arson investigators, firefighters around our country for a long time. It worked.

In 1996, for inexplicable reasons, that standard was loosened and weakened by the Consumer Product Safety Commission. Working with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), I was able to have included in the House version of this bill an amendment which effectively banned the import of children's sleepwear that did not have that safe labeling provision.

I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) to cooperate with us in that respect and their efforts in conference. I regret the fact that the result of the conference was not satisfactory on that.

I will support this bill, nevertheless, because of its basic merits, but I would

call upon the Speaker and others in leadership in this House to permit us to bring to the floor a freestanding bill that lets us have a fair debate as to whether or not this important children's sleepwear standard should, once again, become the law.

That is the proper forum for this. Just as strongly as I would urge passage of this bill, I would urge a fair procedure so that America's firefighters and arson investigators and nurses and emergency room physicians can be heard, and so that America's children can once again be protected.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to once again thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) not only for his judiciousness in the handling of this important matter, but also for making himself available if we needed him.

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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KOLBE. 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 to accompany H.R. 2490 and that I may include tabular and extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2490, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule just adopted, I call up the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2490) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, 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 291, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 14, 1999, at page H8201.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today, along with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), to present to the House the conference report on the fiscal year 2000 Treasury and General Government Appropriations bill. This is a bill that not only meets the commitment we have made to the American people to reform modernize the Internal Revenue Service, but one that continues to strengthen our support for Federal law enforcement, to protect our borders against drugs, and to prosecute violations of our gun laws.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would just like to say that I think that the staff always plays an essential role in preparing and supporting the committee at all stages of its annual appropriations bills, and I am surrounded today by the very valuable staff that has made this work very possible, and it is true also of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) whose staff is on the way.

I want to pay special tribute if I might to one individual, our congressional fellow, Clif Morehead, who leaves us at year end, having performed exemplary service for the House of Representatives. Clif has worked for this subcommittee for the past year, and after serving a year in the personal office of my distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), Clif will be leaving the committee to return to his work as a special agent with the U.S. Secret Service.

Clif has been a terrific asset to this subcommittee, bringing not only his experience and insight into Federal law enforcement from his Secret Service career, but also his understanding of how Congress and the Federal agencies operate from his previous work on defense issues, and as a Marine Corps officer.

□ 1500

Whether it has been preparing for the hearings, doing the in-depth research, briefings, planning and organizing committee travel, including a very informative trip that we participated in to review counterdrug efforts in the Andes earlier this year, to the drafting and negotiations of the bill and its report, Clif has been an invaluable staff member. I am grateful for his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Appropriations Subcommittee will soon bid farewell to our Congressional Fellow, Clifton, D. Morehead, as he begins his next assignment as Special Agent for the U.S. Secret Service. Special Agent Morehead has proven himself to be tremendous asset to the work of this Subcommittee, bringing with him the experience he has gained with the Secret Service, as a business manager for Procter and Gamble,

and as a Marine Corps officer. Clif began his fellowship in 1998 in the office of the distinguished ranking member of this subcommittee, STENY HOYER, where he served as his legislative assistant for defense policy and appropriations issues. Clif therefore arrived in this subcommittee with a strong background in the technical issues and folkways of the appropriations process.

Serving as a member of my subcommittee staff, Clif has brought a unique perspective to bear on many of the lively debates and sometimes convoluted issues we face as we craft this appropriation bill, and in overseeing the agencies and programs in our jurisdiction. In particular, Clif's insight and contribution has been invaluable on matters affecting law enforcement, national security, and management issues. Throughout his service here, Clif's unqualified professionalism, perceptiveness, great sense of humor and cool head have helped this Subcommittee and the Congress move forward on a wide range of policy and budgetary issues. His assistance in planning for and coordinating a complicated trip to the Andean countries to review the U.S. counter-narcotics assistance programs there was of particular benefit to us.

Special Agent Morehead has served me, this subcommittee, and the House well: we are sorry to see him leave, and will miss him as a colleague and as a friend. Each of us on the Treasury Appropriations Subcommittee wish Clif all the best as he resumes his Secret Service career, and expect to see great things there.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to join the chairman of the committee in commending the work of Clif Morehead. This is an extraordinarily valuable program for the Federal Government, these exchange programs. They give the Members of various different agencies a perspective on how the Congress operates, and other agencies, but how this process works.

Clif Morehead is an extraordinary young man who has contributed a great deal to the quality of our work during the past frankly 24 months, first working in my office, where he was an invaluable asset, and then in the committee office, as well.

I want to join the chairman in commending Clif Morehead. He is an extraordinary asset of the Secret Service, and has been an outstanding asset of ours. I join with the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) in wishing him the very best as he returns to his position as an agent in the United States Secret Service, where I know he will continue to prove to be a valuable asset to our country.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his kind remarks about Clif. Clif is on the floor with us today, and Clif, it is not our eulogy to you but rather a tribute to you, and we look forward to continuing to work with you.

Mr. Speaker, let me return to the conference report, if I might, and discuss for a moment some of the key parts about it.

This conference agreement provides \$13.7 billion for agencies which come under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee. That is \$240 million above the current fiscal year, an increase of less than 2 percent, but it is \$220 million below what the President requested.

I am concerned to learn there are some Members who believe that this level of funding is both excessive and unnecessary. In fact, it is neither. Just to keep pace with inflation, the administration requested an increase of \$600 million. That was before any of the initiatives, and before the mandatory requirements, such as Y2K readiness for the IRS, or workloads associated with the upcoming Presidential elections, the workload increase that will be caused during the upcoming Presidential election for the Secret Service, or for increases in the critical drug programs, such as the high-intensity drug trafficking areas or the Drug-Free Communities Act.

Mr. Speaker, a \$240 million increase barely makes a dent towards putting together a bill that meets all of our current law enforcement responsibilities.

Clearly, this subcommittee was faced with a daunting task. I can tell the Members that without this funding level, the conference report before us now would not be pretty from anyone's perspective. The fact is, anything less than what is provided in the conference report would have fallen far short of our shared goals.

Mr. Speaker, on the one hand, I know my colleagues have concerns over these funding levels. On the other hand, I know that we all support the same things. We all support IRS restructuring and reform and improving customer service for our constituents. We all support hardening the borders against drugs and illegal contraband while improving the flow of legitimate commerce. We all support keeping our children off drugs and strengthening our communities and families. Finally, we all support keeping firearms out of the hands of criminals, adult and juvenile criminals, and giving State and local law enforcement officers the tools they need to enforce the firearms laws that we have adopted.

These are items which certainly ought not to be controversial. These are items that are funded within our conference allocation, and I think we can all agree they are not excessive, they are not unnecessary.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me address the issue of legislative items and the suggestion that somehow the conference agreement has put one over on some Members, including items which, for a variety of reasons, should not be

included, or should not be in there in their present form.

Each year, this subcommittee is burdened with controversial legislative provisions that ultimately have to be negotiated in conference with the Senate. The fact is, once they are attached to the bill, we are responsible for negotiating differences with the Senate on behalf of the sponsors. So we did not put anything over on anybody in this conference report. The conferees negotiated to the best of their ability, and with nothing but the best of intentions. The conferees made every effort pos-

sible to accommodate the views of all Members, House and Senate, both sides of the aisle, on these different issues.

The agreement before us now reflects the very best intentions and the very best judgment of the conferees. I might add, it has received the unanimous and unqualified support of the House and Senate conferees. We have a bill that I believe can receive a majority of votes in both sides of the aisle, in both chambers, and one that I believe can and will be signed by the President of the United States.

I hope that, when some of my colleagues say they are threatening to vote against this measure because they disagree with the specifics of it or some of the controversial provisions, that they will reconsider that position. That would be a very shortsighted approach, and I urge Members to look at this conference report in its entirety.

This is an excellent conference agreement. It is strong on law enforcement, it is tough on drugs, and it continues our commitment to restructure and reform the IRS. I urge my colleagues to support this conference agreement.

