Graves  LaHood  Ryan (WI)
Green (WI)  Lodges  Sanchez
Hart  Lucas (KY)  Sanders
Hayes  Luther  Sandlin
Hayworth  Maloney (CT)  Schaffer
Hill  Maloney (NY)  Schiff
Hillery  Mascara  Sherman
Holt  Matheson  Sherwood
Honda  McIntyre  Shimkus
Hooley  McKinney  Shows
Hostetler  Mushkin  Shuster
Hulshof  Mica  Simmons
Inouye  Moors  Smith (WA)
Israel  Napolitano  Solis
Jenkins  Northup  Stevens
Johnson (IL)  Ose  Strickland
Kaptur  Paul  Stump
Keller  Peterson (MN)  Stupak
Kerry  Peterson  Tancredo
Kennedy (MN)  Phelps  Terry
Kerns  Pitts  Thune
Kildee  Platts  Thurman
Kind (WI)  Pomeroys  Tierney
Kucinich  Price (NC)  Toomey
LaHood  Rohrabacher  Turner
Langevin  Riley  Udall (CO)
Larsen (WA)  Rivers  Udall (NM)
Latham  Rogers (MI)  Voinovich
Leach  Ross  Vitter
Lewis (KY)  Royce  Wu

NOT VOTING—11
Hutchinson  Lipinski  Snyder
Hyde  McKeon  Spencer
Lantos  Scarborough  Young (FL)
Lewis (CA)  Skelton

Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Messrs. HAYES, BERRY, LEWIS of Kentucky, SIMMONS, FORBES, SHUSTER, GIBBONS, KENNEDY of Minnesota, PITTs, SHERWOOD, LEACH, BILIRAKIS, TANCREDO, HILLEYARY, POMEROY, STUMP, EVERETT, HILL, MOORE, and Ms. HART changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

Mr. Chairman, realizing that we have been favored with a positive allocation from the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young), it is a fair question how we have applied the extra $1 billion that has been made available. The short answer is we have sought to address some very significant needs, in particular in Federal law enforcement. So the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 206 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. 2590.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 206 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. 2590.

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

There was no objection.

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. 2590) 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, 2002, 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 Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 30 minutes.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 30 minutes.

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

As reported, Mr. Chairman, the spending allocation enables us to do a number of significant things regarding Federal law enforcement in particular.
We put significant new investments into the effort, the manpower, expanding the manpower where they are overburdened and overworked, and also expanding the equipment available to them to do that.

We have funding for the Integrated Violence Reduction Strategy by Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, which is trying to stem the use of illegal weapons, or legal weapons used illegally, by people in the commission of violent crimes. Both the Youth Crime Interdiction Initiative and the Integrated Violence Reduction Strategy receive significant new funding in this measure.

Also significantly increased is what is known as HIDTA, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area program. Some $231 million in Federal resources is made available in this bill for coordinating the efforts between the State, the local and the Federal law enforcement agencies, which all must work together, especially in the areas where there are significant problems of drug trafficking.

We also have, Mr. Chairman, an effort to try to address the accumulated backlog that is clogging up the court system. Federal courthouses are funded in this bill to the tune of $330 million in construction, following the priorities laid out by the administration and the General Services Administration and the Administrative Offices of the Courts, to make sure that we are putting the funding where the courts are most overcrowded. So this includes the funding for site acquisition, design and/or construction of some 15 court houses across the Nation, which is one beyond the number that was originally proposed by the President, but does follow the same priority list as everyone has agreed upon, including the administration.

In regard to legislative items, I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that we continue the prohibition that is part of current law to make sure that Federal funds are not used to help pay for abortions through the Federal Employee Health Benefits Plan. This also continues the requirement that FEHBP includes coverage for prescription contraceptive services with certain circumstances for concerns of conscience and with key exceptions, but overall a clear policy on the coverage of contraceptives.

As we move through consideration of this measure on the floor, Mr. Chairman, I know we will hear different amendments. I will not try to cover them all at this time, rather than give an overview of the bill; but I know we will hear many different policies proposed that, frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not think will be in order under the bill, or, even though they might technically be in order, will not be proper for inclusion in this bill and should be addressed through other legislation. We hope to keep this appropriation bill clear of any extraneous riders that are not really part of the central purpose of the measure.

I wanted to thank my colleagues on the subcommittee for all of their hard work and effort in putting this bill together. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, has been especially helpful in working together to resolve differences; and, frankly, Mr. Chairman, we have been able to come to agreement on some things that sometimes there are significant policy differences on, but a lot of hard work with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and everyone else has gotten us through that.

I want to thank his staff members, including Scott Nance; the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and his staff; Rob Nabors; and of course, I would be remiss if I did not thank the excellent staff that we are able to enjoy on the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government: the chief clerk, Michelle Mrdeza; Jeff Ashford; Kurt Dodd; Tammy Hughes; and, on a delegated status from the Secret Service, Chris Stanley.

It has taken a lot of hard work to go through the details in this bill, having as many different Federal agencies that are at the heart of the executive branch, including the White House, the Office of Management and Budget, the General Services Administration, Office of Personnel Management, the Treasury Department itself, and many of the core Federal agencies, including in particular law enforcement.

I believe this is a good bill. Mr. Chairman, which merits people’s support. It advances our objectives to combat the flow of illegal drugs, yet to improve the flow of legal commerce. It tries to address significant problems of overcrowding in the Federal courts by making sure that facilities are available to them.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask every Member of this body to support this bill, and look forward to working with the Members in considering amendments that they may offer.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following for the RECORD.
## Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Bill, 2002 (H.R. 2590)

### Amounts in thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>FY 2002 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2002 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. Congressional Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE I: Department of the Treasury</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Offices</td>
<td>162,361</td>
<td>181,766</td>
<td>173,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department-wide systems and capital improvements programs</td>
<td>62,150</td>
<td>72,322</td>
<td>68,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>32,827</td>
<td>35,150</td>
<td>35,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration</td>
<td>116,161</td>
<td>122,342</td>
<td>122,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Building and Annex Repair and Restoration</td>
<td>30,932</td>
<td>32,932</td>
<td>30,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Access to Financial Services</td>
<td>9,876</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Crimes Enforcement Network</td>
<td>27,456</td>
<td>45,156</td>
<td>45,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterterrorism Fund</td>
<td>54,879</td>
<td>44,879</td>
<td>36,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Law Enforcement Training Center: Salaries and Expenses</td>
<td>99,294</td>
<td>100,707</td>
<td>101,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquition, Construction, Improvements, &amp; Related Expenses</td>
<td>54,086</td>
<td>21,866</td>
<td>22,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>153,350</td>
<td>122,802</td>
<td>124,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management Service</td>
<td>206,398</td>
<td>211,594</td>
<td>212,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms</td>
<td>771,143</td>
<td>803,521</td>
<td>814,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>771,143</td>
<td>803,521</td>
<td>824,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Customs Service: Salaries and Expenses</td>
<td>1,576,557</td>
<td>1,961,764</td>
<td>2,058,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Maintenance Fee Collection</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>2,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation, Maintenance and Procurement, Air and Marine Interdiction Programs</td>
<td>132,024</td>
<td>162,837</td>
<td>163,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 106-64)</td>
<td>5,665</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automation modernization: Automated Commercial System</td>
<td>122,443</td>
<td>122,432</td>
<td>122,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Trade Data System</td>
<td>5,396</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Commercial Environment</td>
<td>132,020</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>257,632</td>
<td>257,832</td>
<td>427,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs Services at Small Airports (to be derived from fees collected)</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting receipts</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
<td>-3,000</td>
<td>-3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,279,294</td>
<td>2,268,226</td>
<td>2,672,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of the Public Debt</td>
<td>182,699</td>
<td>185,370</td>
<td>187,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of government taxes in shipment</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Revenue Service: Processing, Assistance, and Management</td>
<td>3,594,989</td>
<td>3,783,247</td>
<td>3,808,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Law Enforcement</td>
<td>3,366,350</td>
<td>3,533,182</td>
<td>3,541,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Income Tax Credit Compliance Initiative</td>
<td>144,881</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>1,582,917</td>
<td>1,583,249</td>
<td>1,573,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business systems modernization</td>
<td>71,503</td>
<td>396,593</td>
<td>391,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing tax administration for balance and equity</td>
<td>140,690</td>
<td>140,690</td>
<td>140,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8,640,789</td>
<td>9,422,267</td>
<td>9,460,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Secret Service: Salaries and Expenses</td>
<td>924,885</td>
<td>857,117</td>
<td>943,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, &amp; Related Expenses</td>
<td>8,021</td>
<td>3,252</td>
<td>3,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>933,006</td>
<td>860,469</td>
<td>947,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Title I, Department of the Treasury</strong></td>
<td>13,880,466</td>
<td>14,631,710</td>
<td>15,061,907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TITLE II: Postal Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>FY 2002 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2002 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. Congressional Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payment to the Postal Service Fund</td>
<td>28,096</td>
<td>36,190</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance appropriation, FY 2003</td>
<td>95,005</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance appropriation, FY 2003</td>
<td>47,619</td>
<td>47,619</td>
<td>47,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>95,619</td>
<td>142,799</td>
<td>142,799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TITLE II: Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>FY 2002 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. Congressional Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation of the President and the White House Office: Salaries and Expenses</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Residence at the White House: Operating Expenses</td>
<td>53,171</td>
<td>54,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>53,521</td>
<td>54,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>53,521</td>
<td>54,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Amounts in thousands)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001 Enacted</td>
<td>FY 2002 Request</td>
<td>Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of National Drug Control Policy:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>24,705</td>
<td>25,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center</td>
<td>35,974</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>60,679</td>
<td>65,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Drug Control Programs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program</td>
<td>208,046</td>
<td>208,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td>233,056</td>
<td>247,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unanticipated Needs</strong></td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronics Commission of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico:</strong></td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>2,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Title III, Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President:</strong></td>
<td>700,273</td>
<td>731,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title IV: Independent Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled</td>
<td>4,148</td>
<td>4,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Election Commission</td>
<td>40,411</td>
<td>41,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Labor Relations Authority</td>
<td>25,003</td>
<td>26,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Services Administration:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Buildings Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>476,520</td>
<td>276,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance appropriation, FY 2002-2004</td>
<td>(276,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations on availability of revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and acquisition of facilities</td>
<td>(477,670)</td>
<td>(356,289)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and alterations</td>
<td>(861,613)</td>
<td>(626,676)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inplant acquisition payments</td>
<td>(175,369)</td>
<td>(116,427)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental of space</td>
<td>(2,949,856)</td>
<td>(2,959,550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Operations</td>
<td>(1,624,771)</td>
<td>(1,746,946)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>(5,015,263)</td>
<td>(5,107,691)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repayment of Debt:</strong></td>
<td>(70,580)</td>
<td>(72,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Federal Buildings Fund:</strong></td>
<td>(476,520)</td>
<td>276,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limitations:</strong></td>
<td>(5,086,878)</td>
<td>(5,187,691)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy and Operations:</strong></td>
<td>137,406</td>
<td>138,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>34,444</td>
<td>36,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Government (e-Gov) Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>3,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses, Presidential transition</td>
<td>7,004</td>
<td>7,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, General Services Administration:</strong></td>
<td>857,968</td>
<td>474,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merit Systems Protection Board:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Expenses</td>
<td>26,372</td>
<td>30,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation on administrative expenses</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>2,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris K. Udall Foundation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris K. Udall scholarship</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>1,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Nations Institute</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris K. Udall Trust Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>1,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Archives and Records Administration:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td>206,949</td>
<td>214,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of debt, etc.</td>
<td>-6,064</td>
<td>-6,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and Restoration</td>
<td>101,583</td>
<td>10,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Historical Publications and Records Commission: Grants program</td>
<td>6,436</td>
<td>4,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>310,934</td>
<td>252,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of Government Ethics:</strong></td>
<td>5,665</td>
<td>10,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of Personnel Management:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Expenses</td>
<td>93,888</td>
<td>99,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation on administrative expenses</td>
<td>101,763</td>
<td>115,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation on administrative expenses</td>
<td>9,734</td>
<td>10,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Payment for Annuitants, Employees Health Benefits</td>
<td>5,457,169</td>
<td>6,146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Payment for Annuitants, Employee Life Insurance</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund</td>
<td>6,940,091</td>
<td>9,229,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Office of Personnel Management:</strong></td>
<td>14,009,948</td>
<td>15,630,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of Special Counsel:</strong></td>
<td>11,122</td>
<td>11,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Tax Court:</strong></td>
<td>37,293</td>
<td>37,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, title IV, Independent Agencies:</strong></td>
<td>15,750,361</td>
<td>16,528,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total:</strong></td>
<td>30,416,900</td>
<td>32,035,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current year, FY 2002:</strong></td>
<td>30,290,038</td>
<td>31,963,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009:</strong></td>
<td>99,862</td>
<td>87,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[Limitations]</strong></td>
<td>(5,965,378)</td>
<td>(6,175,891)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Bill, 2002 (H.R. 2590)—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scorekeeping adjustments:</th>
<th>FY 2002 Enacted</th>
<th>Bill Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of the Public Debt (Permanent)</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Reserve Bank Reimbursement Fund</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Mint revolving fund</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal buildings fund</td>
<td>-74,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>-16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance appropriations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal service, FY 2001/2002</td>
<td>64,436</td>
<td></td>
<td>-64,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal service, FY 2002/2003</td>
<td>-69,952</td>
<td></td>
<td>+15,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Across the board cut (0.25%)</td>
<td>-47,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>+47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB/CBO adjustment</td>
<td>-35,481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, scorekeeping adjustments</td>
<td>202,925</td>
<td>336,000</td>
<td>236,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mandatory and discretionary</td>
<td>30,619,825</td>
<td>32,371,261</td>
<td>32,711,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>14,078,007</td>
<td>15,390,450</td>
<td>15,690,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>15,940,318</td>
<td>18,980,811</td>
<td>17,021,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+340,099
Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. This is a reasonable bill, and I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Chairman ISTOOK) and the staff for working closely with our staff and with me and with our Members on bringing this bill to the floor.

As I said, I believe it is a reasonable bill, a bill that is higher than fiscal year 2001 and about one-third higher than the President’s request. The bill provides strong support for our law enforcement agencies. Forty percent of law enforcement is covered by this bill, which surprises some, but it is a critically important component of our law enforcement efforts at the Federal level.

We support our law enforcement agencies by including $170 million above the President’s request for the Customs Service to modernize their systems for the assessment and collection of taxes and fees, which total over $20 billion annually. That is important for all of our exporters and importers. It is important for every consumer in America, and the increase is an appropriate step for us to take to ensure that the information technology capability of Customs is at the level it needs to be.

It includes $15 million above the request for Customs Service to hire additional inspectors, a very important objective; $33 million more for Customs inspection technology; and $45 million in additional funding for the Secret Service to hire additional agents to reduce staggering overtime levels.

The chairman mentioned that, but let me call to the attention of some who may not know these figures that some of our Secret Service agents have been asked to work 90 hours per month.

Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned with several provisions in this bill that reduce legislative oversight responsibilities of the Executive Office of the President. We are going to be talking about those. There is a certain sensitivity that is particularly important as Congress reviews the budget request for the Executive Office of the President. In my opinion, the President of the United States deserves the appropriate respect and deference. However, it is also important that Congress not relinquish its oversight responsibilities. We will hear about these issues today as other Members of the body have similar concerns, and amendments will be offered.

I am encouraged, however, that this bill contains a placeholder for an issue important to all Americans, and that is election reform. We are going to be discussing that when the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) offers an amendment to add substantial dollars to this bill. I will not debate it further at this time, but it is a very significant concern which we will have to deal with either today or in a supplemental some weeks ahead.

Many Members of the body, Mr. Chairman, are rightfully concerned that neither the administration nor Congress has acted on election reform. I truly believe, as I have said in the past, that election reform is the civil rights issue of the 107th Congress. There is no more basic right for an
Mr. Chairman, I have had several conversations with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), who has shown a great willingness to consider and support election reform and election reform funding. I appreciate his efforts, and I hope we can make some positive progress on this issue for all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me say that this is a good bill. It funds properly the priorities that are the responsibility of this bill, and I would urge Members to support it when it comes time for final passage.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who has been on the need to fund Federal civilian employees, and their pay and benefits; he has been extraordinarily helpful in years past and this year in fashioning a bill that Experimental Federal civilian employees are treated fairly and that we have the ability to not only retain our excellent public employees, but also to recruit, to fill the vacancies that will occur in increasing numbers in the years ahead.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my very close friend and neighbor and leader in so many ways, and particularly on the issues that are involved in this Treasury-Postal appropriations bill. I wanted to mention three of them in particular: the effect on the Federal workforce; gender parity in terms of health insurance; and the money for the Customs modernization that is in this bill.

In terms of the Federal workforce, this includes an amendment that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and I put in the full committee markup. It also reflects an amendment that I had added to this year's budget resolution that we should be providing the same pay raises for Federal civilian employees as we do for military employees. President Bush's budget includes a 4.6 to 5 percent increase for military employees and, in some cases, up to 10 percent. We think that civilian employees who work side-by-side with military personnel should get the same pay raise.

We have a crisis developing in the Federal workforce. Over the next 5 years, up to half of our Federal workforce will retire or at least be eligible for retirement. There are a number of things we can do to address this crisis. One of them is to implement the Federal Employees Pay Compensation Act that was passed back in 1990. Right now, we have a 32 percent pay gap between Federal civilian employees and those who perform the same function in the private sector. There is a 10 percent gap between military personnel and those people who perform the same function in the private sector. Both of those gaps should be narrowed and eventually eliminated, but we should at least provide the same pay raise for civilian as well as military personnel.

In terms of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan, this plan has been going up by double digits in each of the last 4 years. So it is important that we bring these premium costs under control while maintaining the current coverage of services, and since about half of our workforce are women, which is the last thing we should certainly treat women the same as we do men in terms of its coverage. Right now, there is a disparity.

President Bush's budget expressly reflects the bipartisan contraceptive coverage proviso that was a part of this bill since 1998, so we put it back in committee to make sure that women's contraception is covered under Federal health insurance plans. It is the largest single out-of-pocket expense for women during their working years, and there is no question that this is an important aspect of health insurance coverage and should be mandated if the executive branch is not going to include it.

There is no additional cost to the plan, according to the Office of Personnel Management; and I am glad that this will be part of this bill and should certainly be enacted.

Now, the last point is the Automated Commercial System for Customs. There is an inclusion of money for the Customs Service to continue the computerization of our Customs Service. This is critical. Importantly, we have miles of trucks backed up on our borders. This should have been put in place years ago. We will now be on schedule to put Customs automation on line within the next 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It should be passed with a strong bipartisan vote.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly mention the subject the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) mentioned earlier and that is the courthouse issue and the priority that might be given it. I would first like to compliment the committee and the professionalism in which they have approached the courthouse issue. As the gentleman knows, there is a long list of which has been developed with the Department of Justice, a very professional, nonpolitical way.

I represent a town called Cedar Rapids, Iowa, which is on the cusp of whether it should be funded this year or the following year.

It is my understanding, based on some public announcements this past week, that Senate appropriations leadership has indicated that they expect to fund the Cedar Rapids Court House, at least the beginning planning funding of about $15 million.

What I would like to inquire of the gentleman is, if resources become available and we can move down this next step, if there is any possibility that Cedar Rapids could be considered in this round.

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

Mr. LEACH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa, because I know he has been working diligently to secure the needed courthouse in Cedar Rapids.

I want to tell the gentleman that that is indeed the item that is next on the priority list that we have. We are fortunate we were able to go one beyond what the administration had proposed as far as funding courthouses. And again, as the gentleman mentioned, on a professional priority basis, a nonpolitical basis, Cedar Rapids has now moved to the top of the list, and we are looking at the potential of being able to find a way to potentially fund that during this year.

Obviously, we have not been able yet to reach that conclusion. We are still not through the entire budget process, but we do want to work together with the gentleman to look at the potential of making sure that moves along rapidly.

I do want to assure the gentleman that whether it ended up being this year or next year, it is at the very top of our priority list now. Mr. LEACH. I appreciate that.

Mr. ISTOOK. Well, I would like to just conclude with two comments.

One, again, I would express my appreciation for the professionalism of this whole consideration. Cedar Rapids, like many towns in America, has been on this list, and each town is anxious to get their courthouse done. There is a case for everyone around the country. It is my impression that the gentleman’s subcommittee has been exceptionally professional in how they have done the prioritization.

I would only conclude with one brief aspect for my community. The community has really done a whole lot on the cost containment grounds with low-cost ground, et cetera. This is the heart of community revitalization for Cedar Rapids, so it is both a judiciary matter and, frankly, a community matter.

So to the degree that sympathetic consideration can be given this year, I
PERSONALLY would be deeply appreciative, and I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his thoughtful leadership.

Mr. ISTOOK. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I very much appreciate his terrific effort on this matter.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies. She does an extraordinary job, We are pleased with her help on this bill. I appreciate the gentlewoman commenting on this, and her very important intervention.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the able gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Budget, for his contribution to the discussion. Mr. ISTOOK, in a colloquy regarding public debt management.

