

Gilchrest	Maloney (NY)	Rogers
Gillmor	Manzullo	Rohrabacher
Gilman	Markey	Ros-Lehtinen
Goodlatte	Martinez	Roybal-Allard
Goodling	Mascara	Ryan (WI)
Goss	Matsui	Ryun (KS)
Graham	McCarthy (MO)	Sabo
Granger	McCarthy (NY)	Salmon
Green (WI)	McCollum	Sanchez
Greenwood	McCrery	Sawyer
Gutierrez	McDermott	Saxton
Gutknecht	McHugh	Schakowsky
Hall (OH)	McInnis	Scott
Hansen	McKeon	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Sessions
Hastings (WA)	Meeke (FL)	Shaw
Hayes	Meeke (NY)	Shays
Hefley	Menendez	Sherman
Hinchee	Mica	Shuster
Hinojosa	Millender-	Simpson
Hobson	McDonald	Sisisky
Hoekstra	Miller (FL)	Skeen
Holden	Miller, Gary	Skelton
Horn	Miller, George	Smith (MI)
Houghton	Mink	Smith (NJ)
Hoyer	Moakley	Smith (TX)
Hunter	Mollohan	Souder
Hutchinson	Moran (VA)	Spence
Hyde	Morella	Spratt
Isakson	Murtha	Stark
Istook	Myrick	Stark
Jackson-Lee	Nadler	Stenholm
(TX)	Neal	Stump
Jefferson	Nethercutt	Sununu
John	Ney	Sweeney
Johnson (CT)	Northup	Talent
Johnson, E. B.	Norwood	Tauscher
Johnson, Sam	Nussle	Tauzin
Jones (OH)	Olver	Taylor (NC)
Kanjorski	Ortiz	Terry
Kelly	Ose	Thomas
Kennedy	Oxley	Thompson (CA)
King (NY)	Packard	Towns
Klink	Pallone	Traficant
Knollenberg	Payne	Turner
Kolbe	Pease	Upton
Kuykendall	Pelosi	Vitter
LaHood	Peterson (MN)	Walden
Lampson	Peterson (PA)	Walsh
Lantos	Pickering	Waters
Larson	Pickett	Watkins
Latham	Pitts	Watt (NC)
LaTourette	Pombo	Watts (OK)
Lazio	Porter	Waxman
Leach	Portman	Weiner
Lee	Price (NC)	Weldon (FL)
Levin	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (PA)
Lewis (CA)	Quinn	Weller
Lewis (GA)	Radanovich	Wexler
Linder	Rahall	Wicker
Lipinski	Rangel	Wolf
Lofgren	Regula	Wynn
Lowey	Reynolds	Young (AK)
Lucas (OK)	Rodriguez	Young (FL)

NOES—141

Aderholt	Deutsch	Hulshof
Baird	Duncan	Inslee
Baker	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Baldwin	English	Jenkins
Barcia	Evans	Jones (NC)
Barrett (WI)	Everett	Kaptur
Becerra	Filner	Kasich
Berkley	Fletcher	Kildee
Berry	Forbes	Kind (WI)
Bono	Ford	Kingston
Boswell	Fossella	Klecza
Brown (OH)	Gejdenson	Kucinich
Bryant	Gekas	LaFalce
Capps	Gibbons	Largent
Carson	Gonzalez	Lewis (KY)
Chabot	Goode	LoBiondo
Chambliss	Gordon	Lucas (KY)
Coble	Green (TX)	Luther
Coburn	Hall (TX)	Maloney (CT)
Collins	Hayworth	McGovern
Cook	Herger	McIntosh
Costello	Hill (IN)	McIntyre
Cramer	Hill (MT)	McKinney
Crowley	Hilleary	Meehan
Danner	Hilliard	Metcalfe
Davis (IL)	Hoefel	Minge
Deal	Holt	Moore
DeFazio	Hooley	Moran (KS)
DeGette	Hostettler	Napolitano

Oberstar	Sanders	Taylor (MS)
Obey	Sandlin	Thompson (MS)
Owens	Sanford	Thornberry
Pascrell	Scarborough	Thune
Pastor	Schaffer	Thurman
Paul	Sensenbrenner	Tiahrt
Petri	Shadegg	Tierney
Phelps	Sherwood	Toomey
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Udall (CO)
Ramstad	Shows	Udall (NM)
Reyes	Slaughter	Velazquez
Riley	Snyder	Visclosky
Rivers	Stabenow	Wamp
Rogan	Stearns	Weygand
Rothman	Strickland	Whitfield
Roukema	Stupak	Wilson
Royce	Tancredo	Wise
Rush	Tanner	Wu

NOT VOTING—11

Baca	Cooksey	Smith (WA)
Barton	Ehrlich	Vento
Campbell	Kilpatrick	Woolsey
Clay	Roemer	

□ 1439

Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. BROWN of Ohio changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. DELAURO changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 420, I was away from the floor and neither the bell system nor my beeper notified me of the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CONGRATULATIONS TO TIM AND SALLY ROEMER ON THE BIRTH OF GRACE ELIZABETH

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

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise just to announce to my colleagues that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), our good friend, and his wife, Sally, had a baby this morning, a little girl.

I think it is important, when we have spent some time talking about marriage today, that we talk about a product of a very great marriage, and that is TIM and Sally ROEMER, who, this morning, at 3:30, had their fourth child, a girl, Grace Elizabeth, who is 7 pounds 11 ounces. I just want to announce this to my colleagues, and we all join them in wishing them the best.

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 consideration of H.R. 4871 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 560 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4871.

□ 1440

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4871) 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, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. DREIER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, 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. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased today to present H.R. 4871, the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001. As reported to the floor, this bill contains \$14.4 billion in discretionary budget authority for the Department of Treasury, the Executive Office of the President, the Postal Service, and other independent agencies. This represents an increase of \$678 million above the current year levels. That is about 5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, in a few moments, I suspect we will hear from some of our colleagues that this bill fails to meet its critical responsibilities for agencies under this subcommittee's jurisdiction. I do not disagree with that. I disagree, however, that we are not meeting our priorities, because we do meet the priorities in this bill.

We do not fund everything, but we meet the priorities. Do we fund everything that was requested by the President? No. But being below the President's request by \$2.1 billion does not make this bill or this subcommittee irresponsible. It means we have somewhat different priorities.

Do we provide \$225 million to hire an additional 2,835 IRS employees? No. Do we fund seven new courthouses for a cost of \$488 million? No, we do not.

The bottom line is this, in putting together this bill, choices had to be made.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have called this bill half empty. I, on the other hand, believe the bill presented here today is more than half full.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today provides \$4.9 billion for Federal law enforcement, and that supports 30 percent of all Federal law enforcement. This includes funds for the U.S. Customs Service to protect our borders from drugs and other contraband as well as to protect our burgeoning trade; funds for the Secret Service to protect, not only our Nation's dignitaries, but also our currency and our children through their school violence program; and funds for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to enforce our gun laws.

As my colleagues are aware, one of the greatest challenges with this bill is keeping it free of controversial legislative riders. We seem to have a great talent for attracting controversy for a whole host of reasons.

It is unfortunate that so much time gets spent debating not appropriations matters on this bill. From my perspective, it is even more unfortunate the passage of this measure has nothing to do with the programs and activities that are funded here but rather with legislative items that either are attached or perhaps not attached.

□ 1445

And what gets lost in the debate is the good things that are accomplished by this bill.

For those who may in the end decide to vote against this measure, let me tell them what they are opposing. They would be opposed to \$185 million for ONDCP, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, for that youth media campaign that keeps kids off drugs and helps parents learn how to teach children just to say no.

They would be opposed to \$30 million for Drug Free Community Grants, partnerships between community coalitions and the Federal Government for the purpose of reducing drug use.

They would be opposed to \$192 million for High Intensity Drug Trafficking Programs, providing assistance to State and local law enforcement in areas most adversely affected by drug trafficking.

They would be opposed to \$13 million to keep children out of gangs through the GREAT program that is administered through the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

They would be opposed to \$76 million for the Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative, called YCGII, to take guns out of the hands of our Nation's youth.

They would be opposed to \$3.6 million for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, reuniting children with their families and supporting the child exploitation unit.

They would be opposed to \$1.7 million for a new program for the Secret Serv-

ice's National Threat Assessment Center, a project designed to prevent targeted violence from occurring in schools by helping schoolteachers and administrators identify problems in advance.

And, yes, \$4 million for the Customs Cybersmuggling Center to target international child pornography trafficking and child exploitation via the Internet.

The list I have just shared with my colleagues is a small sampling of what is included in this bill. I could continue. I could tell my colleagues about the \$233 million that is in here for Customs Automation, including \$105 million for the much-awaited and even more needed Customs information technology modernization program that is known as ACE, and I know that many of my colleagues have a strong interest in this program.

I could also stand here and inform Members about the reporting requirements that we have included regarding the First Lady's use of government aircraft for the Senate campaign, and funding for the National Archives to improve veterans recordkeeping and accessibility or the reforms for the Federal Elections Commission that will help ensure accurate and timely disclosure during the current election cycle or advise my colleagues about improvements in Treasury's ability to collect Federal debts. But, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I will not list all of the many fiscally responsible or the good government provisions that are included in this bill.

My point is simply this: Does the bill do everything that everyone wants? No. But it is strong on law enforcement, it is tough on drugs, it is supportive of efforts to modernize the Customs Service, provides law enforcement with the resources it needs to enforce our current gun laws and is a good government bill. It is a people's bill. And all this is accomplished in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude my remarks in this general debate, I want to take just a moment to say thank you to the other hard-working members of this subcommittee and to all the others who have worked to help make this, I believe, a better bill.

In particular, I want to extend my appreciation to the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and to his staff, Scott Nance and Pat Schlueter; the subcommittee staff on our side who are surrounding us here, Michelle Mrdeza, Jeff Ashford, Kurt Dodd, Tammy Hughes, and Doug Burke; and my personal staff, who has worked so hard on this bill, Kevin Messner. Without their work, Mr. Chairman, the bill that we would have here today would be far more imperfect than it is.

Without the work and the cooperation of the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr.

HOYER), I do not believe we would have a bill here. While it is not acceptable to him, and I understand that, it is a bill that we have at least been able to work together on to try to move through this process and get it to where we are. I am very grateful to the gentleman from Maryland for the cooperation that he has shown and for his hard work on this bill, as I have just said.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

First, Mr. Chairman, let me start by thanking the chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), for not only his comments but, more importantly, for his chairmanship of this committee, which he chairs in a very responsible and fair manner. Unfortunately, I think too often, Mr. Chairman, the American public gets the impression that all we do is come here and yell and scream at one another and try to make political points. Clearly, while that happens, and it happens perhaps too frequently, we do have the opportunity of working together constructively, and it is a great privilege for me to work with the gentleman from Arizona, constructively on fashioning this bill. The chairman has had to make some tough decisions within the allocations for this year; and he has done, I think, a good job with insufficient funds.

I would also like to mention the outstanding job that the Chairman's staff director Michelle Mrdeza does, along with her staff of Jeff Ashford, Kurt Dodd, Doug Burke, Kevin Messner and others on the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the 302(b) allocation for this bill is \$2.1 billion below the requested level. That is in a bill that has \$14 billion of discretionary spending. So it is 17 percent below what the administration believed was necessary to carry out the functions of the agencies in this bill.

By comparison, Mr. Chairman, last year at this time the 302(b) was less than \$.5 billion below the President's request. The chairman has decided to fund law enforcement functions at the expense of other general government responsibilities this subcommittee has. Very frankly, I am not sure he had any alternative. For example, Treasury's law enforcement bureaus are funded at or near the administration's request.

That is relevant because it was not a conclusion that the administration's requests were unreasonable, because we have essentially funded them in the law enforcement area. This law enforcement funding includes ATF agents, enough agents to enforce our gun laws; funding to begin development of the U.S. Customs Service Automated Commercial System, while maintaining their current system; and funding to continue the Secret Service workload balancing initiative.

However, the allocation for this bill is not adequate to fund several priorities that are critical to the American people. The chairman knows this, reiterated it today, and reiterated it in our report. As a matter of fact, quoting the bill's report on pages 4 and 5, it says, "The committee acknowledges that IRS, GSA, and the National Archives have borne the brunt of the restraint on spending found in the bill, requiring denial of requested increases for the upcoming year."

This is not the only bill, Mr. Chairman, which is short. Several other appropriation bills are already facing veto threats from the President because of spending amounts that are inadequate to carry out the responsibilities assigned by this Congress.

Republicans, very frankly, are using this strategy in order to push their tax cut agenda, from our perspective, one that will cost \$175 billion over 5 years and a whopping \$1 trillion over 10 years. It has been segmented, and we are considering those individually, but, nevertheless, their overall impact is the same as it would have been last year. It will put a hole in our ability to bring down the debt; put a hole in our ability to make sure that Medicare and Social Security are secure; put a hole in our ability to fund prescription drugs; and, obviously, as this bill reflects, puts a significant hole in our ability to invest in the responsibilities that we have to the American people.

I might add that I, along with most of my colleagues on this side of the House, supported a tax relief plan for middle-income families that is fiscally responsible. As a matter of fact, I supported the Blue Dog's budget, which would have provided for 25 percent of the surplus for investments, 25 percent for tax cuts, and 50 percent of the surplus applied to budget deficit reduction.

This bill does not do that, however. It underfunds the Internal Revenue Service by \$466 million. This level would not even cover mandatory inflation, resulting in a loss of almost 5,000 FTEs all together and the resultant decline in taxpayer service. The bill jeopardizes implementation of the IRS Reform and Restructuring Act, for which all of us voted, and the report of which said that if we were for IRS reform we had to be at the time of budget writing and tax writing.

It also puts at risk successful completion of the 2001 filing season. Customer service would be reduced. And one of the principal items we said in the restructuring act was that we wanted IRS to be customer friendly. Mr. Rossotti, the Director of the IRS, a nonpartisan director, a manager, and a businessman, has said that he cannot do the job we expect given the funds we are providing.

Audit coverage, and this ought to be of concern to every one of us, would de-

cline to all-time record low levels, reducing revenue to the government by up to \$2 billion. It would provide for less than a quarter of a percent of audits being applied for returns filed. The modernization of IRS, its computer systems and business practices would be threatened.

No funding, Mr. Chairman, is provided for construction projects requested by the administration. We have a serious crisis going on across the country in terms of our Federal Courthouses. We have spent billions of dollars over the last 10 or 15 years on the war against drugs and crime, resulting in a hefty increase to the judiciary's caseload. To handle these changes, we cannot ignore the need to provide adequate courthouses.

The administration's request to continue the Food and Drug Administration's consolidation project is zeroed out, costing us dollars, time, and effectiveness. This project makes sense fiscally and was supported by the Reagan-Bush and Clinton administrations.

The administration's request for a new Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms headquarters is zeroed out. Not funding this project will prolong the serious security risk for the 1,100 ATF employees working at the current location. All told, GSA estimates failure to fund the administration's request for construction projects under its jurisdiction will cost the taxpayers almost an additional \$100 million.

The administration's request to fund the renovation of our National Archives building is zeroed out. None of these things, I think, the chairman wanted to do. First and foremost, the threat of fire in the Archives building is high. Delaying this project will put the lives of visitors and staff at risk and endanger irreplaceable archival records. Delaying this project will also cost the taxpayers millions of dollars in added cost.

Excluding funding for the drug czar's office, the requested increases by the President totaled \$20.9 million, of which only \$6.4 million is included in the bill, resulting in a 69 percent cut from the requested increase for the executive office accounts. Included in these cuts is \$2.5 million for Puerto Rico to hold a referendum to determine the Island's status.

Mr. Chairman, I have other concerns about this bill, including the denial of funding for Treasury's financial management services for computer security and accounting modernization; lack of funding for presidential transition, which is not included at all in this bill, and we know that is going to happen; a 32 percent cut in funding for repairs of Federal buildings. If we do not maintain our buildings, frankly, they will become more expensive. I am concerned as well about the denial of the President's critical infrastructure protection initiative in the General Serv-

ices Administration and the Office of Personnel Management; and the lack of additional funding necessary for the Merit Systems Protection Board to carry out its congressionally mandated requirements.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a good bill as far as it goes. It does not go far enough and, therefore, in this form, I cannot support it.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

□ 1500

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of the bill as it is currently drawn. It certainly has some shortcomings; but it has got I think some great dividends for the Federal workers, for the Federal complex at Lorton, which will soon be returned back to the Commonwealth of Virginia, several million dollars there for environmental cleanup of that site.

But particularly, I want to address the rollback in the Federal retirement contributions. This was something that was put into operation at the time of the Balanced Budget Act. Federal employees were asked to give up one-half of one percent of their salaries to help the Federal deficit.

We thought at that time it would take several years to balance the Federal budget, and these rollbacks were to come out of effect into the year 2003. As we have seen, the budget has been balanced earlier than it was originally forecast.

As a result of this, we think the Federal employees ought to have their money returned to them in a more timely manner. And this legislation does that. It mirrors legislation that I have introduced and have over a hundred cosponsors in the House. It was introduced by my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), in committee.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), for his leadership on this issue and his effective articulation of the equity of this act that we have taken. I appreciate working with him. He has been very effective, and his leadership has been very important.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this has been a good team effort. I see the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is here, as well as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who has also been very active in this.

Some Members oppose this because they think this is going to costs the

Treasury \$1.2 billion over 3 years. But I would remind my colleagues that this money is not the Government's money. It really belongs to Federal employees who worked and earned this money under a contract with the Government and then gave it up to help us balance the budget.

We are simply returning to them their own money to allow them to spend it, the same thing that we are doing to American citizens when we give them tax cuts. This was promised to them to be restored at the time that we balanced the budget, and now we have done that.

As I said before, this was originally slated to expire in 2003 because that was the year it was assumed that the Federal budget would be balanced. But our goals we have arrived at 3 years early. So let us return this money to the people from whom it was taken.

Federal employees sacrificed over \$180 billion in benefits to get us to our goal of a balanced Federal budget. Now it is time that we return to them what we roll back from them. This is our first opportunity to do that. This will help us recruit and retain the best and the brightest for Federal service. This is very important for the Federal Government to fulfill their mission.

I appreciate the efforts of everyone who has been involved with this, and I urge support for the bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on the comments that my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), just expressed with regard to the equity included in this bill for Federal employees.

Back when the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 was implemented, we felt that one provision that would save money and that Federal employees would be willing to do, and in fact they did not have a lot to say about it, was to require them, basically, to contribute another half percent on their Federal retirement contribution.

Now, as a result of this and several other measures that were designed to balance the Federal budget, Federal employees have paid in about \$800 million towards the objective of balancing the budget.

When this was done, the projected deficit was almost \$100 billion. Today we have a surplus of over \$200 billion, a \$300 billion turnaround.

So I agree with the Subcommittee on Appropriations and the full Committee on Appropriations that it is time to undo this provision, because this is Federal employees' money. When we are in a surplus environment, we want

to act as fair and balanced as possible. That is why we lift this burden on Federal employees.

As of next January 1, the retirement contributions required by Federal employees will be reduced by half a percent.

I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) adding this to the bill. I appreciate the support on the part of the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE). This is the right thing to do. I appreciate the fact that we have as many cosponsors as we do to ensure that this stays in the bill.

There are 1.8 million Federal employees. They work very hard. They deserve this equity provision. I trust it will stay in the bill and be enacted.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), who happens to be a very hard-working member on the subcommittee who has contributed tremendously to this bill.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise today in support of the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government appropriations bill.

I really want to congratulate the chairman and ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and their staffs for the incredibly hard work they have done on getting this bill to the House floor today in not the most easy of circumstances, but they have really shown what teamwork is like and working together across the aisle to try to achieve the best results with resources that are scarce.

I want to also say that this bill goes a long way towards tightening our borders, making our streets safer, and fighting the war on drugs. It takes important steps towards these goals by increasing the budgets of the Customs Service, the Secret Service, and High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas.

I think the legislation continues to show Congress's strong commitment toward winning the war on drugs. Through the funding of HIDTAs and the Office of National Drug Control Policy, we are making a strong statement that we will not give up on this fight and that we will take any and all steps necessary to make sure that our children and our Nation are drug free.

I just want to say that, coming from a very rural area in southern Missouri, I know firsthand the problems that drugs and specifically methamphetamine can cause for families for a region and for a State. We are currently in the midst of a methamphetamine epidemic, Mr. Speaker. It endangers our children both from its use and from the violence associated with it by endangering our youth; then meth endangers the very future of Missouri and of our very Nation.

I must say that our local law enforcement officials have their hands full and are looking for any additional re-

sources to assist them in stopping the spread of this awful drug.

With 1.1 million acres of the Mark Twain National Forest, I can tell my colleague it is a haven for methamphetamine production. Anything we can do to put funds toward more law enforcement to monitor this area would be very, very helpful.

I really do think the HIDTA program has been a key factor in assisting our law enforcement officials to get this problem under control. I think that this is one of the most important programs that we fund in the Treasury-Postal bill. I would hope that if any additional resources come our way that we could revisit the HIDTA appropriation at some time. And I am hopeful that that will be done.

I again want to thank the chairman for his hard work and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his hard work, and I look forward to working with both of them through the process.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman for her comments and say, as she knows, I support her. I think the HIDTA program is one of the best programs in our bill, and I look forward to working with her and the chairman and the administration to properly fund it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has already indicated some of the reasons for concern on this bill. This bill falls far short of the administration's request in meeting basic community needs for courthouses and the rest.

I also am concerned, as the committee knows, with the nongermane provision which was added to this bill in committee with respect to retirement. That is water over the dam, and I am not going to milk that one any longer. But I would like to raise the same issue I raised in full committee.

We have seen a tremendous drive to privatize virtually everything in this society in the last 20 years, and in some places that is appropriate. But I would like to describe what I see happening in a number of middle-sized towns all over this country where we have a lot of Federal offices that have become fragmented.

In my hometown, for instance, we have a wide variety of Federal offices. We have military recruitment offices. We have Labor Department offices, wage-and-hour division. We have Social

Security. We have the Justice Department. You name it.

The problem is that they used to all be located in the same place; and so if you were a constituent not exactly fully attuned to the niceties of the Government's organizational tables, you could still walk into the Federal building and know that somebody could point you to the right floor, the right office and you could get the job done without having to go all over town.

Today, in my hometown and in many others across the country, all of those services are fragmented; and so what happens is, and this does not just happen in Wausau, Wisconsin, it happens all over the country. You can send a senior citizen who may see the VA in one place, they may see the Social Security people in another place, they may see the Labor Department in another place. They have got to criss-cross town half a dozen times before they have figured out who is the lead agency and how you deal with the problem.

We have had a great deal of talk when we deal with the Labor-Health bill about one-stop service for people who are in need of job training, for instance. I think we ought to try to create a situation where you have one-stop service for everybody who is trying to walk into a government office to try to get some help on a problem they have.

I do not believe we are going to have that unless this Congress forces a re-evaluation of the way we provide service to people in this country. It just seems to me that the Congress ought to ask the administration and GSA to review what options are available so that we can begin to pull Government services, at least Federal services, together again in any one place so that people feel a little bit better about their Government tomorrow than they do today because they have a little bit better idea of where they can go to get some help when they need it.