H.R. 2490 - TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
Departmental Offices.....	123,151	134,630	134,206	133,168	134,034	+ 10,883
Salaries and expenses:						
Counterdrug (emergency funding).....	1,500					-1,500
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	1,238					-1,238
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	1,890					-1,890
Automation enhancement:						
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	37,403					-37,403
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	2,762					-2,762
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	12,500					-12,500
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	6,731					-6,731
Department-wide systems and capital investments programs.....	28,690	53,561	31,017	35,561	43,981	+15,271
Office of Inspector General.....	30,678	32,017	30,716	30,483	30,716	+ 38
Inspector General for Tax Administration.....		112,207	112,207	111,340	112,207	+ 112,207
Treasury Buildings and Annex Repair and Restoration.....	27,000	23,000	23,000	15,000	23,000	-4,000
(Delay in obligation).....	(-27,000)					(+ 27,000)
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.....	24,000	28,418	29,656	27,681	27,818	+3,818
Violent Crime Reduction Programs:						
General programs authorized by section 190001(e):						
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.....	3,000	3,000	26,800	17,847	27,920	+24,920
United States Secret Service.....	22,628	3,196	4,200	21,950	4,200	-18,428
United States Customs Service.....	65,472	64,952	64,000	52,774	61,000	-4,472
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.....	1,400	1,263		1,863	1,863	+ 463
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.....				9,200	9,200	+9,200
Interagency crime and drug enforcement.....	24,000	49,716	27,000	28,366	14,817	-9,183
ONDCP.....	1,000					-1,000
Federal Drug Control Programs:						
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program.....	1,500					-1,500
Special forfeiture fund.....				49,000		
Subtotal.....	119,000	122,127	122,000	181,000	119,000	
Grants authorized by section 32401:						
Gang Resistance Education and Training: Grants.....	13,000	10,000	10,000	13,000	13,000	
Total, Violent Crime Reduction Programs.....	132,000	132,127	132,000	194,000	132,000	
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center:						
Salaries and Expenses.....	71,923	86,846	82,827	80,114	84,027	+ 12,104
Antiterrorism (emergency funding).....	3,548					-3,548
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses.....	34,760	21,000	24,310	21,611	21,611	-13,149
Total, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.....	110,231	107,846	107,137	101,725	105,638	-4,593
Interagency Law Enforcement: Interagency crime and drug enforcement.....	51,900	26,184	48,900		61,083	+9,183
Financial Management Service.....	196,490	202,670	201,320	200,054	201,320	+4,830
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	6,000					-6,000
Federal Financing Bank (debt liquidation).....	(3,317,960)					(-3,317,960)
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms:						
Salaries and Expenses.....	546,074	584,859	567,059	570,345	565,959	+ 19,885
(Delay in obligation).....	(-2,206)					(+ 2,206)
Rescission.....	-4,500					+ 4,500
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	2,665					-2,665
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	5,000					-5,000
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	3,530					-3,530
Laboratory facilities and headquarters.....		15,000				
Total, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.....	552,769	599,859	567,059	570,345	565,959	+ 13,190
United States Customs Service:						
Salaries and Expenses.....	1,642,565	1,720,370	1,708,089	1,670,747	1,705,364	+ 62,799
(Delay in obligation).....	(-9,500)					(+ 9,500)
Counterdrug (emergency funding).....	106,300					-106,300
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	10,200					-10,200
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	1,701					-1,701
Subtotal.....	1,760,766	1,720,370	1,708,089	1,670,747	1,705,364	-55,402
Harbor Maintenance Fee Collection.....	3,000			3,000	3,000	
Operation, Maintenance and Procurement, Air and Marine Interdiction Programs.....	113,688	109,413	109,413	108,688	108,688	-5,000
Counterdrug (emergency funding).....	162,700					-162,700
Subtotal.....	276,388	109,413	109,413	108,688	108,688	-167,700
Customs Services at Small Airports (to be derived from fees collected).....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
Offsetting receipts.....		-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000
Customs facilities, construction, improvements and related expenses (Counterdrug emergency funding).....	7,000					-7,000
Total, United States Customs Service.....	2,049,154	1,829,783	1,817,502	1,782,435	1,817,052	-232,102

H.R. 2490 - TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Bureau of the Public Debt.....	172,100	177,819	176,919	176,983	177,819	+5,719
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	1,000					-1,000
Payment of government losses in shipment.....		1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	+1,000
Internal Revenue Service:						
Processing, Assistance, and Management.....	3,086,208	3,312,535	3,270,098	3,291,945	3,312,535	+226,327
(Delay in obligation).....	(-130,000)					(+130,000)
Tax Law Enforcement.....	3,184,189	3,336,838	3,301,136	3,305,090	3,336,838	+172,649
Earned Income Tax Credit Compliance Initiative.....	143,000	144,000	144,000	144,000	144,000	+1,000
Information Systems.....	1,265,456	1,455,401	1,394,540	1,450,100	1,455,401	+189,945
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	483,000					-483,000
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	22,312					-22,312
Information technology investments.....	211,000					-211,000
(Delay in obligation).....	(-211,000)					(+211,000)
Net total, Internal Revenue Service.....	8,375,165	8,248,774	8,109,774	8,191,135	8,248,774	-126,391
United States Secret Service:						
Salaries and Expenses.....	600,302	661,312	662,312	638,816	667,312	+67,010
(Delay in obligation).....	(-5,000)					(+5,000)
Antiterrorism (emergency funding).....	80,808					-80,808
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	3,000					-3,000
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	695					-695
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses.....	8,068	4,923	4,923	4,923	4,923	-3,145
Total, United States Secret Service.....	692,873	666,235	667,235	643,739	672,235	-20,638
Net total, title I, Department of the Treasury.....	12,637,225	12,376,130	12,189,648	12,214,649	12,354,616	-282,609
Appropriations.....	(10,714,759)	(12,376,130)	(12,189,648)	(12,214,649)	(12,354,616)	(+1,639,857)
Rescissions.....	(-4,500)					(+4,500)
Emergency funding.....	(963,483)					(-963,483)
TITLE II - POSTAL SERVICE						
Payment to the Postal Service Fund.....	100,195	93,436	29,000	29,000	29,000	-71,195
(Delay in obligation).....	(-71,195)					(+71,195)
Advance appropriations, FY 2001.....			64,436	64,436	64,436	+64,436
Total.....	100,195	93,436	93,436	93,436	93,436	-6,759
TITLE III - EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
Compensation of the President and the White House Office:						
Compensation of the President.....	250	250	250	250	250	
Salaries and Expenses.....	52,344	52,444	52,444	52,444	52,444	+100
Executive Residence at the White House:						
Operating Expenses.....	8,691	9,260	9,260	9,260	9,260	+569
White House Repair and Restoration.....		810	810	810	810	+810
Special Assistance to the President and the Official Residence of the Vice President:						
Salaries and Expenses.....	3,512	3,617	3,617	3,617	3,617	+105
Operating expenses.....	334	345	345	345	345	+11
Council of Economic Advisers.....	3,668	3,840	3,840	3,840	3,840	+174
Office of Policy Development.....	4,032	4,032	4,032	4,032	4,032	
National Security Council.....	6,806	6,997	6,997	6,997	6,997	+191
Office of Administration.....	28,350	39,198	39,448	39,198	39,198	+10,848
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	12,200					-12,200
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	7,666					-7,666
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	9,925					-9,925
Office of Management and Budget.....	60,617	63,495	63,495	63,495	63,495	+2,878
Office of National Drug Control Policy:						
Salaries and Expenses.....	48,042	43,133	52,221	21,963	22,951	-25,091
Counterdrug (emergency funding).....	1,200					-1,200
Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center.....				31,100	29,250	+29,250
Total.....	49,242	43,133	52,221	53,063	52,201	+2,959
Federal Drug Control Programs: High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Prog.	184,877	185,777	192,000	205,277	192,000	+7,023
Special forfeiture fund.....	214,500	225,300	225,000	127,500	216,000	+1,500
Counterdrug (emergency funding).....	2,000					-2,000
Unanticipated Needs.....	1,000	1,000	1,000		1,000	
Emergency funding.....	30,000					-30,000
Rescission.....	(-10,000)					+10,000
Total, title III, Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President.....	670,112	638,498	654,759	570,128	645,489	-24,623
Appropriations.....	(617,121)	(639,498)	(654,759)	(570,128)	(645,489)	(+28,368)
Rescission.....	(-10,000)					(+10,000)
Emergency funding.....	(62,991)					(-62,991)