Mr. Chairman, as part of the House report accompanying the fiscal year 2002 appropriation bill for the Treasury Department, the Committee on Appropriations directs the Bureau of Public Debt to provide a report to review the complete debt program of the Bureau from a fiscal management perspective, providing cost comparisons between high amount-low volume debt instruments and low amount-high volume debt instruments.

Another major concern regards the ownership of our public debt, particularly the extent and growth in foreign ownership of U.S. debt securities.

I would say to the chairman, the ownership of the government’s debt is increasing in the hands of foreign owners. Our government may not be sufficiently active in promoting the domestic ownership of our debt, especially to individuals, something that many of us in this Chamber can recall being a matter of national will and, indeed, pride.

As part of this review of the national debt, I believe that we should have a detailed report regarding the levels of ownership of savings bonds and other forms of public debt, rates of return on those savings bonds and other forms of public debt, and how savings bond ownership historically compares to other forms of public debt.

Would the gentleman agree that the review of the complete debt program of the Bureau of the public debt requested by the committee should contain a thorough analysis of debt ownership, differentiating between foreign and domestic customers as well as between individuals by income category, corporations, and governments; trends over the last 20 years with respect to what groups are purchasing U.S. debt; the amount of interest being paid to each bondholder category; and developments over the last 20 years with respect to what media and methodologies are being used to affect debt transactions?

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her interest, which is bona fide, on an important issue.

Yes, it is the intent of the Committee that the report provide information on customer demographics and transactional changes such as the gentlewoman described, as well as the detailed cost data, with sufficient detail to allow determination of how much of all of the major forms in which the public debt is financed.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for the clarification and for his willingness to engage in this colloquy. I have been a pleasure to work with the gentleman.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) to engage in a colloquy.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also thank the ranking member and the chairman, both of them, for their support of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Artesia, New Mexico, and in Brunswick, Georgia.

This very important Federal Training Center trains over 70, I believe the number exactly is 71, different Federal agencies. They have over 250 different classes. They get all kinds of hands-on training. It is very important for our law enforcement effort.

Mr. Chairman, I would be certainly remiss on this 3-year observance of the terrible tragedy we had with the Capitol Hill Police in this very building to not recognize yesterday’s moment of silence in the memory of those great officers who bravely put their lives on the line and sacrificed their 3 years ago for this body and for all the officers who come to the United States Capitol. They were trained at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the chairman if he would engage in a colloquy with me. I appreciate the gentleman’s courtesy. I want to thank the gentleman for all the support he has given, and also ask a question.

As the gentleman knows, FLETC, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, is in the midst of a master plan for construction to meet their long-term capacity requirements, in particular the closure of the temporary U.S. Border Patrol Training Facility in Charleston, South Carolina, and to allow for transition of all basic training for border patrol officers to be carried out at the FLETC location in Brunswick, Georgia, and Artesia, New Mexico, on those campuses, by the year ending 2004.

This transition will increase the workload both at Glyngo and Artesia. Glyngo is preparing to meet the increased demand. It is very important that they have the space and facilities needed to accommodate the additional students.

I greatly appreciate the efforts of the chairman and the ranking member and all the subcommittee members for the improvements that are already in this bill. I greatly appreciate the manager’s amendment, which the gentleman just passed, and the gentleman’s support of the additional construction funds.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask, as we move into conference, if the gentleman could say that these additional resources, and any others that may be out there, will have the support of the chairman as we go through the process with the other body.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am very well aware of the important work being done at Glyngo and of FLETC’s critical role in providing the very highest quality in consolidated law enforcement training to Federal law enforcement organizations, as well as others that participate.

I applaud the strong personal support of the gentleman from Georgia for FLETC’s work to achieve this mission. We have indeed addressed some important construction required at FLETC to keep it on its necessary construction schedule. I certainly want to assure my colleague that I look forward to working with him further to ensure that additional FLETC funding is going to be given every consideration as the bill does move through the process.

Mr. KINGSTON. I certainly thank the gentleman for yielding.

Again, I wanted to emphasize to the chairman and to the very capable staff, we appreciate everything that they do for them, not just in Brunswick, Georgia, but in Artesia.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his support of FLETC. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has visited the facility before, and I know staff has visited it, but the doors are wide open. Any time the Members want to come to Georgia, we would be glad to put on our dog and pony show for the gentleman and show off the capability.

Mr. ISTOOK. I certainly look forward to meeting the dogs and the ponies.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say to the gentleman from Georgia, he is absolutely correct. The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, located in Glync, in his district, is not only a law enforcement agency that trains Treasury law enforcement, but, as the gentleman knows, trains a broad array of law enforcement officers, including non-Federal officers. It is a very, very important facility. They are one of the experts in the field.

We are very pleased to work with the gentleman and with them to carry out the very, very important job of not only training initially our law enforcement officers but from time to time giving them training that keeps them both technically, physically, mentally on top of their game.

I am also pleased, as the gentleman knows, Customs have the capability to provide some local law enforcement training for all the law enforcement officers that are located here so they can keep up to speed on a week-to-week and month-to-month basis.

But there is no doubt that FLETTC's job and its location at Glync, which we have fought to keep centralized, so we do not put training centers all over the country and can marshall and focus our expertise at that site, is a very important effort. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), a very outstanding member of the subcommittee and of the Committee on Appropriations, someone who represents her district extraordinarily well in south Florida, in the Miami area, and someone who I count as a very dear friend. She has an amendment that has been included, which is a very, very important one. I think it is well worth the time to talk about that.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, the ranking member of our subcommittee, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very good bill. Certainly we need the support of the entire Congress on this bill. It is quite an improvement over last year's bill. It is a very, very important bill. Certainly we need the support of the entire Congress on this bill. It is as it should be.

I like protection for the civil service. I like protection for the civilians, the civilians who are in Glynco, in his district, is not only a very important facility. They are one of the experts in the field.

I cannot say too much on behalf of law enforcement in the area of the Treasury-Postal bill in that each of the law enforcement agencies did receive considerable help through this bill. They very much needed it.

The Customs Service's Automated Commercial Environment, which we call the ACE program, ACE received $170 million more than the President's request. It is important that this particular initiative be bolstered by our subcommittee.

Most of all, Mr. Chairman, we owe a debt of gratitude to the staff of this committee. I am sure each of our subcommittees have wonderful staffs, but I saw that this particular committee staff went beyond what staff normally does to reach out to Members who need help, and I appreciate that.

We provide $15 million for the Miami Federal courthouse. That has been a long time coming, but it is here now; that has been so long, that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HOYER) talks about that.

All Members realize that the Federal courts are really packed, and they do need money. They are the busiest ones in the country. Mr. Chairman, this bill does a lot.

I also want to mention the fact that there is one issue that we are not putting enough emphasis on in this country, and in this particular bill we did not put emphasis on it, either. That was electoral reform. The time has come that we do pay sufficient attention to election reform, and this is the committee to do that. So I do hope that this problem will be addressed in a better fashion another year.

I am advised that my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) have already introduced legislation that will help us in terms of election reform. They are providing leadership on that, and it does not only fit some of the problems in Florida but the entire Nation.

Now, I do not have the time to discuss all the particulars, Mr. Chairman, and all the needs that were met through this particular piece of legislation, and there are, I am sure, other items that we could have funded and could have done a better job of, but we did cover law enforcement, we covered Customs, certainly, we covered the First Accounts initiative, and I am pleased with those significant steps that we take in this bill to improve our support for Treasury law enforcement, particularly with respect to Customs and the Secret Service.

I mentioned the $300 million investment for ACE, and as I have repeatedly discussed before, we need more Customs employees at Miami International Airport and the Miami seaport.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHlers).

Mr. EHlers. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I would like to comment on a statement that appears in the report accompanying this legislation, to the effect that the Federal Elections Commission (FEC) has asked for approximately $2.5 million, to update and enhance voting system standards. The committee notes they support these efforts but will wait for authorization from the Committee on House Administration, of which I am a member and of which the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is also a member.

I have good news for the chairman. I think I can save him some of that $2.5 million, and that is the reason I rise today. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 2275, that would hand this standards-setting duty over to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which is the Nation's standard-setting organization. NIST is specifically given the mission of, and is well equipped to, set standards. They would do a very fine job of setting voting technology standards, at considerably less cost, and essentially at no cost to the gentleman's budget.

Let me describe this bill a bit more. As I said, the National Institute of Standards and Technology is the Nation's chief standard-setting organization; and they do not just pull standards out of the air. They always work with the user communities. They have a 200-year history of doing this, and do it well. A commission, which would be formed as part of this, would have the director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology as the Chair. The commission would also include a member from the American National Standards Institute, which is the private sector arm of standard setting and is well-known. There would be a representative of the Secretaries of State throughout this country, a representative from the Election Directors of the States, representatives from local governments, county clerks, city clerks and so forth, as well as technical representatives, individuals who are in universities and have experience working on voting and voting standards issues. And, of course, I am sure they will work with the FEC on this.

This commission would recommend standards. They would establish rather voluntary technical standards; and then, after some time, they would develop permanent standards which are accepted by the user community. These standards would ensure the
Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak about the Members’ annual cost of living allowance, not to oppose the COLA but to reject the procedure we are using to consider it.

During my time in Congress, we have addressed this issue several times. In 1997, I opposed the increase because the Federal budget was in deficit, and we were proposing massive cuts to programs that everyday people rely upon. I was also concerned about the process the House employed in considering the COLA. I was unhappy that there was little public debate on the issue and only a procedural rather than a straight yes or no vote.

In 1999, the procedure was the same. Again, I was uncomfortable; and as I did with the 1996 COLA, I did not accept the increase and returned the net amount to the Treasury.

Now, many Members argue that COLA is not a raise per se and that the statute automatically authorizes implementation without resort to an appropriations enactment. I point out that COLAs for other workers operate in just this fashion. This is true. It is absolutely correct. However, we are not like other workers. One hundred percent of our costs, both for employment and office expenses, are borne by the taxpayers. We also set our own salaries, and we have no direct employer or supervisor, except the public in the collective.

Few workers in this country enjoy such circumstances. We have the luxury through our own action, or in this case inaction, to alter the amount of money we earn. Given that, I believe a substantive vote on the COLA is the appropriate way to handle the annual increase. Nevertheless, it does not appear that my views are likely to prevail on this issue, although I will continue to promote a direct vote.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman ISTOOK and Ranking Member HOYER for their hard work on this bill. I also want to thank members of the Appropriations Committee for supporting the reinstatement of my provision to provide contraceptive coverage to America’s federal employees.

This is a very important provision, and I am grateful that the vote to sustain this coverage was bipartisan.

I am very proud to say that this provision, which gives 1.2 million federal employees of reproductive age access to contraception in their health plans, has been very, very successful.

Since the provision’s enactment, there have been no problems with implementation and no complaints received by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). Let me repeat that—no plan, no provider, no beneficiary has contacted OPM with a concern or complaint about the contraceptive provision.

Before my provision was enacted, 81% of all FEHB plans did not cover the most commonly used types of prescription contraception. A full 10% covered no prescription contraception at all.

Today, federal employees can choose the type of contraceptive best medically suited for them.

My colleagues, let’s remember why this is so very important.

Contraception is a family issue, and it is basic health care for women. Although abortion rates are falling, today—still—nearly half of all pregnancies in America are unintended and half of those will end in abortion. Increasing access to the full range of contraceptive drugs and devices is the most effective approach to reducing the number of unintended pregnancies, the first step toward our ultimate goal. According to a recent national survey, 87 percent support women’s access to birth control, and 77 percent support laws requiring health insurance plans to cover contraception.

Their message is clear: if we want fewer abortions and unintended pregnancies, we must make family planning more accessible. And, my colleagues, this important benefit has not added any cost to FEHB premiums. This is important because when first introduced, the two main arguments against my provision were that covering contraceptives would add prohibitive cost to FEHB plans, and discriminate against religious providers.

Neither of those charges have proven to be true. This benefit has not added any cost to FEHB premiums.

Since the provision’s inception, the OPM has not received any complaints about the provision from either beneficiaries, health professionals, or participating health plans. And this year’s bill continues to respect the rights of religious organizations and individual providers.

These protections are identical to those that passed by the House in 1999. Let me summarize what the religious exemption in the bill right now provides:

Two plans identified by OPM as religious providers are explicitly excluded from the requirement to cover contraceptives, and any other plan that is religious is given the opportunity to opt out.

Furthermore, individual providers are exempted from having to provide contraceptive services if it is contrary to their own religious beliefs or moral convictions.

I believe that Americans want us to look for ways—as we did with contraceptive coverage for federal workers—to find common ground. Increasing access to family planning is one way we can do that.

This is a good provision and I thank my colleagues for continuing to support it.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Hon. ISTOOK and Mr. YOUNG for their cooperation in addressing the concerns of the Committee on Financial Services with respect to the Treasury, Postal and General Government Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002. And while I am supportive of the bill in its current form, I do have a concern with certain language contained in the committee report. That language states:

The Committee is aware that concerns have been expressed about the impact of the Federal Reserve/Department of Treasury proposed regulation to redefine real estate brokerage and management activities. The Committee expects Treasury to work with the Department of Housing and Urban Development when developing the final rule.

This language contradicts section 103 of the Gramm Leach Bliley Act of 1999 which provides that the Federal Reserve Board, together with the Department of the Treasury, shall have the sole responsibility to determine for federal holding companies what activities are financial in nature or incidental or complementary to such financial activity. Given this conflict between statutory law and the Appropriations Committee report, I have every
expectation that the Federal Reserve Board will follow the letter and intent of the law.

In responding to this commendation, I do not express an opinion on the Federal Reserve Board/Treasury proposal to classify real estate brokerage and management activities as financial activities. I trust the Federal Reserve Board and the Department of the Treasury will fully consider the views of the public, the industries affected by this proposal, as well as the relevant Federal and State agencies, and take any time necessary to do so.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2590, the Treasury and Postal Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002. I congratulate Chairman ISTook on his leadership on this bill. This bill meets our requirements under the Balanced Budget Act and properly provides for critical operations of the Treasury Department and other important agencies.

I also want to thank the Subcommittee, in particular, for including a requirement that I requested to prevent federal government websites from collecting personal information on citizens who access federal websites and doing so without the knowledge of the person visiting the site. This is an important policy for our government—it is a policy that makes clear that we will lead by example when it comes to protecting peoples' privacy on the web.

Mr. Chairman, last year I added a provision to the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations bill to prohibit federal agencies funded under this bill from using funds to monitor and collect personally identifiable information from the public who access government websites. Unfortunately, the previous Administration chose to ignore this law and allowed federal websites to continue to use tracking software to gather personal information from citizens who visit the website of federal agencies.

Even more disturbing, this past April a summary report from the Inspector General of one federal agency found that 64 federal websites are still using unauthorized tracking software, despite our direction to do otherwise.

What that means to the average citizen is that our government could be creating a database that would know about your visit to the IRS website and what you looked at there, your visit to the NIH website where you may have looked up information on a personal health matter, or that your child visited the website of the Drug Czar's office to do a report on the dangers of drug abuse. Do we really want to allow the government to keep that information about you and do so without your knowledge? The answer is clearly no.

Given the fact that my previous efforts have gone largely ignored, this year I expanded the provision to apply government-wide to all federal agencies as well.

Mr. Chairman, the federal government has a responsibility to set the standard for privacy protection in the information age. Federal websites are fast becoming a primary source of information for the public and that's an excellent opportunity; it is essential that we not allow the public to lose confidence in the Internet or their taxpayer funded federal websites. These websites were designed to serve the public—they were not designed for the government to secretly collect personal information and track our movements on the Internet.

Mr. Chairman, we must ensure that if you visit a federal government website, both our tax dollars and our privacy are protected. With this prohibition in place, we do just that.

Again, my thanks to Chairman ISTook for his help and leadership on this issue. I urge support of the bill.

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the remainder 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 and the amendments printed in House Report 107–158 are adopted.

The amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 5 may be offered only by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) or his designee, and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill.

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 in order.

The Clerk will read:

The Clerk reads as follows:

H.R. 2590

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, 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, 2002, and for such other purposes as follow:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

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 $3,500,000 for official travel expenses; not to exceed $8,313,000, to remain available until expended for information technology modernization requirements; not to exceed $5,000,000 for official reception and representation expenses; not to exceed $235,000 for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General of the Treasury, $35,508,000.

TREASURY 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 1982, as amended, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General for Tax Administration, $123,474,000.

TREASURY BUILDING AND ANNEX REPAIR AND RESTORATION

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of the Treasury Building and Annex, $30,924,000, to remain available until expended.

EXPANDED ACCESS TO FINANCIAL SERVICES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

To develop and implement programs to expand access to financial services for low- and moderate-income individuals, not to exceed $10,000,000, such funds to become available upon authorization of this program as provided by law and 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 1986, 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, $35,508,000.

For necessary expenses of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1982, as amended, not to exceed $2,000,000 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, $123,474,000.

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of the Treasury Building and Annex, $30,924,000, to remain available until expended.

Expanded Access to Financial Services (Including Transfer of Funds)

To develop and implement programs to expand access to financial services for low- and moderate-income individuals, not to exceed $10,000,000, such funds to become available upon authorization of this program as provided by law and 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.

For necessary expenses of the 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 $14,000,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for assistance to Federal law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement, $45,837,000, of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2003; and of which $7,790,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2003:
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Provided, That funds appropriated in this ac-
count may be used to procure personal serv-
cices contract.

Counterterrorism Fund

For necessary expenses, as determined by the
Secretary, $36,879,000, to remain avail-
able until expended, to reimburse any De-
partment, bureau, or agency of the Federal
Government, or any entity at the request of
the Secretary, to provide funds to facilitate
the conveyance of law enforcement trainees to
participate in law enforcement activities in
foreign countries, including transportation
and per diem allowances, and for the payment
of expenses for personal protective equip-
ment for interagency personnel.

Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Law
Enforcement Training Center, a bureau of
the Department of the Treasury, for paying
travel expenses of non-Federal personnel in-
cluding contractual, per diem, and transportation
costs, and the hiring of personnel to perform
services for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,
and Firearms; and for payment of the
Department of the Treasury, for the payment
of necessary additional real property and facili-
ties, and for ongoing maintenance, facility
improvements, and related expenses, $27,594,000,
to remain available until expended.

Interagency Law Enforcement
Intergovernmental and Drug Enforcement
For expenses necessary to conduct investiga-
tions and to provide law enforcement train-
ing to Federal, State, and local law enforce-
ment officials and others as determined by
the Secretary, $7,891,000, of which not to
exceed $2,500 shall be available for
official reception and representation ex-
penses.

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of
Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, including
travel expenses of non-Federal personnel in-
cluding contractual, per diem, and transporta-
costs, and the hiring of personnel to perform
services for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,
and Firearms; and for payment of the
Department of the Treasury, for the payment
of necessary additional real property and facili-
ties, and for ongoing maintenance, facility
improvements, and related expenses, $7,891,000,
to remain available until expended.

Interagency Law Enforcement
Intergovernmental and Drug Enforcement
For expenses necessary to conduct investiga-
tions and to provide law enforcement train-
ing to Federal, State, and local law enforce-
ment officials and others as determined by
the Secretary, $7,891,000, of which not to
exceed $2,500 shall be available for
official reception and representation ex-
penses.

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of
Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, including
travel expenses of non-Federal personnel in-
cluding contractual, per diem, and transporta-
costs, and the hiring of personnel to perform
services for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,
and Firearms; and for payment of the
Department of the Treasury, for the payment
of necessary additional real property and facili-
ties, and for ongoing maintenance, facility
improvements, and related expenses, $7,891,000,
to remain available until expended.

Interagency Law Enforcement
Intergovernmental and Drug Enforcement
For expenses necessary to conduct investiga-
tions and to provide law enforcement train-
ing to Federal, State, and local law enforce-
ment officials and others as determined by
the Secretary, $7,891,000, of which not to
exceed $2,500 shall be available for
official reception and representation ex-
penses.

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of
Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, including
travel expenses of non-Federal personnel in-
including contractual, per diem, and transporta-
costs, and the hiring of personnel to perform
services for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,
and Firearms; and for payment of the
Department of the Treasury, for the payment
of necessary additional real property and facili-
ties, and for ongoing maintenance, facility
improvements, and related expenses, $7,891,000,
to remain available until expended.

Interagency Law Enforcement
Intergovernmental and Drug Enforcement
For expenses necessary to conduct investiga-
tions and to provide law enforcement train-
ing to Federal, State, and local law enforce-
ment officials and others as determined by
the Secretary, $7,891,000, of which not to
exceed $2,500 shall be available for
official reception and representation ex-
penses.

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of
Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, including
travel expenses of non-Federal personnel in-
cluding contractual, per diem, and transporta-
costs, and the hiring of personnel to perform
services for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,
and Firearms; and for payment of the
Department of the Treasury, for the payment
of necessary additional real property and facili-
ties, and for ongoing maintenance, facility
improvements, and related expenses, $7,891,000,
to remain available until expended.