This is nothing that is very sexy politically; and so it is one of those things that just does not get focused on. But, in my view, if we want to improve the reputation of government at the local level, one of the most important things would be to give people the opportunity to stop in at one place and get their questions answered and get their problems addressed.

So I would simply ask the committee, by the time this bill is produced next year, to work with me and others who are interested in it so that we can begin to get some alternatives for dealing with this fragmentation problem, which leaves people with a more and more sour taste in their mouths each day.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make an announcement.

For all those Members on the floor or those who may be listening and staff people who may be listening, we are trying very diligently to complete consideration of this bill in a timely fashion. It would be helpful if Members would advise us if there are amendments that they have not yet filed, if they would bring them here to either the ranking minority member or myself so that we could perhaps consider whether or not a unanimous consent agreement on time limitations might be in order at some point during this afternoon's debate.

So I would ask all Members that may have amendments that we are not aware of if they would like to alert us to that so that we can begin to consider whether or not time limitations when we get to considering amendments might be possible.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the second-ranking member of the subcommittee and a very hard working member.

□ 1515

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the bill and want to commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and also the staffs. I want to thank the staffs for the courtesy and the help and support that we have had on a number of these issues. I appreciate it very much. Having been a staff person years ago, I know how hard they work. So I just want them to know that I appreciate it.

When the 1997 balanced budget agreement was reached, a provision in it mandated that Federal and postal employees contribute a higher proportion of their salaries to the retirement contribution plans in order to do their part to help increase Federal revenues to balance the budget. Originally this provision was to remain in effect until the year 2003, a time when many thought we would still be in an era of deficits. Fortunately, we are running surpluses earlier than anyone anticipated, and it is time to roll back the specific deficit reduction provision on Federal and postal employees. They have paid their share, and it is time to roll it back.

The second issue is on the issue of diamonds which will come up later. I thank the gentleman for his cooperation in helping us. I also want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his help and support, and also I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), who is in the chair, for his help and support on this issue with regard to conflict diamonds that are resulting in young people in Sierra Leone losing their arms. For all three gentlemen, I personally appreciate their help very much.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. I want to say before

the gentleman leaves the floor, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) continues to be one of our ranks who I think is most focused on human rights throughout this world. He takes an extraordinary amount of his own time to visit, to learn and returns to the United States as one of the most powerful and effective voices on behalf of those who are being visited with atrocities and savagery on a regular basis. His voice is one of the strongest in the international community on behalf of protecting individuals and human rights. I congratulate him and am proud to be his colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time. I would also like to say that as a member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, I am very proud of the leadership of this subcommittee. I do not think that you will find any two better leaders in the Congress than the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). So it is not that we have not had good guidance on this subcommittee. We have been cut short in the resources which are available to our subcommittee.

I do not think many Members of Congress understand how important this committee is, certainly maybe not the leadership has not really understood that the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government holds at its very function general government, and being sure that our government is run well and efficiently, and in doing so, that will certainly leverage the amount of money that is given to this subcommittee to work with. With these inadequate resources, they have been well handled, there are a lot of good things about this bill; and there are several weaknesses about the bill. What we try to do in this subcommittee is to take what we have and do the very best we can.

One of my criticisms of the bill is that we have been very strong on law enforcement; and, of course, I do support law enforcement. I certainly look very strongly to see that we do have an adequate amount of enforcement of the law, that we have very strong customs services and that we protect our borders. That is very crucial to us on the subcommittee.

On the other side of that, I also would like to see our government function more efficiently and with more efficacy when it comes to general government functions, such as a Medicare program, such as Social Security. Think of it, Mr. Chairman. If these functions were not done very well, it would be chaotic to the people we serve. So this subcommittee does need adequate money for administration of

these things, not only in personnel but in bricks and mortar as well.

I want the Congress to be more aware of the things that this subcommittee works with. It is not always what happens with the money in this country, but it is the administration of what happens in this committee. We look over the educational administration; we look over all the key government functions. So it is very important. Think of the national security of this country. It is also addressed by this subcommittee.

My plea is that when we begin to divide and give our 302 funds out, we need to think perhaps more strongly of what this committee does and the function it does to keep government going, because if you want to be criticized back in your district, please note that if the Internal Revenue Service is not functioning effectively, the administration of it is skewed and is not doing well, you will get the criticism for it. If Social Security is not administered effectively, you get the criticism. That is the nuts and bolts of this subcommittee.

The Internal Revenue Service could have gotten a better allotment. I just think we have gotten too inadequate funding in terms of the IRS. That is the place where we need to have it funded and to be sure that the President's budget request which has been strongly gleaned and looked at by the administration and by OMB is more thoroughly looked at.

And, of course, in the area I come from, I am very concerned about fighting drugs and being sure that there is no terrorism. We need more moneys in those particular categories. The committee was not able to fund that as well as I would have liked to see it done. The drug kingpins are still running this country in places that we do not want them to be. We should really enhance the work of the Treasury Department in doing this. I do not think we have done enough of a job to be able to deter this kind of terrorism. We all look at television all the time, Mr. Chairman; and we see what happens in some of these places where we have allowed terrorism to reign instead of being able to administer these funds correctly.

Last but not least, I want to say that this committee could have been stronger on general government funding and perhaps kept the law enforcement but being sure that general government funds are done much better. Last, I would like to say we need these courthouses which are in the budget. They are not in the budget, but they have been in and out of the budget for the last 2 or 3 years. The judicial caseload of these courthouses will need to be met. We no longer can overlook that by saying we do not have adequate funds, because the administration of justice is based on a good climate for the judiciary to conduct itself.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL).

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of this legislation. The measure includes much-needed funding to modernize the outdated Customs computer system. The current system is so susceptible to failure that when this flow of \$2.2 trillion worth of goods is stopped, it costs us about \$6 billion a day worth of cargo coming across our borders. \$6 billion a day. Many assembly lines slow down or shut down, and retailers and consumers all end up paying the price.

In today's "just in time" business environment, a company's warehouse is often a 40-foot container that is carried on a ship or on the back of a truck with trailers. Deliveries to factories and consumers is delayed when that box does not move when it is supposed to. This is how U.S. companies are keeping their inventory costs down to stay competitive. Businesses are using the Internet and information technology to make virtually every aspect of business more efficient. Indeed, the typical business supply chain, ranging from manufacturing parts and components to finished goods, is just hours long in many cases. Only a few years ago, this supply chain may have extended days or even weeks. But today that is a different story and a failure in the Customs computer system now has crippling consequences. Let me give my colleagues two real-life examples:

The first is General Motors. They literally will shut down a plant and send people home if parts are delayed as much as 3 or 4 hours at a U.S.-Canadian border crossing point. Another one is Caterpillar, one of the country's largest exporters. They are forced to shut down a production line at their plants in Peoria if they cannot get parts in a timely fashion from an overseas distribution point.

Consumers bear the burden when the shelves at Wal-Mart are empty due to a computer failure that occurred thousands of miles away. What will mothers and fathers tell their kids when it is time for back-to-school supplies and clothing to be there, but the shelves are empty because container boxes were not passing through a port on time because of Customs brownouts? Many of these products are time sensitive now, some are even perishable and must reach retail outlets in a specific time period.

There are also national defense consequences to this computer system. It helps us protect ourselves from the importing of counterfeit or dangerous products. It helps us with the war on drugs by helping tell us where to search for them in the flow of products coming through. It is an integral part of the defense system. You can see when it is going to block bad material, counterfeit material, or drugs.

In my specific district, one-third, one-third of all the trade travels through the Los Angeles region that this Nation does. The combination of the Port of Los Angeles and Los Angeles International Airport make my district one of the most dynamic in the country in terms of Customs activities. Manufacturers throughout the country rely on the goods that move through the Port of Los Angeles and Long Beach. Every shipper, broker, trucker, longshoreman, importer and exporter relies on smoothly operating ports to make their paycheck. A failure in this system, in this region, will disrupt movement of goods throughout the entire Nation.

Modernizing the United States Customs computer system must remain a high priority. It has national defense consequences. It has economic consequences far beyond the reach of that computer system in and of itself. We must continue our efforts to ensure that a potential disaster is averted because this equipment gets modernized in a timely fashion and the flow of goods and services is maintained. I am pleased that funds were designated in the bill for this Customs modernization and much more is needed to be done. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I regrettably rise in opposition to H.R. 4871. I would have liked to have supported this bill, because I believe the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) crafted the best bill possible under the tight funding constraints that he was given. The bill does, for example, fully fund most of the key law enforcement activities of the bill. However, this bill falls woefully short in other critical areas. As the gentleman from Arizona himself has stated, this bill is \$175 million short of what is needed to maintain the current level of services and activities provided for under our subcommittee's jurisdiction.

For example, the underfunding of the IRS by \$466 million completely jeopardizes the ability of the IRS to make the changes necessary to improve services and to protect the rights of American taxpayers as required by law. Another glaring deficiency in the bill is the total lack of funding for the construction of critically needed Federal courthouses. The Federal war on crime and drugs has increased to the breaking point the workload of our Federal courts, resulting in the need for more judges and court employees. Yet our court facilities have not come close to keeping pace with this growth.

As a Member who represents the Los Angeles Federal Court district, the

largest in the Nation, covering seven counties and over 17 million people, I know firsthand the severity of this problem. The Los Angeles court, which is at the top of the GSA and Judiciary's priority list, continues to operate out of the original courthouse built in 1938. The lack of adequate space has forced the court to split its operations between the original facility and one several blocks away, causing long delays, inefficiencies, and mass confusion to the public. More importantly, the current situation causes security to be insufficient to protect workers and the public.

□ 1530

Prisoners facing trial, for example, must be transported between the two court facilities by using public corridors and public elevators. In fact, the U.S. Marshals Service documented critical security concerns with the current facilities in Los Angeles, including life-threatening security deficiencies.

These conditions are simply unacceptable. Congress must act to correct these serious security deficiencies before they result in a terrible tragedy.

Finally, from a fiscal perspective, it is irresponsible not to fund these badly needed new courthouses. According to GSA, the delaying funding for new

courthouse projects increases costs by an average of 3 percent to 4 percent a year, meaning that the Federal Government will have to pay significantly more for the same projects in years to come.

These are just some of several reasons I cannot support this bill. I sincerely hope that as we move through the process, additional funding will be added to this bill to ensure that our core government functions are adequately funded. Until that time, however, I must regrettably oppose this bill.

Mr. KOLBE. I include the following table for the RECORD as follows:

**TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4871)
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY					
Departmental Offices.....	134,034	161,006	149,437	+15,403	-11,569
Contingent emergency supplemental	24,900			-24,900	
Department-wide systems and capital investments programs	43,448	99,279	41,787	-1,661	-57,492
Office of Inspector General.....	30,599	33,608	31,940	+1,341	-1,668
Inspector General for Tax Administration.....	111,781	118,427	116,427	+4,646	-2,000
Treasury Building and Annex Repair and Restoration	22,700	31,000	31,000	+8,300	
Expanded Access to Financial Services		30,000	2,000	+2,000	-28,000
Money Laundering Strategy.....		15,000			-15,000
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.....	27,818	34,694	34,694	+6,876	
Counterterrorism Fund (emergency funding).....		55,000			-55,000
Violent Crime Reduction Programs.....	130,081			-130,081	
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center:					
Salaries and Expenses.....	84,027	93,483	93,483	+9,456	
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, & Related Expenses	21,175	17,331	17,331	-3,844	
Total.....	105,202	110,814	110,814	+5,612	
Interagency Law Enforcement: Interagency crime and drug enforcement	60,502	103,476	103,476	+42,974	
Financial Management Service.....	200,555	202,851	198,736	-1,819	-4,115
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms: Salaries and Expenses	564,773	760,051	731,325	+166,552	-28,726
United States Customs Service:					
Salaries and Expenses.....	1,698,227	1,867,866	1,821,415	+123,188	-66,451
Harbor Maintenance Fee Collection	3,000	3,000	3,000		
Operation, Maintenance and Procurement, Air and Marine Interdiction Programs	108,688	156,875	125,778	+17,090	-31,097
Automation modernization:					
Automated Commercial System		123,000	123,000	+123,000	
International Trade Data System.....		5,400	5,400	+5,400	
Automated Commercial Environment.....		210,000	105,000	+105,000	-105,000
Subtotal		338,400	233,400	+233,400	-105,000
Customs Services at Small Airports (to be derived from fees collected)	2,000	2,000	2,000		
Offsetting receipts.....	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000		
Total.....	1,809,915	2,386,141	2,183,593	+373,678	-202,548
Bureau of the Public Debt.....	177,143	182,901	182,901	+5,758	
Payment of government losses in shipment.....	1,000	1,000	1,000		
Internal Revenue Service:					
Processing, Assistance, and Management.....	3,280,250	3,699,499	3,512,232	+231,982	-187,267
Tax Law Enforcement.....	3,336,838	3,443,859	3,332,676	-4,162	-111,183
Earned Income Tax Credit Compliance Initiative.....	144,000	145,000	145,000	+1,000	
Information Systems.....	1,455,401	1,583,565	1,488,090	+32,689	-95,475
Information technology investments.....		71,751			-71,751
Advance appropriation, FY 2002.....		422,249			-422,249
Total, FY 2001.....	8,216,489	8,943,674	8,477,998	+261,509	-465,676
Advance appropriation, FY 2002.....		422,249			-422,249
United States Secret Service:					
Salaries and Expenses.....	667,312	824,500	823,800	+156,488	-700
Title II general provisions (P.L. 106-113)	10,000			-10,000	
(By transfer)	(21,000)			(-21,000)	
Contingent emergency supplemental	10,000			-10,000	
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, & Related Expenses	4,185	5,021	5,021	+836	
Total.....	691,497	829,521	828,821	+137,324	-700
Total, title I, Department of the Treasury.....	12,352,437	14,520,692	13,225,949	+873,512	-1,294,743
Current year, FY 2001	12,352,437	14,098,443	13,225,949	+873,512	-872,494
Appropriations	(12,352,437)	(14,043,443)	(13,225,949)	(+873,512)	(-817,494)
Emergency funding.....		(55,000)			(-55,000)
Rescissions.....					
Advance appropriations, FY 2002.....		422,249			-422,249
TITLE II - POSTAL SERVICE					
Payment to the Postal Service Fund.....	28,620	29,000	29,000	+380	
Advance appropriation, FY 2002.....	64,436	67,093	67,093	+2,657	
Total.....	93,056	96,093	96,093	+3,037	
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	390	390	+140	
Salaries and Expenses.....	52,243	53,288	52,135	-108	-1,153
Executive Residence at the White House:					
Operating Expenses.....	9,225	10,900	10,286	+1,061	-614
White House Repair and Restoration.....	808	5,510	658	-150	-4,852
Special Assistance to the President and the Official Residence of the Vice President:					
Salaries and Expenses.....	3,609	3,673	3,664	+55	-9
Operating expenses	330	354	354	+24	

**TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4871)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Council of Economic Advisers	3,825	4,110	3,997	+172	-113
Office of Policy Development	4,017	4,032	4,030	+13	-2
National Security Council	6,970	7,165	7,148	+178	-17
Office of Administration	39,050	43,737	41,185	+2,135	-2,552
Contingent emergency supplemental	8,400			-8,400	
Office of Management and Budget	63,256	68,786	67,143	+3,887	-1,643
Office of National Drug Control Policy:					
Salaries and expenses	22,823	25,400	24,759	+1,936	-641
Title II general provisions (P.L. 106-113)	3,000			-3,000	
Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center	29,052	20,400	29,750	+698	+9,350
Total	54,875	45,800	54,509	-366	+8,709
Federal Drug Control Programs:					
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program	191,271	192,000	192,000	+729	
Special forfeiture fund	215,297	259,000	219,000	+3,703	-40,000
Unanticipated Needs	996	1,000		-996	-1,000
Elections Commission of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico		2,500			-2,500
Total, title III, Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President	654,422	702,245	656,499	+2,077	-45,746
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled	2,664	4,158	4,158	+1,494	
Federal Election Commission	38,008	40,500	40,240	+2,232	-260
Federal Labor Relations Authority	23,737	25,058	25,058	+1,321	
General Services Administration:					
Federal Buildings Fund:					
Appropriations	-20,022	681,871		+20,022	-681,871
Advance appropriation, FY 2002-2004		477,484			-477,484
Limitations on availability of revenue:					
Construction and acquisition of facilities	(74,979)	(779,788)		(-74,979)	(-779,788)
Rescission of funds in P.L. 104-208	(-20,782)			(+20,782)	
Repairs and alterations	(598,674)	(721,193)	(490,592)	(-108,082)	(-230,601)
Installment acquisition payments	(205,668)	(185,369)	(185,369)	(-20,299)	
Rental of space	(2,782,186)	(2,944,905)	(2,944,905)	(+162,719)	
Building Operations	(1,580,909)	(1,624,771)	(1,580,909)		(-43,862)
Repayment of Debt	(100,000)	(70,595)	(70,595)	(-29,405)	
Total, Federal Buildings Fund, FY 2001	-20,022	681,871		+20,022	-681,871
(Limitations)	(5,342,416)	(6,326,621)	(5,272,370)	(-70,046)	(-1,054,251)
(Rescission of limitations)	(-20,782)			(+20,782)	
Policy and Operations	116,223	136,980	115,434	-789	-21,546
Contingent emergency supplemental	3,300			-3,300	
Disposal of property		8,000			-8,000
Office of Inspector General	33,317	34,520	34,520	+1,203	
Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents	2,241	2,517	2,517	+276	
General provision (P.L. 106-113, Title II)	2,000			-2,000	
Expenses, Presidential transition		7,100			-7,100
Total, General Services Administration, FY 2001	137,059	870,988	152,471	+15,412	-718,517
Advance appropriations, FY 2002-2004		477,484			-477,484
Merit Systems Protection Board:					
Salaries and Expenses	27,481	29,437	28,857	+1,376	-580
Limitation on administrative expenses	2,430	2,430	2,430		
Federal payment to Morris K. Udall scholarship and excellence in national environmental policy foundation	1,992	3,000	2,000	+8	-1,000
Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund	1,245	1,250	1,250	+5	
National Archives and Records Administration:					
Operating expenses	179,674	209,393	195,119	+15,445	-14,274
Reduction of debt	-5,598	-5,598	-5,598		
Repairs and Restoration	22,296	99,560	5,650	-16,646	-93,910
Records Center Revolving Fund	22,000			-22,000	
National Historical Publications and Records Commission: Grants program. Rescission	6,250	6,000	6,000	-250	
Rescission	-2,000			+2,000	
Total	222,622	309,355	201,171	21,451	-108,184
Office of Government Ethics	9,080	9,684	9,684	+604	
Office of Personnel Management:					
Salaries and Expenses	90,240	100,558	93,471	+3,231	-7,087
Limitation on administrative expenses	95,124	101,986	101,986	+6,862	
Office of Inspector General	956	1,360	1,360	+404	
Limitation on administrative expenses	9,608	9,745	9,745	+137	
Government Payment for Annuity, Employees Health Benefits	5,105,395	5,427,166	5,427,166	+321,771	
Government Payment for Annuity, Employee Life Insurance	36,200	35,000	35,000	-1,200	
Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund	9,120,558	8,940,051	8,940,051	-180,507	
Total, Office of Personnel Management	14,458,081	14,615,866	14,608,779	+150,698	-7,087

**TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4871)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Special Counsel.....	9,703	11,147	10,319	+ 616	-828
United States Tax Court.....	35,045	37,439	37,305	+ 2,260	-134
Total, title IV, Independent Agencies.....	14,969,147	16,437,796	15,123,722	+ 154,575	-1,314,074
Current year, FY 2001.....	14,969,147	15,960,312	15,123,722	+ 154,575	-836,590
Appropriations.....	(14,971,147)	(15,960,312)	(15,123,722)	(+ 152,575)	(-836,590)
Rescissions.....	(-2,000)			(+ 2,000)	
Advance appropriations, FY 2002-2004.....		477,484			-477,484
Grand total.....	28,069,062	31,756,826	29,102,263	+ 1,033,201	-2,654,563
Current year, FY 2001.....	28,004,626	30,790,000	29,035,170	+ 1,030,544	-1,754,830
Appropriations.....	(28,006,626)	(30,735,000)	(29,035,170)	(+ 1,028,544)	(-1,699,830)
Emergency funding.....		(55,000)			(-55,000)
Rescissions.....	(-2,000)			(+ 2,000)	
Advance appropriations, FY 2002-2004.....	64,436	966,826	67,093	+ 2,657	-899,733
(Limitations).....	(5,342,416)	(6,326,621)	(5,272,370)	(-70,046)	(-1,054,251)
(Rescission of limitations).....	(-20,782)			(+ 20,782)	
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Bureau of The Public Debt (Permanent).....	142,000	145,000	145,000	+ 3,000	
Federal Reserve Bank reimbursement fund.....	128,000	131,000	131,000	+ 3,000	
Limitation on admin expenses adjustment to BA.....	-1,561			+ 1,561	
US Mint revolving fund.....	11,000	14,000	14,000	+ 3,000	
Sallie Mae.....	1,000	1,000	1,000		
Federal buildings fund.....	-119,366	63,000	-309,000	-189,634	-372,000
Advance appropriations:					
Postal service, FY 2000/2001.....	71,195	64,436	64,436	-6,759	
Postal service, FY 2001/2002.....	-64,436	-67,093	-67,093	-2,657	
IRS, FY 2002.....		-422,249			+ 422,249
GSA, FY 2002-2004.....		-477,484			+ 477,484
Conveyance of land to the Columbia Hospital for Women (sec. 410).....	-8,000			+ 8,000	
NOAA retirement provision (sec. 654), FY 1999.....	5,650			-5,650	
Government-wide early buyout (sec. 651).....	30,000			-30,000	
GSA early buyout (sec. 411).....	-1,000			+ 1,000	
FY 1999 supplemental (sec. 654).....	-5,650			+ 5,650	
Across the board cut (0.38%).....	-73,000			+ 73,000	
OMB/CBO adjustment.....	72,153			-72,153	
OMB/CBO adjustment (mandatory to discretionary).....	(-408)			(+ 408)	
Total, scorekeeping adjustments.....	187,985	-548,390	-20,657	-208,642	+ 527,733
Total mandatory and discretionary.....	28,257,047	31,208,436	29,081,606	+ 824,559	-2,126,830
Mandatory.....	14,532,995	14,679,607	14,679,607	+ 146,612	
Discretionary.....	13,724,052	16,528,829	14,401,999	+ 677,947	-2,126,830

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleague, the distinguished Chairman of the Treasury, Postal and General Government Subcommittee, in supporting funding for an Automated U.S. Customs Environment or ACE. The points in favor of prompt, and sufficient, funding for a modern Customs processing system are numerous:

The Customs Service's existing computer system is nearly two decades old and operating at more than 95% capacity. The system can no longer handle either the volume of trade coming through the borders, nor can it adequately collect the \$22 billion in tariffs and user fees generated by the record volume of trade we are experiencing.

Despite its critical functions, Customs' present system has been experiencing crashes or "Brown Outs" for several years, the most recent occurring only a few weeks ago. These failures put our nation and our economy at risk.

On a typical day, Customs processes over \$8.8 billion in exports and imports, 1.3 million passengers and nearly 350,000 vehicles at U.S. ports of entries. Delays in processing this volume of traffic costs the nation untold billions of dollars in lost revenues as just-in-time delivery systems at manufacturing plants across this country are stalled.