H.R. 2490 - TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled....	2,464	2,674	2,674	2,657	2,674	+210
Federal Election Commission.....	36,500	38,516	38,152	38,175	38,152	+1,652
Counterdrug (emergency funding).....	243					-243
Federal Labor Relations Authority.....	22,586	23,828	23,828	23,681	23,828	+1,242
General Services Administration:						
Federal Buildings Fund:						
Appropriation.....	450,018					-450,018
Limitations on availability of revenue:						
Construction and acquisition of facilities.....	(492,190)	(102,194)	(8,000)	(76,979)	(74,979)	(-417,211)
Rescission of funds in P.L. 104-208.....				(-20,782)	(-20,782)	(-20,782)
Repairs and alterations.....	(668,031)	(664,869)	(559,869)	(607,869)	(588,674)	(-69,357)
(Delay in obligation).....	(-181,500)					(+181,500)
Installment acquisition payments.....	(215,764)	(205,668)	(205,668)	(205,668)	(205,668)	(-10,096)
Rental of space.....	(2,583,261)	(2,782,186)	(2,782,186)	(2,782,186)	(2,782,186)	(+198,925)
(Delay in obligation).....	(-15,000)					(+15,000)
Building Operations.....	(1,554,772)	(1,590,183)	(1,590,183)	(1,590,183)	(1,580,909)	(+26,137)
(Delay in obligation).....	(-88,000)					(+88,000)
Repayment of Debt.....	(91,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+9,000)
Total, Federal Buildings Fund.....	450,018					-450,018
(Limitations).....	(5,605,018)	(5,445,100)	(5,245,906)	(5,362,885)	(5,342,416)	(-262,602)
(Rescission of limitations).....				(-20,782)	(-20,782)	(-20,782)
Policy and Operations.....	109,584	122,158	110,448	120,198	116,223	+6,829
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	12,701					-12,701
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	4,800					-4,800
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	5,002					-5,002
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	18,796					-18,796
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	7,108					-7,108
Office of Inspector General.....	32,000	33,917	33,317	33,858	33,317	+1,317
Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents.....	2,241	2,241	2,241	2,241	2,241	
Supplemental general provision (P.L. 106-31).....	1,700					-1,700
Total, General Services Administration.....	643,960	158,316	146,006	156,297	151,781	-492,179
Merit Systems Protection Board:						
Salaries and Expenses.....	25,805	27,586	27,586	27,422	27,588	+1,781
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	66					-66
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(2,430)	(2,430)	(2,430)	(2,430)	(2,430)	
Federal payment to Morris K. Udall scholarship and excellence in national environmental policy foundation.....		3,000	1,000		2,000	+2,000
Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund.....	4,250	1,250	1,250		1,250	-3,000
National Archives and Records Administration:						
Operating expenses.....	224,614	186,452	180,398	179,738	180,398	-44,216
(Delay in obligation).....	(-7,861)					(+7,861)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	6,662					-6,662
Reduction of debt.....	-4,012	-5,598	-5,598	-5,598	-5,598	-1,586
Repairs and Restoration.....	11,325	13,518	13,518	21,518	22,418	+11,093
Records Center Revolving Fund.....		22,000	22,000	22,000	22,000	+22,000
National Historical Publications and Records Commission:						
Grants program.....	10,000	6,000	6,000	6,250	6,250	-3,750
(Delay in obligation).....	(-4,000)					(+4,000)
Rescission.....			-4,000	-3,800	-2,000	-2,000
Total, National Archives and Records Administration.....	248,589	222,372	212,318	220,108	223,468	-25,121
Office of Government Ethics.....	8,492	9,114	9,114	9,071	9,114	+622
Office of Personnel Management:						
Salaries and Expenses.....	85,350	91,584	90,584	91,584	90,584	+5,234
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	2,428					-2,428
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(91,236)	(95,486)	(95,486)	(95,486)	(95,486)	(+4,250)
Office of Inspector General.....	960	960	960	960	960	
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(9,145)	(9,645)	(9,645)	(9,645)	(9,645)	(+500)
Government Payment for Annuity, Employee Health Benefits.....	4,854,146	5,105,482	5,105,482	5,105,482	5,105,482	+451,336
Government Payment for Annuity, Employee Life Insurance.....	34,576	36,207	36,207	36,207	36,207	+1,631
Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.....	8,703,180	9,120,872	9,120,872	9,120,872	9,120,872	+417,692
Total, Office of Personnel Management.....	13,480,840	14,355,105	14,354,105	14,355,105	14,354,105	+873,465
Office of Special Counsel.....	8,720	9,740	9,740	9,689	9,740	+1,020
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	100					-100
United States Tax Court.....	32,765	36,489	36,489	34,179	35,179	+2,414
Total, title IV, Independent Agencies.....	14,515,180	14,887,990	14,862,262	14,876,384	14,878,877	+363,697
Appropriations.....	(14,399,368)	(14,887,990)	(14,866,262)	(14,880,184)	(14,880,877)	(+481,509)
Rescission.....			(-4,000)	(-3,800)	(-2,000)	(-2,000)
Emergency funding.....	(115,812)					(-115,812)

H.R. 2490 - TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Grand total	27,922,712	27,997,054	27,800,105	27,754,597	27,972,418	+49,706
Appropriations	(26,852,832)	(27,997,054)	(27,739,669)	(27,693,961)	(27,909,982)	(+1,057,150)
Rescissions	(-14,500)		(-4,000)	(-3,800)	(-2,000)	(+12,500)
Advance appropriations, FY 2001			(64,436)	(64,436)	(64,436)	(+64,436)
Emergency funding	(1,084,380)					(-1,084,380)
(Limitations)	(5,707,829)	(5,552,661)	(5,353,467)	(5,470,446)	(5,449,977)	(-257,852)
(Rescission of limitations)				(-20,782)	(-20,782)	(-20,782)
Scorekeeping adjustments:						
Bureau of The Public Debt (Permanent)	138,000	142,000	142,000	142,000	142,000	+4,000
Federal Reserve Bank reimbursement fund	128,000	128,000	128,000	128,000	128,000	+2,000
Trust fund budget authority	102,000	106,000	106,000	106,000	106,000	+4,000
US Mint revolving fund	15,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	-4,000
Sallie Mae	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	
Federal buildings fund	-30,000	4,000	-195,000	-97,000	-119,366	-89,366
Postal service advance appropriation, FY 2000	-71,195	71,195	71,195	71,195	71,195	+142,390
Postal service advance appropriation, FY 2001			-64,436	-64,436	-64,436	-64,436
General provision (sec. 408)	5,000					-5,000
Ethics Reform Act adjustment	-2,000					+2,000
Emergency funding	-1,084,380					+1,084,380
Outlay adjustment and BA adjustment			3			
GSA general provision (sec. 410)				-118,407		
Conveyance of land to the Columbia Hospital for Women (sec. 410)					-8,000	-8,000
NCAA retirement provision (sec. 654)					5,850	+5,850
Total, scorekeeping adjustments	-800,575	463,195	199,762	179,352	273,043	+1,073,618
Total mandatory and discretionary	27,122,137	28,460,249	27,999,867	27,933,949	28,245,461	+1,123,324
Mandatory	13,656,152	14,533,811	14,533,811	14,533,811	14,539,461	+883,309
Discretionary	13,465,985	13,926,438	13,466,056	13,400,138	13,706,000	+240,015

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and his staff for their leadership and work on this bill. This has been in some respects a difficult bill, and in other respects a relatively easy bill. Within the 302(b) allocation level that had been provided to this subcommittee, this is a very good conference report. Even though we were not able to fund the courthouse construction within the constraints of this allocation, this report deserves bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I was one, and I know the Chair shares my view, that believes we should be moving forward on courthouse construction. There is a backlog in the criminal justice system which certainly requires this, as does the civil side of the court dockets. Notwithstanding the fact that we have not been able to do that, the balance of the bill warrants the support of both sides of the aisle.

This conference report funds the Treasury Department at \$12.355 billion, which is \$21 million below the President's request. However, it is certainly sufficient to give to the Treasury the ability to do the job that we expect of them.

Included within this amount is \$3.3, almost \$3.4 billion for the Treasury's five important law enforcement agencies. Those agencies comprise, Mr. Speaker, 40 percent of law enforcement at the Federal level. In addition, I am happy to note that this bill fully funds the IRS at the requested level, providing for enhanced customer service and the restructuring of the IRS recently mandated by this Congress.

As my colleagues know, this is one of the major problems I raised with respect to the bill as it passed the House. I was very concerned that we were not providing the resources necessary to implement the reform program that we had adopted just a short time ago.

Happily, in conference, we have now provided the resources so that that reform can be fully implemented. I have talked personally, as I know the chairman has, to Mr. Rissotti, and he believes that, given the resources in this bill, that he will be able to meet the expectations that the Congress has to ensure that citizens are treated well and served effectively and efficiently by the Internal Revenue Service.

This bill also funds many drug activities, including \$460 million for the Office of National Drug Control Policy. This important, yes, even critical office has the lead role in coordinating all of this government's efforts in the war against drugs.

Within this \$460 million, \$192 million is for the very successful high-intensity drug trafficking program, \$185 mil-

lion for the ONCDP, National Youth Antidrug Media Campaign, and \$30 million for the third year of the Drug-Free Communities Act. I think the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) received a request from almost every Member of the Congress, it seemed, to fully fund this drug-free communities effort.

While we could not fully fund the General Services Administration within the 302(b) allocation, GSA is funded near the requested level, including funding for needed border stations in several States, and the first stage of the project to consolidate the Food and Drug Administration at White Oak, in Maryland.

This bill addresses the rate of increase also for Federal employees' compensation. Just a few minutes ago, maybe an hour ago or so, we passed the defense authorization bill, which authorizes a 4.8 percent level for the military. Happily, this bill, pursuant to the parity language adopted by this House on two different occasions this year, funds Federal employees at the same rate.

I thank the chairman for his leadership and assistance in accomplishing that objective. Both he, Senator CAMPBELL, and Senator STEVENS were very supportive of this objective, and I thank them for their efforts in that regard.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we have extended the authority for voluntary early retirement for Federal employees in this bill, critical as we downsize in a smart way. Clearly an across-the-board RIF is very inefficient. It does not necessarily remove those employees who are no longer needed, and is, both from an efficiency standpoint and from an economic standpoint, a very poor way to manage our service.

This language, which gives permanent authority to OPM to authorize early outs, will be extraordinarily helpful, I think, in managing well the Federal Government.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this conference report provides government agencies with the authority to use appropriated dollars to provide child care for low-income Federal employees. I know this has some controversy to it and I know that the chairman has indicated that he intends to have our committee very closely monitor this initiative, and I look forward to working with him on this effort.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report. It deserves bipartisan support. Mr. Speaker, indeed, I would hope that every Member of the House, on both sides of the aisle, could support this report. I thank the chairman for his leadership and his work, and join him in his words of praise, again, for the competency and commitment of our staff in reaching this result.