Interagency Law Enforcement
Intergovernmental and Drug Enforcement
For expenses necessary to conduct investiga-
tions and to provide law enforcement train-
ning to Federal, State, and local law enforce-
ment officials and others as determined by
the Secretary, $7,891,000, of which not to
exceed $2,500 shall be available for
official reception and representation ex-
penses.

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of
Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, including
travel expenses of non-Federal personnel in-
cluding contractual, per diem, and transporta-
costs, and the hiring of personnel to perform
services for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,
and Firearms; and for payment of the
Department of the Treasury, for the payment
of necessary additional real property and facili-
ties, and for ongoing maintenance, facility
improvements, and related expenses, $7,891,000,
to remain available until expended.

Interagency Law Enforcement
Intergovernmental and Drug Enforcement
For expenses necessary to conduct investiga-
tions and to provide law enforcement train-
ing to Federal, State, and local law enforce-
ment officials and others as determined by
the Secretary, $7,891,000, of which not to
exceed $2,500 shall be available for
official reception and representation ex-
penses.

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of
Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, including
travel expenses of non-Federal personnel in-
cluding contractual, per diem, and transporta-
costs, and the hiring of personnel to perform
services for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,
and Firearms; and for payment of the
Department of the Treasury, for the payment
of necessary additional real property and facili-
ties, and for ongoing maintenance, facility
improvements, and related expenses, $7,891,000,
to remain available until expended.

Interagency Law Enforcement
Intergovernmental and Drug Enforcement
For expenses necessary to conduct investiga-
tions and to provide law enforcement train-
ning to Federal, State, and local law enforce-
ment officials and others as determined by
the Secretary, $7,891,000, of which not to
exceed $2,500 shall be available for
official reception and representation ex-
penses.

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of
Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, including
travel expenses of non-Federal personnel in-
cluding contractual, per diem, and transporta-
costs, and the hiring of personnel to perform
services for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,
and Firearms; and for payment of the
Department of the Treasury, for the payment
of necessary additional real property and facili-
ties, and for ongoing maintenance, facility
improvements, and related expenses, $7,891,000,
to remain available until expended.

Interagency Law Enforcement
Intergovernmental and Drug Enforcement
For expenses necessary to conduct investiga-
tions and to provide law enforcement train-
ning to Federal, State, and local law enforce-
ment officials and others as determined by
the Secretary, $7,891,000, of which not to
exceed $2,500 shall be available for
official reception and representation ex-
penses.

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of
Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, including
travel expenses of non-Federal personnel in-
cluding contractual, per diem, and transporta-
costs, and the hiring of personnel to perform
services for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,
and Firearms; and for payment of the
Department of the Treasury, for the payment
of necessary additional real property and facili-
ties, and for ongoing maintenance, facility
improvements, and related expenses, $7,891,000,
to remain available until expended.

Interagency Law Enforcement
Intergovernmental and Drug Enforcement
For expenses necessary to conduct investiga-
tions and to provide law enforcement train-
ning to Federal, State, and local law enforce-
ment officials and others as determined by
the Secretary, $7,891,000, of which not to
exceed $2,500 shall be available for
official reception and representation ex-
penses.
For necessary expenses connected with any public-duty issues of the United States, $192,327,000, of which not to exceed $15,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, and of which not to exceed $2,000,000 shall remain available until expended for such purposes: Provided, That none of these funds may be obligated until the Internal Revenue Service submits to the Committees on Appropriations, and such Committees approve, a plan for expenditure that: (1) meets the capital and investment requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget, and the Office of Management and Budget; (5) has been reviewed by the Department of the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget; (3) complies with the acquittal rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

S. 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.

S. 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.

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

S. 104. Funds made available by this Act for any other Act to the Internal Revenue Service shall be available for improved facilities to the extent that it is determined that such improvements will significantly enhance the quality and efficiency of the service performed by the Internal Revenue Service, and as necessary to carry out the tax code.
Internal Revenue Service 1-800 help line services.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Secret Service, including purchase of or to exceed 745 vehicles for police-type use, of which 545 are for replacement only, and hire of American-made side-car compatible motor vehicles; hire of aircraft; training and assistance to law enforcement authorities; purchase of insurance for official motor vehicles operated under Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, 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.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of construction, repair, alteration, and improvement of facilities, $3,457,000, 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 any part of the Treasury in a law enforcement organization in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 9703(g)(1), by striking “three years” and inserting “ten years”.

SEC. 111. Appropriations to the Department of the Treasury in this Act shall be available for any agency of the Department of the Treasury authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901), including maintenance, repairs, and cleaning; purchase of insurance for official motor vehicles operated by such agency; purchase of motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitations for vehicles purchased and used for the current fiscal year; the use of vehicles under 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 2002 in this Act for the enforcement of 18 U.S.C. 1531 et seq. (the Anti-terrorism 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 appropriation in this Act made available to the Federal Law Enforcement Center, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, United States Customs Service, Interagency Crime and Drug Enforcement, 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 appropriation in this Act made available to the Departmental Offices, Office of Inspector General, Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, Financial Management Service, and the Comptroller General, 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 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. 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. 119. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Department of the Treasury are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 106(c) of the Counterintelligence and National Security Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2002 unless enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2003.

SEC. 120. Sections 105 of Public Law 105-119 (5 U.S.C. 3104 note), as amended by Public Law 105-277, is further amended in subsection (g)(1), by striking “three years” and inserting “five years”.

SEC. 121. None of the funds appropriated or made available by this or any other Act may be used by the United States Mint to construct or operate a museum at its National Headquarters in Washington, D.C., without the explicit approval of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

This title may be cited as the “Treasury Department Appropriations Act, 2002”.

Mr. ISTOOK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to this portion of the bill?

Mr. KUCHINICH (to the Chairman). I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, senior citizens in my district have worked hard their entire lives and, with the help of Social Security, have been able to enjoy their golden years. A favorite pastime of seniors is attending card parties. Seniors enjoy the card playing. It can be fun and challenging as a test of skill and luck. Sometimes people will go from one card party to the other, they enjoy it so much. I see that as I visit my district. Something people do not like, though, is when they know that cards are being played with a stacked deck, a game that is rigged. That is really repugnant to the American sense of fairness.

Well, in its efforts to turn Social Security over to Wall Street, the administration has stacked the deck against senior citizens on Social Security, because the administration’s Commission on Federal Spending has made the kickings of finance who want to privatize Social Security so they can get money for Wall Street interests. One member of the administration’s Commission on Social Security is a former World Bank economist; another member, president of the business-financed Economic Security 2000, favors a fully privatized system; another member, an investment company executive with Fidelity; another member, AOL Time Warner former chief operating officer, who, at the same time, is involved with a Labor Department matter where the Labor Department has filed suit against Time Warner for denying its own workers health and pension benefits.

The deck is being stacked against our seniors. And while Wall Street’s backing for the commission is being made known, Wall Street Journal reports on June 12 of the year 2001, a range of financial service firms are pooling their efforts and millions of dollars for advertising to assist in privatization. But the ad dollars, the Wall Street Journal goes on to say, are a pittance compared to the billions of dollars at stake for
Wall Street should Mr. Bush achieve his goal of carving private accounts from Social Security. To help Wall Street and his own political coalition will hold a luncheon at New York’s Windows on the World atop the World Trade Center.

The deck is stacked against the people of this country. Social Security is headed to the stock market to benefit the kings of finance. That is all this is about.

Well, we have other things to do in this Congress. We know that the administration has a doublethink on the size of the Social Security financial problem. The administration’s tax cut would reduce revenue by about the same amount of the shortfall between Social Security obligations and revenues. The administration considers the tax cut “quite modest.” Says Paul Krugman in today’s New York Times in an article on the op-ed page, “If it’s a modest tax cut, then the sums Social Security will need to cover its cash shortfall are also modest. We’re supposed to believe that $170 billion a year is modest if it’s a tax cut for the affluent, but that it’s an insupportable burden on the budget if it’s an obligation to retirees.”

He talks about the commission wanting it both ways, what George Orwell called doublethink. That is what the commission report is all about, Paul Krugman says. It is biased, internally inconsistent, and intellectually dishonest.

I will be offering an amendment, Mr. Chairman, and that amendment would establish a commission that would oppose the privatization of Social Security. This commission would have the ability to protect Social Security and stop the diversion of Social Security revenues to the stock market and a reduction of Social Security benefits. This commission would be the answer to this administration’s stacked deck, which wants to privatize Social Security to take money from the seniors and to give it to Wall Street.

The Social Security is solvent through the year 2034 without any changes whatsoever, and we have to defend the right of our senior citizens to have a secure retirement free from the greedy hands of Wall Street trying to grab our Social Security Trust Fund. We need to defend Social Security and everything it stands for.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for raising this issue. There is obviously a desire to privatize Social Security by some. We, on this side, think that this is a bad, bad mistake.

There can be no more dramatic showing of why that is a mistake than to look at the stock market into which presumably those private investments would go over the last 60 days. If one subtracts what Wall Street took for their fees, it is a shambles.

Social Security has taken a situation which will be in the trillions of dollars. It is an estimate. It is based upon numbers that are made up. It is projections based upon those made-up numbers. If we used a different set of numbers, of course, we would likely come up with a different result.

Let us try that. Let us take the numbers that were used to justify the President’s tax cut, a tax cut which I regard as being irresponsible, particularly in view of the fact that it gives most of its benefits to the wealthiest 1 percent of the population; but let us take the numbers that were used by the administration to justify that tax cut. Under those numbers we come up with a very different situation.

If we were to apply those numbers to the Social Security scenario, those more optimistic numbers, those numbers that show economic growth going out into the future, what we find is the Social Security system will begin to pay out more benefits in 2016, but rather, the Social Security system will last with great strength and vigor until at least 2075.

So, what does that tell us? It tells us that people are being dishonest, people are using numbers to try to create an impression to undermine confidence in Social Security where there is no justification whatsoever for undermining confidence in Social Security.

The President tells us he would like to have a system whereby people could invest in the stock market. Well, there is nothing wrong with that. People, if they can afford it, ought to invest in the stock market. Why does the President not set up a program whereby this government will match the funds that people set aside outside of Social Security, independent of Social Security, and have that money invested in the stock market? That would be a very good idea. It today, not undermining Social Security. It would leave it just as it is, strong and secure, providing benefits into the future just as it was intended to do and has always done.
If the President were really serious about trying to do something to help people in their retirement years, I have an idea for him. Here is what I would like him to do. He ought to send to this Congress legislation which would strengthen the private pension plans of all American workers. We need that because there are a growing number of corporations in this country which are undermining their own pension plans, which are providing fewer benefits to their workers in the future, taking away from them health insurance as well.

We need to protect those pension plans. Many corporations are using those pension plans to pretend that they are profits within the company, thereby enabling the compensation of executives for the company and making it appear as if the company is actually stronger than it is. That is wrong, and the private pension plans ought not to be used in that way.

So Social Security is in no trouble. Let us leave it. If we want to do something for retirees, we can set up an independent plan.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 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. 4 offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

At the end of title I (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. The Secretary of Treasury shall establish a commission to oppose the privatization of Social Security, the diversion of Social Security revenues to the stock market, and the reduction of Social Security benefits.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has made his presentation and is prepared to have the Chair rule on his point of order.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply troubled by the way this Administration appears to go about policy questions. I fear that a pattern may be developing.

The GAO is already investigating Vice President's Cheney's secret meetings with energy executives on federal energy policy. There are questions about this Administration's relationship with the Salvation Army about allowing discrimination with federal funds. There are further allegations that the President's Medicare Drug Plan was done in secret consultation with representatives from the drug companies. Now, the Social Security Commission is looking at only one possibility to strengthen Social Security—those who want to privatize it.

This type of one-sided look at policy questions is hurting the Bush Administration. Poll after poll shows that there is a growing concern that the President is too concerned with powerful special interests. His Administration appears to cause more worry about energy companies and drug companies, than about consumers and seniors who need to buy prescription drugs.

Well, today, we are offering the President the opportunity to change that perception. Why not balance his one-sided, unbalanced, biased, pro-privatization Social Security Commission with another Commission to study the other side of the issue? Both Commissions could make recommendations, and Congress and the President could hear from both sides of the debate before making any decisions. This is entirely reasonable, and I hope this amendment is adopted.

The new Commission, unlike Bush's current Commission, might be composed of people who have NOT advocated raising the retirement age and cutting benefits. The President should not have any problem filling the seats on this Commission, because most Americans do not support raising the retirement age or cutting benefits.

The new Commission might point out many of the views that Bush's Commission might not mention. The new Commission could study the need, feasibility, cost, fairness, and risks involved in privatization.

It might conclude, as many of us do, that privatization of Social Security is not necessary, not workable, not cheap, not fair, and not worth the risk.

Let me briefly explain these shortfalls:

First, privatization is not necessary. The Social Security Trustees predict a system that is solvent for 37 years and may in fact be solvent as far as the eye can see.

Second, the Trustees predictions are pessimistic, and have had to be revised every year.

Third, the Trustees pessimistic predictions are unreliable because they don't take into account the effect of the predicted long-term labor shortage on wages, productivity, unemployment, or immigration policy.

IT WON'T WORK

(1) Privatization does not restore solvency to the system—simply diverting 2% of payroll to individual accounts simply makes the funding problem worse. It hastens the insolvency of the system.

(2) Privatization plans that claim to restore solvency to Social Security, only do so because they also cut guaranteed benefits, increase the retirement age, or create huge deficits in the non-social security federal budget. Cutting benefits, raising the retirement age, or adding general fund revenues can make the system solvent with or without the private accounts.

THE TRANSITION COSTS TOO MUCH

(1) The transition costs to a private system are enormous. Furthermore, $1.3 trillion of the surplus is no longer available to finance the transition because of the tax cut.

(2) There are enormous administrative costs to setting up millions of small investment accounts. Why not simply put that money into Social Security directly to make the system more solvent?

IT IS UNFAIR

(1) Under privatization the rich will earn more than the poor in their private accounts.

Two percent of $70,000 is much more than two percent of $20,000. This will increase the disparity in the system.

(2) Privatization (diverting funds to private accounts) may jeopardize existing survivor and disability payments—putting children and those with disabilities at risk.

IT IS EITHER RISKY OR WILL NOT PRODUCE MAJOR GAINS

(1) Investing in the stock market is riskier than investing in bonds. As a result of the risk, the potential for gains is higher, but the potential for losses is higher as well.

(2) If you want to minimize the risk of people ending up poor, you could limit their investments in lower risk stocks or mutual funds. Fine, but then the rate of return is smaller, and the accounts are less likely to make up for the cuts in guaranteed benefits needed to set up the accounts.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) insist on his point of order?

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill; and, therefore, it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

That rule states in pertinent part: “An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.”

This amendment gives affirmative direction, in effect, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be recognized on the point of order?

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I have made my point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that the amendment imports direction to the executive. As such, it is legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained.

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 2601 of title 39, United States Code, $70,000,000, of which $47,000,000 shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 2002: 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 who requests funds mailed to an address.

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 2002.

This Act is referred to as the “Postal Service Appropriations Act, 2002.”

TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

COMPENSATION FOR 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 year as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 102, $450,000: Provided, That none of the funds made available for official expenses shall be expended for any other purpose and any unexpended 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 $90,000 for official entertainment expenses, to be separately accounted for and available for expenses relating to reimbursable political event to pay in advance an amount equal to the estimated cost of the event, $15,000,000: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated shall be available for reimbursement to the White House Communications Agency.

EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE

Operating Expenses

For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, furnishing, improvement, heating, and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Residence at the White House, $8,625,000, to be expended and accounted for as provided for in 3 U.S.C. 102; and not to exceed $19,000 for official entertainment expenses: Provided, That all reimbursable operating expenses of the Executive Residence shall be made in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph: Provided further, That the Executive Residence shall ensure that a written notice of any amount owed for reimbursable operating expenses 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 3107 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 expenses as political or nonpolitical: Provided further, That no provision of this paragraph may be construed to exempt the Executive Residence from any other applicable requirements of chapter 1 or chapter II of title 31, United States Code.

WHITE HOUSE REPAIR AND RESTORATION

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of the Executive Residence at end of fiscal year 2001: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated shall be available for reimbursable operating expenses of the White House Communications Agency, $318,000: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated shall be available for reimbursable expenses to the White House.

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 this paragraph: Provided further, That the Executive Residence shall require each person sponsoring a reimbursable event to pay in advance an amount equal to the estimated cost of the event, $3,925,000: Provided further, That the Executive Residence shall ensure that a written notice of any amount owed for reimbursable operating expenses 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.

OPERATING EXPENSES

Including transfer of funds

For the care, operation, furnishing, improvement, and is approved by the House Committee on Appropriations:
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 preced- ing shall not apply to printed reports released by the Committees on Appropriations or the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to pay the salary or expenses of any employee of the Office of Management and Budget who calculates, prepares, or approves any tax or other material that proposes the sub-allo- cation of budget authority or outlays by the Committees on Appropriations among their subcommittees: Provided further, That of the amounts appropriated, not to exceed $6,331,000 shall be available to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, of which $1,982,750 shall not be obligated until the Office of Management and Budget sub- mits a report to the House Committee on Ap- propriations that provides an assessment of the total costs of implementing Executive Order 13166: Provided further, That the Housing, Treasury and Finance Division shall, in consultation with the Small Business Admin- istration, determine that subsidy cost estimates for the (a) General Business Loan Program and the (b) Certified Development Company loan program which track the actual default experience in these programs since the im- plementation of the Credit Reform Act of 1992: Provided further, That these subsidy esti- mates shall be included in the President’s fiscal year 2003 budget submission and the Office of Management and Budget shall sub- mit a report to the House Committee on Ap- propriations that provides an assessment of the subsidies needed to support such pro- grams. Provided further, That the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Programs, as provided in the National Drug Control Policy: Special Federal Account, shall be available for necessary expenses of the Executive Office of the President, the House Committee on Appropriations, and the House Committee on Small Business prior to the submission of the President’s fiscal year 2003 budget.

Office of National Drug Control Policy

(SALARIES AND EXPENSES

INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Na- tional Drug Control Policy, for research ac- tivities pursuant to the Office of National Drug Control Policy Authorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); not to exceed $12,000 for official reception and representa- tion expenses; and for participation in joint programs, for the purposes of the House Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Small Business prior to the submission of the President’s fiscal year 2003 budget.

Office of National Drug Control Policy

HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Na- tional Drug Control Policy’s High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, $231,882,000 for drug control activities consistent with the approved strategy for each of the des- ignated High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, of which no less than 51 percent shall be transferred to States and local entities for drug control activities, which shall be obligated within 120 days of the date of the en- actment of this Act: Provided, That up to 49 percent, to remain available until September 30, 2003, may be transferred to Federal agen- cies and departments at a rate to be deter- mined by the Director: Provided further, That of this latter amount, not less than $2,100,000 shall be used for auditing services and activities: Provided further, That High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Programs designated as of September 30, 2001, shall be funded at fiscal year 2001 levels unless the Director submits to the Committees on Ap- propriations, and the Committees approve, justification for any changes in those levels based on clearly articulated priorities for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Programs, as well as published Office of Na- tional Drug Control Policy performance measures of effectiveness.

SPECIAL FORFEITURE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For activities to support a national anti- drug campaign for youth, and other pur- poses, designated as of September 30, 1997, of which $1,000,000 shall be available to the United States Anti-Doping Agency for their anti-doping efforts; of which $50,000,000 shall be to continue a program of matching grants to drug-free communities, as author- ized in the Drug-Free Media Campaign Act of 1998, of which $4,000,000 shall be made avail- able by grant or other appropriate transfer to the United States Anti-Doping Agency for their anti-doping efforts; of which $350,000 shall be available to the Office of National Drug Control Policy to continue a program of matching grants to school districts and drug-free communities, as authorized by the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986, of which $2,500,000 shall be available to the United States Anti-Doping Agency for their anti-doping efforts; of which $5,000,000 shall be transferred to the United States Anti-Doping Agency for the purposes of aiding or facilitating the work of the United States Anti-Doping Agency: Provided, That the United States Anti-Doping Agency shall be a nonprofit entity that is responsible for the development of a national anti-doping program; provided further, That in order to accomplish this, the United States Anti-Doping Agency shall be authorized to accept, hold, administer, and use any dollars of spending to the bill, nor does it reduce any dollars of spending to the bill. The effect of the amendment, however, is to consolidate the Executive Office of the President, the White House Office. By way of explanation, Mr. Chair- man, this amendment is offered on be- half of myself and the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). We have had some continuing discussions throughout the process of considering this legislation trying to accommodate the legitimate needs both of the executive branch and the legitimate needs of the legislative branch. The executive branch sees that in having the White House accounts split up into some 18 different accounts, a number of unnecessary transactions, that adds burdens, that adds administra- tive hurdles that they must go through to accomplish anything. For example, when we have funding that is appropriated separately to the executive residents, to White House re- pairs, to special assistants to the Presi- dent, to the Office of Policy Develop- ment, to the White House office and so forth, any time they may have some- thing as simple as say a service con- tract for copier services, or equipment repairs, they have to enter into mul- tiple contracts, do multiple sets of bookkeeping.