Customs has prepared to modernize its old systems for several years, and is now ready to move forward expeditiously. Customs has met all the General Accounting Office's requirements for proceeding with a major information technology procurement. And today, the leading IT companies in the world are poised to help the government transform these old systems and processes, providing needed improvements for the way we bill companies for trade and tariffs and detect illegal contraband.

The business community is clamoring for our support. The presidents of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the International Mass Retailers Association, and the Coalition for Customs Automation Funding wrote all of Congress in urging funding of ACE:

"Trade volume is expected to double over the next six years. This will place further pressures on the current system. When you consider the benefits derived by both industry and the government from this system, there is no question that we must fund the development of a 21st century automated customs system."

The investment will be hefty—approximately \$1.5 to \$2 billion to fully complete modernization. But that investment will more than repay itself. Failure to modernize could result in untold consequences. I agree with Chairman KOLBE—this investment is vital to protecting our nation's borders. It is vital to ensuring the smooth processing of trade. We need ACE now—not next year.

Chairman KOLBE, I salute your commitment to modernizing our U.S. Customs Environment. As a nation, we must have both the will and the commitment to ensure that this vital government function does not break down.

Ms. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this legislation, which offers \$96.1 million for the U.S. Postal Service as part of the Treasury-Postal Appropriations Act, but I do want to mention one area of real concern to the American people. As we consider this,

I want to make my colleagues aware of a priority project the Postal Service must undertake—the correction of its ZIP Code to Representative database.

This database is currently relied upon by Members of Congress, their staffs, businesses and thousands of Americans each day as a method of matching districts to Members. Unfortunately, most users are unaware that this product is massively flawed.

A brief inspection of the database revealed errors that affect more than half of the Congressional Districts in the United States. Included in these mistakes, which include ZIP Codes incorrectly split between Members and the complete omission of ZIP Codes in certain districts, are more than 75 errors that defy geography by being shared by two or more Members whose districts are not contiguous. I have found more than 10 errors in my district alone and have urged my colleagues to take a closer look at their jurisdictions and report what they have found. The response has been overwhelming, and the scope of these difficulties is appalling.

On a daily basis, this erroneous product misdirects mail, creates confusion and allows for the accidental violation of federal franking law. Each day citizens wishing to find their Member of Congress are referred to the wrong district, delaying the commencement of case-work for those requiring help with a federal agency. Vendors who use the database or products based on the database perpetuate the mistake in the materials they distribute, and Members creating mass mailings inadvertently include addresses that are not in their actual district, violating Congressional Franking Regulations.

In an era of accuracy and responsibility, the correction of this defective product should be made a priority by the United States Postal Service. I ask my colleagues to join me in working to ensure that the Postal Service begin the new fiscal year by making the development of an accurate database a priority and reality.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to declare my intention to vote against the Treasury-Postal Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2001. I will do so despite supporting the funding levels for gun crime enforcement in the bill. However, I have consistently voted against cost of living increases (COLAs) for Members of Congress and will do so again today. All of us spend a great deal of time working on issues of particular importance to senior citizens. I am especially active on the topic of providing affordable prescription medicines to the elderly, and am committed to protecting and strengthening Social Security and Medicare. In recent years, despite the thriving U.S. economy, the COLA that seniors receive for their Social Security benefits has been too small, as low as 1.3 percent. By comparison, we are preparing to give ourselves a 2.7 percent increase, and I do not think this is appropriate on fair, especially in light of the enormous budget surpluses that are projected over the next decade. Let us take care of our seniors before we take care of ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers on this side.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on page 1, line 2, after the comma, the following be inserted: "That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, 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, 2001, and for other purposes, namely:"

Mr. Chairman, this vital section was simply left out in preparing the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4871

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

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Departmental Offices including operation and maintenance of the Treasury Building and Annex; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance, repairs, and improvements of, and purchase of commercial insurance policies for, real properties leased or owned overseas, when necessary for the performance of official business; not to exceed \$2,900,000 for official travel expenses; not to exceed \$3,813,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002, for information technology modernization requirements; not to exceed \$150,000 for official reception and representation expenses; not to exceed \$258,000 for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and to be accounted for solely on his certificate, \$149,437,000: *Provided*, That of these amounts \$2,900,000 is available for grants to State and local law enforcement groups to help fight money laundering.

DEPARTMENT-WIDE SYSTEMS AND CAPITAL
INVESTMENTS PROGRAMS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For development and acquisition of automatic data processing equipment, software, and services for the Department of the Treasury, \$41,787,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds shall be transferred to accounts and in amounts as necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Department's offices, bureaus, and other organizations: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated shall be used to support or supplement the Internal Revenue Service appropriations for Information Systems.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, not to exceed \$2,000,000 for official travel expenses, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$100,000 for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General of the Treasury, \$31,940,000.

INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR TAX ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, including purchase (not to exceed 150 for replacement only for police-type use) and hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Inspector General for Tax Administration; not to exceed \$6,000,000 for official travel expenses; and not to exceed \$500,000 for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General for Tax Administration, \$116,427,000.

TREASURY BUILDING AND ANNEX REPAIR AND
RESTORATION

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of the Treasury Building and Annex, \$31,000,000, to remain available until expended.

EXPANDED ACCESS TO FINANCIAL SERVICES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For a demonstration project to expand access to financial services for low-income individuals, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of these funds, such sums as may be necessary may be transferred to accounts of the Departments offices, bureaus, and other organizations: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act.

FINANCIAL CRIMES ENFORCEMENT NETWORK
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel expenses of non-Federal law enforcement personnel to attend meetings concerned with financial intelligence activities, law enforcement, and financial regulation; not to exceed \$14,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for assistance to Federal law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement, \$34,694,000, of which not to exceed \$2,800,000 shall remain available until Sep-

tember 30, 2003; and of which \$2,275,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That funds appropriated in this account may be used to procure personal services contracts.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING
CENTER
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, as a bureau of the Department of the Treasury, including materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training; purchase (not to exceed 52 for police-type use, without regard to the general purchase price limitation) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; for expenses for student athletic and related activities; uniforms without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; the conducting of and participating in firearms matches and presentation of awards; for public awareness and enhancing community support of law enforcement training; not to exceed \$11,500 for official reception and representation expenses; room and board for student interns; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$93,483,000, of which up to \$17,043,000 for materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training shall remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That the Center is authorized to accept and use gifts of property, both real and personal, and to accept services, for authorized purposes, including funding of a gift of intrinsic value which shall be awarded annually by the Director of the Center to the outstanding student who graduated from a basic training program at the Center during the previous fiscal year, which shall be funded only by gifts received through the Center's gift authority: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, students attending training at any Federal Law Enforcement Training Center site shall reside in on-Center or Center-provided housing, insofar as available and in accordance with Center policy: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this account shall be available, at the discretion of the Director, for the following: training United States Postal Service law enforcement personnel and Postal police officers; State and local government law enforcement training on a space-available basis; training of foreign law enforcement officials on a space-available basis with reimbursement of actual costs to this appropriation, except that reimbursement may be waived by the Secretary for law enforcement training activities in foreign countries undertaken pursuant to section 801 of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, Public Law 104-32; training of private sector security officials on a space-available basis with reimbursement of actual costs to this appropriation; and travel expenses of non-Federal personnel to attend course development meetings and training sponsored by the Center: *Provided further*, That the Center is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from agencies receiving training sponsored by the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available at the end of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is authorized to provide training for the Gang Resistance Education and Training program to Federal and non-Federal personnel at any facility in partnership with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms: *Provided further*, That the Federal Law Enforcement

Training Center is authorized to provide short-term medical services for students undergoing training at the Center.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS,
AND RELATED EXPENSES

For expansion of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, for acquisition of necessary additional real property and facilities, and for ongoing maintenance, facility improvements, and related expenses, \$17,331,000, to remain available until expended.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

INTERAGENCY CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT

For expenses necessary to conduct investigations and convict offenders involved in organized crime drug trafficking, including cooperative efforts with State and local law enforcement, as it relates to the Treasury Department law enforcement violations such as money laundering, violent crime, and smuggling, \$103,476,000, of which \$7,827,000 shall remain available until expended.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Financial Management Service, \$198,736,000, of which not to exceed \$10,635,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2003, for information systems modernization initiatives; and of which not to exceed \$2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, including purchase of not to exceed 812 vehicles for police-type use, of which 650 shall be for replacement only, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire of aircraft; services of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Director; for payment of per diem and/or subsistence allowances to employees where a major investigative assignment requires an employee to work 16 hours or more per day or to remain overnight at his or her post of duty; not to exceed \$20,000 for official reception and representation expenses; for training of State and local law enforcement agencies with or without reimbursement, including training in connection with the training and acquisition of canines for explosives and fire accelerants detection; not to exceed \$50,000 for cooperative research and development programs for Laboratory Services and Fire Research Center activities; and provision of laboratory assistance to State and local agencies, with or without reimbursement, \$731,325,000, of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be available for the payment of attorneys' fees as provided by 18 U.S.C. 924(d)(2); and of which \$1,000,000 shall be available for the equipping of any vessel, vehicle, equipment, or aircraft available for official use by a State or local law enforcement agency if the conveyance will be used in joint law enforcement operations with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and for the payment of overtime salaries, travel, fuel, training, equipment, supplies, and other similar costs of State and local law enforcement personnel, including sworn officers and support personnel, that are incurred in joint operations with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms: *Provided*, That no funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to transfer the functions, missions, or activities of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to other agencies or Departments in fiscal year 2001: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated

herein shall be available for salaries or administrative expenses in connection with consolidating or centralizing, within the Department of the Treasury, the records, or any portion thereof, of acquisition and disposition of firearms maintained by Federal firearms licensees: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay administrative expenses or the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States to implement an amendment or amendments to 27 CFR 178.118 or to change the definition of "Curios or relics" in 27 CFR 178.11 or remove any item from ATF Publication 5300.11 as it existed on January 1, 1994: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be available to investigate or act upon applications for relief from Federal firearms disabilities under 18 U.S.C. 925(c): *Provided further*, That such funds shall be available to investigate and act upon applications filed by corporations for relief from Federal firearms disabilities under 18 U.S.C. 925(c): *Provided further*, That no funds under this Act may be used to electronically retrieve information gathered pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 923(g)(4) by name or any personal identification code.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Customs Service, including purchase and lease of up to 1,050 motor vehicles of which 550 are for replacement only and of which 1,030 are for police-type use and commercial operations; hire of motor vehicles; contracting with individuals for personal services abroad; not to exceed \$40,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and awards of compensation to informers, as authorized by any Act enforced by the United States Customs Service, \$1,821,415,000, of which such sums as become available in the Customs User Fee Account, except sums subject to section 13031(f)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985, as amended (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(3)), shall be derived from that Account; of the total, not to exceed \$150,000 shall be available for payment for rental space in connection with preclearance operations; not to exceed \$4,000,000 shall be available until expended for research; of which not less than \$100,000 shall be available to promote public awareness of the child pornography tipline; of which not less than \$200,000 shall be available for Project Alert; not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be available until expended for conducting special operations pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2081; not to exceed \$8,000,000 shall be available until expended for the procurement of automation infrastructure items, including hardware, software, and installation; and not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be available until expended for repairs to Customs facilities: *Provided*, That uniforms may be purchased without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the fiscal year aggregate overtime limitation prescribed in subsection 5(c)(1) of the Act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 261 and 267) shall be \$30,000.

HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE COLLECTION
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses related to the collection of the Harbor Maintenance Fee, pursuant to Public Law 103-182, \$3,000,000, to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and to be transferred to and merged with the Customs "Salaries and Expenses" account for such purposes.

OPERATION, MAINTENANCE AND PROCUREMENT,
AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION PROGRAMS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of marine vessels, aircraft, and other related equipment of the Air and Marine Programs, including operational training and mission-related travel, and rental payments for facilities occupied by the air or marine interdiction and demand reduction programs, the operations of which include the following: the interdiction of narcotics and other goods; the provision of support to Customs and other Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Customs Service; and, at the discretion of the Commissioner of Customs, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in other law enforcement and emergency humanitarian efforts, \$125,778,000, which shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no aircraft or other related equipment, with the exception of aircraft which is one of a kind and has been identified as excess to Customs requirements and aircraft which has been damaged beyond repair, shall be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of the Treasury, during fiscal year 2001 without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For expenses not otherwise provided for Customs automated systems, \$233,400,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$5,400,000 shall be for the International Trade Data System, and not less than \$105,000,000 shall be for the development of the Automated Commercial Environment: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated for the Automated Commercial Environment until the United States Customs Service prepares and submits to the House Committee on Appropriations a final plan for expenditure that (1) meets the capital planning and investment control review requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget, including OMB Circular A-11, part 3; (2) complies with the United States Customs Service's Enterprise Information Systems Architecture; (3) complies with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government; (4) is reviewed and approved by the Customs Investment Review Board, the Department of the Treasury, and the Office of Management and Budget; and (5) is reviewed by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated for the Automated Commercial Environment until that final expenditure plan has been approved by the House Committee on Appropriations.

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT
ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For necessary expenses connected with any public-debt issues of the United States, \$187,301,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, and of which not to exceed \$2,000,000 shall remain available until expended for systems modernization: *Provided*, That the sum appropriated herein from the General Fund for fiscal year 2001 shall be reduced by not more than \$4,400,000 as definitive security issue fees and Treasury Direct Investor Account Maintenance fees are collected, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2001 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at \$182,901,000, and in addition, \$23,600 to be derived from the Oil Spill

Liability Trust Fund to reimburse the Bureau for administrative and personnel expenses for financial management of the Fund, as authorized by section 1012 of Public Law 101-380.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

PROCESSING, ASSISTANCE, AND MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service for tax returns processing; revenue accounting; tax law and account assistance to taxpayers by telephone and correspondence; providing an independent taxpayer advocate within the Service; programs to match information returns and tax returns; management services; rent and utilities; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner; \$3,512,232,000, of which up to \$3,950,000 shall be for the Tax Counseling for the Elderly Program, and of which not to exceed \$25,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

TAX LAW ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service for determining and establishing tax liabilities; providing litigation support; issuing technical rulings; providing top quality service to tax exempt customers; examining employee plans and exempt organizations; conducting criminal investigation and enforcement activities; securing unfiled tax returns; collecting unpaid accounts; compiling statistics of income and conducting compliance research; purchase (for police-type use, not to exceed 850) and hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner, \$3,332,676,000 of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2003, for research.

EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT COMPLIANCE
INITIATIVE

For funding essential earned income tax credit compliance and error reduction initiatives pursuant to section 5702 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33), \$145,000,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 may be used to reimburse the Social Security Administration for the costs of implementing section 1090 of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service for information systems and telecommunications support, including developmental information systems and operational information systems; the hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner; \$1,488,090,000 which shall remain available until September 30, 2002.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—INTERNAL
REVENUE SERVICE

SEC. 101. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available in this Act to the Internal Revenue Service may be transferred to any other Internal Revenue Service appropriation upon the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 102. The Internal Revenue Service shall maintain a training program to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are trained in taxpayers' rights, in dealing courteously with the taxpayers, and in cross-cultural relations.

SEC. 103. The Internal Revenue Service shall institute and enforce policies and procedures that will safeguard the confidentiality of taxpayer information.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Secret Service, including purchase of not to exceed 844 vehicles for police-type use, of which 541 shall be for replacement only, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire of aircraft; training and assistance requested by State and local governments, which may be provided without reimbursement; services of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Director; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia, and fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control, as may be necessary to perform protective functions; for payment of per diem and/or subsistence allowances to employees where a protective assignment during the actual day or days of the visit of a protectee require an employee to work 16 hours per day or to remain overnight at his or her post of duty; the conducting of and participating in firearms matches; presentation of awards; for travel of Secret Service employees on protective missions without regard to the limitations on such expenditures in this or any other Act if approval is obtained in advance from the Committees on Appropriations; for research and development; for making grants to conduct behavioral research in support of protective research and operations; not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; not to exceed \$100,000 to provide technical assistance and equipment to foreign law enforcement organizations in counterfeit investigations; for payment in advance for commercial accommodations as may be necessary to perform protective functions; and for uniforms without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, \$823,800,000, of which \$3,633,000 shall be available as a grant for activities related to the investigations of exploited children and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That up to \$18,000,000 provided for protective travel shall remain available until September 30, 2002.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS,
AND RELATED EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of construction, repair, alteration, and improvement of facilities, \$5,021,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE
TREASURY

SEC. 110. Any obligation or expenditure by the Secretary of the Treasury in connection with law enforcement activities of a Federal agency or a Department of the Treasury law enforcement organization in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 9703(g)(4)(B) from unobligated balances remaining in the Fund on September 30, 2001, shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines.

SEC. 111. Appropriations to the Department of the Treasury in this Act shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901), including maintenance, repairs, and cleaning; purchase of insurance for official motor vehicles operated in foreign countries; purchase of motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitations for vehicles purchased and used overseas for the current fiscal year; entering into contracts with the Department of State for the furnishing of health and medical services to employees and their dependents serving in foreign countries; and services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 112. The funds provided to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms for fiscal year 2001 in this Act for the enforcement of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act shall be expended in a manner so as not to diminish enforcement efforts with respect to section 105 of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act.

SEC. 113. Not to exceed 2 percent of any appropriations in this Act made available to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, United States Customs Service, and United States Secret Service may be transferred between such appropriations upon the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations. No transfer may increase or decrease any such appropriation by more than 2 percent.

SEC. 114. Not to exceed 2 percent of any appropriations in this Act made available to the Departmental Offices, Office of Inspector General, Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, Financial Management Service, and Bureau of the Public Debt, may be transferred between such appropriations upon the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations. No transfer may increase or decrease any such appropriation by more than 2 percent.

SEC. 115. Not to exceed 2 percent of any appropriation made available in this Act to the Internal Revenue Service may be transferred to the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration's appropriation upon the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations. No transfer may increase or decrease any such appropriation by more than 2 percent.

SEC. 116. Of the funds available for the purchase of law enforcement vehicles, no funds may be obligated until the Secretary of the Treasury certifies that the purchase by the respective Treasury bureau is consistent with Departmental vehicle management principles: *Provided*, That the Secretary may delegate this authority to the Assistant Secretary for Management.

SEC. 117. None of the funds appropriated in this Act or otherwise available to the Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Engraving and Printing may be used to redesign the \$1 Federal Reserve note.

SEC. 118. Section 5547(c) of title 5, United States Code is amended by adding the following paragraph:

“(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2), premium pay for protective services authorized by section 3056(a) of title 18, United States Code, may be paid without regard to the biweekly limitation on premium pay except that such premium pay shall not be payable to an employee to the extent that the aggregate of the employee's basic and premium pay for the year would otherwise exceed the annual equivalent of that limitation. The term premium pay refers to pay authorized by sections 5542, 5545 (a), (b), and (c), and 5546 (a) and (b) of this title. Pay authorized by section 5545a of this title will be treated as basic pay for the purpose of this paragraph to the extent that it does not cause an employee's biweekly pay to exceed the limitation in paragraph (2). Payment of additional premium pay payable under this section may be made in a lump sum on the last payday of the calendar year.”

SEC. 119. The Secretary of the Treasury may transfer funds from “Salaries and Expenses,” Financial Management Service, to the Debt Services Account as necessary to cover the costs of debt collection: *Provided*,

That such amounts shall be reimbursed to such Salaries and Expenses account from debt collections received in the Debt Services Account.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no reorganization of the field operations of the U.S. Customs Service Office of Field Operations shall result in a reduction in service to the area served by the Port of Racine, Wisconsin, below the level of service provided in fiscal year 2000.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms shall reimburse the subcontractor that provided services in 1993 and 1994 pursuant to Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms contract number TATF 93-3 from amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2001 or unobligated balances from prior fiscal years, and such reimbursement shall cover the cost of all professional services rendered, plus interest calculated in accordance with the Contract Dispute Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)

SEC. 122. (a) No funds appropriated to the Department of the Treasury in this or any Act for the establishment and operation of a new law enforcement training facility may be obligated or expended until an assessment of the need for, and cost-effectiveness of, such facility has been carried out by the Comptroller General of the U.S. General Accounting Office, submitted to the Committees on Appropriations, and the establishment of said facility has been approved by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

(b) This assessment shall include, but not be limited to:

(1) An analysis of the Department of the Treasury's master plan for the proposed facility;

(2) Projected law enforcement training workloads at the new facility and existing Treasury facilities;

(3) Training requirements for the U.S. Customs Service and other law enforcement agencies;

(4) Federal law enforcement training facility assets currently available and proposed in the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) master plan;

(5) The total estimated cost associated with the design, construction, and establishment of the proposed facility;

(6) Projected annual operating costs for the proposed facility;

(7) Projected costs associated with establishment of a new law enforcement training center, including environmental impact statements, environmental remediation, utilities and other infrastructure; and

(8) Cost savings and benefits of in-service training at the proposed facility compared to using existing or modified facilities.

This title may be cited as the “Treasury Department Appropriations Act, 2001”.

Mr. KOLBE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title I?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Ms.

VELÁZQUEZ) for the purpose of entering into a colloquy before the amendment is offered.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member.

First of all, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member, for the increased funding included in this bill for the State and local money laundering grant program. Although it is a small increase, we are headed in the right direction.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) if they will make a commitment to me to seek as much funding as possible for this program in conference, and, should there be a reallocation of funds during conference, that they will work to increase funding for this program.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for yielding to me and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for her remarks. I would concur with her, this is an important and a useful program. I would be happy to work with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking minority member, and the Senate to seek funding for this effort in the conference.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), I understand the importance of county money laundering efforts at the State and local level, and the role the grant program plays in those efforts.

As the gentlewoman knows, I supported her amendment on the House floor last year that provided the initial funding for this program, and she has, and will have, my continued support.

I share her concerns about this particular report language, and I will work with her to make sure it gets corrected in the conference report.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, second, I want to express my concern over language included in the report accompanying the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill. On page 12 of the report, in the section explaining the committee's recommendations for funding the grant program, the committee has included language about the National Money Laundering Strategy and the grant program that I find troubling.

The committee's concerns about adequate program oversight are laudable;

however, some of the language used in the report mischaracterizes the intent of the national strategy, the grant program and the authorizing legislation.

Some of the language in this section of the report could be interpreted as calling into question the appropriateness of the grant program for State and local law enforcement officials to combat money laundering. The committee expresses concern that the strategy will focus the fight against money laundering solely in local geographic areas.

I want to respond to that concern and explain the intent of my 1998 legislation and the grant program. Currently, counter-money laundering funding is concentrated at the Federal level. The intent of the authorizing legislation in question, the Money Laundering and Financial Crimes Strategy Act of 1998, is to foster cooperation between State, local, and Federal law enforcement officials.

The purpose of the national strategy required by the law is to focus on corporation and information sharing between the Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies. This cooperation and sharing of information is an integral part of tracing the funds from illegal activities back to the source; that is why, in order for a State and local law enforcement agency to receive a grant under the program, they must demonstrate how they will enter into a working relationship with both Federal law enforcement agencies and other State and locals to combat money laundering and drug trafficking.

Quite the opposite of focusing money solely at the local level, the intent of this legislation is to make small grants available to State and local law enforcement agencies who have a demonstrated need and an acceptable plan.