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

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

I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member, for his kind comments, and I would say that it has also been a great pleasure for me and my staff to work with him. We do not always agree on everything, and we will not, that is the nature of this body, that is the nature of the legislative process. But it also is the nature of the legislative process experience on appropriations that we work together to solve problems, and work together to make sure that we have a government that functions for the best interests of all of our citizens.

I think that this bill reflects the very best of that process, and certainly both with his staff and with the ranking minority member and the other members of the subcommittee, I think we have achieved a result that we can all be quite proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), who has been very instrumental in working for child care provisions in legislation.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this conference report. I want to very much thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) for his leadership and hard work on this important bill. It has been inch by inch hard work, diligent work, every step of the way.

I also want to commend the ranking member, my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for the work that he has done. He has done a yeoman's job, and it is a great product that has come about. I also want to thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for working with me to ensure that the legislation incorporates the provisions of my bill, H.R. 206, the Federal Employee Child Care Affordability Act.

This important and yet simple legislation would allow Federal agencies to use funds from their salary and expense accounts to help low-income Federal employees pay for child care. The legislation does not require any additional appropriations. It would be up to individual agencies to determine whether or not to use funds from their salary accounts to help provide child care. Agencies, not employees, would make payments to child care providers to help lower-income Federal employees pay for their child care.

One of the greatest challenges that families face is finding safe, affordable day care. America's lack of safe, affordable day care is not a new problem, but its consequences are becoming more dire. It does require new, innovative solutions.

In 1995, 62 percent of women with children younger than 6 and 77 percent

of women with children between the ages of 6 and 17 were in the labor force. Federal employees working, for example, at the National Institutes of Health in my district face significant financial choices in paying for child care.

□ 1515

A GS-6 secretary earning \$26,000 per year as a single parent of a 1-year-old child would have to pay \$11,440, more than half of her after-tax salary, on child care alone. This is a personal example. Put simply, without help from her employer, she would not be able to afford to work and raise her child.

This legislation gives federal agencies the flexibility similar to that enjoyed by the Department of Defense to tailor their child care programs to meet the particular needs of their employees. The Department of Defense, writing in support of my legislation, stated that these provisions will help remedy the current situation creating "the 'have's and the have not's' between the Department of Defense and other federal agencies because other agencies lack the authority to subsidize personnel costs." That is a quote.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that these child care provisions do not grant regulatory authority to the Office of Personnel Management that could lead the way to federalized child care. Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed at the level of misinformation that is being spread against these common sense provisions. The conferees explicitly stated that any regulations promulgated by OPM pursuant to this authority "shall only address the use of appropriated funds to provide child care services and improve the affordability of child care for lower income employees."

Mr. Speaker, by empowering agencies to work as partners with employees to meet their child care needs, Congress truly will be encouraging family-friendly federal workplaces in higher productivity. Retaining our good civil servants is essential to the well-being of our democracy.

In addition to empowering our agencies to create family-friendly workplaces, I am pleased that the conference report provides a 4.8 percent pay increase for our federal civilian employees, equaling the pay increase provided for uniformed military personnel and other legislation.

I am encouraged that this legislation includes the victory that we won during the debate on the fiscal year 1999 Treasury, Postal bill providing for contraceptive coverage in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program. Contraceptives help couples plan wanted pregnancies and reduce the need for abortions. This conference report ensures that we will continue treating prescription contraceptives the same as all other covered drugs in order to

achieve parity between the benefits offered to male participants in FEHB plans and those offered to female ones.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased about the inclusion of language that would require federal agencies to have a policy in place to address sex discrimination and harassment. It is a provision that steps in the right direction to counter the roadblocks for women in federal employment and can only bring us closer to creating a highly effective work force as we face the challenges of the new millennium.

I think this conference report is important. I think it reflects a sensible compromise between multiple interests.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), and thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member, for the very good work. I encourage all of my colleagues to support these important provisions to help federal employees and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense:

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, May 18, 1999.

Hon. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MORELLA: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Defense on H.R. 206, the Federal Employee Child Care Affordability Act, and how it would benefit the Department of Defense.

The Department of Defense has no objections to the proposed legislation and in fact will benefit from H.R. 206.

The Department of Defense is committed to providing quality affordable child care for both military and civilian employees of the Department. We also are active partners with both the Office of Personnel Management and the General Services Administration in trying to share "lessons learned" from the military child care experiences with the rest of the Federal government. One of the lessons we have learned is that quality child care costs more than most lower income and lower ranking members of our community, both military and civilian, can afford. Because of this, we established a policy where families pay child care fees based on their total family income. We pay the balance from funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for its operations and maintenance.

H.R. 206 would provide other Federal agencies the authority to lower the cost of child care for lower income families in a similar manner to how the Department of Defense has done this. The bill, if enacted, would make it easier for us to become partners with other Federal agencies when we are collocated in Federal buildings or leased facilities. For example, many of our military recruiting offices are located with other Federal agencies in buildings conveniently located for the communities they serve. Your legislation, if enacted, would permit us to offer more affordable care to these very critical personnel.

The current Federal child care policies create the "have's and the have not's" between

the Department of Defense and all other Federal agencies because other agencies lack the authority to subsidize personnel costs. H.R. 206 would assist other Federal agencies in moving closer to the military in quality, cost and availability of child care by decreasing the gap in funding. Requiring any appropriated funds to be used to improve the affordability of child care for lower income employees would move other Federal child care programs closer to the military model which subsidizes child care for lower income employees. This sets the stage to make the entire Federal Government a model for the country in the provision of affordable child care.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the Committee.

Sincerely,

JUDITH A. MILLER.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a moment on language that is in the statement of managers for the conference report on the Treasury and General Government's appropriations bills. This deals with the issue of a report that is to be submitted to Congress on personal search inspections policies and practices of the U.S. Customs Service.

Because of the implications the personal search policy has for individual rights, Congress clearly needs to monitor proposed policies and their implementation. We have anticipated and we expect that Customs Service will prepare this report, a report that will cover changes being implemented, together with an action plan for further improvement in its personal search policies, and that they would submit this to the Secretary of the Treasury for approval and transmittal to the Committee on Appropriations.

Let me make note of the fact that Commissioner Kelly has taken steps that demonstrate his commitment to improving Customs' policy on personal search of international passengers at our airports. The search process has been made less invasive. Supervisors are being made more accountable by being more closely involved in decisions to conduct a personal search.

I think it is clear that the commissioner is committed to fairness in the processing of international passengers and making sure that there is no racial bias in selecting who is searched. But this does not diminish our responsibility as a Congress to oversee this issue and to make sure that individual rights are being protected.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) if he would like to add any comments to this.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), and I agree with him. Allegations of unfair treatment by Customs

personnel toward minorities at international airports is certainly taken seriously by this committee. This is an area where we need to exercise our oversight responsibilities.

The United States Customs Service has taken these allegations seriously as well and has undertaken a thorough review of its policies. More importantly, an independent panel has been appointed to review the practices of personal searches at the Customs Service and by the Customs Service.

The Personal Search Review Commission is chaired by a widely respected individual, Ms. Constance Newman, and includes three esteemed officials from other agencies. As someone who has had the opportunity of working with Connie Newman over the years, I have full confidence in her fairness, in her thoroughness, and in her impartiality.

The collective experience, knowledge, and insight of the commission will provide a firm basis for an objective analysis of the Customs Service's methods for carrying out this aspect of their mission.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sanford Cloud, the President of the National Conference for Community and Justice, has been selected to be an independent advisor to the Commission of the Customs Service on personal search matters.

In this time of change at Customs, it is imperative that Congress be provided with the information to evaluate the modifications in personal search policy. That is why we intend for this report to be prepared by the Customs Service with the approval of the Secretary of Treasury and Under Secretary for Enforcement on the changes and its implementation.

I thank the chairman for allowing us to clarify this matter so that we fully understand the import of the language that is included in our bill.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) for yielding me the time, and I do want to express my appreciation to him and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). They had a difficult job this year within the parameters that were given to them. In the Treasury, Postal, there is no question of very key important facets to our Government agencies. I, however, wanted to speak, because I am adamantly opposed to this bill as it is written, and I wanted to spend a minute so that my colleagues can know why.

In this bill, we have a 4.8 percent increase for federal workers. A third of them will receive another 3 percent increase. That is a 7.8 percent increase. Now, as we look at what the average federal worker, and this comes from the Federal Government statistics, not

my statistics, the average Federal Government worker who works in the D.C. area, Maryland, Virginia and the D.C. area, their present average salary is \$57,371.

With this increase, which is four-tenths of a percent above what the President asked for, they will receive on average a \$2,754 a year raise. That is \$1.40 an hour is what the average federal employee is.

Now, I want to contrast with, we are going to give our seniors in Social Security a 1.8 percent increase. That is what we are going to give the seniors that are out there struggling to make it on their Social Security.

The money that is going to be used to enhance the federal employees far above the level of the other people's average salary, and if my colleagues look at the whole average federal employee salary in this country, \$44,886, which is 2½ times the average family income in the State of Oklahoma, that is what the average federal worker's salary is, they will receive over \$1 an hour increase.