Mr. HOYER. The amendment offered by Mr. ISTOOK

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISTOOK

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).
We did want to offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I think the point of order was raised against what the gentleman from California thought was going to be the amendment which had some substantive language to try to put in some safeguards for the benefit of the Congress to make sure that consolidating these accounts would not remove our oversight ability, and would make sure that the persons involved in the White House and expending public funds are still accessible and available to the Congress when we might need testimony and information and to perform our constitutional duties.

Because the gentleman from California intended to offer an objection to the unanimous consent that was necessary to do that, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and I offer the second amendment which does consolidate accounts. It does not have the additional language that we would like to have; but I would represent to the body that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and I and everybody else involved with this intend to make sure that the final product of this committee, whatever it might or might not do with consolidated different accounts, does with all of the necessary safeguards to protect the proper constitutional prerogatives of the Congress.

So this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I believe will clearly be in order. It does not consolidate all 18 of the accounts that are generally under the Executive Office of the President. It does a consolidation of the funding of some 10 of those, but it is done with the express intent and purpose of being the placeholder that we need as we continue to work with the Senate and in conference, and of course with the White House in finalizing the final bill that ultimately will come before this body.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that this amendment does not increase nor decrease the funding for the White House and the Executive Office of the President. It merely takes 10 separate line items in the bill, consolidates them into one so we might indeed make sure that we can bring up this issue when we get into a conference with the Senate. It is our placeholder for that purpose.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform, leaves the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) correctly points out that this is a placeholder. As I told the gentleman from California, I opposed the original amendment that was offered. It was defeated in committee. But I believe this is a subject worthy of discussion between now and conference, and I want to assure the gentleman that I will be talking with him as well to get his thoughts on this proposal that OMB has made.

Clearly they believe it is a proposal which will encourage greater efficiencies and greater management. Whether that is the case or not, we will see. I assure the gentleman that I will discuss it further with him.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentleman very much for those assurances. I understand the chairman of the subcommittee also expressing the view that this is a placeholder.

The original proposal I found very troubling. I thought it was rather like allowing all the money from the National Security Council to be used for the residence of the Vice President. I do not think that much power ought to be delegated away from the Congress to the executive branch. There are many accounts over which we ought to have a much closer opportunity to review.

I thank the gentleman for his assurances and will look forward to discussing the issue with him further.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, let me say to the gentleman that the gentleman is correct that money could be shifted from the NSC account to other accounts, the Vice President’s account or any other account. Obviously, that would have to be done, however, with the approval of the committee, because they would need a request to shift from one program to the other. However, I raised similar concern that this would facilitate that happening. Because at times we do not give as careful attention to the shifting of funds from one account to another as we do to the initial appropriations to that account, I think the gentleman’s concern is well placed. I expressed it as well in committee. We will see how comfortable we can become with the ultimate agreement that we might reach.

I thank the gentleman for his input. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

For necessary expenses of the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled established by Public Law 92-28, $4,629,000.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, $43,689,000, of which no less than $5,128,000 shall be available for internal automated data processing systems, and of which not to exceed $1,068,000 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 Number 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, $26,524,000: 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 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, any funds received from fees charged to non-Federal participants at labor-management relations conferences shall be credited to and merged with this amount, 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, as amended (40 U.S.C. 495(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 federal buildings; moving governmental agencies (including space adjustments and telecommunications relocation expenses) in connection with the assignment, allocation and transfer of space; contract 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 of such buildings acquired by installment purchase and purchase contract; in the aggregate amount of $6,086,138,000 of which (1) $34,662,000 shall remain available for expenditure for construction (including funds for sites and expenses and associated design and construction services) of additional projects at the following locations: New Construction:  Alabama:  
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That funding for any project identified above may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other such projects, but not to exceed 10 percent of the amounts included in an approved prospectus, if required, unless advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations. Provided further, that all funds for direct construction projects shall expire on September 30, 2003, 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; (3) $186,427,000 for installation of reimbursable special services to other agencies under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 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 reimbursable special services to other agencies under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)) and amounts necessary 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 2002, excluding reimbursements under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)) shall remain available 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 lands owned by the Government; and for expenses 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 Congress: Provided further, That the differences between the amounts 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 Basic Repairs and Alterations projects shall expire on September 30, 2003, 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; (3) $186,427,000 for installation of reimbursable special services to other agencies under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 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 reimbursable special services to other agencies under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)) and amounts necessary 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 2002, excluding reimbursements under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)) shall remain available in the Fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General for services authorized under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $36,478,000: Provided, That not to exceed $15,000 shall be available for payment for information and detection of fraud against, or 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 made available to Government agencies by the Information Technology Fund, General Services Administration, under section 110 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 751) and sections 5124(b) and 5128 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1424(b) and 1428), 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, Limitation” for the fiscal year 2003 request for United States Courthouse, Alaska, $300,000: Provided, That the amount expended during fiscal year 2001 for the purchase of alternative fuel vehicles shall be at least $5,000,000 more than the amount expended during fiscal year 2002 for the purchase of alternative fuel vehicles shall be at least $5,000,000 more than the amount expended during fiscal year 2001 for such purposes.

SEC. 408. The amount expended by the General Services Administration during fiscal year 2002 for the purchase of hybrid vehicles shall be at least $5,000,000 more than the amount expended during fiscal year 2001 for such purposes.

SEC. 409. For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Merit Systems Protection Board pursuant to Reorganization Plan Number 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 supplies totaling $5,555,000, together with not to exceed $2,520,000 for administrative expenses to adjudicate retiree, annuity, and deferred retirement allowances 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

MORRIS K. UDALL SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY TRUST FUND

For payment to the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Trust Fund, pursuant to the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental and Native American Public Policy Act of 1992 (20 U.S.C. 5601 et. seq.), $2,500,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That up to 60 percent of such funds may be transferred by the Director for expenses authorized in the Environmental Policy Foundation for the necessary expenses of the Native Nations Institute; Provided further, That not less than 50 percent of the amount expended under this section shall be used for the pursuit of the research and development of new ideas and new initiatives for the protection and preservation of the environment; Provided further, That $2,500,000 shall be made available from the Fund to the Office of Government Ethics for expenses authorized in the Environmental Policy and Conflict Resolution Act of 1998, $1,309,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 401. Appropriations and funding for the National Archives and Records Administration are subject to the provisions of the Office of Management and Budget, and Public Law 95-138, $3,196,000: Provided, That the Administrator of the General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of such Acts.

SEC. 402. Funds available to the General Services Administration shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of such Acts.

SEC. 403. Funds in the Federal Buildings Fund made available for fiscal year 2002 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 Committee on Appropriations.

SEC. 404. No funds made available by this Act shall be used to transfer a fiscal year 2003 request for United States Courthouse construction funds totals; (1) does not meet the design guide standards for construction as established by 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 priorities of the Judicial Conference of the United States as set out in its approved 5-year program; Provided further, That the amount expended during the fiscal year 2003 request shall 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 occupied square feet, provide cleaning services, securities, or 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 section 110 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 751) and sections 5124(b) and 5128 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1424(b) and 1428), for performance of pilot 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, Limitation” for the fiscal year 2003 request shall be accompanied by a standardized courtroom utilization study of each facility to be constructed, replaced, or expanded: Provided, That the amount expended during the fiscal year 2002 for the purchase of alternative fuel vehicles shall be at least $5,000,000 more than the amount expended during fiscal year 2001 for such purposes.

SEC. 408. The amount expended by the General Services Administration during fiscal year 2002 for the purchase of alternative fuel vehicles shall be at least $5,000,000 more than the amount expended during fiscal year 2001 for such purposes.

SEC. 409. For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Merit Systems Protection Board pursuant to Reorganization Plan Number 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 supplies totaling $5,555,000, together with not to exceed $2,520,000 for administrative expenses to adjudicate retiree, annuity, and deferred retirement allowances 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

MORRIS K. UDALL SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY TRUST FUND

For payment to the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Trust Fund, pursuant to the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental and Native American Public Policy Act of 1992 (20 U.S.C. 5601 et. seq.), $2,500,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the amount expended during the fiscal year 2002 for the purchase of alternative fuel vehicles shall be at least $5,000,000 more than the amount expended during fiscal year 2001 for such purposes.

SEC. 402. Funds available to the General Services Administration shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of such Acts.

SEC. 403. Funds in the Federal Buildings Fund made available for fiscal year 2002 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 Committee on Appropriations.

SEC. 405. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to increase the amount of

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Government Ethics pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, as amended 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, $10,117,000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

SEC. 401. Appropriations and funding for the Office of Personnel Management are subject to the provisions of the Office of Management and Budget, and Public Law 95-138, $3,196,000: Provided, That the Administrator of the General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of such Acts.

SEC. 402. Funds available to the General Services Administration shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of such Acts.

SEC. 403. Funds in the Federal Buildings Fund made available for fiscal year 2002 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 Committee on Appropriations.

SEC. 404. No funds made available by this Act shall be used to transfer a fiscal year 2003 request for United States Courthouse construction funds totals; (1) does not meet the design guide standards for construction as established by 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 program; Provided further, That the amount expended during the fiscal year 2003 request shall be accompanied by a standardized courtroom utilization study of each facility to be constructed, replaced, or expanded: Provided further, That the amount expended during the fiscal year 2002 for the purchase of alternative fuel vehicles shall be at least $5,000,000 more than the amount expended during fiscal year 2001 for such purposes.

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

MORRIS K. UDALL SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY TRUST FUND

For payment to the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Trust Fund, pursuant to the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental and Native American Public Policy Act of 1992 (20 U.S.C. 5601 et. seq.), $2,500,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That up to 60 percent of such funds may be transferred by the Director for expenses authorized in the Environmental Policy Foundation for the necessary expenses of the Native Nations Institute; Provided further, That not less than 50 percent of the amount expended under this Act, the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation shall submit to the House Committee on Appropriations a report describing the distribution of such funds.
transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Social Security Trust Fund, without regard to other statutes, including direct procurement of printed materials, for the retirement and insurance programs, of which $21,777,000 shall be available until expended for the cost of automating the retire-
ment 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), 8909(g), and 9001(f)(1)(A) and (2)(a) of title 5, United States Code, provided further, That this part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit of the Office of Personnel Man-
agement, established as may be necessary under Executive Order No. 9538 of July 1, 1943, or any suc-
cessor 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, dur-
ing fiscal year 2002, accept donations of money, property, and personal services in connection with the development of a pub-
llicity 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 Commis-

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF TRUST FUNDS):

For necessary expenses of the Office of In-
spector General in carrying out the provi-
sions of the Inspector General Act, as amended, including services as authorized by
5 U.S.C. 3109, hire of passenger motor vehi-
cles, $1,498,000; and in addition, not to exceed $10,016,000 for administrative expenses to audit, investigate, and provide other over-
sight of the Office of Personnel Manage-
ment's retirement and insurance programs, to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Office of Personnel Manage-
ment, as determined by the Inspector Gen-
eral: 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 contribu-
tions for retired employees authorized by chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, and the Retired Federal Em-
ployees Health Benefits Program established under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, such as may be necessary.

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For financing the unfunded liability of new and increased annuity benefits becoming ef-
fective on or after October 20, 1969, as au-
thorized by 5 U.S.C. 8348, and annuities under special Acts to be credited to the Civil Ser-
vice Retirement and Disability Fund, such sums as may be necessary: Provided, That an-
nuities authorized by the Act of May 28, 1944, as amended, and the Act of August 19, 1950, as amended (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 func-
tions of the Office of Special Counsel pursu-
in to Reorganization Plan Number 2 of 1970, title 5, United States Code, and the Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-444), the Whistleblower Pro-
tection Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-12), Pub-
lic Law 103-424, and the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-353), the services of an official authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, payment of fees and expenses for witnesses, rental of con-
ference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; $11,891,000.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including contract
rents, and per diem allowances to the Chief Judge authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $3,876,809,000: Provided, That trav-
el expenses of the judges shall be paid upon
the written certificate of the judge, but the enforcement be cited as the "Independ-
ent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002":

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

This Act

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation con-
tained in this Act shall remain available for
obligation beyond the fiscal year un-
less expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 502. The expenditure of any appropria-
tion under this Act for any consulting ser-
vice through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under exist-
ing Executive order issued pursuant to exist-
ing law.

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available for any activ-
ity or for paying the salary of any Govern-
ment employee where funding an activity or paying a salary to a Government employee would result in a decision, determination, rule, regulation, or policy that would pro-
hibit the enforcement of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

SEC. 504. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available in fiscal year 2002 for the operation of the United States Marshals Service as authorized by section 101(a) of the Omnibus Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-395) for the operation of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center located at Glyco, Georgia, and Artesia, New Mexico, out of the Department of Justice appropriation for the Treasury Department.

SEC. 505. No part of any appropriation con-
tained in this Act shall be available to pay the salary for any person filling a position, other than a temporary or acting position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of ac-
military or naval service, and has with-
in 90 days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after dis-
charge for a period of not more than 1 year, made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Office of Personnel Management as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 506. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity un-
less the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with the con-
tions 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

SEC. 507. (a) IMPORTATION OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be au-
thorized to be purchased with financial assis-
tance provided pursuant to this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the as-
sistance, purchase only American-made equip-
ment and products that are American-made.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pro-
vide to each recipient of the assistance a no-
tification describing the statement made in sub-
section (a) of this section.

SEC. 508. If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ‘‘Made in America’’ inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or sub-
contract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, sus-
pension, andeligibility procedures de-

SEC. 509. No funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to pay for an abortion, or the administrative expenses in connection with any health plan under the Federal em-
ployees health benefit program provided by law, to provide any benefits or coverage for abortions.

SEC. 510. The provision of section 509 shall not apply where the life of the mother would be endangered if the foetus be allowed to term, or the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

SEC. 511. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2002 from appropri-
aitions made available for salaries and expen-
se for fiscal year 2002 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2003, for each such account for the purposes au-
thorized: Provided, That a request shall be
provided for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: Provided further, That these re-
quests shall be made in compliance with re-
programming guidelines.

SEC. 512. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Executive Of-
ifice of the President to request from the Fed-
eral Employees Health Benefits Program established under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 513. The cost accounting standards promulgated under section 26 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (Public Law 93–409, 41 U.S.C. 422) shall not apply with respect to a contract under the Federal Em-
ployees Health Benefits Program established under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 514. For the purpose of resolving liti-
gation and implementing any settlement agreements regarding the foreign area cost-of-living allowance program, the Office of Personnel Management may accept and use any unanticipated travel expenses imposed in an Appropriations Act; funds made available to the Office pursuant to court approval.

SEC. 515. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Office of Man-
agement and Budget who makes an appropriation under subsection (a) of section 301 of title 31, United States code, that prevent the expenditure or obligation by December 31,
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2001, of at least 75 percent of the appropriations made for fiscal year 2002 to carry out the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 161 et seq.), the Food for Peace Act of 1965 (7 U.S.C. 1736a), and section 416(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1502).

Mr. ISTOOK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 68, line 2, be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point prior to title VI. The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to note for anyone that may be confused because we had a pause, we were anticipating there would be another amendment that was to have been presented a moment ago, and it has not. So the effect of what we have asked unanimous consent to do is to open up the bill to amendments and move on to title VI, which is the general provisions where we know there are several Members that have amendments to offer in that section.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. So am I correct that through title VI now is closed?

Mr. ISTOOK. We are opening up the bill up to title VI. The entire bill is open for amendment to title VI. Then Members who have amendments on title VI may offer those. We are about to close off the bill prior to title VI.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, we are now closed through title VI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

TITTLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

SEC. 601. Funds appropriated in this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year may be used for expenditures of any department or agency during the current fiscal year of the corporations subject to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia, services in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 3109; and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: Provided, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limits which apply to such functions shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 602. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States), whose post of duty is in the continental United States unless such person: (1) is a citizen of the United States; (2) is a person in the service of the United States; (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States; (4) is an alien from Cuba, Poland, South Vietnam, the countries of the former Soviet Union, or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence; (5) is a South Vietnamese, Cambodian, or Laotian refugee paragraph (6) of section 201 of the Act of January 1, 1975; or (6) is a national of the People’s Republic of China who qualifies for adjustment of status pursuant to the Chinese Exclusion Act and is actually residing in the United States on or after January 1, 1975.

SEC. 603. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 1234; 40 U.S.C. 504) shall be $9,100: Provided, That these limits may be exceeded by not to exceed $3,700 for police-type vehicles, and by not to exceed $4,000 for special heavy-duty vehicles, where purchase of any such vehicle is for demonstration purposes under the provisions of the Electric and Hybrid Vehicle Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1976: Provided further, That the limits may be exceeded by the incremental cost of clean alternative fuels vehicles acquired pursuant to Public Law 101-549 over the cost of comparable conventionally fueled vehicles.

SEC. 604. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year available for expenses of travel, or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 5922-5924.

SEC. 605. Unless otherwise specified during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to make payment of any false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, Provided, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limits which apply to such functions shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 606. Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall not be used to provide charges for personal services for the benefit of the Administrator of General Services for charges for space and services and those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements.

SEC. 607. In addition to funds provided in this or any other Act, all Federal agencies are authorized to receive and use funds received from the sale or disposal of funds made available by the Federal records disposed of pursuant to a records schedule recovered through recycling or waste prevention programs. Such funds shall be available until expended for the following purposes:

(1) Acquisition, waste reduction and prevention, and recycling programs as described in Executive Order No. 13101 (September 14, 1998), including any such programs adopted prior to the effective date of the Executive order.

(2) Other Federal agency environmental management programs, including, but not limited to, the development and implementation of hazardous waste management and pollution prevention programs.

(3) Other employee programs as authorized by law or as deemed appropriate by the head of the Federal agency.

SEC. 608. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to chapter 91 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia, services in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 3109, and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: Provided, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limits which apply to such functions shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 609. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of any corporation (except Federal Executive Boards), commission, council, committee, or similar groups (whether or not they are interagency entities) which do not have a prior and specific statutory approval to receive financial support from more than one agency or instrumentality.

SEC. 610. Funds made available by this or any other Act to the Postal Service Fund (39 U.S.C. 2003) shall be available for employment of guards for all buildings and areas owned or occupied by the Postal Service and under the charge and control of the Postal Service, and such guards shall have, with respect to such property, the powers of special policemen provided by the first section of the Act of June 1, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 318; 40 U.S.C. 318), and, as to property owned or occupied by the Postal Service, the Postmaster General may take action under Executive Order No. 13101 (September 14, 1998), including any such programs adopted prior to the effective date of the Executive order, and the Administrator of General Services may take under the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of the Act of June 1, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 318; 40 U.S.C. 318), and, as to property owned or occupied by the Postal Service, the Postmaster General may take action under Executive Order No. 13101 (September 14, 1998), including thereto penal consequences under the authority and within the limits provided in section 4 of the Act of June 1, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 318; 40 U.S.C. 318).

SEC. 611. None of the funds made available pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall...
be used to implement, administer, or enforce any provision of law, and except as otherwise provided in this section, no part of any of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 2002, by this or any other Act may be used in any prevailing rate employee described in section 5342(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code—

(1) during the period from the date of expiration of the limitation imposed by section 613 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001, until the normal effective date of the applicable wage survey adjustment that is to take effect in fiscal year 2002, in an amount that exceeds the rate payable for the applicable grade and step of the applicable wage schedule in accordance with such section 613; and

(2) during the period consisting of the remainder of fiscal year 2002, in an amount that equals, as a result of a wage survey adjustment, the rate payable under paragraph (1) by more than the sum of—

(A) the percentage adjustment taking effect in fiscal year 2002 under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule; and

(B) the difference between the overall average percentage of the locality-based comparability payments taking effect in fiscal year 2002 under section 5304 of such title (whether by adjustment or otherwise), and the overall average percentage of such payments which was effective in fiscal year 2001 under such section.

SEC. 614. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no prevailing rate employee described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 5342(a) of title 5, United States Code, and no employee covered by section 5348 of such title, may be paid during the periods for which subsection (a) is in effect at a rate that exceeds the rates that would be payable under subsection (a) were subsection (a) applicable to such employee.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the rates payable under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, and the rates payable under section 5304 of such title, which are payable during the periods for which subsection (a) is in effect at a rate that exceeds the rates that would be payable under subsection (a) were subsection (a) applicable to such employee, and which are paid during the periods for which subsection (a) is in effect at a rate that exceeds the rates that would be payable under subsection (a) were subsection (a) applicable to such employee, are separately applicable for the interagency funding of national security and emergency preparedness telecommunication initiatives which benefit multiple Federal departments, agencies, or entities, as provided by Executive Order No. 12472 (April 3, 1984).