Federal law enforcement agents cannot fight money laundering and drug trafficking without the cooperation of the State and local law enforcement officials who are on the streets and know the local players. By the same token, the State and local law enforcement officials can benefit greatly from resources and experience of the Federal agents.

By seeming to encourage a focus only on the Federal level, the language in the report represents their way of thinking about counter-money laundering activities. Mr. Chairman, if the conference committee does not address this issue, we may be taking a giant step backwards in our fight against money laundering and drug trafficking.

Furthermore, I would like a commitment from the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member, that they will work with me and my staff to draft language that addresses the committee's concerns about the program's oversight without mischaracterizing the intent of the na-

tional strategy and the State and local grant program.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding to me, and I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for raising these, again, very important issues. It certainly was not the intention of the subcommittee to question the usefulness or the importance of State and local grants that help to combat money laundering.

We recognize that money laundering is a significant problem and that State and local officials are critical in our efforts to combat this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has expired.

(On request of Mr. KOLBE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. I am committed to working with the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) to make sure that this program is adequately funded and receives the necessary oversight.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I will assure the gentlewoman that I will work with her as well and with the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) on this issue and want to congratulate her for her leadership and continued careful attention so that this program is carried out as effectively as it possibly can be. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY—DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES—SALARIES AND EXPENSES", insert before the period at the end the following: "Provided, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$500,000 shall be for preparing a report to the Congress on the contents of agreements between the International Monetary Fund and debtor countries and the World Bank and debtor countries: *Provided further*, That in preparing such report, the Secretary of the Treasury shall report all provisions of those agreements that require countries to privatize state-owned enterprises and public services; lower barriers to imports, including basic food products; privatize their public pension or social security systems; raise bank interest rates; eliminate regulations on the environment and natural resources; and reform their labor laws and regulations, including legal minimum wages, benefits, and the right to strike".

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to direct the Department of Treasury to report to Congress on the IMF and World Bank's international advocacy of privatization, deregulation, and trade liberalization. Policies such as privatizing government services, reforming bank laws, and reforming labor standards are debated here in the United States, in Congress, and in State legislatures. There is no consensus on whether and in what measure these policies are good for the U.S. economy. Good arguments can be made on both sides.

I believe that the evidence shows that rapid privatization, deregulation, and trade liberalization when applied to poor countries, have worsened short-term poverty, aggravate economic instability and increased indebtedness. At the appropriate time, I would like to submit for the RECORD reports by the Development Group for Alternative Policies, Friends of the Earth and the Preamble Center which make this point.

Mr. Chairman, but one does not have to agree with me to want the report that I propose. There is no question that the IMF and World Bank are important institutions that have considerable influence, particularly among developing countries.

When those countries seek loans or relief from payment on their debts, they enter into agreements with the IMF and the World Bank in which they pledge to make changes in their economies that the IMF and the World Bank desires.

Every Member of Congress would appreciate knowing the extent to which the IMF and World Bank use that influence, that leverage, to push debtor countries towards privatization, deregulation and trade liberalization.

One way of obtaining this information is through the agreements and documents exchanged between the debtor countries and the IMF and the World Bank. My amendment would direct the Secretary of Treasury to produce a report to Congress on the contents of agreements and documents between the IMF and the debtor countries and the World Bank and the debtor countries. In preparing the report, the Secretary would report all provisions of those agreements and documents that require countries to privatize State-owned enterprises and public services; lower barriers to imports including basic food products; privatize their public pension or Social Security systems; raise bank interest rates; reform regulations on the environment and national resources; and reform their labor laws and regulations, including legal minimum wages, benefits and the right to strike.

While the objection could be raised that information sought in this request is available in thousands of pages of documents on the Web and elsewhere,

there is no easy, centralized location where this information can be found. The government routinely compiles information so that citizenry and Congress can get a better grasp.

All sides of the many debates we have had in this House regarding trade and economic policy would benefit from having an accurate and centralized accounting of such requirements.

Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to withdraw this amendment and would hope to work with the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) to obtain a report from the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, listening to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), I would just say that I think that the information that the gentleman seeks from Treasury about these loans would be useful information to Congress. And if the gentleman does agree to withdraw his amendment, I will certainly work with him to find language that is mutually acceptable to us, that we could include in the conference report requiring such a study to get this information.

Mr. KUCINICH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE), and I certainly will, at the appropriate time, withdraw the amendment.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments and his intensive observations. I agree with the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE), and I certainly look forward to working with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) who has been, I think, one of the most tenacious and thoughtful voices on issues like this, and I certainly want to make sure that we do have information that is accurate and full so that we can understand exactly what is going on.

□ 1545

Quite obviously, as the gentleman knows, there have been issues raised and we will work with him and with the administration to see if they can be resolved.

Mr. Chairman, I would include for the RECORD a Survey of the Impacts of IMF Structural Adjustment in Africa.

A SURVEY OF THE IMPACTS OF IMF STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT IN AFRICA: GROWTH, SOCIAL SPENDING, AND DEBT RELIEF—APRIL 1999

(By Robert Naiman and Neil Watkins)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The role of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in managing the economies of developing countries has come under in-

creasing criticism in the last two years, especially since the Asian financial crisis.

Presently, increasing calls for international debt cancellation and debates over United States economic policy in Africa have focused attention on the IMF's policies in Africa, home of many of the world's poorest and most indebted countries. Several initiatives currently being considered by Congress would have the effect of reducing the role of the IMF in Africa, while others would continue and even increase its role.

This paper relies largely on the IMF's own data to consider the results of the IMF's intervention in the economies of sub-Saharan Africa. We examine the record of countries that have participated in the IMF's Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility (ESAF), the IMF's concessional lending facility for the least developed countries.

Among this report's main findings: Developing countries worldwide implementing ESAF programs have experienced lower economic growth than those who have been outside of these programs. African countries subject to ESAF programs have fared even worse than other countries pursuing ESAF programs; countries in Africa subject to ESAF programs have actually seen their per capita incomes decline. It will be years before these populations recover the per capita incomes that they had prior to structural adjustment.

While African countries urgently need to increase spending on health care, education, and sanitation, IMF structural adjustment programs have forced these countries to reduce such spending. In African countries with ESAF programs, the average amount of government spending on education actually declined between 1986 and 1996.

Neither IMF-mandated macroeconomic policies nor debt relief under the IMF-sponsored HIPC (Heavily Indebted Poor Countries) Initiative have reduced these countries' debt burdens. Total external debt as a share of GNP for ESAF countries increased from 71.1% to 87.8% between 1985-1995. For sub-Saharan Africa debt rose as a share of GDP from 58% in 1988 to 70% in 1996. IMF debt relief has not significantly reduced the debt service burden of Uganda or Mozambique, two of the three African HIPC countries that have proceeded furthest under the HIPC initiative. Poor countries continue to divert resources from expenditures on health care and education in order to serve external debt.

In light of this track record, it appears that efforts to increase economic growth, increase access to health care and education, and reduce the burden of debt repayment are likely to fail so long as the IMF remains in control of the economic policies of countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Efforts to reduce Africa's debt burden should be coupled with efforts to reduce the role of the IMF. Debt cancellation or relief should not be conditioned on compliance with the IMF's structural adjustment programs or policies.

COUNTRY EXPERIENCES WITH IMF STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT

The External Review examined the experiences of five African countries under IMF adjustment. Below, we take a closer look at three of these countries—Zimbabwe, Cote d'Ivoire, and Uganda. We also briefly consider the experience of Mozambique—a country not examined in the External Review—under the IMF/World Bank HIPC Initiative.

1. Zimbabwe

During the 1980s, Zimbabwe's economy grew briskly: real growth averaged about 4%

per year. During the early and mid-part of the decade, Zimbabwe's exports were diversified and became increasingly oriented toward manufacturing; debts were regularly repaid without the need for rescheduling; a reasonable degree of food security was attained; and the provision of educational and health services was dramatically expanded (due to major increases in government spending on social services). As a result of increased government spending on health care provision in particular, health indicators showed dramatic improvement during the 1980s: the infant mortality rate declined from 100 per 1,000 live births to 50 between 1980 and 1988; life expectancy increased from 56 to 64 years (External Review, p. 179). Primary school enrollment doubled over the decade.

The External Review team summarized the achievements of the 1980s: "The core of the government's redistributive agenda was through (sic) increased public expenditures on education, health, and public sector employment. During the 1980s, much was achieved both in terms of an expansion of these expenditures and in terms of measurable indicators of performance" (p. 172).

Though it had entered agreements with the World Bank in the late 1980s, Zimbabwe began structural adjustment in earnest in 1991 when it signed a stand-by arrangement with the IMF in exchange for a \$484 million loan. Unlike many of the countries that undertake IMF adjustment programs, Zimbabwe did not institute structural adjustment in response to a "crisis," but rather in an effort to "jump start economic growth."

Among the policy changes required by the IMF in exchange for the loan were cuts in Zimbabwe's fiscal deficit, tax rate reductions, and the deregulation of financial markets. The arrangement also required Zimbabwe to dismantle protections for the manufacturing sector and "deregulate" the labor market, lowering the minimum wage and eliminating certain guarantees of employment security (External Review, p. 173-176).

Impact on the economy

IMF policies which mandated the removal of protections for the manufacturing sector, trade liberalization, and reduced government spending combined with the effects of a severe drought on agricultural production to send the Zimbabwe economy into recession in 1992—real GDP fell by nearly 8% that year. In Zimbabwe, economic crisis actually followed rather than preceded the implementation of structural adjustment.

Among the indicators of economic performance that declined over the period of adjustment:

Between 1991-96, manufacturing output contracted 14%;

Real GDP per capita declined by 5.8% from 1991-1996;

Real GDP fell by about 1% between 1991 and 1995. (A January 1992 IMF staff report predicted 18% GDP growth over the same period);

Nominal and real interest rates were high and volatile throughout the period, with nominal rates often exceeding 40%. The result of high real interest rates was to reduce private domestic investment.

Total private investment declined by 9% in real terms between 1991-96 (External Review, p. 172-175).

Furthermore, private per capita consumption fell by 37% between 1991-1996. As the External Review concluded, "This alone transformed the group of those who lost from the

reforms from a minority to a majority" (p. 177).

The combination of reduced protection of the manufacturing sector, the reduction in public spending, and labor market deregulation led to higher unemployment and lower real wages. Between 1991-96, formal sector employment in manufacturing fell 9% and real wages declined by 26%. Meanwhile, food prices rose much faster than other consumer prices; this disproportionately affected the rural poor, who spend a larger share of their income on food (External Review, p. 180, 182).

Impact on health and education spending

In order to meet the IMF's fiscal targets in the 1991 ESAF program, the government had to reduce non-interest expenditures by 46%. The External Review describes this requirement as a "draconian reduction" and found it unsurprising that Zimbabwe never met the fiscal target. Though Zimbabwe never met the IMF target, between 1990/91-1995/96, spending on health care declined as a share of the budget from 6.4% to 4.3%, and as a share of GDP from 3.1% to 2.1% (External Review, p. 178). The IMF's prescriptions for fiscal adjustment included reductions in the real wages of public health sector workers. As a result of the wage cuts, many doctors moved to the private health sector, and the quality of public health care dropped. As health care became less a public service and more a function of the private sector, health services became less accessible to the poor. Because non-wage health spending fell dramatically as well, shortages of prescription drugs became commonplace (External Review, p. 178).

Compared to the previous era in which health care services were made more widely available to all Zimbabweans through increased government spending, the era of IMF adjustment was characterized by decreased access to health services. This trend was reflected in the deterioration of health indicators. For example, between 1988 and 1994, wasting (a phenomenon linked to AIDS) in children quadrupled and maternal mortality rates appear to have increased. And after many years of decline, the number of cases of tuberculosis began to rise in 1986 and by 1995 had quadrupled (External Review, p. 178-179).

The decline in government health care spending occurred during a period of increasing need by the population for more access to health care. AIDS was spreading rapidly in Zimbabwe. Given the present cost of treating AIDS patients, the World Bank predicted that the total cost of treating Zimbabwean citizens already infected with AIDS was four times the entire 1996 government health budget. The IMF's fiscal targets meant that the government was unable to respond to growing health needs of the population effectively. The External Review concluded that access to health care fell under adjustment, compared to the pre-IMF era: "There is no doubt that the previous trend of improving health outcomes was reversed during the period of the reform program" (p. 179).

Expenditure on education also fell sharply under IMF adjustment. Real per capita expenditure on primary and secondary education declined by 36% and 25% respectively between 1990/91 and 1993/94. As in the health sector, wages for teachers and educational staff fell by between 26% and 43% between 1990 and 1993.

Impact on external indebtedness

The External review team analyzed Zimbabwe's external viability (i.e., their

debt burden). The results show that on the basis of nearly every generally accepted indicator of a country's debt burden, Zimbabwe became significantly more indebted during the period of adjustment. But Zimbabwe still does not qualify for the IMF/World Bank HIPC initiative.

On April 11, 1999, the Associated Press reported that Zimbabwe had "severed ties with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank," saying that they had "made 'unrealistic demands'" as a requirement for releasing funds. A day later the Zimbabwean Finance Ministry denied the report, "in a bid to reassure markets." The Wall Street Journal noted that "Other donors have indicated they would take their cue from the IMF on whether to release additional financial support," again indicating the tremendous power which the IMF wields as a result of the fact that other creditors and donors follow its lead.

2. Cote d'Ivoire

Cote d'Ivoire experienced a long period of growth following its independence in 1960, with much of its growth attributable to agricultural exports. Economic decline ensued in the early 1980s as world prices for coffee and cocoa, two of Cote d'Ivoire's main exports, fell. After a brief restoration in growth by 1985, the economic decline resumed in the late 1980s (External Review, 95).

The IMF became involved in Cote d'Ivoire in November 1989, when it reached a stand-by arrangement with the government, which was followed by another agreement in 1991. Following the initial stand-by arrangements with the IMF, there were six World Bank Structural Adjustment Loans from 1989-1993. Then, beginning in 1994, Cote d'Ivoire entered into an ESAF program with the IMF.

Over the first period of adjustment, from 1989-1993, IMF fiscal adjustment requirements were introduced in an effort to reduce the government budget deficit. These included substantial reductions in current government expenditures (-30%) and capital expenditures (-15%), in addition to tax increases. Structural reforms also began during this period, including privatizations and some financial reforms.

The objectives of the next phase (from 1994-1997), under the ESAF program, were threefold:

To generate a primary budget surplus of 3% of GDP, "in order to finance debt service" (External review, p. 97);

To attain GDP growth of 5% by 1995; and

To "protect the most vulnerable during adjustment."

In order to reach the budget surplus target, the IMF required labor market deregulation, price decontrol, trade reform, reductions in civil service employment, and faster privatization (External review, p. 97). The IMF also advocated devaluation of Cote d'Ivoire's currency, the Franc CFA, which occurred in January 1994.

Impact on the economy

From 1989-1993, per capita GDP fell by 15%, pushed along by the overvaluation of the exchange rate and deterioration in the terms of trade (External Review, p. 95-96). The social impact of IMF structural adjustment on Cote d'Ivoire was severe. Between 1988-1995, the incidence and intensity of poverty doubled, with the number of people making under \$1/day increasing from 17.8% of the population to 36.8%. In Abidjan, the rate of urban poverty rose from 5% to 20% between 1993 and 1995 (External Review, p. 101).

Impact on Health and Education Spending

Between 1990 and 1995, real per capita spending on health care fell slightly and education spending fell dramatically (External

Review, p. 101, 105). During the period of IMF structural adjustment (1990–1995), real per capita public spending on education declined by more than 35 percent. Moreover, reductions in the wages of civil servants required by the IMF also led to a reduction in teachers salaries (external review, p. 103). The Review points out that lower wages probably lowered teachers' motivation, and educational quality may have suffered as a result. Despite an improvement in gross enrollment in primary schools over the period 1986–1995, educational indicators overall showed poor results. By 1995, only 45% of girls from the poorest quintile of households were receiving primary education. At the secondary level, the gross enrollment rate declined from 34% to 31% between 1986–1995 (External Review, p. 104).

As part of the policy reforms required by the Fund, user fees were introduced into the public health care system in 1991. The devaluation of the franc CFA made it especially difficult for the urban poor to pay for health care services, and as a result there was a shift towards traditional medicine. Many health problems worsened. For example, the incidence of stunted growth in children increased from 20% in 1988 to 35% in 1995. As access became more expensive, health issues became a more pressing concern. A survey by UNICEF and the Government of Cote d'Ivoire found that when women were asked to identify their problems, health ranked first (External Review, p.103).

The team of external reviewers concluded that in Cote d'Ivoire, "The required reductions in public expenditures were imposed on a system which was already failing to meet basic social needs."

Debt burden

In the first two years of adjustment alone (from the end of 1989 to the end of 1991), Cote d'Ivoire's external debt burden grew by \$3.7 billion (or from 141% to 175% of GDP). In its analysis of external viability, the External Review found that Cote d'Ivoire's external debt burden increased from 132.4% to 210.8% of GDP. Before ESAF, its debt stock to export ratio was 452.8%; following ESAF, it had risen to 545.4% (External Review, p. 190).

Although Cote d'Ivoire has completed the required three consecutive years of structural adjustment to reach its "decision point" for eligibility under the IMF/World Bank HIPC Initiative, it will not reach the "completion point" (of actually receiving debt relief) until March 2001, assuming it does not go off track from the adjustment program. Although the country has an urgent need for increased government spending on health care and education, it is unlikely that this could happen under the terms of structural adjustment.

3. Uganda

When President Yoweri Museveni came to power in Uganda in 1986, his government faced the challenge of rebuilding an economy devastated by the dictatorships of Idi Amin and Milton Obote. Between 1971 and 1986, the Ugandan economy had deteriorated in per capita terms. But in the ten years that followed (between 1986–1996), per capita GDP grew by roughly 40%.

The IMF first became involved in Uganda in 1987, with a loan through its Structural Adjustment Facility (SAF), and it later extended its mission under the ESAF program from 1989–1992 and again from 1992–1997. Real per capita GDP growth averaged 4.2% in Uganda between 1992–1997, and as a result, the IMF often presents Uganda as an exam-

ple of the success of its structural adjustment policies.

As noted in the External Review, part of this rapid growth can be explained by the terrible decline of preceding years. But it is also worth looking at how various sectors of the population fared under the growth that coincided with structural adjustment in Uganda.

Two principal reforms mandated by the IMF arrangements were trade liberalization and the progressive reduction of export taxation. But as the external review points out, "Liberalization of cash crops had only limited beneficiaries." This was the case because only a small number of rural households grow coffee. Liberalization had little impact on rural incomes over the period of adjustment—rural per capita private incomes increased just 4% over the period from 1988/89 to 1994/95.

The IMF also mandated the privatization of state-owned industries, a process that has met particularly criticism in Uganda. The Structural Adjustment Participatory Review International Network (SAPRIN), which was launched jointly with the World Bank, national governments, and Northern and Southern NGOs in 1997, has reported that the privatization process in Uganda has gone too fast and has been flawed from the start. A report by Ugandan NGOs who participated in SAPRIN found that "The privatization process in Uganda has benefitted the government and corporate interests more than the Ugandan people . . . The privatization process was rushed, and as a result, workers suffered. Some 350,000 people were retrenched and, with the private sector not expanding fast enough, unemployment sharply increased. Those laid off were not prepared for life in the private sector, with no training being provided."

During the period of IMF structural adjustment, public spending on health care increased as government spending rose overall. However, health care spending did not rise as a share of the recurrent budget, and its share was slightly lower in 1994 than it had been in 1989. Government spending grew over the period but from a very low starting level at the beginning of Museveni's term: in 1986, government expenditure represented just 9% of GDP. At the same time prices of health care services rose much faster than inflation. This was caused in part by the large depreciation of the exchange rate from 1988–1991, which raised the cost of imported inputs in the health sector. As a result, a given level of public health spending bought fewer health services. Real per capita output in health care was lower in each of the years from 1992–1994 than it had been in 1989. (External Review, p. 139–141).

The SAPRIN review of Uganda's experience with adjustment found that "cost-sharing," where patients are expected to pay for a portion of their health care or education, has led to less access for the poor to health care and public education. The policy of cost-sharing was introduced by the Ugandan government in response to IMF fiscal requirements and high debt service payments, which have made it difficult for the government to channel funds into payments for health care and public education. The NGOs in SAPRIN report that:

"It [higher costs] has made hospitals and institutes of higher education too costly for the poor. People testified that those who cannot pay for critical health care simply die. Cost-sharing is also poorly administered in the hospitals, and it was pointed out that in areas where people have been unable to

pay, the local hospital has simply been closed down. Citizen representatives reported that in villages where the people themselves decide on how much to pay, access to care is much better, so it is best to scrap cost-sharing, which does not benefit the poor."

Despite some limited progress in the area of health service provision during the era of adjustment, general health indicators have not improved. In particular, the proportion of children who are malnourished has not declined. As the external review observes, "This is consistent with the evidence on rural incomes which, as we have seen, suggests little change" (p. 139). Since rural incomes did not rise in tandem with increasing health care costs, the rural poor have not been able to share in increased access to health service provision.

Moreover, a declining share of the recurrent budget has been spent on education over the adjustment period, and this led to an overall reduction (over the period 1987 to 1996) in the provision of educational services per capita. (External Review, p. 140–141).

Debt burden

The IMF and World Bank often present Uganda as an example of the success of its HIPC (Heavily Indebted Poor Country) debt initiative. Uganda was the first country to receive debt relief under the IMF/World Bank HIPC Initiative in April 1998, when roughly \$650 million of its multilateral debt stock was forgiven.

However, the process has, first of all, been plagued by several delays. Uganda was originally scheduled to receive debt relief in April 1997, but this was pushed back one year. This delay occurred despite the fact that Uganda had been following structural adjustment programs for nearly a decade. According to Ugandan government projections, the cost of the one year delay was \$193 million in lost relief. This amount is more than double the projected spending on education or six times total government spending on health in that year. With the delay, public funds were diverted from priority health care services into debt repayments.

Moreover, less than one year after receiving relief, Uganda's debt burden has once again become unsustainable according to HIPC criteria. This is mainly because of an overestimation by the World Bank/IMF of revenues Uganda would receive from coffee exports and from trade with the former Zaire, whose economy has recently gone into decline. The United Kingdom's Secretary of State for International Development, Clare Short, confirmed this is a statement before the British House of Commons, noting that, "the review of Uganda, which has just received debt relief, was very disappointing. As a result of the fall in world coffee prices, it is just as badly off as it was in the first place." Uganda's return to an unsustainable debt service burden illustrates the problem with IMF and World Bank projections of export earnings that do not materialize, even over a period of less than a year. It also shows that the debt burdens set by HIPC as "sustainable" are much too high, and that much deeper debt relief—preferably cancellation—will be necessary to set these countries on a sustainable growth path.

CASE STUDY: MOZAMBIQUE AND DEBT RELIEF

Unlike the other countries examined in this study, Mozambique's experience with the IMF's structural adjustment was not examined in the External Review of the impact of ESAF programs. But Mozambique is one of just three African countries (the others

are Uganda and Cote d'Ivoire) that have reached the final stage under the World Bank/IMF Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative. It is therefore worth examining how Mozambique has fared under this initiative, including the required conditions of structural adjustment.