The four-tenths of a percent increase above what the President requested, and do not get me wrong, I think we should increase the pay for federal employees, is a \$330 million bill. Do my colleagues know where that money is going to come from? It is going to come dead out of Social Security. So not only are we not supplying our seniors with what they should have through an equitable Social Security system, but what we are doing is we are taking \$330 million that ultimately will come from Social Security, because the agreement reached between the Congress and the President of the United States will be violated by the end of this year as far as the budget caps.

We just had the President say he is not going to pass the tax cut; and, yet, he is going to ask the Congress to spend more money. So if we are not going to give a tax cut to the American people and we are going to spend more money, then if we are going to do that, let us pony up a little bit more for the seniors. If we are going to steal their Social Security money anyway, why do we not give them more than a 1.8 percent cost of living adjustment that is not even covering their Medicare costs or their prescription drug costs.

There is a second reason that I am against this bill. I am not against child care. The Morella idea is a good idea. We should care for our children. But the extension of that idea will not work without ultimately what her bill, which will eventually be on the floor to authorize this, says, that there will be a federal mandated standard for federal child care centers.

The other thing about the Morella language that is in this bill is that it is discriminatory. Only can one have the federal benefit if one goes to a feder-

ally approved day care. If one wants one's neighbor to care for one's child, if one wants one's children to care for one's child, one does not get the benefit. So only if one comes to Big Daddy, Big Brother, will one get that benefit.

I would hope that the Members of this body will vote against this bill and put it back into perspective. We are not in position where we can give a \$2,000 a year raise to every federal employee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to debate at length the presentation of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the last speaker, but I understand his point. I do not agree with it.

In fact, I would make the observation that we have a system whereby the federal employees are compared with comparable positions in the private sector. That report is done pursuant to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In fact, for comparable work done in the regions of the country, it is done regionally so it is not over-inflated for high cost areas and low cost areas, but by region, our federal employees for comparable work done in the private sector are 20 to 30 percent behind.

Now, the reason the salaries sound high is because we have NIH scientists, we have NASA engineers, we have law enforcement officials that are skilled and, for instance, in FBI, college graduates, doing some of the most sophisticated criminal investigations possible and DEA and ATF and other agencies. We have at the IRS highly skilled and paid personnel to carry out very sophisticated financial responsibilities and analysis.

So that, yes, by comparison with the overall, they are high. But just as well, Michael Jordan's salary by comparison was high. I tell people that Abe Pollin could have gotten 100 people to apply for the Bullets at \$250,000 a year. There would have been no lack of people applying to play.

Now, the fact of the matter is Abe Pollin would never have won a game because, at \$250,000, which is a lot of money by our standards, by anybody's standards, he would not have gotten competitive ball players.

That is the nature of some of the things that we do in the federal service, very sophisticated, requiring highly skilled people. In the competitive market, one pays what the market pays.

As I pointed out before the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) got here, we just passed the defense authorization bill, I obviously do not know whether he voted for or against it, in which we included 4.8 percent adjustment for military pay because we want to keep them and we want to be able to recruit. The law calls for parity, and that is what we are providing for in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland from yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the conferees for including in this conference report my amendment which provides funding for grants to local and State programs to combat money laundering. This program is the linchpin of the anti-money laundering strategy outlined by my bill, the Money Laundering and Financial Strategy Act of 1998.

We all know how the plague of drugs continue to rock this country. In the United States alone, estimates put the amount of drug profits moving through the financial system as high as \$100 billion. We need to be serious about facing down this threat. Indeed, recent revelations about Russian organized crime laundering money through the Bank of New York shows us that we need to be serious. That means giving our State and local officials the tools they need to follow the money.

This appropriation will be used to stop those who bring drugs into our neighborhoods and into our kids' lives. Together with the national anti-money laundering strategy, which will soon be released, we are sending a strong message that the free ride is over.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just, if I might, respond to a few of the comments that were made by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

□ 1530

Let me say that I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). He has been the conscience of this House, he has been a fiscal hawk, and he has forced those of us on the appropriations committees, and all the committees, to answer questions in a way that I think we need to have answers, not only to our colleagues but to the American people.

So I salute him for the work that he has done and I appreciate it. It may not have always been my days easier, but it is okay. I think it makes for a better bill in the long-run.

But if I might, let me just talk about a couple of things that he mentioned. He talked about the fact that this is \$240 million over last year. In my opening remarks, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was not on the floor at that time, but I noted that that \$240 million, which is less than a 2 percent increase over the current year, is considerably short of what we would need—\$600 million—to maintain current levels. That is just to keep the current operations going.

Now, one can argue that we ought to make it more efficient, that we ought

to be more productive, and that there ought to be ways to make Government do better with less. And I do not disagree with that. I think through the years, for example in the IRS, we have done that very substantially. We have brought the number of employees down in IRS by 20,000. We have brought the amount of money that we have spent in IRS substantially. We do have a much more efficient Internal Revenue Service.

But it, nonetheless, gives us a benchmark I think for where we can compare things. And clearly, the amount of money needed to make all the services that were in our bill last year stay just the same, keep on automatic pilot, would be \$600 million. We are only taking \$240 million over that from last year.

In just two accounts, IRS tax processing, for example, it would take \$118 million more to maintain current levels. In tax law enforcement, it would take \$137 million to maintain current levels. Those two accounts alone, and those are just two accounts of IRS, which is just one very large part of our entire bill, those two accounts alone require more than we are giving this bill just to maintain current services.

So it is clear we are not even maintaining current services with the proposed spending increases. We are doing it frankly by cutting out spending in other areas, and a lot of that comes in courthouse spending that we are not able to do this year.

So I would just make that note that I believe that we do need to have these additional resources if we are to have efficiencies in the Internal Revenue Service.

All of us on this floor, I believe all of us that are here at this moment, and I believe my colleague from Oklahoma, voted for the IRS modernization legislation, which requires much more consumer friendly, much more customer orientation on the part of the Internal Revenue Service. That costs money. We have shifted a lot of people over from IRS tax law enforcement to customer service. It requires more money and more time in order to do that.

That is one of the things that we did not do when we passed the bill on this floor in July. We were not able to give all the money we needed for the new initiatives that this body has authorized for the Internal Revenue Service. We attempted to do that with the money that has been restored in the conference committee. So I think it is reasonable.

I also think that this subcommittee has been very diligent in going after agencies to make sure that we are spending every dollar as wisely as possible.

Does that mean we cannot do more? No. We can do more. Does that mean we can do better? Yes, we can do better. The agencies can do better and the

Office of Management and Budget can help us with that as they prepare the request for this next year. But I think this bill will stand the test of time.

Let me also just finally mention the issue of pay increases for Federal workers. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) said that he thought it was not fair that Federal employees were getting more than retirees were getting into their annual adjustment. We all know the difficulty that that poses for us from a fairness standpoint or from a political standpoint. But we also know that those two items are based on very different kinds of adjustments.

One for workers, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has pointed out, is based on an employment index, that has to do with what is the comparable pay on the outside for workers.

We are in a very tight labor market. Labor costs have been going up fairly dramatically in the last couple of years. Fortunately, inflation has not been going up as rapidly. So we find ourselves with this anomaly, and it is an anomaly based on historic conditions, where inflation remains very low, but thanks to productivity gains and other gains, we have been able to increase real wages more rapidly in the last couple of years.

Now, this was true last year. The difference was not as great, but it was true last year as well.

Many of us can remember going back 15, 16, 17 years ago to the early 1980s when Social Security recipients and Federal retirees were getting 12 and 13 percent COLA adjustments, while Federal workers were getting 3 and 4 percent pay increases. The difference was much more dramatic going the other direction.

So I would just say that these are based on two different indexes and we ought not to start to mix apples with oranges on that issue.

Finally, let me just say on the issue of the pay increase, the fact that this legislation mandates a 4.8 instead of the 4.4 percent that had been requested by the President.

The Members will remember that earlier this year we gave that larger increase to the military because it was felt that we needed to do that in order to try to catch up. There was a sense that the same kind of fairness needed to be given to civilian employees. And so, in the bill that was adopted here on the floor of the House of Representatives, we included a provision, a sense of Congress provision, that Federal civilian employees should get the same 4.8 percent increase.

Subsequently, after the President announced that he was going to agree to a 4.8 percent adjustment, we decided to write it into the bill. That is why we have a 4.8 percent increase in our legislation.

So I would just want to make those points at this time.

I respect what the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has suggested to us, but I think this bill does stand any test and I think it can be fully justified.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I value the Federal employees that work in my district. This is not about any individual employee. But the average Federal employee's salary in this country is greater than the average salary in this country by \$4,000.

So they may be unlike comparisons, but there is an unfairness inherently when the average American makes \$4,000 more than the average Federal employee. That is number one.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if my friend will yield for a question on that point, I ask him, how much does the average doctor make above the average salary?

Mr. COBURN. Probably significant. I do not know what the average doctor's salary is. But I also know that the average doctor has 8 years additional education and debt that the average Federal employee does not have, the average.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I did not say the average Federal employee.