(b) None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

(1) prohibits or prevents, or attempts or threatens to prohibit or prevent, any other officer or employee of the Federal Government from having any direct oral or written communication or contact with any Member, committee, or subcommittee of the Congress in connection with any matter pertaining to the employment of such other officer or employee or pertaining to the department or agency of such other officer or employee in any way, irrespective of whether such communication or contact is at the initiative of such other officer or employee or in response to a request for such communication or contact by the Congress as described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 620. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or “new age” belief systems or “new age” belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N-915.022, dated September 2, 1988; or

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants’ personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, in any way, otherwise, or in any manner, the Office of Personnel Management from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.
SEC. 621. No funds appropriated in this Act or any other Act may be used to implement any policy, form, or agreement that would permit, encourage, or enforce the agreements in Standard Forms 312 and 4141 of the Government or any other nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement if such policy, form, or agreement contain the following provisions: "These restrictions are consistent with and do not supersede, conflict with, or otherwise alter the employee's personal rights, duties, or liabilities created by Executive Order No. 12598; section 7211 of title 5, U.S.C. (governing disclosures to Congress); section 1034 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by the Military Whistleblower Protection Act (governing disclosures to Congress by members of the military); section 2302(b)(8) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by the Whistleblower Protection Act (governing disclosures of illegality, waste, fraud, abuse or public health or safety threats); the Intelligence Identities Protection Act of 1982 (50 U.S.C. 421 et seq.) (governing disclosures that could expose confidential Government agents); and the statute which is a part of the United States, or for the conduct of an intelligence or intelligence-related activity, other than an employee or officer of the United States Government, that may compromise the national security, including sections 611, 793, 794, 798, and 952 of title 18, United States Code, and section 4(b) of the Espionage Act of 1917 (50 U.S.C. 783(b)). The definitions, requirements, obligations, rights, sanctions, and liabilities created by said Executive order and listed statutes are incorporated into this agreement and are controlling. Provided, That notwithstanding the preceding paragraph, a nondisclosure policy or form that is to be executed by a person connected with the conduct of an intelligence or intelligence-related activity, other than an employee or officer of the United States Government, that may compromise the national security, including sections 611, 793, 794, 798, and 952 of title 18, United States Code, and section 4(b) of the Espionage Act of 1917 (50 U.S.C. 783(b)). The definitions, requirements, obligations, rights, sanctions, and liabilities created by said Executive order and listed statutes are incorporated into this agreement and are controlling.

SEC. 622. No part of any funds appropriated in this Act or any other Act may be used by an agency to provide a Federal employee's home address to any labor organization except when the employee has authorized such disclosure or when such disclosure has been ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 623. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any other Act may be used by an agency to provide to any labor organization except when the employee has authorized such disclosure or when such disclosure has been ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(1) means an Executive agency as defined under section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) includes a military department as defined under section 102 of such title, the Postal Service, and the Postal Rate Commission; and

(3) shall not include the General Accounting Office.

SEC. 624. Nothing in this Act or any other Act shall be construed to author or allow suspension of the Whistleblower Protection Act (governing disclosures of illegality, waste, fraud, abuse or public health or safety threats); the Intelligence Identities Protection Act of 1982 (50 U.S.C. 421 et seq.) (governing disclosures that could expose confidential Government agents); and the statute which is a part of the United States, or for the conduct of an intelligence or intelligence-related activity, other than an employee or officer of the United States Government, that may compromise the national security, including sections 611, 793, 794, 798, and 952 of title 18, United States Code, and section 4(b) of the Espionage Act of 1917 (50 U.S.C. 783(b)). The definitions, requirements, obligations, rights, sanctions, and liabilities created by said Executive order and listed statutes are incorporated into this agreement and are controlling.

Provided, That notwithstanding the preceding paragraph, a nondisclosure policy or form that is to be executed by a person connected with the conduct of an intelligence or intelligence-related activity, other than an employee or officer of the United States Government, that may compromise the national security, including sections 611, 793, 794, 798, and 952 of title 18, United States Code, and section 4(b) of the Espionage Act of 1917 (50 U.S.C. 783(b)). The definitions, requirements, obligations, rights, sanctions, and liabilities created by said Executive order and listed statutes are incorporated into this agreement and are controlling.

SEC. 625. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act or any other Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not heretofore authorized by Congress.

SEC. 626. (a) In this section the term 'agency' means:

(1) an Executive agency as defined under section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) includes a military department as defined under section 102 of such title, the Postal Service, and the Postal Rate Commission; and

(3) shall not include the General Accounting Office.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—Nothing in this Act or any other Act may be used to implement the provisions of this section to acquire, use, or release any information to the Committees on Appropriations.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—Nothing in this Act or any other Act may be used to implement the provisions of this section to acquire, use, or release any information to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 627. Notwithstanding section 3136 of title 31, United States Code, or section 609 of this Act, funds made available for fiscal year 2002 by this or any other Act shall be available for the interagency funding of specific projects, workshops, studies, and similar efforts to carry out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Council (authorized by Executive Order No. 12861), which benefit multiple Federal departments, agencies, or entities: Provided, That the Office of Management and Budget shall provide a report describing the budget of and resources connected with the National Science and Technology Council to the Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Science; and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation 90 days after enactment of this Act.

SEC. 628. Any request for proposals, solicitation, grant application, form, notification, press release, or other publications involving the distribution of Federal funds shall indicate the agency providing the funds and the amount provided. This provision shall apply to direct payments, formula funds, and grants received by a State receiving Federal funds.

SEC. 629. (a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with regulations promulgated by the Office of Personnel Management, an Executive agency which provides or proposes to provide child care services for Federal employees may use appropriated funds (otherwise available only for the purpose of child care services) to provide child care, in a Federal or leased facility, or through contract, for civilian employees of such agency.

(b) AMOUNTS.—The total funds transferred shall not exceed $17,000,000. Such transfers may only be made 15 days following notification of the Committees on Appropriations by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 630. (a) In General.—In accordance with regulations promulgated by the Office of Personnel Management, an Executive agency which provides or proposes to provide child care services for Federal employees may use appropriated funds (otherwise available only for the purpose of child care services) to provide child care, in a Federal or leased facility, or through contract, for civilian employees of such agency.

(b) Appropriations.—The total funds transferred shall not exceed $17,000,000. Such transfers may only be made 15 days following notification of the Committees on Appropriations by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 631. Subsection (f) of section 403 of Public Law 103–356 (31 U.S.C. 501 note) is amended by striking "October 1, 2001" and inserting "October 1, 2002".

SEC. 632. Section 3 of Public Law 93–436 as amended (3 U.S.C. 111 note) is amended by inserting "utility" (including electrical) after "as defined", after "for services rendered", covering agreed upon periods, including the performance of law, a woman may breastfeed her child at any location in a Federal building or on Federal property, if the woman and her child are otherwise authorized to be present at that location.

SEC. 633. During fiscal year 2002 and thereafter, the head of an entity named in 3 U.S.C. 112 may, with respect to civilian personnel of any branch of the Federal government performing duties in such entity, exercise administrative authority comparable to the authority that may by law (including chapter 57 and sections 8434 and 8466 of title 5, United States Code) be exercised with respect to the employees of an Executive agency (as defined in 5 U.S.C. 105) by the head of such Executive agency, and the authority granted by this section shall be in addition to any other authority available by law.

SEC. 634. Each Executive agency covered by section 609 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(h) of division A of Public Law 105–277) shall submit a report 90 days after enactment describing the efforts of the Office of Personnel Management regarding its efforts to implement the intent of such section.

SEC. 635. (a) Prohibition of Federal Agency Monitoring of Personal Information on

SEC. 636. (a) Prohibition of Federal Agency Monitoring of Personal Information on
MR. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will benefit three groups of people. First, it will help our constituents, our citizens. The reason is, that our citizens now are experiencing, many of them, skyrocketing electrical costs. In my district people are paying 30, 45, 50, 60 percent more for their electrical bills. My constituents cannot send their bills for these skyrocketing electrical rates to the U.S. Navy. We do not think it is the right message to our constituents for the Vice President to say, but I'm going to send my skyrocketing electrical bill, and that bill is skyrocketing, to the U.S. Navy. We think it is the wrong message for our constituents. So it is good for our constituents who expect personal accountability in these expenditures.

Second, it is good for the U.S. Navy. We have got a lot of service personnel out there who justifiably are not happy about their housing, their pay, something very close to the oil and gas industry. Here's that sentiment has gone out there who justifiably are not happy with the Vice President's budget: midst of this energy crisis remains with the Vice President's budget.

Third, this amendment is good for the Vice President. The Vice President has not asked for this change to be made. This idea was not his, apparently. But the fact of the matter is, and perhaps it is sad to report, but it is true, there are Americans who are concerned about the Vice President's apparent lack of concern for the crisis in energy and some people who have suggested that he might be perhaps too close to the oil and gas industry. Now, I think it would be beneficial if we can squelch those rumors, those rumors that have come up due to these secret meetings that the Vice President has had with the oil and gas industry. He now refuses to divulge information about. Let us help him squelch those rumors that he is squelching, that he will be personally accountable in this electrical rate crisis.
that conservation is just a personal virtue but not an economic policy, some people have concern that that shows too much closeness to the energy industry. Let us help him squelch those rumors to show he wants to be personally accountable and understands the problems of real Americans in this regard.

Some people have suggested that when the Vice President sat for 8 months and did nothing about the electrical crisis in California, Oregon and Washington, people are correct on any point that has demonstrated a lack of compassion and understanding for the plight of people on the West Coast whose energy prices have gone through the roof. Let us help him squelch those rumors to show personal accountability for these.

And some people have suggested that the Vice President's willingness to drill in our most pristine wilderness areas demonstrates that he is the will of the American people but a little too close to the oil and gas industry. Let us help him squelch those rumors by showing personal accountability in fact for these obligations of the Vice President's office.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps this seems like a small budget item, and it is certainly a small dollar amount, about $180,000, in the context of the Federal budget. But leadership involves understanding the plight of those who are led. We have had a lot of people who are in tough times right now because of the downturn in the economy and the huge escalation in their energy prices. Let us help the Vice President demonstrate that he is in touch with the needs of ordinary Americans and assure that the Vice President's budget will in fact remain responsible for his electric bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was hopeful that we could get through this debate without having an amendment such as this offered because I think it is based upon very misleading arguments and claims. I would certainly hope that nobody in this body would want to take a cheap shot at the Vice President of the United States, the Vice President by law resides at the Naval Observatory here in Washington, DC. The grounds are under the jurisdiction of the United States Navy.

Two years ago, they installed a separate meter for the residence. Now, it is not just the residence that comes through it because there is all the security lighting and there is the Secret Service needs. There is a lot more than would come under any residence. Besides that, it is a 33-room building that has the official functions as well as the residential functions as part of it.

After they installed the meter, Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago, they found out that the former Vice President, Mr. Gore, overspent on utilities 220 percent of his office budget. What they did then was to check up on the difference for former Vice President Gore's utility bill, which I believe the difference was somewhere in the neighborhood of $125,000.

In December of 1999, under the former administration, the former administration proposed consolidating the utility bills of the Vice President's residence with the Navy's overall utility bills at the Naval Observatory to be under the jurisdiction of the Navy. That proposal was carried forward and carried out in the current budget, and the budget for the Vice President was reduced by the same amount as we had allocated for former Vice President Gore's utility bills.

Former Vice President Gore went into the Navy to pay the utility bill once they had a separate meter and found out how much it was. Now we are told that Mr. CHENEY is being irresponsible because the Navy is going to pay the bill means the taxpayers pay the bill, which was the same people that pay it anyway.

But, yet, Mr. Chairman, what they are not mentioning is that Mr. CHENEY is using about one-fourth less energy than Mr. Gore did at the residence. Now, there is your story. The current Vice President is only using 75 percent as much energy as the last Vice President. Yet they try to twist and manipulate things to make it appear that somehow Mr. CHENEY is being irresponsible and trying to evade his electric bill.

There is no truth to such an assertion. This is merely carrying out the plan that was put in place by the Clinton administration, to have the Navy pick up the difference between what Mr. Gore had in his budget to pay his utility bill and what the actual bill was, because it was far beyond what Mr. Gore had in his budget. But, instead, they try to twist it where somehow Mr. CHENEY, who has reduced the bill, supposedly Mr. CHENEY is the one being irresponsible? No matter how it is manipulated, Mr. Chairman, that does not wash.

I would hope that any person who tries to use this to embarrass the Vice President of the United States would rethink it and perhaps get a little bit embarrassed, if not ashamed, at what they are trying to do.

This is an outrageous argument that we have been hearing on this. It is not based upon accountability of who pays the bills, because we have the meter, we know regardless. We know that the bill is something that is going to be at the taxpayers' expense, whether it is routed through the Naval Observatory account or whether it is routed through the Office of the Vice President but the funding was not put in Mr. Gore's budget, and the funding was not put in Mr. CHENEY's budget to pay the entirety of the expense. Either way, the Navy is picking up the difference.

Mr. CHENEY is the one who is being responsible, who is getting by with 75 percent as much energy as Mr. Gore was using. That is the bottom line, and that is what we ought to be focusing on.

I do not yield on something as outrageous as this. I yield back the balance of any time.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Inslee-Filner amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington for raising this issue. We are not trying to embarrass the Vice President of the United States; we are trying to embarrass the administration for not having an energy policy for this country.

We are not arguing whether the taxpayer is going to have this bill one way or the other; we are arguing that the people in the West Coast are paying double and triple the prices they paid last year, and they have no help. The administration will not step in and do anything about their prices, will not do anything about the energy cartel that is doing this.

The Vice President does not have to worry about that. He just asks for a shift of the accounts. We are not accusing the Vice President of being irresponsible; we are accusing the Vice President of being clueless. We have suffered for a year in San Diego, California, and the West Coast, with manipulated prices that have doubled and tripled what we were paying a year ago. Think of the small business person who is paying $700 or $800 a month, and, after deregulation, is paying $2,500 a month.

I want the Vice President to think about the small business person who had to close his doors because he did not have anybody to take his bill up. And he conserves. I will accept your premise that the Vice President conserves. Our people conserves, and what happened? Their price went up, and they did not have anybody to bail them out.

Sixty-five percent of small businesses in San Diego County face bankruptcy today. We have asked the administration for help. What about the person on fixed income who was paying $40 or $50 a month and is facing a bill of $150 to $200 a month, and he or she conserves? They are using 30, 40, 50 percent less electricity and their price doubled or tripled anyway. Do they have the Navy to bail them out? No.

We asked the administration, we have asked the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a year now, to bring us cost-based rates to the West Coast. That is what went on in this country for almost a century, the cost of production plus a reasonable profit.
It costs 2 or 3 cents a kilowatt to produce, the energy companies charge 3 or 4 cents, and they were making a real hell out of this in his residence. We are told he actually has taken some steps to reduce his electrical usage, and I think that is great. He should be lauded for his personal virtue in that regard.

What we are critical, however, of, and the point we are trying to make here, is that this administration, while shifting accountability to the Navy, is not lifting a finger to help get refunds of the billions of dollars that are owed to us constituents on the West Coast.

The economic analysis of some folks indicates we have been overcharged $8 billion by electrical gougers on the West Coast, although today the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Finally, between the two energy bills, them, not the administration, they have finally said we are going to do something marginal for California; but we are not going to lift a finger for Washington and Oregon.

Washington and Oregon need refunds. The point we are trying to make is this administration, while it is shifting responsibility for electrical rates to the Navy, will not lift a finger to help us get refunds in the States of Washington or Oregon, because of this worshipping at the altar of the free market.

That is the criticism we have of the Vice President. We laud him for his conservation. We now want him to get busy and help us get refunds in the Pacific Northwest.

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to clarify some of the remarks that were made by the gentleman from Washington. We believe that the difference is approximately 15 percent in the last 4 months. If you compare the first 6 months, it is an interesting comparison, because the Vice President, of course, was not in residence at the Vice President's residence. They were refurbishing the residence for the Vice President.

If you are just comparing the last 4 months, including a hot day yesterday and a cool month of June, there was a 15 percent difference over those 4 months, not between the energy costs, which is clearly explained by the difference in weather.

But that attempts to respond to an alleged attack on the Vice President by attacking his predecessor. Now, I know consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds, but it would seem to be fair to the former Vice President not to go after these energy costs, as the majority wants the present Vice President to be free of these attacks.

The gentleman from Washington State pointed out, absolutely correctly, this is not about the Vice President. This is about the cost of energy. This is about a sensitivity that the administration ought to have, that the Congress ought to have, to the cost of heating one's home, of air conditioning one's home.

Now, let me correct, if I might, the chairman. The Secret Service is separately metered. The Secret Service has its own meter. Why? Because they use a lot of electric utilities. They use a lot of security lights, and they are metered themselves. So this is not an opportunity nor an effort to embarrass the Vice President.

I will tell my friend, the chairman of this committee, with whom I have been working positively, who did not serve on all the years from 1995 to 2001 when there were repeated attempts to embarrass the President and the Vice President on the expenditures in the White House account, repeated attempts, unlike, I will tell the chairman, as he knows I feel strongly about, unlike 1981 through 1989, when Ronald Reagan was President of the United States, and unlike 1989 to 1993, when George Bush the First was President of the United States. It did not start to occur, for Members of Congress to go after individually either the Vice President or the President on administration of the House in which they live, until 1995, and it became very popular in 1996, 1997 and 1998 to rag on the President and the Vice President.

That is not what the gentleman meant. We have a crisis in America, and that crisis is energy costs. Some people in California and other areas of this country are put to the test of whether they are going to pay for an electrical bill or pay for their prescription drugs or pay for food.

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

Mr. HOYER. I am glad to yield to my friend from the Northwest, from Washington State, who has offered this amendment, to cogently raise this issue for all of America, not for the Vice President.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to read to the gentleman an e-mail I got from a guy named Cliff Sinden a few months ago. He said, 'I saw the press conference with you and the Senator. The message was the U.S. Government won't do a darn thing for you, just conserve. I have cut my electric consumption by 50 percent from last year, and the next 2 months should be even more, with the full effect of my conservation efforts.'

What reward do I get? A $45 increase in my monthly charges.' I guess it is true that no good deed goes unpunished.

What we are saying by this amendment is that it is important for the administration to have an appreciation of the fragility of individual Americans are going through. Sending this signal to them is consistent with the rest of the administration's policies that they do not understand the depth of this crisis, and
that is why we think this amendment is important.

Mr. HOFER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman for the addition to the remarks that I made and that he is making.

I would reiterate what the gentleman just said. This is an issue about us focusing on what it costs from an emergency standpoint to run the residency of the Vice President and the residency of the White House, the President; it is not to embarrass either one of them. I do not think Vice President CHENEY is frankly using more or less energy than Vice President Gore.

What I think we ought to have is a focus of this Congress on those costs so that it shows us very clearly what it costs to heat, to air condition homes. I think in that respect, it is a good educational moment and gives us a better budget focus, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think this issue is in the larger scheme of things, as we talk about our national budget, certainly not a huge sum of resources or money, but the most important thing we do in this Chamber is to decide how to use the resources available to us.

I am struck by the fact that last weekend when I was in my district, I met with a veteran who shared with me his concern that currently, when he went to the VA to get his prescriptions filled, he pays a $2 co-pay for his prescription, and that is likely to be increased to $7 per prescription. He shared with me that he takes 12 prescriptions a month. Going from a $2 copay to a $7 copay is a 250 percent increase for veterans in order for them to be able to afford the medicines they need.

Mr. Chairman, we make choices around here all the time about how we are going to use our resources.

I have another constituent in my district who wrote me, saying that they had a child who was very ill and on oxygen, and they are struggling to keep their electricity from being cut off because they have been unable to pay their electricity bills.

Again, we make choices up here about how we are going to use our resources.

Now we want to use military funds to pay for the electricity bill at the Vice President’s home. Well, in southern Ohio, we have a saying: “What is good for the goose is good for the gander.” and I would like to share with my colleagues some quotes from the Vice President that appeared recently in the July 17 issue of The New York Times. I read: “Several weeks ago, Mr. CHENEY said something that should decide for themselves whether or not they wanted to conserve electricity based on their ability to pay utility bills.” I quote: “If you want to leave all the lights on in your house, you can, Mr. CHENEY said. There is no law against it. But you will pay for it.”

What is good for the goose is good for the gander. It is unwise and I think unconscionable at a time when we are requiring veterans to pay more for their prescription drugs, when we are having constituents communicate with us about their ability to keep the electricity on in their homes, even when they have a sick child in that home, it is wrong to use military resources for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I simply would urge us to do the right thing. I do not think this is an attack on the Vice President, I really do not. It has been said here today that there is evidence that the Vice President has made efforts to conserve, and we applaud him for that. But that are Americans who are suffering deeply and greatly over this energy problem, and this administration has not responded appropriately, and we are just simply saying to the Vice President and to this administration, that you are not out or American people in terms of responsibility and of paying their own bills, we should expect out of the Vice President.

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his eloquent statement. I would point out to our friends across the aisle, we are bringing up this issue on account of the Vice President, and our motives have been attacked for this.