Mozambique is one of the poorest countries in the world, if not the poorest. According to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and UNICEF, only 37% of the population has access to clean water; 39% has access to health services; and just 23% of women can read and write.

Following a decade of war supported by external powers, Mozambique began a modified form of World Bank structural adjustment in 1987, and in 1990 it entered into an IMF directed "stabilization program" under ESAF. Two of the main components of the IMF stabilization program were fiscal adjustment (cuts in government spending) and cuts in credit to the economy (through policies such as higher interest rates). As part of the fiscal adjustment process, government salaries fell. For example, a doctor on the government payroll earned \$350/month in 1991, \$175/month in 1993, and by 1996, took in less than \$100/month. For nurses and teachers, monthly salaries fell from \$110/month to \$60 or \$40—levels at which it is impossible to support a family.

The IMF's primary aim in Mozambique was to contain inflation; the Fund argued that broad post-war reconstruction efforts should be scaled back on the grounds that such actions could be inflationary. While the IMF focused on stabilization policies, World Bank adjustment simultaneously mandated privatization as well as trade and investment liberalization.

Mozambique and the HIPC initiative

In a press release issued on April 7, 1998, the IMF announced that, along with other creditors, it had agreed to "provide exceptional support amounting to nearly US\$3 billion in nominal terms in debt-service relief for Mozambique," claiming that this would "reduce the external debt burden, free budgetary resources and allow Mozambique to broaden the scope of its development effort."

While \$3 billion may seem like substantial debt relief for a country as poor as Mozambique, it does not necessarily make a significant dent in the country's debt service bur-

den. Since countries like Mozambique owe far more in external debt than they have the capacity to pay, it is quite possible to reduce their outstanding debt stock considerably, without any commensurate reduction in the net drain of resources out of the country. This happens when creditors cancel that part of the debt that was not being serviced previously. Therefore, in order to know whether poor countries—and poor people in those countries—actually benefit from IMF/World Bank debt relief, it is necessary to know what the impact of this debt relief is on the actual debt service paid by these countries.

In response to criticism from non-governmental organizations, in May the IMF released estimates for these numbers. According to the IMF's own projections, the actual debt service paid by Mozambique will be as high or higher in each of the years from 2000–2003 as it was in 1997. Even after IMF debt relief, the government will be paying roughly as much in debt service as it is spending on health care and education.

Speaking at a conference on the issue, World Bank representative James Coates noted that more than half of all money allocated to HIPC countries went to cancel Mozambique's debt, and that more debt could not be canceled because the funds allocated under HIPC constituted the maximum that creditors could afford. But the \$100 million that Mozambique pays in debt service each year represents barely one-tenth of one percent of the increase in resources which the IMF alone received last year from member governments. This indicates that the lack of meaningful debt relief so far is not the result of scarce resources, but a lack of commitment to significantly reducing the debt service burden of these highly indebted and very poor countries.

Human impact of the IMF's policies

The importance of debt relief can be illustrated by estimates of the results, in terms of human welfare, that could be achieved if some of the resources now spent on debt service were reallocated to spending on vital needs. In 1997, the United Nations Development Program estimated that, relieved of their debt payments, severely indebted countries in Africa could have saved the lives of 21 million people and provided 90 million girls and women with access to basic education by the year 2000. In the case of Mo-

zambique, Oxfam estimated that debt relief could save the lives of 600,000 children over seven years. Other advocates of debt relief have made similar estimates: based on United Nations Development Program estimates of the impact of increased health and education spending, Jubilee 2000 estimated that if Mozambique were allowed to spend half the money on health care and education which it is now spending on debt service, it would save the lives of 115,000 children every year and 6,000 mothers giving birth.

HAS AFRICA 'TURNED THE CORNER' IN RECENT YEARS?

In 1998, the IMF released a series of publications and public statements claiming credit for an "African economic renaissance" and "a turnaround in growth performance." The claim from the IMF and World Bank is that structural adjustment is beginning to pay off, at least in macroeconomic terms. But examining just-released growth projections by the World Bank, one discovers that the "growth turnaround" has been short-lived. According to the World Bank, real GDP per capita grew by 1.4% in 1996, but by 1997, growth slowed to 0.4% and in 1998, per capita incomes fell by 0.8%. The World Bank projects a further decline of -0.4% in 1999. In short, if there was an "economic renaissance" for Africa, it appears to be over.

Why has there been a sudden downturn in growth? The UN Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) reports that Africa's economic performance in 1997 showed "the fragility of the recovery and underscored the predominance of exogenous factors" in the determining African economic outcomes. Africa's growth prospects are inexorably linked to world prices for its exports. IMF and World Bank structural reforms had actively promoted this strategy, known as export-led growth. The ECA also emphasized this fact: "The major thrust of economic policy making on the continent has been informed for the last decade or so by the core policy content of adjustment programs (of the type supported by the IMF and the World Bank) * * *"

In addition to slower growth in 1997 and 1998, recently released data indicate that the relationship between the IMF and sub-Saharan Africa has taken a turn for the worse during these years.

FIGURE 6. IMF RELATIONSHIP WITH SUB SAHARAN AFRICA 1991–1998

(Millions of U.S. dollars)

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
IMF purchases	579	527	1146	918	2994	652	524	837
IMF repurchases	614	530	455	467	2372	596	1065	1139
IMF charges	228	186	138	170	559	124	101	88
Balance	-263	-189	553	281	63	-68	-642	-390

¹ Preliminary.

The Balance shows the net transfer of funds from the IMF to Sub-Saharan Africa; the negative sign indicate a net transfer from the countries to the Fund. IMF Purchases represent new resources (loans) taken out from the IMF. IMF Repurchases represent repayments of the principal of IMF loans. IMF Charges represent repayments of the interest on IMF loans.

Source: World Bank, Global Development Finance 1999, in Jubilee 2000 coalition, "IMF takes \$1 billion in two years from Africa," April 1999.

As Figure 6 shows, repayments by African governments to the IMF outpaced new resources in the past two years, resulting in a net transfer from Africa to the IMF of more than \$1 billion in 1997 and 1998. Meanwhile, despite increasing repayments to the IMF, total African debt continued to rise: between 1997 and 1998, Africa's debt increased by 3% to \$226 billion. This occurred even as African countries paid back \$3.5 billion more than they borrowed in 1998.

CONCLUSION

The data reviewed in this study suggest that the International Monetary Fund has

failed in Africa, in terms of its own stated objectives and according to its own data. Increasing debt burdens, poor growth performance, and the failure of the majority of the population to improve their access to education, health care, or other basic needs has been the general pattern in countries subject to IMF programs.

The core elements of IMF structural adjustment programs have remained remarkably consistent since the early 1980s. Although there has been mounting criticism and calls for reform over the last year and a half—as a result of the Fund's intervention in the Asian and Russian financial crises—no

reforms of the IMF or its policies have been forthcoming. And there are as yet no indications from the Fund itself that it sees any need for reform. In fact, IMF Managing Director Michel Camdessus has repeatedly referred to the Asian economic collapse as "a blessing in disguise."

In the absence of any reform at the IMF for the foreseeable future, the need for debt cancellation for Africa is all the more urgent. This enormous debt burden consumed 4.3% of sub-Saharan Africa's GNP in 1997. If these resources had been devoted to investment, the region could have increased its economic growth by nearly a full percentage

point—sadly this is more than twice its per capita growth for that year. But the debt burden exacts another price, which may be even higher than the drain of resources out of the country: it provides the means by which the IMF is able to impose the conditions of its structural adjustment programs on these desperately poor countries.

Any debt relief that is tied to structural adjustment, or other conditionality imposed by the IMF—as it is in the HIPC initiative—could very well cause more economic harm than good to the recipients. Debt relief should be granted outside the reach of this institution, preferably without conditions. Moreover, the role of the Fund in Africa and developing countries generally, and especially its control over major economic decisions, should be drastically reduced. Any efforts to provide additional funding or authority to the IMF, before the institution has been fundamentally reformed, would be counter-productive.

ON THE WRONG TRACK:

A SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF IMF INTERVENTIONS IN SELECTED COUNTRIES

January 1998.

OVERVIEW

As Asian economies continue to unravel, investors have looked to the International Monetary Fund for guidance on whether prospective economic performance warrants their continued participation in the economies of those countries. With a war chest of funds and a staff of neoliberal economists at its disposal and the power and influence of Northern governments and financial markets behind it, the IMF not only sets the standards for such performance, but it forces compliance with the carrot of emergency funding and the stick of discouraging the flow of private-sector and other public-sector financing. When the going gets rough under IMF tutelage, the refrain is always the same: deepen the reforms with more of the same medicine.

But how good has IMF advice been, and how accurate a guide has the Fund's stamp of approval been for investors? To start, investments in IMF-touted emerging-market countries over the past five years have performed no better than much safer investments at home, and the Fund failed to warn of the two big crashes of the decade—Mexico and East Asia. In fact, right up to the currency and stock-market collapses, the IMF was praising these countries as models of economic success and rationality. Perhaps blinded by its own prescriptions (and the interests of investors) to open these—and other—economies before the necessary institutional, financial and social infrastructure was in place, the Fund has consistently failed to recognize, or at least publicly acknowledge, the underlying weaknesses in these economies and its own contribution to the debacles.

Friends of the Earth and The Development GAP, with the support of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, have engaged partners in six countries to assess, through short case studies, IMF performance in a representative cross-section of economies. Drafts of four of the studies—Mexico, Senegal, Tanzania and Hungary—have been completed, and summaries are attached, the profiles of the Philippines and Nicaragua are still in progress. These cases paint a consistent picture of an institution bent on fully opening economies to foreign investors on advantageous terms at almost any cost—the destruction of domestic productive capacity and local di-

mand, growing poverty and inequality, the deterioration of education and health-care systems, and, as has been seen, a dangerously expanding vulnerability of these economies themselves to external forces beyond their governments' control.

What is clear from these studies, and from IMF intervention across the board, is that the Fund's economic conditions—which have gone beyond tight monetary and fiscal policies and other stabilization measures to include the liberalization of trade, direct investment and financial capital flows, as well as the dismantling of labor protections and economic infrastructure that supports small producers—have been imposed without linkage to a long-term development strategy aimed at sustainable and equitable growth and economic competitiveness.

In Mexico, a program of rapid trade liberalization, economic and financial-sector deregulation and large-scale privatization, accompanied by policies that undercut local demand and production, had created a growing current-account deficit well before the December 1994 collapse of the peso. The increasing dependency on foreign capital inflows required to finance the deficit eventually led to massive capital flight and the crisis. Subsequent IMF conditions attached to the bailout of foreign investors, which in essence deepened the reform program while ignoring its underlying weaknesses, caused an economic depression, pushing millions of farmers out of agriculture, bankrupting thousands of small businesses, and drastically slashing jobs and wages. Likewise, in Nicaragua, financial-sector deregulation, narrowly focused and without adequate prior institutional reform, has directed capital toward short-term, high-interest deposits and away from productive investment, particularly the activities of small-scale producers in both the agricultural and manufacturing sectors.

In Africa, the IMF record has been even worse. Tanzania, forced to adopt a program of trade liberalization, devaluation, tight monetary policy and the dismantling of state financing and marketing mechanisms for small farmers, has experienced expanding rural poverty, income inequality and environmental degradation amidst growing agricultural export trade. Food security, housing conditions and primary-school enrollment has fallen while malnutrition and infant mortality have been on the rise. The country, under Fund supervision, is today more dependent than ever on foreign aid. Across the continent, Senegal, an IMF pupil for 18 years, has experienced declining quality in its education and health-care systems and a growth in maternal mortality, unemployment and the use and abuse of child labor. Official IMF statistics underestimate the real inflation rate faced by most of the population, while economic growth has not effectively reached the poor. As women constitute the vast majority of the poor and depend more on social services, experience lower education and literacy rates, and are least likely to receive support for their agricultural (food-crop) activities than are men, they have suffered disproportionately under the adjustment program.

With the IMF as its guide, Hungary has led the reform process in Eastern Europe, similarly liberalizing its trade regime, tightening its money supply and selling off assets (on questionable terms) to foreign interests with little concern for the productive contributions of workers and domestic producers in the "real" economy. As a result, an increasing portion of resources are being di-

rected away from investment in human capital and infrastructure formation toward unemployment benefits and payments to wealthy bondholders. A more fragmented and troubled society has emerged in which other big losers include: the elderly, who often cannot afford the cost of medicines or home heating, pensioners, whose stipends will further decrease, gypsies, who are losing access to jobs and public housing, youth, who face decreased access to education and employment, particularly in rural areas, and children, who, for the first time, are experiencing malnutrition as poverty expands in Hungary.

The IMF claims that it is not a development assistance agency and its track record proves its point. Yet, while destroying the basis for sustainable, equitable and stable development around the globe with the imposition of both stabilization and adjustment measures, the Fund has also greatly increased the economic vulnerability of nation after nation. By opening the door prematurely to fickle and unregulated foreign capital flows, liberalizing trade and investment regimes and pushing up interest rates to attract bondholders without adequate support for local production, developing cheap production bases for foreigners and export at the expense of underpaid and undereducated work forces, domestic demand and the natural environment, and rewarding speculators instead of financing critical social investments and equilibrium, the IMF has demonstrated both its biases and its ignorance of local conditions. It should be neither a guide for the market nor a dictator of national development programs. At this point in history, the less influence, the less money, the less power it has, the better.

APRIL 1999.

CONDITIONING DEBT RELIEF ON ADJUSTMENT: CREATING THE CONDITIONS FOR MORE INDEBTEDNESS

(By The Development Group for Alternative Policies)

Over the past year there has been growing public recognition, even within official circles, that foreign-debt burdens, particularly those of the least-developed countries, are unsustainable and constitute severe constraints on those countries' future development. The dire situations in Honduras and Nicaragua after Hurricane Mitch serve to highlight the impossibility of those countries garnering sufficient resources to rebuild their devastated infrastructures while foreign-debt payments continue to absorb much of their governments' and export earnings.

Various proposals have been developed for the cancellation of bilateral and multilateral debt. Most prominent among these proposals is the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative. The stated intention of this program, which is administered by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, is to enable highly indebted poor countries to achieve sustainable debt levels within six years. After three years of implementation of structural adjustment programs (SAPs), countries reach a "decision point", at which time some debt rescheduling may be granted and the level of additional debt reduction needed is calculated. That reduction, however, is typically available only after another three years of adjustment. It could take even longer than six years for a country to receive any debt relief, as the "clock" stops if a country fails to fully adhere to the adjustment program and restarts only when the

IMF has certified that it is in compliance once again. In fact, given the long time frame for debt cancellation, it appears that a central goal of the HIPC initiative is to keep countries locked into adjustment programs, with debt reduction now used—as has been both access to finance and debt itself—as leverage toward that end.

While the recognition that debt levels must be reduced is a step in the right direction, the requirement that countries continue to implement SAPs in order to qualify for and receive that relief greatly diminishes or even negates the benefits that might accrue from debt cancellation. Not only have adjustment programs devastated national economies across the South and caused misery for hundreds of millions of people, evidence shows that, in the large majority of countries implementing those policies at the insistence of the international financial institutions (IFIs), debt levels have increased.

In fact, a study carried out by two researchers affiliated with The Development GAP demonstrates that there is a positive linear relationship between the number of years that countries implement adjustment programs and increases in debt levels. Rather than leading countries out of situations of unpayable debt levels, the HIPC program and others conditioned on the implementation of SAPs would likely push participating countries further into a tragic circle of debt, adjustment, a weakened domestic economy, heightened vulnerability, and greater debt.

METHODOLOGY

The Development GAP study covers 71 economies of the South with a history of at least three years operating under World Bank-supported structural and sectoral adjustment programs during the period 1980–1995. Many of these countries have also implemented IMF adjustment programs. On average, the countries included in the study had implemented SAPs for 7.8 years. Some 42 African and Middle Eastern countries were included and comprised 59.2 percent of the sample. Eleven Asian countries, or 15.5 percent of the total, and 18 Latin American countries, comprising 25.4 percent of the cases, were also included in the study. A list of the countries included in the study, along with data related to SAPs and debt, is provided in the Annex.

The independent variable used in the study analysis was the number of years a country had been implementing a structural adjustment program. The dependent variable was the change in the ratio of debt to GNP. The total debt level used was the sum total of debt and the debt and interest cancelled during the period (so that official debt-reduction plans do not skew the results). Changes in the ratio of debt to GNP were derived by calculating percentage changes in the ratio from the first to last year of a country's SAP. In the cases in which the program was still ongoing, 1995 was used as the final year for calculation due to the unavailability of data on debt after that date. All figures are based on official World Bank information.

RESULTS

Of the countries included in the study, a full two-thirds saw their debt burdens increase during the adjustment period. Furthermore, as cited above and contrary to assertions by the IFIs that "sound economic policy" is the best road out of debt, statistical analysis of the data demonstrates a positive relationship between the number of years under adjustment and increases in debt levels. The longer these countries implemented the neoliberal programs, the worse their debt burdens typically became.

It is striking that none of the countries currently being considered for debt relief under the HIPC initiative has experienced a drop in the debt-to-GNP ratio under their respective adjustment programs. In some countries, the inverse relationship was especially strong. Guyana and Cote d'Ivoire, two countries that are scheduled to receive such debt relief, have experienced phenomenal increases in the debt/GNP ratio. In the former, the ratio grew by 147 percent after 13 years of adjustment, and, in the latter, 13 years of SAPs produced a 120-percent increase in debt to GNP. Of the 35 countries listed by the World Bank as HIPCs, only three experienced decreases in debt-to-GNP levels under adjustment. All others experienced increases, ranging from an 11-percent rise in Mauritania to a 670-percent increase in Nigeria.

The average, or mean, increase in debt for all of the countries in the sample was 49.2 percent. The median, or most frequent, increase was 28.2 percent. The top 25 percent of the countries showed a 75-percent increase in foreign debt.

TRAGIC CIRCLES OF DEBT AND ADJUSTMENT

There are a number of reasons for the rise in debt levels. In some countries, the trade liberalization required under adjustment programs leads to a flood of imports and, consequently, higher trade and current-account deficits. Those deficits need to be compensated for by higher foreign investment, foreign assistance or foreign borrowing. In many countries, such as Brazil, the maintenance of high real interest rates, as often mandated by the IFIs, in order to appease nervous foreign investors, is increasing the cost of domestic debt, thus adding to the government's budget deficit, raising the specter of further devaluation, and, consequently, creating greater difficulty in servicing the foreign debt.

One of the central objectives of structural adjustment programs is to reorient economic activity away from production for domestic consumption and toward production for export. In making this shift, nations become exceedingly vulnerable to the vagaries of the global economy. Countries export more and more as commodity prices continue to fall. Governments deregulate economic activity, "flexibilize" labor markets and raise interest rates in increasingly desperate efforts to attract and maintain fickle foreign investment. The recent crises in Mexico, East Asia, Russia and Brazil demonstrate the hazards of countries betting their future well-being on the erratic global financial market. Indeed, those countries receiving IMF-orchestrated "bailouts" could very likely constitute the next group of debt-crisis countries, as the adjustment conditions attached to these packages include the requirement that governments guarantee payments to private international banks, thus making private debt a public obligation.

High foreign-debt levels are both a result and a symptom of the extreme risk that governments take in tying their economies too closely to the global market. The causes of that debt are flawed economic policies that fail to develop domestic productive capabilities or raise local income levels so as to reduce the need for external financing. For this reason alone, the requirement that governments adhere to the structural adjustment programs designed by the international financial institutions is pure folly. Instead, governments should be encouraged to develop national economic plans designed democratically to expand the domestic financial resource base, incomes and markets and, consequently, reduce their extreme de-

pendence on foreign debt. Otherwise, we can expect the tragic circle of debt and adjustment to continue into the foreseeable future—debt-relief programs notwithstanding.

Prepared by Karen Hansen-Kuhn and Doug Hellinger based on research and analysis by Matt Marek and Nan Dawkins.

ANNEX: COUNTRIES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

Africa and Middle East	Years under SAP	Percent increase in debt/GNP
Algeria	5	72.05
Benin	6	17.74
Burkina Faso	4	65.98
Burundi	9	155.96
Cameroon	6	156.96
Central African Rep.	7	110.76
Chad	66	81.43
Comoros	4	30.30
Congo	7	75.59
Cote d'Ivoire	13	119.53
Egypt	3	-22.89
Equatorial Guinea	4	23.10
Ethiopia	3	28.25
Gabon	7	62.58
The Gambia	5	-25.88
Ghana	12	148.31
Guinea	8	10.92
Guinea-Bissau	10	64.57
Jordan	5	-29.72
Kenya	15	120.50
Madagascar	9	87.87
Malawi	4	142.92
Mali	7	29.06
Mauritania	9	10.55
Mauritius	8	-15.91
Morocco	10	-28.19
Mozambique	7	30.92
Niger	9	63.92
Nigeria	11	669.66
Rwanda	4	106.65
Sao Tome and Principe	8	287.91
Senegal	14	56.66
Sierra Leone	3	-9.77
Somalia	6	37.75
Sudan	7	-25.54
Tanzania	14	361.07
Togo	12	14.43
Tunisia	8	-22.69
Uganda	13	33.19
Zambia	11	61.19
Zimbabwe	11	121.14

Asia	Years under SAP	Percent increase in Debt/GNP
Bangladesh	15	75.76
China	3	15.94
India	3	-16.32
Indonesia	5	-9.32
Lao PDR	5	-33.23
Nepal	6	57.68
Pakistan	4	30.61
Papua New Guinea	5	-35.86
Philippines	14	7.57
Sri Lanka	5	-12.38
Thailand	3	6.72

Latin America and Caribbean	Years under SAP	Percent increase in Debt/GNP
Argentina	9	-11.85
Bolivia	15	51.43
Brazil	9	-8.99
Chile	3	-19.99
Colombia	10	-33.56
Costa Rica	12	-56.61
Dominica	4	-19.22
Ecuador	9	13.80
El Salvador	4	-20.69
Guatemala	3	-13.86
Guyana	13	147.32
Honduras	6	38.97
Jamaica	14	75.13
Mexico	11	30.83
Nicaragua ¹	13	726.07
Panama	11	8.87
Peru	3	8.42
Trinidad and Tobago	3	-5.10
Uruguay	9	-55.72
Venezuela	5	-3.71

¹ Nicaragua was excluded from the analysis because of the unorthodox nature of its debt and because adjustment was implemented sporadically during the period (and at times without support from the international financial institutions), making it difficult to identify beginning and end years for the program.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE IMF'S LENDING POLICIES

(By Friends of the Earth)

Environmentalists around the world have long been concerned about the impact of International Monetary Fund (IMF) structural adjustment policies on the global environment. While economic instability is a threat to the environment, the IMF's approach to economic reform generally induces a blatant disregard for environmental impacts, even when the economic goals go hand in hand with environmental goals.

The result: too many economic policies that promote environmental degradation and too few policies that could promote positive environmental gains.

PRESSURE TO EXPORT

Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) treat natural resources as commodities, exported as cheap products to over-consuming markets in the Northern rich countries. Exports of natural resources have increased at astonishing rates in many IMF adjusting countries, with no consideration of the sustainability of this approach. For example, Benin, under SAPs since 1993, had sawnwood exports increase four fold between 1992 and 1998. (1)

Furthermore, it is often raw resource exports, whose prices are notoriously volatile, that are being promoted, rather than finished products, which would capture more value-added, employ more people in different enterprises, help diversify the economy, and disseminate more know-how.