The gentleman does want to continue to compare apples to apples. The reason I use the NBA analogy is because they make far more than any of us contemplate ever making perhaps in our lifetime in a year.

Why do they do so? Because the marketplace demands that if an owner of an NBA team wants to have the opportunity of winning, he must hire the skill levels necessary to accomplish that objective. The skill level required, and the gentleman knows my point, is such that we need to pay more.

Now, I asked the question for doctors not because I think doctors should not be well compensated. They have to go through extraordinary difficulty to acquire the skills that I want in my doctor. I want my doctor to be highly skilled; and, therefore, I know in the marketplace, in a free market, I am going to have to pay that doctor, society is going to have to pay that doctor, commensurate with the skills required.

What I suggested during my response to the intervention of the gentleman was that we have the requirement for some highly skilled people in the Federal service. The Federal Government does some extraordinarily difficult, complicated things requiring high skills. NIH doctors. That goes into the average my colleague is talking about.

But I will tell my colleague, the average NIH research doctor at NIH makes far less than his private sector counterpart. I think the gentleman would probably concede that.

So when we take the average across the country and compare not just average salaries but compare skill levels, the report of every report that has come out since I have been in Congress in 1989 when we had Ronald Reagan and George Bush and now Bill Clinton in office, it did not really vary in terms of administrations, was that there was a substantial pay gap between the private sector when we compare comparable duties and responsibilities with the public sector. That is my point.

So my colleague continues to say "average," and that is correct, but many of our people do not have average skills any more than a doctor has average skills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would make two points.

I would concede that there is a difference in mix. I do not deny that. But I also say that if we look at the attrition from the Federal Government, it is one-fifth the rate of private industry today. So that, on an economic sense, says that they are not running away and that they are not being underpaid.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman make that point again.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I said the attrition rate in the Federal Government versus private industry is about one-fifth.

Number two is, we did need to raise military pay, but we do not pay military on average anywhere close to what we are paying Federal civilian employees. And to say because we are trying to bring them up to retain when we do not have the retention problem in the rest of the government I think is not an accurate argument.

The final point I would make: In last year's appropriation there was over \$400 million for buildings in this bill that are not in there this year. So the real expenditure that the American people needs to know is this bill has gone up \$640 million. Because we are not buying \$400-plus million worth of buildings this year. We are applying that to run the IRS and some of the other agencies that we run.

So even though the net is only up this additional \$240 million, I think it is accurate to say that. And I am not saying we do not necessarily need to do that. My complaint was on the \$330 million, Mr. Chairman, not the \$240 million.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report for H.R. 2490, the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000.

The bill reported out of conference is a sound bill and a significant improvement over

the House-passed version. Specifically, the \$240 million that irresponsibly was cut from the House bill at the direction of the Republican leadership, was restored in the conference on the bill. As a result, this conference report is unanimously supported by the both the House and Senate conferees.

The conference report provides \$13.7 billion dollars in funding for the important agencies and programs within the bill. The conference report includes increased funding for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms to enforce our gun and tobacco laws and provides increases in funding for key drug control programs, such as a \$10 million increase for the Drug Free Communities Act, a \$5.5 million increase for the High intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program, and a small increase for the drug technology transfer program. Additionally, the conferees approved funding for a much-deserved 4.8% raise for our hard-working federal employees.

I am particularly pleased that the conference report contains two important measures for American families. The first is a provision that would ensure that mothers have the right to breastfeed their babies anywhere on federal property that they have a right to be. It may seem shocking that this legislation is actually needed. However, this provision was attached by Representative CAROLYN MALONEY in response to several instances in which women were asked to stop breastfeeding their babies or leave federal museums, parks, and galleries. Preventing or discouraging mothers from nursing their babies is simply not acceptable. I am pleased that the federal government will now set an example for the country by encouraging the healthy and natural act of breastfeeding.

I am also pleased that Congresswoman MORELLA's provision that allows federal agencies to use their own funds to help low-income federal employees pay for child care was included in the conference report. With the severe shortage of affordable, high-quality child care in our country, this provision is critically needed.

While this is a good bill overall, the strict funding limitations our committee was forced to adhere to means it is certainly not a perfect bill. There are several agencies and programs in this bill that deserved and truly needed additional funding. Specifically, I am very concerned that new federal courthouse construction projects will receive no funding in this bill.

The federal war on crime and drugs has greatly increased the workload of the federal courts. Accordingly, the number of judges and court employees has grown. However, our court facilities have not even come close to keeping pace with this growth. I am particularly aware of this need for new courthouses because the proposed federal courthouse project in my district in Los Angeles is first on the General Services Administration's priority list for fiscal year 2000.

The Central District Court in Los Angeles is the largest district court in the nation, covering seven counties and over 17 million people. The court still operates out of the original courthouse, built over 60 years ago, in 1938. The existing facility lacks the adequate space to house the current court operations. In fact, according to the Judicial Conference, these facilities were officially "out of space" in 1995.

This lack of space has created delays, inefficiencies, and large backlogs of cases.

Moreover, security is insufficient to protect those who work in and utilize the court facilities. Among other problems, the Judicial Conference found that the current facilities in Los Angeles have "critical security concerns," including "life-threatening" security deficiencies documented by the U.S. Marshals service. These conditions are simply unacceptable.

In addition, not providing the funding needed to modernize our court facilities will only cost us more money in the long run. According to GSA delaying funding of new courthouse projects increases costs by an average of 3 to 4% annually, meaning that the 16 courthouses on GSA's priority list, which would cost \$532 million in FY 2000, will cost the taxpayers significantly more in years to come. I sincerely hope that the Administration and my colleagues in Congress will not allow this short-sighted strategy regarding our nation's courts to continue.

In closing, given the current budgetary constraints, the conference report on the Treasury, Postal and General Government Appropriations bill is a fair bill. Chairman KOLBE and Ranking Member HOYER deserve to be commended for crafting a sound bill under these adverse circumstances. As a new member of the Appropriations Committee, I am pleased to support this conference report and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an example of bipartisan leadership at its best. And I want to commend Chairman KOLBE and Ranking Member HOYER for their tireless work on this bill.

I am particularly pleased that this bill includes strong language dealing with the Federal Election Commission.

Not only does this bill give the FEC its full funding request, but it also includes three sensible provisions that will help the FEC operate more efficiently.

Last night, I was proud to stand with my good friend and colleague from Maryland in supporting the Shays-Meehan campaign finance reform bill.

By passing this bill today, we will help the FEC—the agency that is charged with enforcing our campaign finance laws—operate in a more efficient manner and better enforce the law.

It is also worth noting that the FEC provisions in this bill are very similar to language that was included in the Thomas substitute debated last night.

At that time, the gentleman from Maryland very wisely suggested that we should pass the Thomas substitute tomorrow.

In this bill, he seems to be getting at least part of his wish.

So I applaud the gentleman from Maryland, and the gentleman from Arizona for their bipartisan leadership on this issue.

I am also happy to note that an expanded version of my Right to Breastfeed amendment was accepted by the Conference Committee.

This landmark bill will ensure a woman's right to breastfeed her child on any federal property. For too long, new mothers have been shooed away from federal buildings, national parks, national museums, and federal

agencies simply because they were feeding a child.

Until now, they have had little recourse. Now, the law of the land will be clear: The federal government supports a woman's decision to breastfeed her child.

I want to thank my colleagues LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, and CONNIE MORELLA, who worked closely with me on this bill.

I am pleased to see that the conference committee retained contraceptive coverage for federal employees provision from last year. This is a victory for women of reproductive age, who routinely pay 68% more than men in out of pocket health care costs. This will also go a long way toward reducing unwanted pregnancies and therefore reduce abortions.

I would also like to commend my good friend and colleague CONNIE MORELLA of Maryland, who has been a leader on child care issues, got a version of her bill, H.R. 206, included in this conference report.

I was very pleased to support this provision allowing executive branch agencies to use their existing funds to help provide child care service for their employees.

I congratulate her for that, and I applaud the conference committee for treating child care issues with such importance.

This bill shows how much we can accomplish for the American people when we work together on a bipartisan basis. I congratulate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, there is much in this bill that I find to be particularly worthy. Unlike last year, when the Members of this House fought for months over the details of this legislation, the conferees were able to return a final product to this House that a majority of people on both sides of the aisle could support. In particular, I am pleased that this Congress has finally provided our hard working federal employees a 4.8% pay raise. The pay gap between government workers that make this country function and white collar workers in the private sector grows every year. This situation, which failed to be redressed until this year, has negatively impacted the hundreds of thousands of households that are headed by government employees. As a result of the bipartisan agreement embodied by this conference report, thousands of government workers will have an easier time making ends meet.

The Conference Report on H.R. 2490 also contains several other important provisions. First, it makes good on the promise that this Congress made to the American people in the last Congress when we tried to make the Internal Revenue Service more consumer friendly. We do this by fully funding the I.R.S., which will use the funds to continue the administrative reforms necessary to fulfill the intent of H.R. 2676 (P.L. 105-206). It also continues to require health plans that cover federal employees to make contraceptives available as part of their prescription drug coverage. This will assist family planning and reduce abortions. I further applaud the provision in the section funding the United States Customs Service that requires our customs officers to curb the discriminatory treatment of minorities at agency check points, as well as the funding for the crucial fight against drug trafficking.

I could detail more provisions in this conference report that I support, but suffice it to say that I would have voted for this bill had it not been for one provision, the cost of living increase for Members of Congress. For that reason alone, I cast my vote against H.R. 2490.

When I was elected to Congress in 1996, I was, in essence, hired by the people of the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey. Prior to Election Day 1996, I made an agreement with these people to take the salary of the job that they hired me to do. Implicit in this arrangement was my promise to neither vote for nor accept any pay raise prior to another election. When the Members of this House voted to increase our own salaries in 1997, I voted against it. When my paycheck demonstrated the effect of this pay raise, I returned it to the United States Treasury. My stance on this issue is intensely personal, and I have no expectation that others should follow my lead. It is simply a matter of keeping my word to those I represent.

Unfortunately, my colleagues in the 106th Congress have again deemed it necessary to raise their own pay. This deed was accomplished via the same tactic that was used last year, a procedural vote that I would contend that less than half of the people inside the Beltway understand, much less the American people. This is regrettable. If we are going to raise our own pay, it should be done via a straight up or down vote in circumstances that we can all understand. A pay raise should not be tucked in an appropriations bill that almost all of us could support without its presence. There is much here that I want to support. However, to do so would be to break the agreement that I made with the people of the Eighth Congressional District over two years ago. Many say that your word is your bond and I couldn't agree more. I am not willing to sacrifice mine to make a politically popular vote.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report on the Treasury-Postal Appropriations bill.

I do so particularly because of two areas of funding in the bill—the first being the important anti-drug efforts of the National Youth Anti-drug Media Campaign and the Drug Free Communities Act. These are both measures that I strongly believe will make a difference in our fight against substance abuse by reducing demand for illegal drugs. These measures are the key to winning the so-called war on drugs.

I am also pleased that this conference report restores funding to reform the IRS. Last year, we passed this historic IRS Restructuring and Reform Act, the most dramatic reform in over 45 years. The Clinton Administration initially opposed the effort but ultimately agreed with a strong, bipartisan majority in this House that reform was needed.

Mr. Speaker, this appropriations bill honors the commitment to reforming the IRS that we made last year. It funds the very important customer service improvements that were mandated by the legislation we passed last year, including a dramatic taxpayer-friendly reorganization of the whole IRS that will improve customer service for every taxpayer—and including the very popular Tele-File program that lets taxpayers file their tax returns much more easily through the telephone.

Second, it funds the desperately needed computer modernization effort. Every Member of this House has heard horror stories, I know I have, from our constituents who have received erroneous computer notices where the left hand of the IRS does not know what the right hand is doing. I have been very critical of the IRS as have other Members. By investing in improved IRS technology, we will be protecting our constituents from the kind of computer problems we have all seen.

We also need to expand access to taxpayer-friendly electronic filing—and this funding will enable us to move forward on that front. Right now there is a 22 percent error rate on paper filing, compared to less than a 1 percent error rate on electronic filing. That is why we mandated that the IRS work hard on electronic filing and in fact we set a goal of 80 percent electronic filing for the IRS by 2007.

Finally, this funding will enable the IRS to complete its Y2K preparations during this calendar year. While the thought of IRS computers crashing may bring glee to the hearts of many, think about the consequences. Think about no refund checks. Think about erroneous IRS notices sent to innocent taxpayers who think they have paid their taxes in a timely way and in an appropriate way. Think about the unnecessary audits that might result. This appropriations bill gives the IRS the tools it needs to complete its Y2K preparations.

I believe we are making progress in reforming the IRS, and this appropriations bill gives Commissioner Rossotti the resources to continue these efforts. But make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. The Clinton Administration's continued failure to send a full slate of nominees for the new IRS Oversight Board to the Senate is a cause for very deep concern. I am deeply troubled by this continued failure—now eight months past the statutory deadline—and I believe it raises serious questions about this Administration's commitment to reforming this troubled agency. I strongly urge the Administration to stop delaying and send the IRS Oversight Board nominations to the Senate.

□ 1545

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote in favor of this conference report.

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

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY Mr. MURTHA

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I am in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MURTHA moves to recommit the conference report on the bill, H.R. 2490, to the Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 61, nays 359, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

YEAS—61

Bartlett	Graham	Pelosi
Berkley	Green (TX)	Phelps
Boswell	Gutknecht	Pickering
Cannon	Hayworth	Salmon
Carson	Hilleary	Scarborough
Chabot	Hostettler	Shadegg
Coburn	Inslee	Shows
Condit	John	Smith (MI)
Costello	Johnson, Sam	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Jones (NC)	Souder
Crane	Kasich	Stabenow
Danner	Largent	Tancredo
Deal	Lucas (KY)	Tanner
DeMint	Luther	Taylor (MS)
Deutsch	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Duncan	McIntosh	Toomey
Edwards	Miller (FL)	Turner
Fletcher	Murtha	Udall (NM)
Goode	Nadler	
Goodlatte	Pascrell	
Gordon	Pease	

NAYS—359

Abercrombie	Borski	Davis (IL)
Ackerman	Boucher	Davis (VA)
Aderholt	Boyd	DeFazio
Allen	Brady (PA)	DeGette
Andrews	Brady (TX)	Delahunt
Archer	Brown (FL)	DeLauro
Army	Brown (OH)	DeLay
Bachus	Bryant	Diaz-Balart
Baird	Burr	Dickey
Baker	Burton	Dicks
Baldacci	Buyer	Dingell
Baldwin	Callahan	Dixon
Ballenger	Calvert	Doggett
Barcia	Camp	Dooley
Barr	Campbell	Doolittle
Barrett (NE)	Canady	Doyle
Barrett (WI)	Capps	Dreier
Barton	Capuano	Dunn
Bass	Cardin	Ehlers
Bateman	Castle	Ehrlich
Becerra	Chambliss	Emerson
Bentsen	Chenoweth	Engel
Bereuter	Clayton	English
Berman	Clement	Eshoo
Berry	Clyburn	Evans
Biggert	Coble	Everett
Bilbray	Collins	Ewing
Bilirakis	Combest	Farr
Bishop	Conyers	Fattah
Blagojevich	Cook	Filner
Bliley	Cooksey	Foley
Blumenauer	Cox	Forbes
Blunt	Coyne	Ford
Boehlert	Crowley	Fossella
Boehner	Cubin	Fowler
Bonilla	Cummings	Frank (MA)
Bonior	Cunningham	Franks (NJ)
Bono	Davis (FL)	Frelinghuysen

Frost	Maloney (CT)	Ryan (WI)
Galleghy	Maloney (NY)	Ryan (KS)
Ganske	Markey	Sabo
Gejdenson	Martinez	Sanchez
Gekas	Masacara	Sanders
Gephardt	Matsui	Sandlin
Gibbons	McCarthy (MO)	Sawyer
Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)	Saxton
Gillmor	McCollum	Schaffer
Gilman	McCrary	Schakowsky
Gonzalez	McDermott	Scott
Goodling	McGovern	Sensenbrenner
Goss	McHugh	Serrano
Granger	McInnis	Sessions
Green (WI)	McKeon	Shaw
Greenwood	McKinney	Shays
Gutierrez	Meehan	Sherman
Hall (OH)	Meek (FL)	Sherwood
Hall (TX)	Meeks (NY)	Shimkus
Hansen	Menendez	Shuster
Hastings (WA)	Metcalfe	Simpson
Hayes	Mica	Sisisky
Hefley	Millender-Skeem	Skeen
Heger	McDonald	Skelton
Hill (IN)	Miller, Gary	Slaughter
Hill (MT)	Miller, George	Smith (NJ)
Hilliard	Minge	Smith (TX)
Hinchee	Mink	Snyder
Hinojosa	Moakley	Spence
Hobson	Mollohan	Spratt
Hoefel	Moore	Stark
Hoekstra	Moran (KS)	Stearns
Holden	Moran (VA)	Stenholm
Holt	Morella	Strickland
Hooley	Myrick	Stump
Horn	Napolitano	Stupak
Hoyer	Neal	Sununu
Hulshof	Nethercutt	Sweeney
Hunter	Ney	Talent
Hutchinson	Northup	Tauscher
Hyde	Norwood	Tauzin
Isakson	Nussle	Taylor (NC)
Jackson (IL)	Oberstar	Terry
Jackson-Lee	Obey	Thomas
(TX)	Oliver	Thompson (CA)
Jenkins	Ortiz	Thompson (MS)
Johnson (CT)	Ose	Thornberry
Johnson, E. B.	Owens	Thune
Jones (OH)	Oxley	Thurman
Kanjorski	Packard	Towns
Kaptur	Pallone	Trafficant
Kelly	Pastor	Udall (CO)
Kennedy	Paul	Upton
Kildee	Payne	Velazquez
Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)	Vento
Kind (WI)	Peterson (PA)	Visclosky
King (NY)	Petri	Vitter
Kleczka	Pickett	Walden
Klink	Pitts	Walsh
Knollenberg	Pombo	Wamp
Kolbe	Pomeroy	Waters
Kucinich	Porter	Watkins
Kuykendall	Portman	Watt (NC)
LaFalce	Quinn	Watts (OK)
LaHood	Radanovich	Waxman
Lampson	Rahall	Weiner
Lantos	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
Larson	Rangel	Weldon (PA)
Latham	Regula	Weller
LaTourette	Reyes	Wexler
Lazio	Reynolds	Weygand
Leach	Riley	Whitfield
Lee	Rivers	Wicker
Levin	Rodriguez	Wilson
Lewis (CA)	Roemer	Wise
Lewis (GA)	Rogan	Wolf
Lewis (KY)	Rogers	Woolsey
Linder	Rohrabacher	Wu
Lipinski	Rothman	Wynn
LoBiondo	Roukema	Young (AK)
Lofgren	Roybal-Allard	Young (FL)
Lowey	Royce	
Lucas (OK)	Rush	

NOT VOTING—13

Clay	Jefferson	Pryce (OH)
Etheridge	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Sanford
Houghton	McNulty	
Istook	Price (NC)	

□ 1612

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, PAUL, WALSH, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. WOOLSEY

and Mr. DELAHUNT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. TIERNEY, DUNCAN, EDWARDS, Ms. BERKLEY, and Messrs. MANZULLO, GUTKNECHT, GOODE, TURNER, FLETCHER, DEUTSCH, SHOWS, SMITH of Michigan, CONDIT, HOSTETTTLER, COSTELLO and BOSWELL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ARMEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make an important announcement regarding the floor schedule for the rest of today and the balance of the week.

Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that Members are concerned about the safety regarding making flights home before the arrival of the approaching storm. My office has been in contact with the major airlines flying out of both Reagan and Dulles airports, and they are warning us to expect delays and many cancellations beginning this evening and into tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give the Membership the greatest window of opportunity to make flights back to their districts, we are concluding legislative business on the House floor after this next vote.

Mr. Speaker, we are further meeting with key appropriators who will be contacted by the Speaker's office in order for them to use this time to continue their work on the appropriations conference reports.

A notice with next week's legislative agenda will be delivered to all Members' offices later this week, and I wish all my colleagues safe travel home, and of course our prayers will be with all those affected by this hurricane.

The SPEAKER. 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 292, nays 126, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

YEAS—292

Abercrombie	Blagojevich	Calvert
Ackerman	Bliley	Camp
Aderholt	Blumenauer	Campbell
Allen	Blunt	Cannon
Andrews	Boehert	Capps
Archer	Boehner	Capuano
Army	Bonilla	Cardin
Bachus	Bonior	Castle
Ballenger	Bono	Chambliss
Barrett (NE)	Borski	Clement
Bass	Boucher	Clyburn
Bateman	Boyd	Combest
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Conyers
Bentsen	Brown (FL)	Cook
Bereuter	Brown (OH)	Cooksey
Berman	Bryant	Costello
Biggart	Burr	Cox
Bilbray	Burton	Coyne
Bilirakis	Buyer	Cramer
Bishop	Callahan	Crowley

Cubin	King (NY)	Pomeroy	Herger	McIntosh	Shadegg
Cummings	Klecza	Porter	Hill (IN)	Miller (FL)	Shays
Davis (FL)	Klink	Portman	Hill (MT)	Miller, Gary	Shows
Davis (IL)	Knollenberg	Quinn	Hilleary	Minge	Smith (NJ)
Davis (VA)	Kolbe	Rahall	Hoekstra	Moran (KS)	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Kuykendall	Rangel	Holt	Pascrell	Souder
Delahunt	LaFalce	Regula	Hooley	Paul	Spratt
DeLauro	LaHood	Reyes	Hostettler	Peterson (MN)	Stabenow
DeLay	Lampson	Reynolds	Hulshof	Petri	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Lantos	Rodriguez	Hutchinson	Phelps	Strickland
Dickey	Larson	Rogers	Inslee	Pickering	Stump
Dicks	Latham	Rothman	Istook	Pitts	Tancred
Dingell	LaTourette	Roukema	Jenkins	Pombo	Tanner
Dixon	Lazio	Roybal-Allard	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	Leach	Rush	Jones (NC)	Ramstad	Thornberry
Dooley	Lee	Sabo	Kaptur	Riley	Thune
Doyle	Levin	Sanchez	Kasich	Rivers	Thurman
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Sandlin	Kind (WI)	Roemer	Tiahrt
Dunn	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer	Kucinich	Rogan	Toomey
Edwards	Lewis (KY)	Saxton	Largent	Rohrabacher	Turner
Ehrlich	Linder	Scarborough	LoBlondo	Royce	Udall (CO)
Emerson	Lipinski	Schakowsky	Lucas (KY)	Ryan (WI)	Udall (NM)
Engel	Lofgren	Scott	Luther	Ryun (KS)	Watkins
English	Lowey	Serrano	Maloney (NY)	Salmon	Weldon (FL)
Eshoo	Lucas (OK)	Sessions	Manzullo	Sanders	Weygand
Everett	Maloney (CT)	Shaw	Mascara	Schaffer	Wise
Ewing	Markley	Sherman	McInnis	Sensenbrenner	Wu
Farr	Martinez	Sherwood			
Fattah	Matsui	Shimkus			
Filner	McCarthy (MO)	Shuster			
Foley	McCarthy (NY)	Simpson			
Forbes	McCollum	Sisisky			
Fossella	McCrary	Skeen			
Fowler	McDermott	Skelton			
Frank (MA)	McGovern	Smith (MI)			
Frelinghuysen	McHugh	Smith (TX)			
Frost	McKeon	Snyder			
Gallegly	McKinney	Spence			
Ganske	Meehan	Stark			
Gejdenson	Meek (FL)	Stenholm			
Gekas	Meeks (NY)	Stupak			
Gephardt	Menendez	Sununu			
Gilchrest	Metcalfe	Sweeney			
Gillmor	Mica	Talent			
Gilman	Millender-	Tauscher			
Gonzalez	McDonald	Tauzin			
Goodling	Miller, George	Taylor (NC)			
Granger	Mink	Terry			
Green (TX)	Moakley	Thomas			
Greenwood	Mollohan	Thompson (CA)			
Gutierrez	Moore	Thompson (MS)			
Hall (OH)	Moran (VA)	Tierney			
Hansen	Morella	Towns			
Hastings (WA)	Murtha	Trafficant			
Hayes	Myrick	Upton			
Hilliard	Nadler	Velazquez			
Hinchee	Napolitano	Vento			
Hinojosa	Neal	Visclosky			
Hobson	Nethercutt	Vitter			
Hoefel	Ney	Walden			
Holden	Northup	Walsh			
Horn	Norwood	Wamp			
Hoyer	Nussle	Waters			
Hunter	Oberstar	Watt (NC)			
Hyde	Obey	Watts (OK)			
Isakson	Oliver	Waxman			
Jackson (IL)	Ortiz	Weiner			
Jackson-Lee	Ose	Weldon (PA)			
(TX)	Owens	Weller			
John	Oxley	Wexler			
Johnson (CT)	Packard	Whitfield			
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Wicker			
Jones (OH)	Pastor	Wilson			
Kanjorski	Payne	Wolf			
Kelly	Pease	Woolsey			
Kennedy	Pelosi	Wynn			
Kildee	Peterson (PA)	Young (AK)			
Kilpatrick	Pickett	Young (FL)			

NAYS—126

Baird	Chenoweth	Evans
Baker	Coble	Fletcher
Baldacci	Coburn	Ford
Baldwin	Collins	Franks (NJ)
Barcia	Condit	Gibbons
Barr	Crane	Goode
Barrett (WI)	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Bartlett	Danner	Gordon
Barton	Deal	Goss
Berkley	DeFazio	Graham
Berry	DeMint	Green (WI)
Boswell	Deutch	Gutknecht
Canady	Doolittle	Hall (TX)
Carson	Duncan	Hayworth
Chabot	Ehlers	Hefley

McIntosh	Shadegg
Miller (FL)	Shays
Miller, Gary	Shows
Minge	Smith (NJ)
Moran (KS)	Smith (WA)
Pascrell	Souder
Paul	Spratt
Peterson (MN)	Stabenow
Petri	Stearns
Phelps	Strickland
Pickering	Stump
Pitts	Tancred
Pombo	Tanner
Radanovich	Taylor (MS)
Ramstad	Thornberry
Riley	Thune
Rivers	Thurman
Roemer	Tiahrt
Rogan	Toomey
Rohrabacher	Turner
Royce	Udall (CO)
Ryan (WI)	Udall (NM)
Ryun (KS)	Watkins
Salmon	Weldon (FL)
Sanders	Weygand
Schaffer	Wise
Sensenbrenner	Wu

NOT VOTING—15

Brady (TX)	Houghton	Price (NC)
Clay	Jefferson	Proye (OH)
Clayton	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Etheridge	McIntyre	Sanford
Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Slaughter

□ 1630

Mr. KUCINICH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2824

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2824.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Member of Congress:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
September 13, 1999.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that my office has received a subpoena for documents issued by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, State of Maryland.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

ROSCOE G. BARTLETT,
Member of Congress.