I will tell my colleagues, we are a year into an incredible crisis on the West Coast; and yet, the majority party of this House allowed a debate on this issue. We have not been granted any amendments; we have not been granted any bills. I wrote to the Speaker last week expressing, let us have an up or down vote on these issues, of whether we should have cost-based rates on the West Coast, on whether he should have refunds of criminal overcharges. All we are asking is for a debate on this issue and a discussion and a vote. We cannot get it from this party. So we have to use issues that come up in other bills to make our point.

Our point has been made and we are going to keep making it until we get it addressed. We are paying double and triple charges on the West Coast for our electricity, not because that is what the market, the free market gave us, but because that is what a manipulated market gave us. We have been paying those bills for a year; we have been overcharged between $10 billion and $20 billion, and we want a refund on those overcharges.

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

Mr. Chairman, just want to really try to put this in some perspective with what my colleagues have been saying. And the amendment that the gentleman is about is that we are looking at hard-working Americans, and they are facing sky-high energy bills.

We look at the White House wanting the Congress to relieve the Vice President of his high electricity bill. People have spoken about the Western region of our country and the rolling blackouts, the record-setting gasoline prices in the Northeast and the Midwest, families struggling to pay off their energy heating bills, bills skyrocketing over the last several months. We are now looking at searing summer temperatures, the high air-conditioning bills. The prices have constrained the budgets of our families, everyone. I guess what he is saying is that the Vice President is a little man, and he needs our help. He needs to have his electric bills provided for. And what he has said, I think he simply is saying, I have a high electric bill and we are not going to help you with it.

It has been stated here that the Vice President belittles conservation, little more than a personal virtue. “If you want to leave all the lights on in your house, the Vice President said, there is no law against it, but you will have to pay for it.”

The fact is that what he is doing is asking the Navy to assume the burden that he has with the high cost of electricity. Unfortunately, millions and millions of Americans do not have that opportunity. They have to pick up the cost of their electricity bills.

It is about reliving the people of this country of the high cost of electricity. Unfortunately, millions and millions of Americans do not have that opportunity. They have to pick up the cost of their electricity bills.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, just as a closing comment, I just want to make one thing clear. This amendment is not about DICK CHENEY. We have no interest in embarrassing him. Again, we just want to make clear, this is not about the Vice President personally. We simply are saying that we want our Vice President, whose idea of this was not his, this was not his idea to put this over on the Navy; that is that is why he is not personally responsible for it. If we do it, it is our responsibility.

Here is what we suggest. We just think we want our Vice President, when a constituent comes up to him at one of their town meetings that they both went to, he says, Mr. Vice President, I have to wear a parka; I have cut my energy 50 percent, but my bills keep going up, we just want our Vice President to be able to say, I know what you
mean, mine are too. If we pass this amendment, he will be able to say that, I hope we can have bipartisan support of this idea and realize this is not the Vice President’s fault.

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

Mr. Chairman, as has been said numerously, the issue here is not how much energy the Vice President is using. No serious-minded person is going to run around the Capitol as a light switch cop or an energy policeman. Mr. CHENEY happens to be the person who occupies the Vice President’s residence, but this is not about him; this is about the way the office itself should be dealt with. What the issue really is here is whether or not that office is going to be treated the same as other Americans and whether the existing occupant of the office is doing the cost of living ain’t so bad if you don’t have to pay for it.” That is the issue that is at stake today, because if the provision in this bill passes, then whoever occupies that residence in present or future years will not have to pay for increases in the cost of living, as do other Americans.

Now, my understanding is that since 1999, the energy usage at the Vice President’s residence has risen from $33,000 to $135,000, and my understanding is that it is expected to be $186,000 this year. So what is at stake is a simple question here: will whoever occupies that residence be insulated from those future increases in costs, increases which the average American will not be insulated from? That is the sole question at issue here, and it has nothing whatsoever to do with whether one likes the Vice President or not. I happen to like him. I have known him since 1965. I consider him to be a good man and a fine public servant.

But I do note that like all of us, the present occupant of that office has made statements that he probably wishes he had back, and one has been previously cited, when he indicated, quote, “If you want to leave the lights on in your house, you can, but you have to pay for it.” The problem is that under the provisions in this bill, he will not, while everyone else does.

I would point out also that if we take a look at the administration’s justifications for this provision, we find the following sentence: “The rationale for this requested transfer of responsibility is based on the fluctuating and unpredictable nature of utility costs.” Well, I have tried to make the point, it seems to me that we should not be singling out specific occupants of specific offices in this country for exemption from the volatility of those prices.

I also note that in an article in The New York Times, they indicated that the White House said that by transferring the Vice President’s residence from the Naval Facility but this is not about the White House said that by transferring the Vice President’s residence to the Naval Facility, there would be “no need for the administration to return to Congress for emergency appropriations, in the event of an exceptionally cold winter or hot summer.”

But the very facts, the undisputed facts, are that that is not the case. The power bills are being reduced since the Vice President CHENEY has moved into this Naval Facility. The question here is whether it is going to be paid for out of one account or the other account.

If we are trying to impress someone, we ought to impress upon the American people what the Vice President and his family are doing. That is, they are conserving electricity, which is very, very important. We ought to be telling the American people about the history of who used power, who left the lights on, who left the computers on.

But that is not what we are trying to do. We are not concerned about the cost of this. We are concerned about who is going to pay for it.

Let me tell the Members, a lot of people can conserve by being in this program. Mr. Chairman. My mother watches it. I will bet she is watching it right now, although I did not call her and tell her I was coming down here, or I know she would be watching it. If the American people we think are so dumb as they cannot see through this charade of an argument, then we do not have enough respect for the American people. If Members respect this institution, if they respect the government, as we have established in this country, if Members respect their own constituents, they would not waste the taxpayers’ dollars debating this issue for 2 or 3 hours, trying to embarrass one party and trying to say that this party in power now is doing something wrong, because they are not.

This is a government facility. It is a Naval facility. The government has always paid these bills. The bills are less to the Federal government than they were last year. We ought to get on with the business of the state and look at the rest of the important issues of this particular bill and stop trying to convince people watching this on C-SPAN that someone at the White House or someone at the Vice President’s residence is doing something wrong. He is not.

I compliment the Vice President and I compliment Lynn Cheney and I compliment his staff for making the effort to prove to the American people that we can conserve by being the example of reducing his power needs at this official residence of the Vice President of the United States.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for addressing his remarks to the Chair while he talked about C-SPAN. He was not addressing the audience. He did a great job on that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was in my office working, and I happened to have my
TV on to keep an eye on the floor debate. All of a sudden when this amendment was brought up, I felt like I was getting a wake-up call or maybe a wake-back call to a bad memory.

Mr. Chairman, 2 or 3 years ago we had a great debate on this floor. We had a great debate in committee. We had a great debate in conference. In this case, it’s the tax bill, or maybe a wake-back call to a bad memory.

A Member of our institution called Congress from the other side of the building and had a very important piece of legislation he was pushing, an amendment to the tax bill on chicken manure. We debated chicken manure for a long time. That member has since retired, and I had thought I would not be debating chicken manure again. I have to tell the Members, Mr. Chairman, this smells like chicken manure to me.

A few years ago, we had a debate about ammunition, the cost of ammunition to the military. The cost was too high, some people said. What we needed was some cheap shots. Mr. Chairman, I think we have some cheap shots today.

The Vice President of the United States for the last 8 years was a Democrat. To my party’s credit, and I want to thank my colleagues, none of us were small enough to bring an amendment like this to the floor to try to embarrass the Vice President of the United States, as he inhabits the official residence of the United States, the expenses for which are primarily incurred on behalf of the official duties of the Vice President of the United States; a high honor, indeed, and an enormous responsibility to be the Vice President of the United States.

To have that great office ridiculed on the floor of the House in a debate that is reminiscent of the great chicken manure debate of years past, or the great cheap shot debate of years past, both of which were debates that had some legitimacy in public policy, to have those debates mocked here today in an effort to embarrass the Vice President is disappointing; disappointing I think for me, because I so love this body and respect the Vice President of the United States. Let me suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we reserve our chicken manure and our cheap shot debates for another appropriate time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I came in as the majority leader was praising the Vice President and the hard job that he does. All of us on this side of the aisle agree with that. It is an august office, and he is working hard at his job.

But I will tell the Members, I would say to the majority leader, the small business people in my community are working hard every day, for going to their jobs, for supporting their families, for working 16 and 18 hours a day. They conserve their electricity. They are trying to make their ends meet. They are facing an electricity market which puts them out of business.

Scores of business people in my district are out of business, I would say to the leader. That is the tragedy of this crisis, and 65 percent of all small businesses in my county face bankruptcy this year. We need to support them. We need to talk about the glory of their jobs.

How about the tough life that people on fixed incomes have, trying to make decisions between cooling their home and having a somewhat comfortable evening, even if their thermostats are set at 78 or 80 or higher; trying to buy their prescriptions; trying to buy their food? Their bill goes up from $40 or $50 to $150 or $200.

They do not have the option, I would say to the majority leader, of asking the Navy to pay their bill. These are people who have worked their whole lives for America. They have been veterans. They have supported and raised children and grandchildren. They are doing their jobs, just like the Vice President is doing his job. They are as worthy of our support and our eloquence as is the Vice President.

We have asked the leader and the Speaker, we have asked and begged them, put on the floor of the House a bill that allows us in our view to help these people. If they do not agree with it, vote it down, but give us a chance to debate these issues in a realistic fashion, so we do not have to use such appropriation bills that they find so difficult for us to speak on.

Give us an up-or-down vote on cost-based rates for the West Coast. Give us an up-or-down vote on the refund of $10 billion to $20 billion of overcharges. They cannot shift their bills to the Navy. They cannot get a supplemental appropriation that we just passed last week that paid $750 million because the military had increased electricity bills on the West Coast. They got their bills paid for. How come my constituents, the constituents of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), the constituents of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), cannot have their overcharges paid?

I will tell the Members, they are criminal overcharges. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has found the prices that we pay in California and the West Coast to be illegal. They are illegal. Yet, we have paid them for 1 year.

I would ask the leader, yes, let us praise the Vice President, but let us praise the average people in our districts who are being brought to their knees by these prices.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, the majority leader has questioned my right or anyone’s right to bring an amendment of this nature. I will not yield to him one inch.

I am not President, Vice President, majority leader, minority leader, committee chair, or ranking member. I am only one Member who understands one basic thing about my constituents: They question whether this administration understands the depth of the problems that they are experiencing.

I am only here not to do anything about Mr. C HENEY, I am just here asking my colleagues to make it so that the Vice President of the United States, who works for all of us, Democrat and Republican alike, can look Americans in the eye and say, my electricity bills are going up, too.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just say in closing, without coming fully on the merits here I had not intended to speak, but I was struck by the objection to the notion that this might be embarrassing.

As one who has been both embarrassed himself and has sought to embarrass others, I regard the right to embarrass each other as one of the most cherished parts of American democracy. I am sorry to see that right denigrated, particularly by people who have freely engaged in it in the past.

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

This amendment should be better known as the “cheap shot” amendment. This amendment demeans the House. If you want to talk about energy policy, and I am so surprised that Members with as much seniority on the Committee on Appropriations would have the courage to stand up and speak in favor of this amendment. This amendment demeaned the House. It really does, and you know it.

If you want to talk about energy policy, there is going to be an energy bill
on the floor next week. If you want to talk about the lousy policy that California has had, because you know they did not have a policy, talk about it next week. But it does not have anything to do with paying the utilities by the Naval Conservancy of the official Office of the Vice President. That has nothing to do with this.

If you think we need an energy policy, take a look at the Bush-Cheney energy policy. They have one. And I think the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Barton) and his subcommittee are going to trot it out here next week. If you do not like it, bring out an amendment. If you want more LIHEAP money, bring out an amendment. If you want to talk about who should pay the utility bills, bring out an amendment. So I would suggest that the Members from California have said that this amendment demeans the House. Do not try to discredit the Vice President. This is a shell amendment to try and demean the Vice President of the United States. I wonder if you would be doing this if your friend Senator Lieberman were Vice President. I doubt if this amendment would be on the floor today if Senator Lieberman were Vice President Lieberman. It would not be, and you know why.

We need an energy policy. We need to pay attention to energy. Nobody would dispute that. But you do not do it by trotting out an amendment trying to embarrass the Vice President of the United States.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding, and he is my friend, and I respect him because he cares about this institution.

Mr. LAHOOD. Absolutely.

Mr. HOYER. I do not know if he was speaking about me; I did not offer this amendment; but I will tell my friend A, this is an amendment that was offered by the administration in its budget to shift the objective of spending from one account to the other.

Mr. LAHOOD. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman that this amendment says the Secretary of the Navy cannot pay the bill. That is not the amendment that was offered by the administration. You know that.

This amendment is being offered to try and embarrass the Vice President because some people around here think the administration does not have an energy policy. Well, we do have an energy policy, and we are going to debate it next week.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Of course.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman did not allow me to finish.

The fact of the matter is, though, that it is a proposal in the budget to switch presently identified spending in one account to another account.

Mr. LAHOOD. Would you be doing this if you thought it was Vice President Lieberman? Of course, you would not. You know that. Nobody on your side would be doing this. We would not be having this debate.

This is a way to embarrass this administration. That is what it is. You do not have any other way to embarrass him, so you trot out this stupid amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to inform Members that they should avoid references to Members of the other body.

Mr. LAHOOD. How much time do I have, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has 1 1⁄2 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the House, and I am not going to yield to anybody else, you have had plenty of time to demean the House. This amendment demeans the House. It demeans this bill, and it demeans all the Members of the House who vote for it.

So I would suggest that the Members of the House vote against this amendment and send a message you cannot trot out amendments just to embarrass a constitutional officer in the country, the second highest ranking constitutional officer. And, really, what it does, it demeans all of us. We have got better things to do around here than to take a cheap shot at the Vice President.

This is the "cheap shot" amendment. Vote it down.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The distinguished majority leader suggested that this amendment is, in his inimitable styling, chicken manure. I would say that the issue of equity in a democracy is not "chicken manure." It is fundamental to our ability to govern in a democracy with a very large mistrust of government and public officials.

I can understand why someone who thinks that a tax bill that gives $53,000 in tax cuts to the wealthiest 1 percent of people in this society while it denies any tax cut whatsoever to 25 percent of the people who make less than $26,000 a year thinks that kind of a tax bill is equitable would think that an amendment such as this, which tries to address the issue of equal treatment, is somehow "chicken manure."

I think it is simply revealing of the mindset which allows people to call a tax bill like that equitable, and I am not at all surprised by it. I think the gentleman misses the larger point, and I am not surprised by that either. But I would simply say that what is at issue here is not as we have said on countless occasions, it is not what we think of the existing occupant of the Vice Presidential office. The issue is whether the second most powerful person in the land should be exempted from the same inflationary costs which are applied to every other citizen in this country. That is the issue.

The issue is not whether we are trying to embarrass the Vice President or not. We did not propose the change contained in this legislation. The White House did. The only way you can agree with a change proposed by the White House, if it is carried in a bill like this, is to offer an amendment to delete it. That is exactly what we are doing. And for us not to offer this amendment would be in the pervasive acceptance of inequality and inequity which has become, unfortunately, all too routine under the leadership of this House.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The gentleman from Illinois earlier had said that this amendment demeans the House. I take what the gentleman says very seriously, because he has worked for this House, this institution, and loves this institution; and I know that if I would have been the gentleman, we would be bringing up these amendments on energy bills if we were allowed to by the majority.

I would like you, Mr. LAHOOD, to go with me to the Committee on Rules when this energy bill you spoke of does come up, and ask them to give us the amendments that we have asked for. Ask them to give us the amendments for cost-base rates in the West; ask them to give us the amendments for overcharges; ask them to give us the amendments that we have sought.

I have written to the Speaker weeks ago to say schedule a bill that treats this crisis. We have been here for a year with this crisis, and have you responded? No. That is why the House, our inability to talk about a crisis affecting America except in this context.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the ranking member for yielding.
PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY
Mr. BARTON of Texas. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. How much more time remains on the 5 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin, who has the floor on a preferential motion, yield for that purpose.

Mr. O'BEY. No, I do not. I would prefer to stick to the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. O'BEY) has yielded to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. As I started to say, I have a great affection and respect for my friend from Illinois, and we are friends; but I have served a long time in this body. He has been here a long time as well. I do not believe I have ever tried to demean this House, and I hope he thinks I never would.

Now, this is not my amendment; but as I started to say to him, this is an amount which speaks to a legitimate objective of legislators. You may disagree with the amendment, but it is not a demeaning amendment.

Mr. Chairman, stand up and try to say, oh, we are not trying to embarrass the Vice President. Malarkey. Do not insult people's intelligence that way.

If you were sincere, and you said, well, we just want to make sure that the Vice President is accountable for the utility bills, then you would have said he will pay the bills instead of the Navy pay them, as Mr. Gore did; he will pay the bills and we are putting money back in the budget to enable him to do so. Because the money that was allocated to Mr. Gore to pay his utility bills, which was $43,000 a year, will be kicked out of the Vice President's budget.

In addition to that, over the last couple of years, the Navy paid over $200,000 to pay the utility bills of Mr. Gore's residence. Did they offer an amendment that says the Vice President is going to be accountable for his own bills and we will have the money in his budget so that he can do so? No.

The effect of this is they want to strip money out of the Vice President's budget so he has to choose between paying the electric bills or doing the job that he was elected to do, because they will take away facilities, they will take away whatever it is. The money is not in the Vice President's budget to pay his utility bills. That is what was proposed by the Clinton administration, to say, have the Navy do it. That is what is in this.

And what they are really trying to do is say we want to prevent the Vice President from doing his job. Oh, but we are nice and clean and pure. We are not mean-spirited people at all. They are caught. They are caught embarrassed in front of the country trying to take a cheap shot and come back and try to justify it.

You can dress up a pig in as many dresses and designer costumes as you want, Mr. Chairman, but it is still a pig.

That is billed in a separate account. Maybe we should look at that.

Who provides the medical services, the doctor for the Congress? Is that not the Navy?

Mr. ISTOOK. In short, as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) knows, there are a great number of services that are provided to each Member of this body in a collective manner without being allocated or billed to the individual Members.

Mr. KINGSTON. Who runs the Capitol Hill Historical Society or the Architect? Is that billed to the Congress? Mr. ISTOOK. The Architect of the Capitol is part of the Legislative Branch budget.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think one thing we have to accept as Members of government is that there is a lot of cross billing of numbers of words.

Here we are in the Legislative Branch and we get the medical services from the Navy. We have the Historical Society services that provide part of the touring of the United States Capitol, the office of the Architect. It is protected by the Capitol Hill Police.

Mr. ISTOOK. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is correct about cross billing. We can look at the White House. There is a memorandum of understanding at the White House between literally dozens of different Federal agencies because they all become interrelated trying to provide the necessary services to the person that is the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of the United States of America. So too with the Vice President. There is a whole collection of entities that become involved in allowing him to do his duty.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the motion to rise.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). All time has expired.

The question on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. O'BEY) is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ISTOOK. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, it would make no sense for this committee to rise at this time to let people try to distract us from the important work of this House. I realize that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) feels that this is not a mean-spirited amendment. But I cannot offer a mean-spirited amendment.

Now, there is no rule that says you cannot take a cheap shot. There is no rule, as the gentleman from Massachusetts suggested, that says you cannot try to embarrass somebody, whether it is justified or not. No, there is no rule that requires us to use common sense in this body. There is no rule that requires Members of this House to have an electricity meter outside the door of their office so that their constituents can see how much energy they are consuming. There is no rule that says they cannot ask all their constituents to mail to them the people who either did the wrong things or did nothing to let utility rates and fuel prices go up. There is no rule that says you cannot strip your utility bill or your electric bill.

It saddens me, Mr. Chairman, it saddens me to hear people being caught with such an obvious ploy trying to take a cheap shot at the Vice President, and then stand up in front of the Nation, in front of this body, Mr. Chairman, stand up and try to say, oh, we are not trying to embarrass the Vice President. Malarkey. Do not insult people's intelligence that way.

If you were sincere, and you said, well, we just want to make sure that the Vice President is accountable for the utility bills, then you would have said he will pay the bills instead of the Navy pay them, as Mr. Gore did; he will pay the bills and we are putting money back in the budget to enable him to do so. Because the money that was allocated to Mr. Gore to pay his utility bills, which was $43,000 a year, will be kicked out of the Vice President's budget.

In addition to that, over the last couple of years, the Navy paid over $200,000 to pay the utility bills of Mr. Gore's residence. Did they offer an amendment that says the Vice President is going to be accountable for his own bills and we will have the money in his budget so that he can do so? No.

The effect of this is they want to strip money out of the Vice President's budget so he has to choose between paying the electric bills or doing the job that he was elected to do, because they will take away facilities, they will take away whatever it is. The money is not in the Vice President's budget to pay his utility bills. That is what was proposed by the Clinton administration, to say, have the Navy do it. That is what is in this.