BUDGET CUTS AND WEAKENED LAWS

Structural adjustment's goal of balancing the government budget can also hurt the environment. In the effort to shrink budget deficits, cuts in government programs weaken the ability to enforce environmental laws and diminish efforts to promote conservation. Budget cuts in Brazil, Russia, Indonesia and Nicaragua have greatly reduced these governments' ability to protect the environment. Governments may also relax environmental regulation to meet SAP objectives for increased foreign investment.

WORLD BANK IS NO EXAMPLE

The IMF explains that it relies on the World Bank to assess the environmental implications of its adjustment lending. Yet the World Bank has proven to be no help. A recent review found that fewer than 20% of World Bank adjustment loans included any environmental assessment. (2)

Another consequence of the IMF's narrow approach to economic reform is that economic policies that could help promote environmental sustainability are being ignored. Tax promote environmental sustainability are being ignored. Tax policy, for example, could emphasize green taxes in order to generate revenue and discourage excessive resource use. In the IMF's effort to build countries' accounting systems and statistics capabilities, full cost accounting could be pursued to help both countries and international financial institutions realize the value of natural resources and would therefore encourage countries to use them prudently. Immediate steps must be taken to make sure that environmental protection is considered as a core component of economic policy reform.

FORESTRY

Many countries under the IMF's Structural Adjustment Programs are rich in forest resources. SAP's economic incentives for increasing exports of forest products can lead to more foreign exchange earnings, but when

uncontrolled can result in unsustainable forestry management and high deforestation rates.

In Cameroon, IMF-recommended export tax cuts, accompanied by the January 1995 devaluation of the currency, provided great economic incentives to export timber. As a result, the number of logging enterprises increased from 194 in 1994 to 351 in 1995 (3) and lumber exports grew by 49.6% between 1995/96 and 1996/97 (4), threatening the country's rainforests and natural habitat (see inset). In a recent report the IMF finally acknowledged the precarious nature of Cameroon's export strategy and encouraged a strengthening of the government's institutional capacity to promote the rational use of forest resources.

Between 1990 and 1995, forest loss for the 41 Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) greatly exceeded the rate of forest loss for the world. For example, the two Central American HIPC countries, Nicaragua and Honduras, lost almost 12% of their forest, which is 7.5 times greater than the world rate. Approximately 75% of these HIPC countries had an IMF SAP at some point during this time period. (5)

FOREST LOSS, 1990-1995

[In percent]

Region	HIPCs	Non-HIPCs	World
Tropical Africa	3.65	2.60	1.6
Tropical Asia	8.33	4.60	1.6
Central America	11.6	5.12	1.6
America	4.2	2.60	1.6

FAO, 1997

MINING

Like forestry, mineral resources are seen as a quick source of export earnings and a locus for foreign investment. Mining is one of the most environmentally destructive activities, contaminating ground water through acid mine drainage, threatening fish, animal and bird life, and destroying wildlife habitats. SAP policies have promoted the exploitation of mineral resources, and done so without regard to disruption to local communities and indigenous peoples and requirements for land rehabilitation. (6)

Under SAP guidance since the mid 1980s, Guyana implemented policies to increase large-scale, foreign-owned mining ventures. This has led to river pollution, the decline of fish populations, and deforestation (see inset). There are now 32 foreign mining companies active in Guyana and large scale mining permits now cover an estimated 10% of the country. (7) The IMF is encouraging Guyana's government to transform mining and petroleum into one of the country's critical economic sectors by the year 2000. (8)

Under IMF guidance, Cote d'Ivoire has targeted mineral resources for export intensification and is stepping up exploration efforts. The results are new surface mining projects, three new gold mining companies since 1994, and 80 permits issued for mineral exploration to 27 international mining companies in 1995. (9)

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture is another sector SAPs target for export growth. In order to increase yields, farmers must either increase land intensity through fertilizer and pesticide use, or clear new land for more crops. Large-scale agriculture often involves monocropping, resulting in erosion, loss of soil fertility and increased industrial inputs.

SAPs led Cote d'Ivoire to devalue its currency and eliminate export taxes creating incentives for increased agricultural output.

From 1992 to 1996 cocoa production dramatically increased by 44%. The environmental implications included soil degradation, deforestation and loss of biodiversity. (11)

SAP programs in Tanzania resulted in rising input costs for the agricultural sector. Consequently, the need for production increases has led to land clearing at the rate of 400,000 ha per year. Between 1980 and 1993, one quarter of the country's forest area was lost, 1993, one quarter of the country's forest area was lost, forty percent for cultivation. (12)

WEAKENED ENVIRONMENTAL SAFEGUARDS—BUDGET CUTS REPRESENT A TYPICAL RESPONSE TO IMF POLICY MANDATES

In Brazil, government spending on environmental programs was cut by two-thirds in order to meet the fiscal targets set by the IMF. (13)

In Russia the budget for protected areas was cut by 40%. (14)

In Indonesia, budget cuts have forced officials in Jakarta, one of the world's most polluted cities, to suspend environmental programs. (15)

In Nicaragua, the budget of the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources was cut by 36% in order to adhere to IMF budget targets.

CHANGES IN LAWS AND POLICIES

Many countries have changed their laws and regulations to attract foreign investment. In the mining sector, for example, many countries under IMF policy reforms have relaxed regulations for investment and exploration. Some countries still try to assess the environmental impacts of mining, but it is yet to be seen whether concerns for environment will be overshadowed by economics in these cash strapped economies.

Guyana changed its mining policies, giving large mining companies the majority stake in large operations. (16)

Benin and Guinea both revised their mining codes to promote mining and increase exploration.

The Central African Republic established new mining codes citing that mineral resources were "insufficiently exploited."

Mali established a new mining code in 1999 to encourage development, also including plans to consider environmental impact.

Mauritania established a new mining code to increase development and will also formulate policies to assess the environmental impact.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The IMF needs to take immediate steps to reverse the negative ecological impact of structural adjustment. Natural resources are finite, and need to be recognized for their full ecological, social, and economic values. The current model of economic development that is being pursued by the IMF and World Bank is fundamentally unsustainable as it seeks growth at all costs, without regard to ecological limits.

The IMF and WB should take the following steps to integrate environmental concerns into economic development, including:

Conduct environmental and social assessments of SAPs,

Encourage the protection of environmental programs by publishing environmental spending figures,

Refrain from cutting environmental spending or weakening conservation laws,

Publish changes in environmental laws that are the result of structural adjustment discussions,

Include environmental ministers in negotiations on IMF programs,

Pursue environmental accounting as part of IMF technical assistance and data gathering, and

Implement green taxes that could generate revenue and discourage excessive resource use.

SOURCES

1. Food and Agriculture Organization. Statistical Database. www.fao.org.

2. Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development. 1999. Social and Environmental Aspects. A Desk Review of SECALs and SALs Approved During FY98 and FY99. Washington, DC: World Bank.

3. Verolme, Hans J.H., Moussa, Juliette. 1999. Addressing the Underlying Causes of Deforestation and Forest Degradation—Case Studies, Analysis and Policy Recommendations. Washington, DC: Biodiversity Action Network.

4. International Monetary Fund. 1998. "Cameron Statistical Appendix." IMF Staff Country Report No. 98/17. Washington, DC: IMF.

5. Food and Agriculture Organization. 1997. State of the World's Forests.

6. "Mining's Environmental Impacts." <http://www.mineralpolicy.org/Environment.html>

7. Project Underground. 1997. "Investing in Guyana Does Not Bring Riches for All." Drillbits and Tailings. (November 1997).

8. International Monetary Fund. 1998. "Cote d'Ivoire: Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility Policy Framework Paper 1998–2000." Washington, DC: IMF. (February 9, 1998: Section 37).

9. Melvis, Dzisah. 1998. "Mining, Energy Sectors Attract Investors." Panafrican News Agency. (September 1, 1998).

10. Jodah, Desiree Kisson. 1996. "Courting Disaster in Guyana." The Multinational Monitor. 16:11 (November 1995).

11. International Monetary Fund. 1998. "Cote d'Ivoire: Selected Issues and Statistical Appendix." IMF Staff Country Report: No. 98/46. Washington, DC: IMF. (May 1998).

12. Hammond, Ross. 1999. "The Impact of IMF Structural Adjustment Policies on Tanzanian Agriculture." The All Too Visible Hand. Washington, DC: The Development Gap, Friends of the Earth.

13. Schemo, Diana Jean. 1991. "Brazil Slashes Money for Project Aimed at Protecting Amazon." New York Times (January 1, 1999).

14. Personal communications with Russian and Pacific Rim NGO's.

15. Emilia, Stevie. 1998. "Crisis Forces Jakarta to Sacrifice its Environmental Programs." Jakarta Post. (July 2, 1998).

16. Colchester, Mark. Social Exclusion and Development Domination: The Underlying Causes of Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Guyana. World Rainforest Movement Campaigns and News. www.wrm.org.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VITTER

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VITTER:

In the item relating to "INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE—PROCESSING, ASSISTANCE, AND MANAGEMENT", insert after the first dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

In the item relating to "FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS—HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS PROGRAM", insert after the first dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It increases funding for high intensity drug trafficking areas, known as HIDTAs, by \$25 million and reduces the IRS administration account by a like amount, \$25 million. So it clearly is budget neutral.

Mr. Chairman, the Antidrug Abuse Act of 1988 authorized the director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy to designate areas within the U.S. which exhibit serious drug trafficking problems as high intensity drug trafficking areas, HIDTAs. That designation does a few different things. Mainly, it provides additional Federal funds to facilitate cooperation between Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials to really go after in a very geared-up, coordinated way production, manufacture, transportation, distribution, and chronic use of illegal drugs.

Since 1990, 31 areas in 40 States have been designated HIDTAs, and I really want to underscore this point for Members because the great majority of Members are directly impacted by this very successful HIDTA effort. Most Members are directly impacted by a HIDTA in their area.

As I said, HIDTAs have been very successful, enormously successful, because they coordinate Federal, local, State law enforcement. They are an amazingly important clearinghouse. Let me give an example from my area, the Gulf Coast HIDTA. It is located in my district, and in many other districts along the Gulf Coast, last year targeted 65 drug trafficking and money laundering organizations and successfully dismantled, really dismantled, 47. Some of these include long-standing organizations which have long been the targets of local law enforcement.

What does that mean? It means a lot for my city, my State. New Orleans reports an average decrease in crime of about 15 percent. Five of our other six major cities show a decrease in the total crime index of 1 to 14 percent. Murder rates in five other cities have declined 5 to 24 percent. National averages are 4 to 9 percent respectively.

Now, the Gulf Coast HIDTA is not the only reason. We have been doing other things locally, but it is one important reason, because of the coordination, it provides for Federal, State, and local law enforcement.

HIDTAs around the country continue to face new challenges, and we need to fund them properly and to keep up with the challenge. That is why I am afraid this budget is really inadequate. The President did not provide additional money over last year for HIDTAs, nor did this bill. I know the chairman and the ranking member

want to continue to work on HIDTAs in the conference process, but I really think we really need to vote a bill out of the House that provides additional funding. So that is what my amendment would do, \$25 million.

The offset is the IRS administrative account. If we look at the IRS budget overall, the increase in this budget this year for the IRS is \$231 million. So still after my amendment there would be a very significant increase in the IRS account, and we are talking about a total account of \$7 billion. So certainly this is not going to do any damage to that account.

When we look at IRS activity and their track record lately, certainly we are trying to make improvements with positive reform efforts; but certainly in the last full GAO report, which is 1999, there were some very glaring problems in the IRS. In one case it took 18 months for the IRS to correct an input error, and that resulted in a wrong assessment of \$160,000 against a taxpayer who was really due a refund; 4,800 employees hired to process taxes before the proper fingerprinting and other checks were made; on and on and on, some clear problems, abuses in the IRS.

There are really two frames of mind about how to deal with that. Some people look at these gross problems and errors and want to throw more money at it. Personally, I look at these dramatic problems and say we need to show the IRS we mean business and penalize bad behavior, not reward it. But certainly in any case, even after my amendment, the IRS administrative account would get a very significant increase of \$200 million, a total budget of \$7 billion. Certainly, I think in that context this shifting of \$25 million from the IRS administration account to the HIDTAs, which is not getting any increase this year, which is very much on the front line of the war on drugs, is fully justified.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) has made a very good case for the HIDTAs, a case which I concur with entirely. I happen to be a strong supporter of HIDTAs. In fact, one of the first original HIDTAs, that is High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, was designated in Arizona. I work very closely with the law enforcement officials who manage that HIDTA in Arizona. I know the value that this HIDTA provides along the southwest border in helping us to interdict drugs in that area.

There is a need for increased funding, in my view, for the HIDTAs. The problem that I have at this moment, and the reason we do not have additional amounts, is that we have asked the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the drug czar, who has the responsibility for these funds for managing this

and making the grants to the HIDTAs, to come up with some criteria for us by which we can judge HIDTAs, the need for them, new ones being created, the ones that exist, whether they need additional funding or whether the problem has shifted and there may be some HIDTAs that actually require a reduction in funding. We do not have that criteria. We do not have a set of criteria that we can use to consider in a rational way how much additional funding is needed.

The gentleman suggested \$25 million. As he describes the problem, and it is enormous, \$25 million may not be adequate. What is adequate?

The other side of this amendment, of course, is taking the money out of the Internal Revenue Service. Now, the gentleman said it is huge, it is big, it is a big account; and it is. The dollar amount that he is taking out of here is also substantial. The responsibilities of the IRS that we have given them under the Reorganization Act that this Congress passed by an overwhelming majority a few years ago, the responsibilities we have given them to transform themselves and become more customer friendly, to focus more on filers and customer relations, those responsibilities are tremendous; and they have a reorganization requirement.

They have two things. One, they need money for reorganization, and they need money for their technology modernization. This comes particularly out of the account for management processing, assistance, and management. This is where we have told them to become more customer friendly. We have already made a significant reduction in the last several years in the size of the IRS. I think it is justified, and I think the IRS needs to streamline its activities. We need to streamline the Tax Code to make it easier to file, but this would be a reduction of approximately 500 additional employees. That would mean people would wait longer for customer assistance. It would mean they would wait longer to get their refunds, to get questions answered about their filings of their tax returns.

Is it legitimate that we should say it is more important to fight drugs than to do this? I do not have a simple answer to that. This bill attempts to address all of the requirements that we have within it in a way that meets the priorities in the best possible fashion. I said at the outset that we lacked funds to do everything that we would like in this legislation, but I think particularly at this time it would be inappropriate to take the money from this account, where Congress has acted, where Congress has said make this reorganization, where Congress has said meet these specific missions, IRS, to take the money from this account and put it into the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, as valuable as they are, without knowing exactly how that

money should be allocated, what criteria we are going to use for the drug czar to reallocate that money.

So I think it would be inappropriate for us to do that, and for that reason I must oppose the gentleman's amendment, as valuable though I think the idea of increasing HIDTA funding would be.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly respect the perspective and thoughts of the gentleman about the IRS. I just want to clarify. Even under the amendment, we would increase the IRS budget over last year over \$200 million, and I presume we are not going to give them 200 million more dollars and be laying off people.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time, yes, actually we are. We are making a reduction because of the need for meeting current services, that is, the pay increases that all Federal employees will get and so forth. There actually is a reduction under our legislation, the number of people.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we had a very lively debate in the committee on this subject on HIDTA, and I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) for his amendment. I think there is a problem here. I think we have the same problem out in the State of Washington. We have a crisis in my district with these meth labs, and this is a phenomena that I know that the chairman is well aware of in California where there is the same problem. It is a phenomena that is moving kind of from the West Coast to the East Coast.

I am deeply concerned about it. In fact, the governor of the State of Washington, myself, and the prosecuting attorney of Pierce County, Washington, held a conference in our State and brought together all the law enforcement people, including the HIDTA people, and I personally talked to General McCaffrey about this because I am deeply concerned. These meth labs are a tremendous problem. Not only is this a devastating drug that has a terrible impact on the individuals but it also creates tremendous environmental problems, and the cleanup of these meth labs is a tremendous problem for the local communities.

I believe that the budget this year for HIDTA at \$192 million or thereabouts is inadequate. Now I understand that the chairman and the ranking member have a problem with the allocation here, and they probably would like to do more in this area, because I think we in the Congress think that HIDTA is a pretty decent program; and yet we are caught with this problem of the allocation. I would just urge the chairman and the ranking member, based on

the debate we had in the committee, to please take a look at this as we go to conference, as we go through this process. If we get some additional money for this particular bill, I would certainly hope that HIDTA would be one of the areas that we would look at.

I can certainly say that this has been a very successful program in Washington State, in the Northwest, and it is a program that needs some additional funding. I realize the administration did not request additional funding for it; but in my view, based on what I have seen out there with this crisis with these meth labs, and it is going all over the Northwest, we have to do more to deal with this problem. Again, I understand the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) here, and I realize that taking the money out of the IRS is a difficult problem; but somehow in the process, before it is over, we have to do something to increase funding for HIDTA.

□ 1600

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana. I want to congratulate him for his work in this and recognize an extraordinary problem that methamphetamine presents, not just to Louisiana and Arkansas, but really to the entire country and is expanding in the depth of its problems.

In response to the gentleman from Arizona, and I appreciate his work on the committee, because he raises a couple of questions. The first thing that he raised is that there is not sufficient criteria for the development of a HIDTA, and who would be allocated a HIDTA. The gentleman from Washington indicated that the HIDTA is working very well in the State of Washington. My State, Arkansas, does not have a HIDTA program. We have applied for a HIDTA the right way, in my judgment, which is through the channels of General McCaffrey and the Drug Czar's office. I have met with him; we have met the criteria.

Mr. Chairman, we have an extraordinary meth lab explosion in Arkansas; and we would like to be designated a HIDTA. They are reviewing that at the present time, because they have criteria. They have criteria that we have to meet. The difficulty is that whenever this goes to conference, we are going to have some people from various States saying, we want to legislatively write in the fact that this State, blank State, will be designated a HIDTA. So Congress will override the criteria that the Drug Czar has imposed. I would do that if I was in that meeting, probably, for Arkansas. I would like to have that prerogative. But we are trying to apply based upon that prerogative and that criteria that has been set.

So this amendment is very important. Because if we get granted this HIDTA designation, the next thing they are going to say is, well, you have been designated, but there are not funds in order to assist Arkansas. So this amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana will assure that there is at least a larger pool of money, a very modest, greater pool of money that the States can use in their existing HIDTA programs as well as a new one like Arkansas that might be so designated.

Just to give my colleagues an idea of the scope of the problem which many are already aware of, I serve on the Subcommittee on Crime. We have had hearings across this country: in California, we are going to have one in Kansas, we have had one in Arkansas. In Arkansas, we have an explosion of meth labs. But despite our explosion of meth labs, our law enforcement people say that 50 percent of our meth in Arkansas comes from California. So I am delighted that we give more money to California, to Washington and places that have this enormous overabundance of meth that is coming into States like Arkansas.

Secondly is the enormous danger of this. We have had two law enforcement officials in my district shot when they were executing a search warrant on a meth lab. What is the reason for that? An addict testified as to the danger of meth and he said that using heroin, using heroin is like smoking a cigarette compared to the dangers and the effects of methamphetamines. An extraordinary statement, because it increases one's paranoia, it heightens one's senses, one's violence propensity, and that is why it is such an enormous danger to our young people and to our law enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, this is money that is well invested. It is a very modest amount of money. I do agree with the gentleman that the IRS is doing an extraordinary job and they are working hard at their reorganization. But this is a small amount of money to a huge budget to the IRS versus a small amount of money that can make a significant difference to the HIDTA program.

So I ask my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana. Again, I thank him for his work on this issue.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have worked on HIDTA since we created the HIDTAs back in the 1980s. I am a very enthusiastic supporter of HIDTAs. For those of my colleagues who may not be specifically knowledgeable of HIDTA, HIDTA is a High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area. We adopted the premise of HIDTAs in the drug reform bill in which we adopted the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the director, who is affectionately referred to

as the Drug Czar. We did so in an effort to ensure that we had coordination not only among Federal agencies in fighting the drug problem and securing our communities from the scourge of drugs, but we did so for the purposes of ensuring that we had coordination of our assets that are deployed by the Federal, State and local governments. In fact, in my opinion, the biggest benefit in HIDTA is not the money, although the money is important, and it funds the intelligence effort that all levels can access so in that respect, it is critically important. But its greatest contribution, in my opinion, is the coordination between Federal, State and local law enforcement that it has brought.

Mr. Chairman, it needs more money. Very frankly, I could support a sum greater than the gentleman from Louisiana offers in his amendment for adding to HIDTA.

The fact of the matter is, however, we deal in a world of alternatives. Once one votes for a budget that, in my opinion, underfunds our ability to respond to the needs of our country, one is constricted in terms of what one can spend. Now, the fact of the matter is, in this bill, the chairman has funded the law enforcement component of this bill almost exactly at the President's request. He has done so with the recognition that we need to support law enforcement efforts to make sure our communities are safe.

Now, I have not looked at the HIDTA problems in Louisiana, and I have been to Washington State with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and with Mr. BRIAN BAIRD. I have talked with his law enforcement officials, have talked to them about the success of their existing HIDTA and the need to expand HIDTAs along the Route 5 corridor, U.S. Route 5 from Canada down to San Diego, which is obviously a major population area, and a major area of meth labs and other illegal drug activity.

So the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. DICKS) is absolutely correct, Mr. BAIRD is correct, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) is correct. We need more resources.

Now, having said that, it is not enough to say we need more resources. We need to say, where do we get those resources? I think we have sufficient resources, but if we combine the tax cuts and therefore adopt a budget substantially under the President's request, we have to squeeze somewhere. So where did the chairman squeeze? He squeezed, because he was required to, very hard on IRS.

Now, it is very easy to say, well, we will cut IRS. Who here thinks IRS is a popular agency? Well, nobody raised their hand, got up and screamed and who will, so I presume the answer is really nobody. The fact of the matter is, though, we will not fund one HIDTA

without the IRS. We will not fund one member of the Armed Forces without IRS. We will not fund an FBI agent without the IRS. That is to say, it is the agency that we have charged with the responsibility of collecting sums from all of us to fund services that we authorize and appropriate for.

The gentleman is correct, as the chairman has pointed out. The IRS has a large sum of money, because it is a large agency. I will tell my friend, though, from Louisiana, he has come relatively recently to the Congress, that the IRS is 17,000 people less than it was 6 years ago. At the same time, we have enacted the Reform and Restructuring Act which said that the IRS needed to do more services and be more friendly to our customers. That was the right thing for us to do. We want the telephone answered more quickly, we want taxpayers' questions answered accurately; and when they have problems, we want them served appropriately. All of us support those objectives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, in order to accomplish that objective, we have to have personnel to accomplish that. The IRS budget is 70 percent personnel. So that while a \$25 million cut in a \$8.3 billion budget seems like a small amount, relatively speaking, it is a significant amount when we understand that we have already cut \$466 million from the request. A request that Mr. Rossotti who, by the way, is a Republican, so this is not a partisan issue, is a manager hired to manage, says this will undercut his ability to carry out the Reform and Restructuring Act.

So I suggest to my friend from Louisiana that the solution here is, because we all agree that HIDTAs need more money, is not to take dollars out of the IRS and underfund it further and make it unable to perform the functions we expect of it, but to add additional sums so that we can reach the levels that the gentleman suggested, and indeed exceed those, so that we can take care of the needs of Louisiana, and take care of the needs of Washington State. Therefore, I would hope that we would not support the gentleman's amendment and reject it, but not reject the idea.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 560, further proceedings on

the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) will be postponed.

Are there further amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLINK

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLINK:

Page 4, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$950,000)".

Page 12, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$950,000)".

Mr. KLINK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would take \$950,000 from the Treasury Inspector General's account for tax administration and would move that sum over to the Customs Service to provide the Customs Service with funding to monitor the radioactivity in scrap metal that is being imported into the United States. This is a problem that has just recently come to our attention during field hearings with the steel industry in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and we would like to take some action on that.

Currently, the United States has no standard to control the free release of radioactive contaminated scrap metal. Those metals are being recycled into consumer and industrial products and then are being sold on open commerce. Nor is there an international standard that tells us if there is a safe level of radioactivity in these metals that are recycled.

There is tremendous public opposition to any radioactive metal being included in consumer products like the silverware that we eat with or the pots and pans that we cook with or the cans that our food may come in or baby carriage handles or braces on one's teeth, or belt buckles. The steel industry does not want any radioactive scrap metal in its blast furnaces because it could contaminate the entire steel mill and the cleanup could cost \$15 million to \$20 million if that occurs. We are asking for a relatively modest sum to be able to monitor this amount of money.

As we decommission more and more of our nuclear weapons facilities around the world and our nuclear power plants around the world, there are literally hundreds of millions of tons of contaminated scrap metal that will have to be dealt with. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is in the process of seeing if a standard can be established.

While this is underway, the Department of Energy has put a moratorium on the release of any contaminated metal. DOE is studying whether it is

economical to have a dedicated steel facility that produces goods for the complex that will use this metal. I fully support those steps.

However, in the meantime, there have been at least 50 incidents of undetected contaminated metals coming into this country from overseas. Currently, Customs agents at truck ports wear radiation detectors around their belts like a pager. These detectors are only sophisticated enough to detect the really hot items of 10 millirems or higher. The funds we are asking for today would allow for the purchase of portal monitors that trucks can drive through which can detect radiation levels as low as 1 millirem.

Mr. Chairman, this program will not stop shipments of scrap metal from going to the recipients. It will, however, identify those shipments that are contaminated and will also provide the information necessary to determine whether importation of radioactive metals is a problem that deserves further attention.

After one year, I will ask the Customs Service to provide a report to the Congress on the results of this radioactive test monitoring.

Mr. Chairman, the American public, the American steel industry, and those who work in that steel industry deserve the same protections, regardless of the source of the metal that is going into these products. This amendment would provide the funds to make that happen, and I ask the chairman and the ranking member for their support of this amendment. It is a nonpartisan amendment, and it is one that is intended to protect the public and the workers in the steel industry.

□ 1615

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes. I have mixed views about this. I understand what the gentleman is trying to do. I would just point out that this comes out of the Inspector General's account. This is the account that we regard as the one we expect to do the oversight for the IRS and all the other functions in Treasury.

Now, in an account that has over \$100 million, maybe losing \$1 million of that is not that significant. But we do not really know exactly what the impact of this will be in terms of their oversight functions.

I am also a little unclear as to exactly, and I know the gentleman has talked about it being a demonstration project, but I am a little unclear as to exactly how this would work, what the \$950,000 is going to be used for.

There have not been any hearings, as I understand it, in front of the Committee on Commerce. There has been no work done by the authorizing committee on this. I think this needs more information and more discussion before we would proceed with it.

For that reason, I would just say that I think this amendment may be an inappropriate amendment at this point.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concerns. To address them, we have been working in the Committee on Commerce, and while we have not had hearings, we have been working on this in a bipartisan fashion trying to address this issue.

We have a piece of legislation separate from this that is a bipartisan piece of legislation, the bipartisan Steel Caucus is in support of it, called the Scrap Act. We are trying to move that forward at this time.

The figure we came up with is not one that was pulled out of the air, it is one that they tell us, for the two main ports that we have to address where we are most concerned, and these concerns are throughout the government, we are most concerned that this scrap would be coming in from Mexico and South America and the Far East. We can take care of those two main ports.

The reason we chose this account, and I understand, I do not like to cut the Inspector General either, but this account was plussed up by \$7 million. We do not think that taking \$950,000 from that account would be a problem. It is \$7 million higher in 2001 than in 2000. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just note that in full committee, the gentleman may not be aware of this, but this account already was reduced by \$2 million over the amount that was planned for. This is another \$1 million out of that.

In terms of meeting current services and paying the pay increases for the people that are already there doing the jobs of oversight, it will have an effect on that, there is no question about it. But I just raise these questions.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment raises an important issue which I come to the floor today to discuss. That is the overall issue of metals recycling in this country.

I certainly support the gentleman on steel issues and these import questions, and think the intent of his amendment is worthwhile. But I want to come today and express some frustration.

Being a representative of one of the major components of the Manhattan Project in this country, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, where we won the Cold War and broke the back of communism with a nuclear buildup, we now have this challenge, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania well stated, of what to do with this nuclear legacy and how to turn this environmental liability

around, and what to do with these assets.

We have to reindustrialize these assets at some point, in some way. My frustration is that the Department of Energy announced a sweeping plan to tear down these buildings and melt the metals, and where science and the best intelligence that we can find shows that the levels of radiation are below any reasonable standard, then we could put that recycled metal back into the marketplace.

That is where I thought we were when they began this reindustrialization effort and announced what they called a win-win-win situation for the American taxpayer. We could actually recycle the metal and help pay for the clean-up, because these buildings, these huge assets, cannot just sit there in a mothballed state. The maintenance cost is too high. We need to turn them around and put the land and buildings back into some kind of productive use.

We have buildings in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, that are acres and acres and acres under one roof from the Manhattan Project that need to be turned over. We cannot just maintain them at this high cost. So there is a shared national interest in trying to clean up this environmental legacy.

I just want to make sure that science and common sense drives this train, and that hysteria or some special interest groups do not end up winning the day on these issues.

I want to say I am frustrated. I am frustrated because the Department of Energy on July 7 officially retreated from their own program, the one that Secretary Richardson rolled out as a win-win-win, and now they have retreated. They have said no recycling pending the study that may not take place for 2 years.

I am all for the study, but all the studies that I have seen show that we get more radiation from salt substitute than we get from any of these things. Radiation is natural in our environment. Radiation we get from flying on airplanes. We get radiation from a variety of things.

Radiation is not the issue, the level of radiation is the issue. If it is very, very, very low level radiation that is not anywhere near what we would get going to the dentist, it is ridiculous to halt it.

What has happened in East Tennessee by halting it is people are now sent home with no pay pending all these studies, pending the outcomes in a program that DOE initiated.

I would ask the administration to get its act together, to be consistent, at least to follow through on what they say, and do not just send workers, good and decent people in my region now, hundreds of them that are going to be sent home or they have been sent home indefinitely to just wait, and wait on what, I do not know.

I called the Secretary today and he said he would meet me about it next week. I am asking for some answers. I am asking for consistency. I am asking for some solutions for the folks of East Tennessee and the Oak Ridge reservation that have been called on to turn these buildings around, because they are now left hanging because this administration cannot figure out exactly what it wants.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, I would look forward to working with my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, because he brings to light a very real situation that we are faced with today. We are all in favor of getting these buildings cleaned up. The question is, the Federal government has not set a level, and we think a level should be set for those things that are volumetrically contaminated.

We would work with the gentleman. I know he is very serious on this. We have worked together on other issues before. This amendment does not get to the gentleman's point. This is about those things that are imported from China, from Russia, from South America, that we do not know, and as the gentleman knows, 60 percent of steel that is produced today is recycled.

They could be doing things over there that we do not know about. We want to catch it at our ports. It has nothing to do with the domestic content.

Mr. WAMP. Reclaiming my time, I am in total agreement with that. I understand that. I am in support of that. I just use this opportunity to say, please, Administration, give us clear direction. Let our workers know, are we going to clean this up or not? If they do not want us to clean it up, what are we going to do with it, because we need a policy that says, let us clean up the Cold War legacy, let us put people to work and keep them to work until the job is done. Let us not pull the rug out from under them. They are left in limbo. Even over this very weekend that is in front of us, workers in East Tennessee do not know if they are supposed to go back to work or not.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I share the chairman's concern, as I expressed in the last amendment, about the offset. However, this is much less of an offset of a relatively modest number. I was trying to glean carefully what the chairman was saying. I am not going to oppose this amendment. I think the gentleman's amendment is a worthwhile objective.

Again, I am hopeful that we will get the requisite number of dollars so we can, in addition to the dollars the gentleman is seeking, which are relatively modest for this objective, we can add

back into the Inspector General so we do not underfund that, because the chairman is absolutely correct, we cannot further decrease this account.

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Klink amendment. The funds in this amendment will be used to purchase monitoring equipment by the Customs Service to ensure that contaminated metal products do not enter the United States.

Currently, Customs agents use radiation detectors to monitor possible contamination of products entering our country. However, the current equipment used by Customs agents is grossly inadequate. The current equipment employed cannot consistently detect radiation levels that are dangerous to human health. Consumers should not have to worry if their cars or their kitchen utensils are radioactive.

Mr. Chairman, this is a common-sense, nonpartisan amendment that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, has offered. This is an issue of public health and consumer safety. We can all agree that American consumers should be confident that the products they buy are safe.

By giving the Customs Service the tools to better do their jobs, we can be sure that products entering the country are safe and free from contamination.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the most powerful tool the Federal government has to make our communities more livable is not necessarily a rule, regulation, or a mandate placed upon the public, but simply to play by the same rules as the rest of America, to have Federal agencies like the United States Post Office obey the same rules and regulations that we require homeowners and businesses to follow.

There are over 40,000 post offices across America. They are both the symbols of how we connect to one another and of a very real part of each and every community. Time and time again we find that the post office on Main Street anchors the business opportunity. It is a source of pride for people in local communities. Often it is an historic structure.

Each of these post offices is an opportunity for the Federal government to promote livability by being a more constructive partner. While there are many legitimate efforts and real progress by the postal service in some

areas, I see too many examples where the post office has fallen short of the mark.

A good example is to be found in my own hometown of Portland, Oregon, where land use planning has been a hallmark for a generation. There is perhaps no American community that has worked harder to manage growth. Most recently, our community has finished a 20–40 growth plan to prepare for growth over the next 40 years. It involved over 17,000 citizens, businesses, and all the local governments for 5 years.

Yet, the postal service, with over 500 facilities in a fast-growing region, acknowledging that it is playing serious catch-up, made no attempt to coordinate its facilities with the planning of the rest of the community.

Knowing where growth would be concentrated in the years ahead would have enabled the postal service to make strategic facilities decisions in a way that would take advantage of change, rather than trying to continue to play catch-up. The Federal government cannot afford to pursue independent strategies on its own. Opportunities in this case were lost for coordinated planning to avoid mistakes and save money, time, and effort.

Too often the postal service uses its exemption from local land use laws to avoid making investments that would be prudent not just for the community but for its own customers. Again, in my own community, I had a post office under construction where the city received a communication from the postal service that they would not cooperate with us because they were immune from all local laws.

Despite the fact that any other business or the city itself would have been required to, for instance, put in pedestrian sidewalks, the postal service decided they would not even accede to this modest requirement. We got them to put in half the sidewalks only by threatening to block the entrance to their facility.

To assist the post office in partnering with communities, I have introduced the Community Partnership Act, which would require the postal service to obey local land use laws and planning laws and environmental regulations and to work with local citizens before they make decisions that could have a wrenching effect on communities.

It is ironic that our postal service gives the public more input into what version of the Elvis stamp we are going to print than on decisions that could be literally life or death for small town America.

I am pleased that our legislation, H.R. 670, has a Senate companion bill by Senators BAUCUS and JEFFORDS, and that they have attracted a broad coalition of supporters, including Governors, mayors, cities and counties, a host of preservation action groups, and

I believe is the only environmental priority of both the National Association of Homebuilders and the Sierra Club.

With its 240 bipartisan sponsors, this bill would easily pass if it were brought to the floor for a vote. I will continue to work with the bill's supporters on and off the Hill, and hope that we can achieve floor action.

But in the meantime, I would hope that the leadership of this Chamber and the conferees on the Postal-Treasury bill would at least include language that would encourage the postal service to, at a minimum, make public their capital plans for communities as a result of their 5-year capital investment plan.

□ 1630

In Blackshear, Georgia, last year, the public was notified that their post office might be moved in less than a month. The service management delivered the verdict that it would be closed, a new one would be built, and a new site was chosen on a highway away from town.

Now a great fight has ensued with the Rotary Club, the chamber of commerce, the American Legion, their local historical society, both the Republicans and the Democrats joining with over 1,000 postal patrons in opposing the move.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BLUMENAUER was allowed to proceed for 10 additional seconds.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, this type of pitched battle does not have to occur if the postal service would start working with our communities earlier. I would hope that this committee would bring its good offices together to encourage that common sense approach.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word simply to say to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who focuses on the quality of life in our communities more than any other Member of this House and who raises a very important issue. We have also discussed this in our committee. Obviously, there is discussion between ourselves and the authorizing committees. But I want to assure the gentleman that I intend to give this very great attention.

I look forward to working with the chairman on this issue to see if we can come up with language which will encourage, maybe will not go further than that, a better performance with respect to the post office cooperation with local communities to ensure the objectives the gentleman spoke of.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—POSTAL SERVICE

PAYMENT TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND

For payment to the Postal Service Fund for revenue forgone on free and reduced rate mail, pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of section 2401 of title 39, United States Code, \$96,093,000, of which \$67,093,000 shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 2001: *Provided*, That mail for overseas voting and mail for the blind shall continue to be free: *Provided further*, That 6-day delivery and rural delivery of mail shall continue at not less than the 1983 level: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Postal Service by this Act shall be used to implement any rule, regulation, or policy of charging any officer or employee of any State or local child support enforcement agency, or any individual participating in a State or local program of child support enforcement, a fee for information requested or provided concerning an address of a postal customer: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be used to consolidate or close small rural and other small post offices in fiscal year 2001.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE).

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the chairman and the ranking member for increasing funding that they have included in this bill for fire-arm-related issues, specifically: \$62.2 million to expand the Integrated Violence Reduction Strategy; 76.4 million to expand the Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative, which will expand to 12 more cities, a total of 50 now, which includes the rapid gun tracing analysis to allow State and local law enforcement and new ATF agents to work in a task force operation with local law enforcement for illegal arms investigation; \$26.4 million to support ATF's Ballistic Identification System; and \$25 million for a nationwide comprehensive gun tracing.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BILBRAY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) for underscoring the fact that this bill is about making our laws work for the safety of all citizens and especially for our children.

All the laws of the world that we might pass are not going to make a difference if we do not put an effort behind them to enforce them, and that is one of the things that I think every Member of this House believes in and can support, regardless of what side of the aisle we are on and wherever we might stand on the issue of gun use and gun ownership.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to also thank the gentleman from Arizona for showing the type of bipartisanship and the ability to set politics aside. I think the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), ranking

member, ought to be commended along with the gentleman from Arizona for working on the common goal of allocating additional funds to enforce existing laws in combatting gun violence.

As a supporter of moderate gun safety legislation measures in the past, and in fact the items that are being discussed by the Senate-House Conference Committee at this time, I think we all can agree that it is important that we allocate necessary funds to those agencies tasked with enforcing existing laws. It has been an important goal of mine and many of my colleagues that we focus on those laws that combat gun violence and provide additional funding to the Federal, local, and State agencies in charge of enforcement. The gentleman has seized this opportunity with this bill through this appropriation process to achieve this goal, and I commend the gentleman for it, and his committee and his ranking member.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman is aware, I wrote a letter to the gentleman from Arizona regarding this issue last year, and I will submit the letter for the RECORD.

But I just want to stop a second and say to the chairmen and ranking members, during these appropriation processes, many Members will stand up on the floor and talk about provisions that were not included in the legislation or in the appropriations bill.

I just thought it was important for me as just one Member of this body to stand up and include a "thank you" for having this funding and this focus there. I look forward to working with the committee at reducing gun violence by implementing common sense gun safety laws, but more importantly in focusing on enforcing those laws and making them actually work.

Mr. Chairman, the letter I referred to is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2000.

Hon. JIM KOLBE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, Committee on Appropriations, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KOLBE: I am requesting your support in the Fiscal Year 2001 Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations Act to increase funds for those programs designed to reduce youth gun violence, prosecute criminals who commit crimes using a firearm, and enforce existing gun laws.

While I support moderate gun safety measures being discussed in the Senate-House Conference Committee, such as requiring trigger locks on new guns and to close the loophole on background checks on individuals who purchase firearms at gun shows. I also believe it is essential that we focus on those existing laws that combat gun violence and provide additional funds to those federal, local and state agencies in charge of enforcing these laws.

I understand the difficult choices that need to be made in the current era of operating under a balanced budget, but it is my belief

that a top priority during the upcoming appropriation process should be to allocate additional funding for the Department's of Justice and Treasury. Specific funds that will enable law enforcement agents to continue implementing and administering those laws that will enable law enforcement agents to continue implementing and administering those laws that will keep firearms out of the hands of felons and potential criminals. Additionally, increasing funds to hire new prosecutors and to expand intensive firearm prosecutions will aid in keeping these law breaking criminals off the streets.

As the Senate-House Conference Committee debate the issues surrounding gun control, it is important that this Congress work concurrently by allocating funds to enforce existing laws. This is a bipartisan issue that can lead to real results and I would like to assist in any way to bring these goals forward.

Mr. Chairman, please feel free to contact me for any additional information. Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

Sincerely,

BRIAN P. BILBRAY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for purposes in engaging in a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will be happy to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for his committee's work in protecting many important priorities in this bill. I also want to express my gratitude for his generosity and patience regarding a matter of great importance to my district and the many districts that have point-of-entry border crossings into Canada.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona if he would agree to protect the language on rural border staffing and hours of operation as this legislation moves forward and if he will agree to work with me to ensure that the hours of operation at the Pittsburgh-New Hampshire border station and all such rural crossings reflect the security concerns and the concerns of many citizens who depend on open and accessible borders.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS. I certainly yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) for the issue that he has raised and the efforts that he has made to make my subcommittee and our staff aware of the problems that exist along his border.

I share his concerns, both about the security and about operational issues on the border, and I look forward to working with the gentleman as this bill moves forward through the conference.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for that commitment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the "Postal Service Appropriations Act, 2001".

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The text of title III is as follows:

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

For compensation of the President, including an expense allowance at the rate of \$50,000 per annum as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 102; \$390,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available for official expenses shall be expended for any other purpose and any unused amount shall revert to the Treasury pursuant to section 1552 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available for official expenses shall be considered as taxable to the President.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the White House as authorized by law, including not to exceed \$3,850,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 105; subsistence expenses as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 105, which shall be expended and accounted for as provided in that section; hire of passenger motor vehicles, newspapers, periodicals, teletype news service, and travel (not to exceed \$100,000 to be expended and accounted for as provided by 3 U.S.C. 103); not to exceed \$19,000 for official entertainment expenses, to be available for allocation within the Executive Office of the President, \$52,135,000: *Provided*, That \$9,072,000 of the funds appropriated shall be available for reimbursements to the White House Communications Agency.

EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE OPERATING EXPENSES

For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refurbishing, improvement, heating, and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Residence at the White House and official entertainment expenses of the President, \$10,286,470 to be expended and accounted for as provided by 3 U.S.C. 105, 109, 110, and 112-114.

REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES

For the reimbursable expenses of the Executive Residence at the White House, such sums as may be necessary: *Provided*, That all reimbursable operating expenses of the Executive Residence shall be made in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, such amount for reimbursable operating expenses shall be the exclusive authority of the Executive Residence to incur obligations and to receive offsetting collections, for such expenses: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall require each person sponsoring a reimbursable political event to pay in advance an amount equal to the estimated cost of the event, and all such advance payments shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That

the Executive Residence shall require the national committee of the political party of the President to maintain on deposit \$25,000, to be separately accounted for and available for expenses relating to reimbursable political events sponsored by such committee during such fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall ensure that a written notice of any amount owed for a reimbursable operating expense under this paragraph is submitted to the person owing such amount within 60 days after such expense is incurred, and that such amount is collected within 30 days after the submission of such notice: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall charge interest and assess penalties and other charges on any such amount that is not reimbursed within such 30 days, in accordance with the interest and penalty provisions applicable to an outstanding debt on a United States Government claim under section 3717 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That each such amount that is reimbursed, and any accompanying interest and charges, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall prepare and submit to the Committees on Appropriations, by not later than 90 days after the end of the fiscal year covered by this Act, a report setting forth the reimbursable operating expenses of the Executive Residence during the preceding fiscal year, including the total amount of such expenses, the amount of such total that consists of reimbursable official and ceremonial events, the amount of such total that consists of reimbursable political events, and the portion of each such amount that has been reimbursed as of the date of the report: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall maintain a system for the tracking of expenses related to reimbursable events within the Executive Residence that includes a standard for the classification of any such expense as political or nonpolitical: *Provided further*, That no provision of this paragraph may be construed to exempt the Executive Residence from any other applicable requirement of subchapter I or II of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code.

WHITE HOUSE REPAIR AND RESTORATION

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of the Executive Residence at the White House, \$658,000, to remain available until expended, for projects for required maintenance, safety and health issues, Presidential transition, telecommunications infrastructure repair, and continued preventive maintenance.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE OFFICIAL RESIDENCE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to enable the Vice President to provide assistance to the President in connection with specially assigned functions, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 106, including subsistence expenses as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 106, which shall be expended and accounted for as provided in that section; and hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$3,664,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES

For the care, operation, refurbishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the official residence of the Vice President, the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and not to exceed \$90,000 for official entertainment expenses of the Vice President, to be accounted for solely on his certificate; \$354,000: *Provided*, That

advances or repayments or transfers from this appropriation may be made to any department or agency for expenses of carrying out such activities.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Council of Economic Advisers in carrying out its functions under the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021), \$3,997,000.

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Policy Development, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 107, \$4,030,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Security Council, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$7,148,000.

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administration, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 107, and hire of passenger motor vehicles \$41,185,000, of which \$8,893,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2002, for a capital investment plan which provides for the continued modernization of the information technology infrastructure.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Management and Budget, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$67,143,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided*, That, as provided in 31 U.S.C. 1301(a), appropriations shall be applied only to the objects for which appropriations were made except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Office of Management and Budget may be used for the purpose of reviewing any agricultural marketing orders or any activities or regulations under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.): *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available for the Office of Management and Budget by this Act may be expended for the altering of the transcript of actual testimony of witnesses, except for testimony of officials of the Office of Management and Budget, before the Committees on Appropriations or the Committees on Veterans' Affairs or their subcommittees: *Provided further*, That the preceding shall not apply to printed hearings released by the Committees on Appropriations or the Committees on Veterans' Affairs.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of National Drug Control Policy; for research activities pursuant to the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (title VII of division C of Public Law 105-277); not to exceed \$8,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for participation in joint projects or in the provision of services on matters of mutual interest with nonprofit, research, or public organizations or agencies, with or without reimbursement, \$24,759,000, of which \$2,100,000 shall remain available until expended, consisting of \$1,100,000 for policy research and

evaluation, and \$1,000,000 for the National Alliance for Model State Drug Laws: *Provided*, That the Office is authorized to accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts, both real and personal, public and private, without fiscal year limitation, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Office.

COUNTERDRUG TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT CENTER

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center for research activities pursuant to the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (title VII of Division C of Public Law 105-277), \$29,750,000, which shall remain available until expended, consisting of \$16,000,000 for counternarcotics research and development projects, \$13,050,000 for continued operation of the technology transfer program, and \$700,000 for a grant to the United States Olympic Committee for its anti-doping program: *Provided*, That the \$16,000,000 for counternarcotics research and development projects shall be available for transfer to other Federal departments or agencies.

FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS

HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of National Drug Control Policy's High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, \$192,000,000 for drug control activities consistent with the approved strategy for each of the designated High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, of which no less than 51 percent shall be transferred to State and local entities for drug control activities, which shall be obligated within 120 days of the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That up to 49 percent, to remain available until September 30, 2002, may be transferred to Federal agencies and departments at a rate to be determined by the Director: *Provided further*, That, of this latter amount, \$1,800,000 shall be used for auditing services.

SPECIAL FORFEITURE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For activities to support a national anti-drug campaign for youth, and other purposes, authorized by Public Law 105-277, \$219,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds may be transferred to other Federal departments and agencies to carry out such activities: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, \$185,000,000 shall be to support a national media campaign, as authorized in the Drug-Free Media Campaign Act of 1998: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, \$30,000,000 shall be to continue a program of matching grants to drug-free communities, as authorized in the Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, \$1,000,000 shall be available to the Director for transfer as a grant to the National Drug Court Institute: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, \$3,000,000 shall be available for transfer to, or reimbursement of, other Federal departments and agencies to support the operations of the Counterdrug Intelligence Executive Secretariat.

This title may be cited as the "Executive Office Appropriations Act, 2001".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title III?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES
 COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO
 ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED
 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled established by the Act of June 23, 1971, Public Law 92-28, \$4,158,000.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title IV be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of title IV is as follows:

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, \$40,240,000, of which no less than \$4,689,500 shall be available for internal automated data processing systems, and of which not to exceed \$5,000 shall be available for reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY
 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978, and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, including hire of experts and consultants, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$25,058,000: *Provided*, That public members of the Federal Service Impasses Panel may be paid travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons employed intermittently in the Government service, and compensation as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, funds received from fees charged to non-Federal participants at labor-management relations conferences shall be credited to and merged with this account, to be available without further appropriation for the costs of carrying out these conferences.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
 REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES
 FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND
 LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE
 (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

To carry out the purpose of the Fund established pursuant to section 210(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)), the revenues and collections deposited into the Fund shall be available for necessary expenses of real property management and related activities not otherwise provided for, including operation, maintenance, and protection of federally owned and leased buildings; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving governmental agencies (including space adjustments and telecommunications relocation expenses) in connection with the assignment, allocation and transfer of space; contractual services incident to cleaning or servicing buildings, and moving; repair and alteration of federally owned buildings including grounds, approaches and appurtenances; care

and safeguarding of sites; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment; acquisition of buildings and sites by purchase, condemnation, or as otherwise authorized by law; acquisition of options to purchase buildings and sites; conversion and extension of federally owned buildings; preliminary planning and design of projects by contract or otherwise; construction of new buildings (including equipment for such buildings); and payment of principal, interest, and any other obligations for public buildings acquired by installment purchase and purchase contract; in the aggregate amount of \$5,272,370,000 of which (1) \$490,592,000 shall remain available until expended for repairs and alterations which includes associated design and construction services, of which \$290,000,000 shall be available for basic repairs and alterations: *Provided*, That funds made available in any previous Act in the Federal Buildings Fund for Repairs and Alterations shall, for prospectus projects, be limited to the amount identified for each project, except each project in any previous Act may be increased by an amount not to exceed 10 percent unless advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations of a greater amount: *Provided further*, That the amounts provided in this or any prior Act for "Repairs and Alterations" may be used to fund costs associated with implementing security improvements to buildings necessary to meet the minimum standards for security in accordance with current law and in compliance with the reprogramming guidelines of the appropriate Committees of the House and Senate: *Provided further*, That the difference between the funds appropriated and expended on any projects in this or any prior Act, under the heading "Repairs and Alterations", may be transferred to Basic Repairs and Alterations or used to fund authorized increases in prospectus projects: *Provided further*, That all funds for repairs and alterations prospectus projects shall expire on September 30, 2002, and remain in the Federal Buildings Fund except funds for projects as to which funds for design or other funds have been obligated in whole or in part prior to such date: *Provided further*, That the amount provided in this or any prior Act for Basic Repairs and Alterations may be used to pay claims against the Government arising from any projects under the heading "Repairs and Alterations" or used to fund authorized increases in prospectus projects; (2) \$185,369,000 for installment acquisition payments including payments on purchase contracts which shall remain available until expended; (3) \$2,944,905,000 for rental of space which shall remain available until expended; and (4) \$1,580,909,000 for building operations which shall remain available until expended, of which \$500,000 shall be available to conduct a site selection analysis for a replacement facility for the National Center for Environmental Prediction of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration: *Provided further*, That funds available to the General Services Administration shall not be available for expenses of any construction, repair, alteration and acquisition project for which a prospectus, if required by the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, has not been approved, except that necessary funds may be expended for each project for required expenses for the development of a proposed prospectus: *Provided further*, That funds available in the Federal Buildings Fund may be expended for emergency repairs when advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That amounts necessary to provide re-

imbursable special services to other agencies under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)) and amounts to provide such reimbursable fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control as may be appropriate to enable the United States Secret Service to perform its protective functions pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3056, shall be available from such revenues and collections: *Provided further*, That revenues and collections and any other sums accruing to this Fund during fiscal year 2001, excluding reimbursements under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)) in excess of \$5,272,370,000 shall remain in the Fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

GENERAL ACTIVITIES

POLICY AND OPERATIONS

For expenses authorized by law, not otherwise provided for, for Government-wide policy and oversight activities associated with asset management activities; utilization and donation of surplus personal property; transportation; procurement and supply; Government-wide responsibilities relating to automated data management, telecommunications, information resources management, and related technology activities; utilization survey, deed compliance inspection, appraisal, environmental and cultural analysis, and land use planning functions pertaining to excess and surplus real property; agency-wide policy direction; Board of Contract Appeals; accounting, records management, and other support services incident to adjudication of Indian Tribal Claims by the United States Court of Federal Claims; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and not to exceed \$5,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$115,434,000, of which \$14,659,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated from this Act shall be available to convert the Old Post Office at 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue in Northwest Washington, D.C., from office use to any other use until a comprehensive plan, which shall include street-level retail use, has been approved by the Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works: *Provided further*, That no funds from this Act shall be available to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise the leasehold rights of the existing lease with private parties at the Old Post Office prior to the approval of the comprehensive plan by the Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General and services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$34,520,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$15,000 shall be available for payment for information and detection of fraud against the Government, including payment for recovery of stolen Government property: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,500 shall be available for awards to employees of other Federal agencies and private citizens in recognition of efforts and initiatives resulting in enhanced Office of Inspector General effectiveness.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE STAFF FOR FORMER
PRESIDENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958, as amended (3 U.S.C. 102 note), and Public Law 95-138, \$2,517,000: *Provided*, That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of such Acts.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—GENERAL
PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the General Services Administration shall be credited with the cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair, and improvement, included as part of rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129).

SEC. 402. Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 403. Funds in the Federal Buildings Fund made available for fiscal year 2001 for Federal Buildings Fund activities may be transferred between such activities only to the extent necessary to meet program requirements: *Provided*, That any proposed transfers shall be approved in advance by the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 404. No funds made available by this Act shall be used to transmit a fiscal year 2002 request for United States Courthouse construction that (1) does not meet the design guide standards for construction as established and approved by the General Services Administration, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the Office of Management and Budget; and (2) does not reflect the priorities of the Judicial Conference of the United States as set out in its approved 5-year construction plan: *Provided*, That the fiscal year 2002 request must be accompanied by a standardized courtroom utilization study of each facility to be constructed, replaced, or expanded.

SEC. 405. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to increase the amount of occupiable square feet, provide cleaning services, security enhancements, or any other service usually provided through the Federal Buildings Fund, to any agency that does not pay the rate per square foot assessment for space and services as determined by the General Services Administration in compliance with the Public Buildings Amendments Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-313).

SEC. 406. Funds provided to other Government agencies by the Information Technology Fund, General Services Administration, under 40 U.S.C. 757 and sections 5124(b) and 5128 of Public Law 104-106, Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996, for performance of pilot information technology projects which have potential for Government-wide benefits and savings, may be repaid to this Fund from any savings actually incurred by these projects or other funding, to the extent feasible.

SEC. 407. From funds made available under the heading "Federal Buildings Fund, Limitations on Availability of Revenue", claims against the Government of less than \$250,000 arising from direct construction projects and acquisition of buildings may be liquidated from savings effected in other construction projects with prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 408. Section 411 of Public Law 106-58 is amended by striking "April 30, 2001" each place it appears and inserting "April 30, 2002".

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Merit Systems Protection Board pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978 and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and direct procurement of survey printing, \$28,857,000, together with not to exceed \$2,430,000 for administrative expenses to adjudicate retirement appeals to be transferred from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund in amounts determined by the Merit Systems Protection Board.

MORRIS K. UDALL SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY FOUNDATION

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO MORRIS K. UDALL SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY FOUNDATION

For payment to the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Trust Fund, to be available for the purposes of Public Law 102-252, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ENVIRONMENTAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FUND

For payment to the Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund to carry out activities authorized in the Environmental Policy and Conflict Resolution Act of 1998, \$1,250,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS
ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in connection with the administration of the National Archives (including the Information Security Oversight Office) and archived Federal records and related activities, as provided by law, and for expenses necessary for the review and declassification of documents, and for the hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$195,119,000: *Provided*, That the Archivist of the United States is authorized to use any excess funds available from the amount borrowed for construction of the National Archives facility, for expenses necessary to provide adequate storage for holdings.

REPAIRS AND RESTORATION

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of archives facilities, and to provide adequate storage for holdings, \$5,650,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND
RECORDS COMMISSION

GRANTS PROGRAM

For necessary expenses for allocations and grants for historical publications and records as authorized by 44 U.S.C. 2504, as amended, \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Government Ethics pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 and the Ethics Reform Act of 1989, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and not to exceed \$1,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$9,684,000.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF TRUST FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Personnel Management pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978 and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; advances for reimbursements to applicable funds of the Office of Personnel Management and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred under Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended; and payment of per diem and/or subsistence allowances to employees where Voting Rights Act activities require an employee to remain overnight at his or her post of duty, \$93,471,000; and in addition \$101,986,000 for administrative expenses, to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Office of Personnel Management without regard to other statutes, including direct procurement of printed materials, for the retirement and insurance programs, of which \$10,500,000 shall remain available until expended for the cost of automating the retirement recordkeeping systems: *Provided*, That the provisions of this appropriation shall not affect the authority to use applicable trust funds as provided by sections 8348(a)(1)(B) and 8909(g) of title 5, United States Code: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit of the Office of Personnel Management established pursuant to Executive Order No. 9358 of July 1, 1943, or any successor unit of like purpose: *Provided further*, That the President's Commission on White House Fellows, established by Executive Order No. 11183 of October 3, 1964, may, during fiscal year 2001, accept donations of money, property, and personal services in connection with the development of a publicity brochure to provide information about the White House Fellows, except that no such donations shall be accepted for travel or reimbursement of travel expenses, or for the salaries of employees of such Commission.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF TRUST FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act, as amended, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$1,360,000; and in addition, not to exceed \$9,745,000 for administrative expenses to audit, investigate, and provide other oversight of the Office of Personnel Management's retirement and insurance programs, to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Office of Personnel Management, as determined by the Inspector General: *Provided*, That the Inspector General is authorized to rent conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS,
EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

For payment of Government contributions with respect to retired employees, as authorized by chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, and the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 849) such sums as may be necessary.

GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS,
EMPLOYEE LIFE INSURANCE

For payment of Government contributions with respect to employees retiring after December 31, 1989, as required by chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, such sums as may be necessary.

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND
DISABILITY FUND

For financing the unfunded liability of new and increased annuity benefits becoming effective on or after October 20, 1969, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 8348, and annuities under special Acts to be credited to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, such sums as may be necessary: *Provided*, That annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944 and the Act of August 19, 1950 (33 U.S.C. 771-775) may hereafter be paid out of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Special Counsel pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978, the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-454), the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-12), Public Law 103-424, and the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-353), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, payment of fees and expenses for witnesses, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$10,319,000.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including contract reporting and other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$37,305,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses of the judges shall be paid upon the written certificate of the judge.

This title may be cited as the "Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. QUINN

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. QUINN:

H.R. 4871

In the item relating to "GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND—LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE"—

(1) after the first and last dollar amounts, insert "(increased by \$3,600,000)";

(2) redesignate paragraphs (1) through (4) as paragraphs (2) through (5), respectively; and

(3) before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), insert the following:

(1) \$3,600,000 shall remain available until expended for construction of additional projects at locations and at maximum construction improvement costs (including funds for sites and expenses and associated design and construction services) as follows:
New York:
Buffalo, U.S. courthouse, \$3,600,000;

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona reserves a point of order.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to urge my colleagues to support funding for courthouse construction projects in the fiscal year 2001 Treasury, Postal and General Government Appropriations bill.

Specifically, I want to highlight a local concern of ours up in Buffalo, New York, and ask that we consider providing \$3.6 million for site acquisition and design work on a Federal courthouse in my district in western New York.

The President's fiscal year 2001 budget resolution includes funding for eight Federal courthouse projects nationwide, totalling over \$480 million. However, the bill before us today contains no funding for courthouse construction projects.

The Administrative Office of the United States Courts has ranked the project in Buffalo, New York, as seventh highest as a priority across the country, seventh highest; and yet it has not been included in the President's budget.

So I have actively lobbied colleagues of ours up in New York, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) and others, to assist us in making certain that people here in our Nation's capital know of the importance. Unfortunately, because of tight budget constraints, our pleas have not been answered.

So I would like to take this opportunity today to stress the importance of the project and to ask the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the distinguished chairman, to agree to work with us on this project.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUINN. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from New York yielding to me, and I appreciate the comments that he has made.

I share the concern that the gentleman has, first, that we are not able to do any of the courthouse funding and construction that we would like to do. We have a significant need for infrastructure in this country, and the longer we postpone building courthouses, the more difficult it gets. So I am concerned about that. I hope that perhaps an additional allocation of funds might make it possible for us to do some of the courthouse construction.

We also know that courthouse construction is a priority for a number of Members whose districts are affected by that. Buffalo, while it is number six on the priority list for the courts, was not included in one of the seven projects which the administration recommended be funded, a moot point, as I said, because we did not recommend funding any of these.

But I look forward very much to working with the gentleman from New

York (Mr. QUINN) and with other Members of his delegation as we move forward on the construction to be sure that this priority that the courts have held for this is adhered to and that we are able to fund this in a timely fashion.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE). I only want to conclude by saying that I appreciate the tough, tough job that he has with these budget constraints, and everybody has these concerns. But I appreciate the time of the gentleman from Arizona and the efforts of the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Are there further amendments?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I do so is, I understand that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is on his way. He is going to offer an amendment and withdraw it. But he wants to make the point similar to the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN) with reference to the FDA consolidation at White Oak, which is in his district.

The President included over \$100 million for the FDA consolidation in his request. That is a consolidation which was supported by the Reagan administration, by the Bush administration, and now the Clinton administration to save very substantial dollars in terms of leases that exist all over the Washington metropolitan region with respect to the FDA.

Some of those leaseholds are very aged and very inefficient. The fact that FDA is spread over such a wide area leads to a lack of efficiency in the operations of its responsibilities.

I know the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), when he gets here, will make it very clear that this is something that we think is supported in a bipartisan fashion.

This is an item that was not included in the budget, as was the Buffalo courthouse project that the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN) just referred to because of the fact that we had insufficient funds. However, I know that the administration will be looking very carefully at this bill as it moves through the process and is very supportive of adding the FDA money back in as it is in adding the courthouse money back in as well as I know the chairman is. So I am hopeful that we will have the requisite dollars to get there.

The facility in question, which, again, is in the district of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is a

facility which is vitally needed. It is a facility that has been in this administration's plans and certainly the Bush administration's in terms of planning.

To delay this, as I said in my opening comments, will cost millions of dollars because it will prolong the payment to leaseholds and leasehold expenses as we fail to consolidate and provide space at the White Oak site.

The particular project in question is a little over \$100 million for lab space for FDA and additional office space as well. It will be a more efficient and effective use of space than currently exists.

□ 1645

So that I would hope that we could see that amount added to the bill at the appropriate time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Maryland, I know, is trying very well to use up some time here while he is waiting for his colleague to arrive, I would just suggest we do have one Member here who does have a colloquy prepared, if he would like to yield back.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, the underlying bill directs the U.S. Customs Service that it shall not, in the event of a reorganization of field operations, reduce the level of service to the area served by the port of Racine, Wisconsin, below the level of service provided in the year 2000.

As the gentleman from Arizona knows, earlier this year, the U.S. Customs Service issued a notice of proposed rulemaking announcing their intention to close down their operations in Racine, Wisconsin. Unfortunately, the U.S. Customs Service continues to disregard the Racine community and the negative impact this proposal would have on southeastern Wisconsin.

I thank the gentleman for recognizing the need for continued Customs Service in Racine and including this requirement in the underlying bill. I want to take this opportunity to clarify that Racine will receive no change in service under any proposal put forth by the U.S. Customs Service.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin for his work in this area. In fact, I can say with absolute certainty, no issue in this bill has been raised more times by any Member in this

body than this issue has by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN). So his defense of the interests of Racine, Wisconsin have been tremendous.

I appreciate the comments that he has made and understand what he is talking about, and I am very pleased that we could include statutory language, which I believe addresses this issue for him.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his support and his efforts to address this very important matter.

I would just like to say, I have discussed this matter several times on several occasions with the gentleman from Arizona and I really appreciate the professionalism and the courtesy that has been extended toward me in this matter, and I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona on behalf of the residents of Racine, Wisconsin. This is exciting for us and we really appreciate all of the gentleman's help.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYNN:

In title IV, add at the end (before the short title) the following section:

SEC. 6. Of the amounts appropriated in title IV of this Act for the account "GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES—FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND—LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE", \$101,000,000 is transferred and made available for the design and construction of laboratory facilities for the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. WYNN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I begin by thanking my colleague from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for holding the fort for me, as it were. This is a very important amendment to my district; very important to the entire State of Maryland. It deals with the consolidation of the Food and Drug Administration at a location in Montgomery County, Maryland, known as White Oak.

Currently, the FDA has approximately 39 different buildings in 21 different locations, housing 6,000 employees. The purpose of this project was to consolidate those buildings, employees and locations into one site, the former Naval Surface Warfare Center in White

Oak in my district. Importantly, this amendment would allow for the construction and design of a 100,000-square-foot center for drug evaluation and research. This is a very important laboratory in the overall work of the Food and Drug Administration.

Equally important, or perhaps more importantly, the consolidation would result in significant savings. Specifically, we can save \$200 million in lease costs over a 10-year period if we pass this amendment, which would allow for the construction of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research Laboratory.

In addition to serving the purposes of the Food and Drug Administration, this project will also help fill a void left in my district with the closure of the Naval Surface Warfare Center. As my colleagues know, in the course of base closings some facilities were no longer needed. And in the process of determining which facilities were not needed, we also developed programs and processes which would basically say that while we are closing this facility, we are looking at other options. One of the options that was considered and, in fact, agreed upon, was to consolidate the Food and Drug Administration at this site. It is a very beautiful campus-like setting, a wooded facility that could easily house the Food and Drug Administration in an appropriate setting which concentrates and brings together all of their facilities.

We think this is a very important project, but we also understand that no construction projects were funded by the committee, and we are sensitive to the fact that we would not be given an inordinate preference in this case. I raise the amendment for purposes of increasing the profile of this particular issue in the hopes that the chairman would consider this project in the course of discussions in conference. I do not intend to press the amendment, but I believe this is an important project for the country in terms of consolidating the Food and Drug Administration, it is an important project for the community in Montgomery County and the Washington region in terms of having these facilities consolidated in an effective way and developing this new laboratory, and it is important for the taxpayers in terms of saving significant lease costs.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYNN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Before he got to the floor here, the gentleman's colleague, the distinguished ranking member of this subcommittee, spoke eloquently about the project, and I concur.

This is a project that we have looked at very closely. There is no question that the consolidation of the Food and Drug Administration is badly needed,

and we have actually started that process. To me, it is a great disappointment that our bill requires the interruption of that process of consolidation. This is a very long-term process.

We do hope that in conference, if funds are made available, that we would be able to move this project forward into the second phase, and certainly we do understand the importance of this consolidation. So I appreciate the gentleman's rising and making us very aware of this and bringing this again to our attention.

Mr. WYNN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his thoughts.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding. My colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), has worked tirelessly on this project and very effectively on this project. As the chairman of the subcommittee has indicated, there is no controversy with respect to doing this project, we just have to find the money to do it.

I appreciate the gentleman's raising this issue, and I assure him that I will be working closely with the chairman to see that before this process is over that, hopefully, we get the requisite funds so that this project can be fully funded.

Mr. WYNN. Reclaiming my time once again, Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand the considerations, and I thank the chairman and my colleague for their cooperation.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is considered withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HERGER) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4871) 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, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4871, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further con-

sideration of H.R. 4871 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 560, that no further amendment to the bill shall be in order except:

(1) Pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate.

(2) The following additional amendment, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes:

Ms. DELAURO, regarding health services.

(3) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes each:

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, regarding sales to any foreign country;

Mr. RANGEL, regarding Cuba;

Mr. COBURN, regarding section 640;

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, regarding Federal election contracts; and

The amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 14.

(4) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes:

Mr. TRAFICANT, regarding Buy America Act;

Mr. INSLEE, regarding Inspector General reports;

Mr. GILMAN, regarding day care centers; and

The amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 15.

Each additional amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request, or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed, or a designee, and shall be considered as read. Each additional amendment shall be debatable for the time specified equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. HOYER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to simply say that we have tried to check with everybody on our side to make sure that those who had amendments were agreeable to this. We think that that is the case and, as a result, we will not object and hope this facilitates the handling of this bill tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HERGER). Pursuant to House Resolu-

tion 560 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4871.

□ 1657

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4871) 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, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. DREIER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, the amendment by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) had been withdrawn and title IV was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, no further amendment to the bill shall be in order except pro forma amendments offered by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate, and the following additional amendments, which may be offered only by the Member designated in the order of the House or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question:

The following additional amendment, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes:

(1) Ms. DELAURO, regarding health services.

(2) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes:

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, regarding sales to any foreign country;

Mr. RANGEL, regarding Cuba;

Mr. COBURN, regarding section 640;

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, regarding Federal election contracts; and

The amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 14.

□ 1700

(3) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes:

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), regarding Buy America Act; the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), regarding Inspector General reports; the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) regarding day-care centers; and the amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 15.