And what they are really trying to do is say we want to prevent the Vice President from doing his job. Oh, but we are nice and clean and pure. We are not mean-spirited people at all. They are caught. They are caught embarrassed in front of the country trying to take a cheap shot and come back and try to justify it.

You can dress up a pig in as many dresses and designer costumes as you want, Mr. Chairman, but it is still a pig.

I am not about to kiss this pig. Vote no on any motion to rise and vote no on the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me as odd that here we are in this legislative branch. As I recall, in this building, which is our office, we have a protection service, an excellent protection service, the Capitol Hill Police. Is that billed, so to speak?
before us. It cannot be read too well, but it is tolerance. I want to speak a little bit about tolerance, and I want to speak a little bit about facts.

Facts are troublesome things but they are facts. The fact is that we use about 100 quads of energy in this country every year. A quad is a quadrillion BTUs. That is a fact. The fact is we produce about 70 quads. Subtract 70 from 100 and we have a deficit of about 30. Thirty quadrillion BTUs of energy that this Nation is importing. That is a lot of energy.

Most of that is in the form of oil, but not all of it. We import electricity. We import natural gas. We import uranium to be refined into enrichment rods for our nuclear power plants. The only thing we do not import in terms of energy is coal. We are a net exporter of coal.

Some of the gentlemen that are supporting this particular amendment by the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. INSLEE) have been talking about the lack of an energy policy. We are going to have a bill on the floor next week. The major committees in the House reported it out last week. The Committee on Science reported it out by voice vote. That shows a little bit of tolerance there and a little bit of bipartisanship.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce where I am a subcommittee chairman, we reported it on a 50 to 5 vote. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and others voted for the bill. That shows a little bit of bipartisanship there.

The Committee on Ways and Means was a little bit tougher. It was a party line vote. The Committee on Resources was a bipartisan vote.

The bills are being packaged together and it will be on the floor next week, we think, on Wednesday. There will be a lot of amendments made in order, some by Democrats and some by Republicans. We will have that debate on energy policy beginning next week.

My subcommittee this fall will put together an electricity restructuring bill, a pipeline safety bill, a nuclear waste bill, a hydroelectric reform bill. Hopefully, we will get bipartisanship, a little bit of tolerance, and we will put those bills on the floor sometime this fall or next spring.

So we will have our energy debate. We will have our energy policy. I think the House will do what it is supposed to do and pass much of that and send it to the other body and hope that they work their will.

The particular pending amendment is kind of cute. Nobody can deny that. It gives people a forum to vent their frustrations and frustration with that. Nothing illegal. But is it really worthwhile? I think not.

If we want to do some cute things look at the lights right up here. Some of the most energy inefficient lights in the country are lighting this debate so to speak.

The powerplant that provides the electricity is an old coal and oil-fired powerplant two blocks from the Capital that many in the neighborhood think is an environmental hazard. If we want to engage in the kind of debate where we begin to point fingers, let us at ourselves first. I am willing to be a part of that. But I am not willing to be a part of this particular amendment being considered as a serious amendment. It is really an amendment made in order to try to highlight an issue that we are going to have a lot of opportunity in the next week and in the next months to highlight. I hope we vote against this.

I am working with the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. INSLEE) on an amendment. He is a champion of something called real-time metering and net metering. That will be in a bill that will come out of my subcommittee hopefully in the next 6 weeks. He will be a part of that process.

My friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) has very eloquently depicted the plight of some of his constituents in southern California. We tried to put together a package for that earlier in the year. It floundered primarily on the fact that we could not get a consensus on price caps and we tried. We tried to get a consensus on price caps and we could not get it.

We may have that debate again next week on the floor, and, if so, we will have a spirited debate and let the votes fall where they may.

But on this amendment we should vote it on down and move on to the more substantive parts of the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think like many Americans, when I first saw the articles in the paper about problems that the Vice President was having at his residence and his attempt to have the cost shifted to the Navy, what struck me more than anything was, wow, that is an expensive place to live. I was just amazed at how expensive it was. I started thinking about the time of year when this gentleman in his bills and the major component, of course, is going to be air conditioning. It is summertime. We are here in Washington, D.C.

As I listened to this debate in my office, I was struck by the fact that I had an amendment to this bill that the Committee on Rules would not consider in order which would require the Federal Government to purchase energy-efficient air conditioners. It was taken out at the subcommittee basically as a party-line vote saying we do not require the Federal Government to purchase energy-efficient air conditioners.

That same amendment was part of the staff consensus bill in the Subcommittee on Energy and Commerce that would have required the Federal Government to purchase energy-efficient air conditioners. It was taken out at the subcommittee basically as a party-line vote saying we do not require the Federal Government to purchase energy-efficient air conditioners.

It is my hope the amendment will be permitted on the floor next week when we discuss the energy bill. But make no mistake about it, many of us on this side of the aisle believe there is a problem and that we, as the Federal Government have to purchase, energy-efficient air conditioners.

Mr. Chairman, in this Chamber we can talk the talk all we want; but until the Federal Government walks the walk, the American people are not going to believe us. Many Americans believe that elected officials say that is a problem for Middle America, but we are politicians, we are going to take care of ourselves. That is what it looks like to the American people. Until we as Congress support this fight and try to do more to conserve energy, the American people are not going to buy it. I support the gentleman’s amendment. I think it is a good amendment because I think it strikes at the heart of the matter.

To say that somehow it is not offered in good faith is wrong. Remember this change was requested by the administration. The only way to get this language out of the bill is to offer an amendment on the floor. That is exactly what my friend from Washington did. I hope most Members, a majority of Members in this Chamber vote ‘yes.’ It is good public policy.

Mr. Chairman, next week we can make an impact on the real debate which is how do we as the Federal Government make sure that we purchase energy-efficient appliances.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would admonish Members to refrain from mentioning Members of the other body by name.
Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to recognize how we got here. We got here because we changed the way we measured the use of electricity and the use of power at the Vice President’s residence. It turns out that the Navy has been subsidizing the Vice President’s use of electricity for years, for years, all of the time with the previous administration.

Mr. Chairman, we are trying to make sure that we address this fairly. I have to say that I believe that it would have been nice if the previous administration had had a strategy to address energy for everybody. We all wanted a strategy. They had no strategy, and now we do have a crisis. Many of our constituents want us to address this and to be part of that strategy.

I appreciate the gentleman that talked about our senior citizens on a fixed income and people of moderate income, and small businesses that are closing down. They all could have used a long-range energy strategy, and it failed to materialize with the last administration. That is why our constituents are suffering. I appreciate that the current Vice President has a strategy, that he is working hard to make sure that every American’s bills come down. I appreciate that he is conserving energy and using less than the previous Vice President so that what he advocates in conservation he is also demonstrating by his own actions. But the fact is that we did not have an administration that addressed these causes. In fact, last year the Vice President moved out of his residence and reminded us every day that he had moved to Tennessee, while the American people continued to pay high energy costs on his residence at the Naval Observatory.

So they got hit two ways. They had nobody that was addressing energy policy, and they were paying these energy costs.

The fact is that we are trying to address this now. We have an energy policy. We know the Vice President needs the staff, he needs to be able to do his job. That is why the American people support the Vice President and the Office of the Vice President.

We are glad that he has decided to stay in Washington and do his work instead of moving home like last year’s Vice President did. As far as his own personal bills, he does have a residence in Wyoming where he came from, and he is paying the higher bills just like every other American is all over this country. He is paying the higher bills that he is incurring in the residence that he owns.

But he is like every other American that goes to work someplace else than the home they own, the business, and in this case the government, is covering those expenses. That is the way every other American is treated. We certainly never send a bill to our Armed Forces when they live in our bases. He is paying the higher bills on our bases and tell them to pony up for more of the energy costs, and we should not do that for anybody else that has to be away from the home they own to go to work.

He is using less energy. He is addressing himself to an energy policy for the first time that will bring all American’s prices down.

Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for the restraint you have shown, for the hard work in leadership to stop talking about a problem and put an action plan together, and to have the courage for doing that. And thank you for staying in Washington, D.C. despite energy bills and acrimony and what is in your best political interest for staying here and doing the job.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it has been well documented the problems we are having in California with energy. My colleague from San Diego talks about his constituents. I think he works very hard for his constituents. But I would ask the gentleman from California, when Bill Clinton had this problem, for a year and a half, a year and a half, there were no calls for price caps. But now that we have a new President, the political expediency is to say, "Well, let’s have cap and trade.

I would say that, under President Clinton’s rule, for 8 years there was no energy policy and now we are developing a policy that looks long term, that is a balance between exploration, technology and, yes, conservation and energy efficiency. Bill Clinton’s FERC was nonexistent. Where were my colleagues on the other side calling for caps when FERC, in my opinion, did not do their job and let the horse out of the barn that caused many of the problems we are in right now? We warned Governor Davis.

George Bush appointed a FERC, and already they have started to act to control prices, and I think FERC has saved a lot of the ratepayers money in the State of California. We have already seen some of the prices come down. Some of that is because of the conservation of California residents who have seen that it is a way to bring their prices down.

Pete Wilson first came up with the idea. Governor Wilson, a Republican, for deregulation. But then we went to Gray Davis, the Governor, and said, if you allow this deregulation, but you do not allow for long-term purchasing contracts, it is going to kill San Diego. In where my friend from San Diego lives, as I do, San Diego Gas and Electric will not take any money. They cannot buy public power unless there is an excess. Of course, there is no excess. And when we put ourselves at the mercy of outside resources, which has happened, then we end up in the situation we are in right now.

We warned Governor Davis. Governor Davis came in with a $4 billion surplus and increased that after we balanced the budget because we sent more money to the States. Now the State is bankrupt. There is no money for education. There is no money for health care for the people of California. There is no money for transportation, because he has bankrupted the State. We want our State back.

We have a President now that has an energy plan. We ought to get behind it and pass it. We have gone to a very positive plan. But I want to tell my colleagues, we doubled our population in the last 12 years in California. Most States cannot claim that. We have. But at the same time we have been forced to shut down existing oil and gas refineries. We have been prevented and even shut down many of the electricity generators by the same type of radical environmentalists that shut off all the water in Klamath that put 40 percent of the farmers out of business up there. They do not care.

Where were my friends then when we asked they, we need more power for long-term planning? They were silent, the same people that are still trying to shut down hydroelectric in northern California. Farmer Davis. Governor Davis.

We say, "Let’s build spillways around so we can still have it." But, no, to the extremists, to the radical environmentalists, energy and water means growth, and they want to stop all growth.

Where were my friends from California then pointing the finger for their constituents for a long-term plan? We warned that this was going to happen. We are going to double our population in California over the coming decades. If we do not have this long-term plan for infrastructure, for conservation, for technology, for exploration, then we are going to really be in a problem.

But, no, they just want to say caps. We say, let’s build a caps bill to the floor so they can point at the White House, who was in business one day and they started pointing the fingers at the White House.
The White House has helped.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

The need for this provision. I hope that fathom why the administration feels private persons who come to meet with dent to accept food and drink from pri-

vates giving the green light to the Vice Presi-
dent to accept food and drink from pri-

vates seeking favors from the ad-

ministration.

Current expenditure and recep-
tions costs incurred in the Vice Presi-
dent’s residence for official func-
tions are funded with appropriated dol-

lars, and that is as it should be. Food

and beverage at the Vice President’s re-
sidence cost less than $50,000 a year. Surely we can afford to appropriate these funds so that the Vice President does not need to take handouts from corporations trying to curry favor with the administration.

Unfortunately, instead of trying to avoid the appearance that it is not be-

holden to special interests, this admin-

istration goes out of its way to be extra accommodating. From its deci-
dion on arsenic and mining wastes that have benefited big polluters to the Vice President’s energy task force that met in secrecy and came up with a plan to benefit Halliburton and cost, this admin-

istration, even in its infancy, has been particularly adept at serving special interests.

Now we have meetings at the Vice President’s residence sponsored by us do not know who, sponsored by perhaps Enron and Exxon meeting on energy issues, we can see the banners hanging over the room now; sponsored by Ar-

cher-Daniels-Midland on issues relat-
ing to agriculture; on meetings of so-
cial policy sponsored by the Cato Insti-
tute.

This is wrong. We ought not to have this crass kind of commercialization polluting the Vice President’s resi-
dence. Meetings that occur there ought to be free and clear of inappropriate influence. Meetings that oc-
ture there and decisions that are made there ought to be based on the merits exclusively, entirely; and they ought not to be subject to the kind of outside influence that these meetings will in-

evitably be if we allow this provision to prevail.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I will not take 5 minutes.

We are all concerned about elec-
tricity costs, but let me tell Members some of the things that the Vice Presi-
dent and the President are not doing. They are not holding 400 Lincoln Bed-
room lavish dinners for campaign con-
tributors every single day for millions of dollars for the DNC. They do not have John Huang, Trie and Riady that are agents for the Chinese government and then sign an executive order giving missile secrets away to the Chinese. They are not holding these lavish par-

ties.

There is a controlling authority, a legal controlling authority in the Vice President’s office now, unlike the Vice President that made fund-raising calls out of there and then charged it to the taxpayers. So when you want to point fingers, where were you pointing fin-

eral finger to the Clinton-Gore administra-
tion? Oh, no, they were silent.

But when you talk about costs, let us be realistic. The Vice President is try-
ing to do everything he can to diminish the cost. The President has assigned the military a 50 percent goal of energy reduction. In California, they are al-
ready doing that. We were at Camp Pendleton. We were at other military bases. They have shut the things down. That is the same thing the Navy is doing, by reducing consumption. The President is doing that. So is the Vice President. But my colleagues want to talk about increased costs and shifting the blame.

The whole Clinton-Gore administra-
tion have spent, over the last eight

years, you know how corrupt they were. You know the millions and bil-

lions of dollars they spent. Look at Af-

rica, $12 million for a trip to Africa. Where were the gentlemen when the

President spent $12 million for press and aids going to Africa?

Yes, we are concerned about costs. But when you have got somebody that is focusing on that and then you blast them, we think it is a little ridiculous.

We have a good bill. We have a good balance from the President. We have bipartisan support. What we need to do is focus the energy of my colleagues on the other side. The gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and I are sup-
porting a bill on fusion. We have got 11 nations involved in that. With the help of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), we actually got some things into the bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) to give tax relief to people that conserve en-

ergy. Yet my colleagues want to talk about stuff like this. I think it is ridic-

ulous.

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me re-

spond to what I perceive to be the un-

fortunate assertion of the gentleman from California with reference to cor-

ruption. He uses that word awfully lightly. No such things were ever frankly as I recall asserted even. They may have asserted that there was an overuse, but the word corruption I cannot recall being used. I think it was un-
fortunate that the gentleman from California used it. There is no such proof of any of that allegation.

The gentleman from Illinois talked about demeaning the House. I did not really get into it, but let me tell you, for the last 6 years we have heard rhet-

oric like that. The chances of this pro-

vision being included in this bill if it was Vice President Gore, the Vice President of the United States, are zero.

I do not say that because I speculate or that is my opinion. It is because I
I saw the attention to detail and the objections that were raised repeatedly by this committee’s majority on expenditure audits and fine-tooth-comb analysis of those expenditures. This is not about corruption. This is about policy.

Now, I am not going to get deeply into this debate, but I do want to respond as forcefully as I know how to the assertion that somehow these amendments are different than amendments that have been offered in the past by the majority when the other party, my party, was in control of the White House and the Vice Presidency. Very frankly, we can debate these on policy grounds; I think that is appropriate.

There is no assertion here that the Vice President has done something wrong because they suggest that consumables be donated to the Navy for use at the Vice President’s residency. What is asserted by the gentleman from New York is this, again, takes out of our purview, first of all, the oversight on the expenditures, and, secondly, opens up the Vice President’s residency to substantial private sector donations. Not to the Vice President’s residency, but to the Navy, and puts the Secretary of the Navy in the position of accepting these donations. That is the issue before us, as to whether or not that is appropriate.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not use 5 minutes. We do not need to bog down in more partisan debate on this. But I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we apply the same standard to the Vice President that is currently in the office as was applied to the White House with the current and former occupant. For all I know, Mr. Chairman, it may have been the practice, whether it was expressively authorized or not, by a former Vice President.

But I do know it is the practice every day, every night, involving the Congress of the United States. We have a multitude of meeting rooms here in this United States Capitol building. We have groups that commonly come in here, have breakfasts, lunches, dinners, receptions, in which the food and the beverage is provided by these groups. That is common practice.

Now, to say that somehow the Vice President, by having a far, far smaller number of events where somebody else might provide food or drink, is going to be irresponsible or corrupted, if that is the issue, then I would expect the proponents of this amendment to be on this floor all the receptions out of the U.S. Capitol, kick them all out of the House and Senate office buildings, if you believe that they have a corrupting influence.

Now, I know it is common, Mr. Chairman, for people to try to arrange meet-ings at times they can get people together, and floor staff tell you when you know they are going to have breakfast anyway, or lunch or dinner. That is common practice.

But to say that does not apply to the Vice President, who lives in the Naval Observatory and is away from facilities that otherwise could host things, if you want him bouncing back and forth every time he is going to do the same thing that most Members of Congress do on a regular basis, to be able to meet with people who have come from all across the country because they think they have important things that need to be shared with government officials in Washington, let us apply a uniform standard here.

If one honestly believes that somebody is going to be corrupted by having a hamburger or a steak or chicken or something to drink, or whatever it is, then, by all means, make sure you have a uniform standard, and go for what they would call the cup of coffee rule,” that you cannot have a cup of coffee paid for by somebody else because it might corrupt you.

But let us not say that we are going to be putting things on a level playing field or being evenhanded by voting to put that restriction only on the Vice President. I do not think that washes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GUTENBECH). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHIE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the nay votes appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHIE) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Collins: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 1. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for “Federal Buildings and Facilities” (as specified in clause (5) under such heading for building operations) and increasing the amount made available for “Federal Buildings and Facilities” by $14,000,000.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on behalf of a project to construct a new Southeastern Regional Archives in Atlanta, Georgia, for its National Archives and Records Administration. The regional archives provide a necessary service of acquiring, preserving and making available for research the permanent records of the Federal Government. Currently, all of the records in the Southeast are stored in a World War II-era warehouse that does not meet building codes and is scheduled to be condemned and torn down. My amendment would transfer $14 million of GSA’s buildings operations account into the National Archives Repair and Registration Account.

The Southeast Regional Archives serves Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Its holdings include the records of the Civil War, World War I, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Marshall Space Flight Center, the Kennedy Space Center, the Manhattan Project, the Centers for Disease Control, and the Federal courts of the Southeast region.

President错y, the Navy, and the White House only have the White House and the Vice Presidency. That is common practice.

That is the issue before us, as to whether or not that is appropriate.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this important amendment. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I state that we certainly have no objection to the gentleman’s amendment. It is an important
need that he has mentioned. We are unsure as we work with him regarding potential sources ultimately for funding, but well do not have a placeholder for the bill for an account from which to fund it. So I look forward to working with the gentleman from Georgia to fill this important need.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill includes $146 million for the Internal Revenue Service to continue the Earned Income Tax Credit Compliance Initiative. I share the concern of the committee that the IRS have adequate resources for expanded customer service and public outreach programs, and strengthened enforcement programs to ensure the highest possible level of taxpayer compliance.

The EITC, which was created in 1975 and was significantly expanded by President Reagan and then again by President Clinton, serves to reward low-income Americans for the work they do. Millions of American families receive needed assistance in the form of tax credits that are based on the amount of income they earn.

But it is my understanding, I want to address the matter pending before the House, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Chairman ISTOOK) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland, in their continuing efforts to improve the effectiveness of the EITC, so that millions of low-income working families receive the assistance that this Congress has intended.

I am committed to working to streamline and improve the EITC, so that millions of low-income working families receive the assistance that this Congress has intended. I look forward to working with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Chairman ISTOOK) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), in their continuing efforts to improve the effectiveness of the EITC, very important and worthwhile provision of our tax system.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Maryland wish to address the matter pending before the House, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS)?

Mr. HOYER. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia talked to me about this amendment just a little while ago, I do not know exactly how long ago it was; and very frankly, I have not had the opportunity to review it, I have not really discussed it with the chairman, and I am not going to ask for a vote on this.

But it is my understanding, I want to be clear, I am a big supporter of the National Archives and its work, and they need facilities that are adequate and protective of the materials that they store. But I am in the unfortunate position of not knowing enough about the amendment, frankly, to support it. I would tell the gentleman I will not oppose it at this point in time because the chairman wants to accept it, but I will be looking at this and I will discuss it with the gentleman and the conference committee to determine what we are going to do.

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

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman’s opinion and position on this, and I appreciate that, and we will be glad to work with the gentleman and with the Chairman in any way possible that we can to make sure that everyone understands that this is where the current location is, where the future location will be, and in 2 weeks we will know whose district it possibly will be in, if it is in an open district in Georgia.

But it is a very vital need. It is one that has been worked on for quite some time. Also, in reference to GSA, there is a GSA facility that is across the county line from my particular district that is being closed as an effort to save money in the long run, and we concur with that effort. And we certainly appreciate and respect the gentleman’s position.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

In closing, I also want to make the comment that although he takes this money out of an account that is a large account, it is a large account that has huge obligations in terms of the objects to which it is dedicated: that is, the maintenance and repair of Federal buildings all over this country. So although it seems to be a big pot out of which he is taking this money, it is, nevertheless, a pot which does not have enough money in it at this point in

Under the new law, the IRS is directed to study and eventually implement use of “math error authority” to deny EITC to individuals who do not reside with the children they claim. Perhaps the most important change is the bill simplifies the AGI tie breaker by giving the parent of a qualifying child clear primacy in claiming the credit.

The changes, which will begin to take effect next year, will have a significant impact on removing complexity from the Tax Code and making it easier for taxpayers to comply with the law in claiming the EITC. They will spare taxpayers from filling out pages of complicated work sheets and hunting down information not required on any other tax form.

EITC compliance has received a great deal of attention and study. Of course, we must maintain the integrity of this program, just as we must ensure the integrity of our income tax system. Efforts to further examine and improve the EITC compliance should accurately reflect the recent changes in the credit and IRS’s growing list of tools to promote compliance.

Finally, such efforts must focus on IRS management of the program, its outreach and education strategy for taxpayers and tax preparers, and whether it is efficiently allocating its resources to achieve maximum reduction of EITC overpayments.

I am committed to working to streamline and improve the EITC, so that millions of low-income working families receive the assistance that this Congress has intended. I look forward to working with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Chairman ISTOOK) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), in their continuing efforts to improve the effectiveness of this program. The gentleman’s amendment is very important and worthwhile provision of our tax system.
time to accomplish what GSA says is necessary in terms of repairs and alterations.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GUTENKNECHT). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill (preceding the short title) insert the following new section:

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, actually, I have a total of four amendments to this bill. This is the Buy American amendment that has been added to all appropriations bills.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order, because I am not sure which of the Traficant amendments is being offered.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, it is the Buy American amendment.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I have not seen a copy of the amendment. We understood that the only reference was to an amendment at the desk and did not identify which amendment was at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would have to rule that the debate had already begun and the time had passed to reserve a point of order.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distingushed ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to say that the gentleman has offered this amendment to previous bills, and we have accepted this on previous bills, and I would presume, although I have not talked to the chairman about it, that he will accept it on this bill.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlemen from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 2590 providing appropriations for the Department of Treasury, Postal Service and various general government operations. I compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member, for their work on this bill, as well as for their cooperation in making sure that this bill complies with the Budget Act and the budget resolution of 2002. H.R. 2590 provides $17 billion in budget authority and $16.3 billion in general outlays for fiscal year 2002. This amount is within the subcommittee on Treasury and postal services and general operations 302(b) allocation, and the bill, therefore, complies with section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The bill also provides $48 million in advance appropriations for fiscal year 2003, which will account against the allocation established pursuant to next year’s budget resolution. This is an advance appropriation which is included in the list of permissible advance appropriations pursuant to section 201 of H. Con. Res. 83, which is the budget.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2590 does not designate any emergencies, an act that has increased that appropriations committee’s 302(b) allocation by the amount that is appropriated for this activity, up to a maximum of $146 million. So accordingly, I do not suggest that an appropriations committee’s allocation be increased that appropriations committee’s allocation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this very important bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK:

Page 96, after line 16, insert the following new section:

In summary, H.R. 2590 is fully consistent with the budget resolution and on this basis, I urge my colleagues to support this very important bill.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, the bill that comes before us makes a change in existing law that I think is a mistake. Under existing law, and I am told since 1950, if the United States Senate votes down a nomination, that individual whose nomination was voted down cannot be the subject of a recess appointment. On
the other hand, it has always been the case that if the Senate does not act on a nominee, that nominee can be the subject of a recess appointment.

Previous administrations, and I know we had some talk back and forth about whether the amendment involving the Vice President’s house and his electric bill would have been offered if we had had the former Vice Presidential candidate as the Vice President; I am not sure, as a fellow religionist of the former candidate, maybe the lights would have been out from Friday night to Saturday night, so maybe the electric bill would have been cheaper, but we do not have to face that here. Because this provision, the provision that says that you could appoint someone to a recess appointment, even if that person had been rejected by the Senate, that was requested by the Senate, not the administration and previous administrations who wanted to be unfettered. This was an amendment offered by the Clinton administration.

Since President Truman, this has been the rule. The President has a right to make a nomination. The Senate has a right to vote on it. If the Senate fails to vote, then that individual could be given a recess appointment, as was, for instance, Bill Lamm Lee, the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights. His nomination has not been voted on and, therefore, he could be given a recess appointment. But if the Senate votes someone down, takes up a nomination and votes it down, the law has been that that individual could not be paid and, therefore, could not get a recess appointment.

Now, people will say, and I know we are dealing here with inter-branch situations, and I know one of the taboos is that this Chamber of the House is not supposed to take in vain the name of the lofty institution on the other end of the building, but it is relevant here for legislative purposes, so I assume I will have the indulgence of the Chair in pointing this out.

Here is the problem: right now, there is a difference in impact if the Senate votes someone down or fails to vote. If they fail to vote, that person is eligible for a recess appointment. If they vote the person down, he or she is not eligible. If we adopt the language that this administration and the Clinton administration and previous administrations have asked for, that difference will disappear, whether the Senate votes down a nomination or refuses to vote on it at all will make no difference in the President’s ability to appoint that individual.

I think it is a mistake to do that. Many of us think it is wrong for action to be taken against opposition to a nominee, that opposition ought to come forward, there ought to be a debate and there ought to be a vote. Nominees ought to get votes. It ought not to be the case that nominations that are killed simply by inaction.

Under the current system, as I said, the Senate used to make this decision. If they let a nomination die by inaction, that nominee is eligible for a recess appointment. If they do what the Constitution calls for and vote the nomination down, the nominee is not eligible for the appointment. Let us not collapse that difference. Let us not remove one incentive which now exists for the Senate to take action. Let us not create a situation legislatively where, if a nominee is voted down in an open vote with debate and a chance for people to speak on it, it has the same effect as if that nominee is held up by some inaction.

I do not think we ought to contribute to this situation. As Members know, that directly affects us. Sometimes disagreements occur. They have happened in the Senate. Bills have been held up. Appropriations bills have been held up because of a dispute over whether or not nominations would be voted on.

There is a bicameral interest in there being action as opposed to inaction in the other body, because inaction in one body can lead to a host of disputes that prevent both bodies from acting.

So this is not partisan, this is executive versus legislative. This was a request that was made by previous administrations who wanted to be unfettered. What this says is in this administration, as in any other, let the Senate vote. If they vote and vote someone down, he or she should not subsequently be given a recess appointment, which is constitutionally permitted but, in effect, a defiance of the vote.

If, on the other hand, they fail to vote at all, then it ought to be the case that that person is subject to a recess appointment, because they should be able to benefit from their own inaction.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

I understand the policy issues that he talks about regarding funding of persons who have been appointed but have not been confirmed by the U.S. Senate. However, the reason for not including language in this bill to try to protect the prerogatives of the Senate is because I believe, and many of us believe, that any language to protect the prerogatives of the Senate ought to be composed and sought by the Senate. Any language to protect the prerogatives of the House should be composed and offered by the House.

For this reason, I believe that we should leave this matter alone and not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I expect that the Senate in their version of this bill will want to include some language that they craft which may be the same or not the same as the gentleman prefers, but I would rather address that in conference with the Senate, knowing what the Senate will do.

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

Mr. ISTOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I would say this. If we were talking solely about something that affected only the Senate, that I suppose would be reasonable.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yielded for a factual questioning, not for a running argument. I realize we may have different interpretations of what is important here, but I do believe that this ought to be the prerogative of the Senate. The Senate can pursue it. They have the points of order to do it.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have had some discussion about demeaning the House. The lack of intellectual integrity demolishes the House. The bipartisan treatment of what the gentleman from Massachusetts refers to very clearly as institutional matters in a partisan way deals with the House. Mr. Chairman, this is a constitutional issue not just for the United States Senate but for the Congress of the United States and for the House of Representatives, which, under the Constitution of the United States, has primary responsibility for appropriating dollars. It is not the Senate. The Senate cannot initiate appropriation bills or tax bills, as the chairman-to-be of the Committee on Ways and Means knows.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is, I would hope that all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would take note of this debate, this provision has been in this bill for half a century. When I was chairman of the Committee, the Clinton administration sought to delete this language in 1993 and 1994.

I rejected that request and carried it in this bill. Why? Because what this amendment says is that an administration cannot appoint somebody who has already been rejected under the Constitution of the United States, which, yes, gives to the Senate the power to advise and consent, and if they have failed to consent to an appointment, the Congress of the United States has consistently held that we can then, whatever administration we are, Democrat or Republican, turn around and in effect thumb our nose at not just the Senate but at the Congress, and spend money that we have appropriated on an appointment that has been rejected by a previous Congress. For 50 years the Congress, both sides of the aisle, both houses, have stood for that.

Now, I said intellectual integrity, which I think also implies consistency.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I want to remove this in his tenure and why it would appear now. Would it be that if someone is not acted on, there is not a vote, that it would be a way to vote or actually voted down. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on amendment as adopted. Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman suggests, in my opinion, that money that we have appropriated cannot be spent on an appointee that has been rejected by the Senate. That is of interest to us both. Why are you bringing this amendment? They sought and were then placed in, and equal stature of the Congress of the United States.

Lastly, let me say this. Is there any doubt by anybody on the Republican side of the aisle, any doubt, that they would have rejected this proposal out of hand if it had been made by the Clinton administration? They would not have given it 5 seconds worth of thought, and they would have stood on this floor and rallied against the arrogance of the administration to think that they could place in office somebody rejected under the Constitution pursuant to law for the position that they sought and were then placed in, notwithstanding the actions of the United States Senate.

I would hope on this issue that we would come together from an institutional perspective and accept this amendment, and reinstate this language that we have carried for 50 years.

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

Mr. Chairman, I tend to agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Maryland. I get upset when I think that someone is taking potshots, I am the first one to stand up and defend him if the other two issues were, in my own opinion.

But I asked myself why, and I would yield time, why would President Clinton want to remove this in his tenure and the nominee fails, then the nominee cannot get a recess appointment. If the Senate does what the gentleman and I agree it should do, it takes it and votes it up or down in the public way and the nominee fails, then the nominee cannot get a recess appointment.

In other words, today, and with the amendment as adopted, if the Senate refuses to vote, then the administration can appoint that individual. But if the Senate does what the gentleman and I agree it should do, it takes it and votes it up or down in the public way and the nominee fails, then the nominee cannot get a recess appointment. Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is one of the effects of putting back the existing law there is a difference in incentive to vote on the confirmation of a nominee to vote or actually voted down. The amendment would assure the Senate: "Look, you have an incentive, if you do not like someone, to take up that nomination and vote the person down because that will keep the person from a recess appointment, rather than killing it silently.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida:

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 1. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any of the proposed amendments to part 1 or 31 of title 26 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as published in the Federal Register on January 17, 2001 (66 Fed. Reg. 3925), relating to guidance on reporting of deposit interest paid to nonresident aliens.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman thinks that both President Clinton and President Bush would have wanted to put people in office that they wanted, even though they were not voted upon.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will continue to yield, yes, I think Presidents want to operate with as little constraint as possible. It is not personal matter, it is institutional.

I do think that, although, frankly, I think the administration is making a mistake in asking this, because I think it is in their interest to get a vote, and this is the one mechanism we have for encouraging nominees to get a vote, rather than to be killed silently.

In other words, there should be a difference in consequence whether a nominee is killed by a refusal to vote or actually voted down. The amendment would assure the Senate: "Look, you have an incentive, if you do not like someone, to take up that nomination and vote the person down because that will keep the person from a recess appointment, rather than killing it silently."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

The amendment was agreed to.
subject to U.S. tax. This additional reporting requirement for banks will not further any U.S. financial interests in collecting revenues from foreign depositors, nor, in my view, is this requirement an appropriate means to accomplish any other public policy purpose intended to be served by the proposal.

This regulation will impose significant costs on the Nation as a whole. The proposal is in conflict with a long-standing objective of the Department and the Congress to encourage nonresident aliens to deposit their money in U.S. banks so that those funds can in turn be used to foster growth and development in this country and in the communities served by these banks.

For 80 years we have been encouraging foreign deposits in U.S. banks. I am concerned that adoption of this IRS proposal would place U.S. banks at a competitive disadvantage relative to banks of our trading partners, and will result in the significant withdrawal of foreign deposits in U.S. banks.

Indeed, as we are reducing taxes in an effort to put more money into our economy and stave off a recession, the IRS is proposing a regulation that could cause a much larger amount of capital to flee our economy.

Furthermore, I would like to point out to my colleagues that I am in possession of a letter from Americans for Tax Reform supporting this amendment.

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I understand his concern about this proposed regulation.

However, I want to underscore that all of the gentleman’s comments are in anticipation of this regulation being approved. It is in fact in the process of being reviewed. It was presented in the last few hours of the Clinton administration, and the Bush administration is examining it.

I do believe it may have the unfortunate consequence that the gentleman from Florida has indicated, and that is that a wholly unnecessary flight of capital, not just out of Florida but out of the United States, at a time when obviously people are looking to this country; notwithstanding our current economic concerns, they are still placing enormous amounts of capital in this country because of a reasonable return and primarily because of the security or low risk.

We ought not to rock that boat unnecessarily.

I rise in concern on this amendment to the Postal Treasury bill because it is an amendment prohibiting monies being spent on a proposed regulation; and I do believe that is fraught, if in fact this practice were to become popular, with really completely disrupting the administrative process in the administrative branch. Because the language says no money can be used, how do we then collect the data to make an informed decision on whether the rule should go forward or not. The gentleman from Vermont does not want the rule to go forward, but that is in this particular instance.

Therefore, I rise, one, to respond to his concerns about the potential problematic aspect of this proposed regulation, but, more importantly, to offer, because the Ways and Means has jurisdiction over this material, my office and potential hearing, but especially to get Treasury together with those particular interests and make sure that there is a complete understanding of the consequences of this regulation, if it goes forward.

Notwithstanding that effort, if it goes forward, I can assure the gentleman that there will be hearings on what would then be the completed regulation; and if in fact we did not get significant changes, we would then very well be moving legislation. That I believe would be the appropriate way to deal with this potentially vexing rule that is in the examination process in Treasury.

This amendment, although I know well-intentioned, really has, in the chairman’s opinion, ramifications far beyond this one particular issue.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his insights. It is my intent now to withdraw the amendment, and I am certainly looking forward to working with the gentleman in the months ahead on this very, very important issue.

I know for Florida bankers this is an area of major concern. If the rule, as intended, were fully implemented, it could really hurt in particular minority communities that rely on these community banks for loans.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I want to thank the gentleman very much for his interest in this issue, but most importantly his courtesy in not moving forward.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act for the United States Customs Service may be used to allow the release into the United States of any good, ware, article, or merchandise on which the United States Customs Service has in effect a detention order, pursuant to section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930, on the basis that the good, ware, article, or merchandise may have been mined, produced, or manufactured by forced or indentured child labor.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS, Mr. Chairman, this is a noncontroversial amendment that I believe is going to be accepted by the majority and the minority.

Because, Mr. Chairman, we live in a world in which hundreds of millions of children work at child labor, in some cases in horrendous conditions and in some cases as indentured servants, without any freedom at all, several years ago we passed legislation here that prohibits the importation of products into this country made by children who are indentured servants.

This amendment strengthens that legislation by saying that if the Customs Service detains that product because they believe it is made by children who are indentured servants, it should not be released into the general public. Occasionally that happens now, and this amendment would put an end to that.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with one of the most disgraceful and embarrassing aspects of our global economy: child labor.

Mr. Chairman, it is an outrage that American workers must compete for jobs with as many as 250 million defenseless children working around the world today without any hope of escaping the cruel conditions under which they work.

Children’s rights groups estimate that the United States imports more than $100 million in goods each year which are produced by bonded and indentured children.

Especially outrageous is the plight of millions of child laborers, some as young as 4 years old, who are sold into virtual slavery and chained to looms for 14 hour days knotting the oriental rugs that grace the foyers and living rooms of countless homes and offices all across the country.

These children toil in factories, mines, fields, at looms, and even brothels, sacrificing their youth, health, and innocence for little or no wages.

They are hand stitching the soccer balls that our kids play with every day. They are stitching blouses and slacks made in China and sold in Wal-Mart. They are even sharpening the surgical instruments used in our hospital operating rooms.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will help end this disgrace. Specifically, it would prohibit the importation of goods on which the U.S. Customs Service has issued a detention order because of the use of forced or indentured child labor. I believe that this amendment would provide real teeth to the Indentured Child
Labor Import Ban that was first signed into law as part of the Fiscal Year 1998 Treasury-Postal Appropriations Act.

Consequently, if the Customs Service finds information that reasonably indicates that imported merchandise has been produced with forced or indentured child labor, Customs may issue a detention order on these goods. However, these goods may still be exported into the United States unless the Customs Service issues a finding banning the importation of these goods into the United States.

Mr. Chairman, according to the Customs’ website, the U.S. Customs Service has 24 outstanding detention orders on forced and indentured child labor dated as far back as October 3, 1991, but has only issued 6 findings banning the importation of these goods into the United States. At the very least, Congress should ban the importation of goods on which Customs has reasonable evidence that were made by forced or child labor.

According to 60 Minutes II, the U.S. Customs Service used the present law to curb the flow of unfiltered cigarettes, also known as ‘bidis’ produced by indentured child labor in India. In India alone, there are approximately 50 million children working in factories or fields for little or no pay. Bidis are an especially insidious product. They are made by children in India, and are purchased by children in the United States. According to the Centers for Disease Control, 40 percent of American adolescents between seventh and 12th grade have tried them. These cigarettes are popular among American youth because they are sweet knowing that somewhere in the world a child is locked up for the night without adequate bathroom facilities, and is never paid. If ingredients are purchased for them, they will be as cheap.

But, now I must wonder—will they be as cheap?

We are constantly hearing about how we are the world’s greatest economy we are in position to use our purchasing power to end this terrible practice.

What does this mean for American growers?

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

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to advise the gentleman from Vermont that I appreciate his amendment, and I advise the Chair that we have no objection to the amendment and certainly are willing to accept it.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I, too, thank the gentleman for this amendment. As the gentleman may know, there have been similar amendments that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLP) and I offered last year at Hallow to this bill all throughout the 1980s.

This is a good amendment. Clearly, the United States needs to be on the side of ensuring that this kind of abuse does not occur to children, women, and workers generally. This is a very good amendment, and I thank the gentleman for offering it.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the gentleman for his support as well.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague for offering this Amendment—it is very much in line with one that I offered to the FY02 Agriculture bill concerning cocoa products. My amendment passed this House with 291 votes—a strong statement by this body against the repugnant practice of child slavery.

We are constantly hearing about how we are at the dawn of a new millennium—we are in the 21st Century—and that things are just great and getting better.

But, Mr. Chairman, we still have labor practices that date labor practices so abhorrent that we thought that they were long gone—but they still remain. Child slavery continues to plague our world—and as the world’s greatest economy we are in position to use our purchasing power to end this terrible practice.

I am particularly concerned about a recently passed amendment focused on child slavery in cocoa fields in the Ivory Coast. The U.S. imports 3 billion tons of cocoa each year spending $13 billion on the chocolate industry. That means Americans do have a great deal of influence with their dollars.

Every year, between our kids wander our neighborhoods in costumes to Trick or Treat. They collect dozens of chocolate treats. But, now I must wonder—will they be as sweet knowing that somewhere in the world a child is forced to work 12-14 hours a day in cocoa fields, locked up for the night without adequate bathroom facilities, and is never paid. If he tries to escape he is severely beaten.

Let me quote one of the farmers about this: “If I let them go, I am losing money, because I spent money for them.” He told one child, “You know I spent money on you. If you try to escape, I’ll catch you and beat you.” This is an absolute horror.

Now the chocolate industry has responded—they are moving forward to determine the extent of the problem and to develop programs for monitoring labor practices. But I believe the federal government must act as well. The American people do not want to buy products made with child slave labor. It is wrong and we must act swiftly.

My colleague from Vermont’s amendment wouldn’t affect the cocoa industry, because cocoa products don’t have a detention order on them. However, during this fiscal year, FY2001, the U.S. Customs Service has undertaken an investigation into these reports about the Ivory Coast.

Title 19 United States Code, §1307, prohibits importation of products made, in whole or in part, with the use of convict, forced, or indentured labor under penalty sanctions. A general provision in the FY1998 Treasury Appropriations Act specified that merchandise manufactured with “forced or indentured child labor” falls within this statute.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment for two reasons—first and foremost because there is just no reason for child slavery in our world. Second, because American farmers shouldn’t be put out of business because of other country’s non-existent labor standards.

I have said it before, but it bears repeating, we must be ever vigilant in our fight against child slave labor. Support the Sanders Amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of the amendments numbered 5, 7, and 8 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 206: