

Members' time, but I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this conference is going to take long. We have had a very good meeting, and we are reaching agreement; and basically they are suggestions that we discussed the last time we visited this issue on the floor of the House.

I do hope that that bizarre idea of adding the Labor, Health and Human Services appropriations bill to the D.C. appropriations bill is a stillborn idea. Obviously, that would seriously complicate things. But as long as that does not occur, I think we can dispatch the D.C. appropriations bill in very quick order and bring it back to the floor and find the kind of agreement, in fact, hopefully unanimous consensus, that it is a bill that we can all live with and that the White House can sign.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the District of Columbia Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000. This legislation funds the operations of the federal share for the D.C. government and its 600,000 residents, including city government, its social service agencies and fire and police departments.

Unfortunately, the conference reports passed by the Congress the last several weeks have been flawed. While they do include several provisions I support—prohibiting the use of marijuana for medicinal purposes, and the implementation of a needle exchange program for illegal drug addicts—they did not contain the level of oversight I believe is necessary for the Congress to safeguard the taxpayers' money. While I disagreed with the Administration's veto for different reasons, in particular its support of the needle exchange and marijuana programs, I believe it gives us a new opportunity to include more accountability for the District's programs.

The District oversees billions of dollars in housing, education, health care and law enforcement programs administered to its residents. While improvements have been made in past years, in particular with a new police chief and law enforcement operations, problems continue to plague its housing and educational facilities. The District's new mayor, Anthony Williams, has begun to take steps to put the right people in place to make the changes necessary to provide full accountability for the federal funds administered by its government, and changes are needed. However, until those changes are in place and reform has begun, it is incumbent on this Congress to continue in its oversight role.

We know the difficulties that have plagued the District government for years—mismanaged housing programs that have resulted in dilapidated structures for its public housing residents, and schools that have not opened on time because of faulty roof construction, leaving thousands of public school students without a place to go during the day. We must continue to provide support and oversight to see that these long-term problems affecting the District's residents are resolved.

I urge my colleagues to reject any report that does not have sufficient oversight so that we can work with the City Government to achieve the goals of the new Mayor while providing the nation's taxpayers with some assurance their funds are being used to give a new direction to their nation's capital city.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair will appoint conferees on H.R. 3064 later.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 71. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. UPTON moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2670 be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in section 102 of the Senate amendment (relating to repeal of automated entry-exit control system).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) is opposed to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) opposed to the motion?

Mr. LAFALCE. I AM STRONGLY IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION, MR. SPEAKER.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in that case, pursuant to clause 7(b) under rule XXII, I rise to claim a third of the time since I am in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will divide the time 20 minutes for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), 20 minutes for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), and 20 minutes for the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE).

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion. There is no one in this body who represents more territory along a border of the United States bordering another country than I do. I have almost 800 miles of the Texas-Mexico border in my congressional district. It is a wonderful area.

The section that we are discussing today, known as section 110, was put into law sometime ago by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), my dear friend, with very good intentions. However, as he knows, and other Members of this body know, there are many communities along the Mexican border and the Canadian border that are terrified that the implementation of this program will cause greater congestion at the border than we even see today.

If any of my colleagues were to visit any of the communities along the Texas-Mexico border, Laredo, Texas, for example, Eagle Pass, Del Rio, El Paso, they will see long lines of traffic and pedestrians clogging the border at points of entry. In some cases, in the heat of summer, traffic is backed up several hours. It is extremely difficult to move traffic, to move commerce back and forth in the spirit of free trade that we have, today for example, with Mexico and Canada.

The chambers of commerce and the people, the good entrepreneurs, the small business people, those that are trying to move goods and products and services, and shoppers going back and forth across the border have enough to deal with now and would greatly be concerned about a new system that would be implemented.

I know that the process that is being discussed and proposed into law right now is designed to facilitate traffic. I realize that is the intention. But in all practicality, those of us who live along the border and know the border communities understand that unless this process is refined tremendously, we are greatly concerned that it would impede traffic even more than we are seeing now at these ports of entry. That is why I strongly support this motion by the gentleman from Michigan, who is greatly concerned as well about traffic along the Canadian border.

Again, this is something that even communities that are not right on the border, communities that are in existence a few miles inland from the northern border with Canada and from the Mexican border on the southwest are greatly concerned that this will have a ripple effect with communities that would feel the brunt of the additional traffic jams and the problems with pedestrians crossing at these checkpoints.

So I commend the gentleman from Michigan for offering this motion. I know that this is probably going to be a motion that will perhaps not see the light of day in this session, because the conference report, my understanding

is, is already closed. However, I think it is commendable this issue remain out front, because it is very important to all of us on the northern border and the southern border who believe so strongly that free trade must continue to flow across without any kind of additional barriers that may be implemented with section 110.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ).

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Upton motion to instruct our conferees on the matter of removing section 110 of the Immigration and Reform Act of 1996.

Those of us Texans who border Mexico would like to continue to be the front door for commerce, not the back door, and I think that this is a great motion. I understand that my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), has good intentions; but while this might not be the appropriate vehicle to do it, I think that it is the right thing to do.

Congress' intentions in this bill was commendable, but it was added at the last minute to the immigration bill to address the problem of people overstaying visas. Overstaying visas. Thank God that these people are going back. What will happen if we implement this section? People are going to be afraid to go back because they are afraid that they are going to be incarcerated or picked up.

I would like to echo what has been said by my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA). The people who do business along the border have seen long lines of traffic. I think that this is going to be an insult to our borders, to the citizens on the borders of Canada and Mexico. It is essential that the final appropriations conference report include a repeal of section 110 to avoid the problem that has been described by my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), and has been brought to my attention by the people that we talk to.

Mr. Speaker, the INS say there is no way that they can implement this system between now and the year 2000. And American businesses do not want to face the prospect of a never-ending string of extensions and cannot afford the uncertainty of not knowing what burdens will be imposed on them and when.

I would like to commend the leadership of my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), for bringing this up. I know that already the real-life implications of section 110 are being felt in border communities at this moment, already struggling to direct resources to the current infrastructure and enforcement personnel. We have billions of dollars in commerce crossing our borders each day, so I would like to request my colleagues to vote for the Upton resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague and classmate, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), is offering a motion to instruct conferees to, quote, "agree to the provision in the Senate bill repealing section 110 of the Immigration Reform Act of 1996."

This motion, however, defies logic. Why? The conference is over. There is nothing left on which to instruct the conferees. The Senate conferees have already receded to the House bill, which contained no provision on section 110. Why should the House recede to the Senate when the Senate wants to recede to the House?

Some claim, and we have heard that in the last few minutes, that section 110 will shut down our borders and that we must act now. That claim is simply not true. Let me give my fellow Members some of the facts.

Congress overwhelmingly passed the Immigration Reform Act of 1996 because we recognized that our immigration laws needed to be strengthened. Section 110 required the Attorney General to establish an automated entry-exit control system for aliens at points of entry to the United States.

Last year, through an agreement negotiated by the leadership, the Omnibus Appropriations Act extended the deadline for implementation for the land and seaports to March 30, 2001. The extension also included the requirement that the system not, repeat, that the system not significantly disrupt trade, tourism, or other legitimate cross-border traffic at land border points of entry.

□ 1830

So section 110 will not shut down the borders.

I would direct the Members to the actual language of the bill itself that I just read. The INS is already conducting technology tests. The INS' preliminary results 'indicate that radio frequency technology works fast enough to collect entry-exit records in a land border environment. Many critics of the entry-exit control said it could not be done, no technology was feasible. The tests indicate it can be done.'

In fact, the use of technology promises to expedite legitimate traffic at land points, which is exactly what we all want to do, expedite that trade in traffic. The deadline for implementation is 18 months.

Let us give the INS more time to work on implementation. Repeal is clearly not the answer. Let me tell my colleagues why we need section 110 for the good of the country.

Two million of the five million illegal aliens in the United States entered legally on tourist and business visas

and never left. They know we have no departure system so they simply enter and then disappear. Seventy percent of the illegal drugs smuggled into the United States came across our southwestern border.

Our northern border is also at risk. The Canadian Security Intelligence Service reported earlier this year "Most of the world's terrorist groups have established themselves in Canada, attempting to gain access to the United States of America." Mr. Speaker, that is the Canadian Security Intelligence Service itself that just said that.

Seven border counties in Washington State have been classified "high-intensity drug trafficking" areas, the same designation given to Los Angeles, the southwest border, and New York City by Federal law enforcers. The Federal drug czar's report on the Northwest high-intensity traffic areas states, "The Pacific Northwest increasingly appeals to drug traffickers as an entry point for illicit drugs. Having a highly developed commercial and transportation infrastructure, the area is favored by large-scale drug smugglers from the Far East."

An automated entry-exit system will decrease these threats to our national security because the entry-exit system will allow the INS to compare entrants against databases of law enforcement agencies and the Department of State.

As a result, with an automated entry-exit system, the deterrent value of our current system will be significantly enhanced when criminals and terrorists learn they must face the prospect of inspections.

Our interest in facilitating legitimate traffic can be balanced with our national security needs to protect our country against visa overstayers, drug smugglers, and terrorists. The motion should be opposed.

Mr. Speaker, let me also say that this debate tonight is not about trade or traffic. All of us who are involved in this debate, all of us who support section 110 want to increase trade and traffic with our neighbor to the north. That is why this debate is not about trade and traffic. This debate is about trying to reduce illegal immigration, stop terrorism, and try to discourage drug smugglers from entering the United States.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman in opposing this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the concerns of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that filed the motion and the others who are in favor of this motion to instruct.

Let me say this: The conference with the Senate is concluded and the bill will be filed in a matter of minutes, certainly maybe an hour or so or less. So the conference is concluded and we will have the conference report on the floor, I hope, tomorrow.

Nevertheless, this is an issue that we have all struggled with. It is a tough one. But the motivation behind section 110, of course, as the gentleman from Texas has said, is to try to close the biggest loophole that we have in illegal immigration. Upwards of 40 percent, I am told, of all illegal entries that the country has start out to be legal. They come in on a visa and then simply overstay.

Forty percent of the illegal immigrants in the country came to the country in that fashion, and we have no way of checking to see who is here on an overstay. This section 110 was an attempt to be able to check off of the list those who are simply here over-stayed on a visa, of course, legally entering with that passport.

As the gentleman has said, the implementation of the system is required by the law to "not significantly disrupt trade, tourism, or legitimate cross-border traffic at land border points of entry."

That has to be addressed by the INS as they implement the law. We want to work with our colleagues to be sure that we do not disrupt the normal legitimate traffic across the borders. It is very important to us and, of course, very important to our neighbors, and there is technologically, I think, ways that that can be done.

INS is now examining those ways. Perhaps it is electronic reading of a vehicle as it comes across the border. Perhaps it is a fast lane, as we have now in Southern California, that allows traffic to bypass the regular stop and be read by a machine as they motor past the checkpoint at a rapid rate of speed.

We think there are ways this can be done, all the while achieving the goal that we have set; and that is to try to close this enormous loophole in the illegal immigration into the country by using the visa system and simply overstaying the time on the card.

I think it can be done. We want to work with our colleagues to make that happen. But we hope that the motion to instruct conferees will be defeated so that we can proceed to try to close the loophole as we recognize the legitimate crossings that take place every hour and every day by people who commute either for tourism or business into and out of this country.

So I would hope that we could defeat the motion. I will be happy to say to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and others who are in favor of the motion that we will be happy to work with them on ways to get both of our goals achieved.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the Commerce, State, Justice Committee on Appropriations and my friend and colleague the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) as well for their willingness to try to work with us.

I just want to say that the unintended consequences of section 110 is it

will shut down the border. We have heard from virtually every business group that does trade, particularly in my home State of Michigan, with Canada, my friends in other States along that border, as well.

I know that the President met with the Prime Minister of Canada just last week. This was the number one issue that they raised. We have heard from the U.S. Chamber. We have heard from the National Association of Manufacturers. We have heard from American truckers. We have heard from the American Association of Export and Importers. We have heard from the travel industry.

We have heard from the National Governors Conference. And I just want to say in the letter that we received from many of the governors, they cite this: "Although we support its objective to curb the illegal entry of aliens into our country, implementation of an entry-exit control mechanism as described by 110 will not only not solve the problem but it is also not feasible. Besides causing major delays in our land borders and disrupting legitimate cross-border traffic, such a control mechanism will also unnecessarily cause a significant disruption in economic development, international trade, and commerce tourism, and it requires sizable infrastructure investment. The global marketplace, driven by on-time delivery, will also be negatively impacted. Section 110 has the right intention but indeed it is the wrong approach."

We have heard from a number of our border-crossing communities. They tell us it will take days, 2 or 3 days, for trucks to pass through these borders. Yes, it would be nice if we could think that there is going to be an automobile and we are going to have the right card on it and go through the smart lane and register when it comes and goes. But who is to tell who is inside that vehicle, whether there are three people going across the border and what were their names, whether there were four people when they came back?

It is a system that will cost billions of dollars; and if it is ever designed and fully implemented, it still will not work. We need a new approach.

What we are suggesting here is that we repeal, for the time being, section 110. We will look at a feasible study. We will look at some alternative legislation down the road to replace it if and when it is ever ready. But this thing will shut down the border the way that it is now, and that is why in a vote in the Senate I think it was unanimous to get this thing repealed.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON).

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not really know where to start here because we are at cross purposes. Logic does not make any difference. We are coming from emotional standpoints.

I guess I have to come from the standpoint of being a businessman who

operated on both sides of the Canadian border. I know what this means. I know what the people who I used to work with say it will mean, it is one of these obstructionist laws which does not make any sense at all.

I think what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) is doing is absolutely right. Now, if they are down in Texas or they are in another part of the country or have a different set of intellectual or philosophic approaches, that is one thing. But from a practical standpoint, they are making it very difficult. It seems to me that if they are in a business or even if they are in the area of international relations, what they try to do is to make friends.

This is not making friends. The Canadians hate it. They scratch their heads and wonder what we are trying to do. They are great friends, the best friends we have in the world. Whenever we are in trouble, we call upon them. It does not make long-term either international or diplomatic or tourism or business or any other sense.

I agree with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) in terms of offering a motion to instruct conferees on the Commerce, Justice, State bill. I support him and I support the motivation behind the things that he is trying to do. I would hope the rest of us would do the same.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct. I came to this issue about 2½ or 3 years ago when I became the ranking member of the Immigration and Claims Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and found that most of the decisions that we are making on an immigration basis for this country are being made on very, very subjective criteria.

If we are going to have a policy of checking people who come in and go out of the country and monitoring that, it seems to me that we have got to have an objective way of doing that, and we cannot say to the folks on the Mexican border we are going to have one system and say to the folks on the Canadian border that we are going to have a completely different system.

So if we are going to have a system, it has got to apply all around the borders to all of the entry and exit points. And it seemed to me that that was the only way we were going to get this kind of subjective, I am going to single them out because they look a different way and stop their car because they look a different color, and have a consistent set of principles that apply to all of our border entry and exit places.

So I kind of got on this agenda trying to come up with a set of consistent criteria that applied everywhere.

whatever system we put in place, if it is going to be effective, cannot be selectively applied using one standard at the Mexican border and another standard at the Canadian border.

It is exactly what the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) indicated that I think is troubling about this. He would like to have, and some people would like to have, and I should not attribute motives to him because I know his motives are always good, but there are people who would like to have a completely different set of rules applicable to the Canadian border than are in application at the Mexican border. You simply cannot do that and have a rational system of immigration in this country.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully have to stand in opposition to this direction to the conferees. Let me just compliment the gentleman from North Carolina, because I think there is this issue of we need to start finding reasons to continue the issue of addressing illegal immigration and drug smuggling. The trouble is we can always find problems with implementing any program.

I live and grew up within a mile of the largest port of entry in the world, the Tijuana-San Diego port of entry. Technology has been a major asset at not only controlling the immigration in the drug issue but actually encouraging the legal crossings. We have electronic systems there to where businesspeople and individuals who cross the border extensively can electronically tag in when they are coming and when they are going. There is a special lane set up for that. The fact is this technology should be applied universally, not just in San Diego, not just in Mexico but also at every entry.

I ask that we continue with control of our borders, not retreat from them. Let us not retreat from our responsibilities at the border.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the role of government is to attempt to solve problems, but the intent of the government should be to solve the problems with reasonable solutions. The point here is not just whether or not we should do this. The point is coming up with a solution that works.

The section 110 that is being implemented simply will not work in Michigan. Now, I have no idea whether it would work well in San Diego or other border crossing points. But the immensity of the problem in Michigan is hard to describe unless you have been there and watched. In a major metropolitan area, we have the Ambassador Bridge with 12 million vehicles crossing per day, the Detroit-Windsor Tunnel, 9 million vehicles, and up in Port Huron, the

Blue Water Bridge with 5.5 million vehicles crossing.

Now, when we talk about the amount of trade crossing that border, it exceeds \$1 billion worth of goods and services crossing the border every day, counting between the U.S. and Canada. We have more trade crossing over the Ambassador Bridge in Detroit, trade between Canada and the U.S., we have more crossing there than we have with the entire nation of Japan. That gives you some idea of the immensity of the problem and why we need a special solution.

If we are trying to reach a solution for this problem, we have to have a different type of solution to fit that situation in that congested metropolitan area dealing with that much traffic and that much trade flowing over one single artery. And so the plea is that we do adopt this motion. It is absolutely essential. Because if the purpose of section 110 is to try to solve the problem, it fails. If the attempt is to create a roadblock to trade with Canada, it succeeds. We do not want that kind of success. We want a solution to the problem and something that works. Please vote for this motion to instruct.

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

First of all, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) has indicated that this provision in the law was passed overwhelmingly in 1996. I would concede the fact that the immigration changes of 1996 were passed overwhelmingly, although I opposed the bill, but I also would argue that there were only a handful of individuals in the entire United States Congress, or the world, who were aware of section 110 in particular. It was not until months or a year later that an awareness of section 110 developed. The author may have been aware, but nobody else was voting for that 1996 law because of that specific provision.

Now, with respect to section 110, notice what it calls for, the documentation—the documentation—of all aliens entering and departing the United States. Now, we have never had such a requirement. They say, "Oh, well, there is technology being developed." Technology is being developed that can read license plates and so you might be able to document vehicles entering and departing the United States through technology, but to my knowledge no technology has been developed or is on the radar screen that is going to read the name, address, phone number, et cetera of every individual within a vehicle entering or leaving the United States. That is why every single person of any expertise who has testified on this issue said it would create 2- to 3-day delays at the borders rather than 2 to 3-minute delays at the border as might now be experienced. In effect what it would do is shut down the borders. In effect what it would do, section 110, if implemented, is create a great wall. We have heard of the Berlin Wall, we have heard of the Great Wall of

China. We would now have the Great Canadian Wall and the Great Mexican Wall.

With respect to the arguments of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATTI), I should point out to him, it is too bad that he was not here to listen to the eloquent arguments in opposition to section 110 and in favor of the gentleman from Michigan's resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) because this would affect Mexico at least as much as it would affect Canada, and we want to deal with the problems on both our borders.

Now, what is the problem that they intend to get at? Well, it is a shifting problem that they attempt to get at. On the one hand, it is overstays, and then maybe it is drug smuggling and then maybe it is terrorism. The fact of the matter is that this is not going to get at any of those problems. This is going to divert the resources that we have, and 99 percent of those resources will have to be spent on nonproblems when they should be spent on the real problems.

There is another problem, too: planning for the future. Every year along the border, millions and millions of dollars are being invested in infrastructure. This is true in Buffalo, New York; it is true in Niagara Falls, New York; it is true in Seattle, you name it. It is true across the entire southern border, also. How do you plan when you have this Damoclean sword over your head called section 110 that says you must document all aliens entering and departing the United States? What infrastructure do you build on your side of the border to deal with individuals departing the United States when you have no physical infrastructure right now to deal with individuals departing the United States and you certainly do not have any human resources now or prospectively in the future to deal with them?

It is unfortunate that we have to take this issue up on a motion to instruct conferees in an appropriations bill because it would be much preferable if this House of Representatives could work its will as the United States Senate has done on five separate occasions. On five separate occasions when the issue came before the United States Senate, they have voted, I believe unanimously in each and every instance, to repeal section 110, but we have not been afforded the opportunity to vote on a clear-cut repeal of section 110, and so we must resort to whatever device we possibly can. Is this the best device? Of course not. But then give us the right to vote on a clean bill repealing section 110. Let us take it up on the suspension calendar if need be. But make it be a clear, simple issue, repeal of section 110 or not. It would pass overwhelmingly. It would pass overwhelmingly. That is why it is not being allowed on the floor.

I urge everyone, should we be able to vote on this resolution, to vote for it,

to vote with the unanimous vote of the Senate, with the administration, with the perspective of the Canadians, with the perspective of the Mexicans, with the perspective of virtually every single association that has addressed the issue and with the interest of those who truly do want to spend their time, energy, resources and money in an effective fight against overstays, in an effective fight against drug smuggling and in an effective fight against terrorism.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, let me assure my colleagues that their fears are unfounded and simply not justified. I would turn their attention again to the specific language in the bill, that it would not be implemented and I will repeat that for emphasis once again, it will not be implemented if it would impede trade or traffic. So all these scare stories of hours of wait, all the fearmongering is really on the wrong subject because the bill would never be implemented because of the language in the bill saying it would not be if there were any diminution of trade or traffic. The experts, Mr. Speaker, tell us that such a system is workable and the experts I quoted a while ago have confirmed that.

Mr. Speaker, finally I want to point out that such a system would benefit both countries because citizens of both Canada and the United States have well-grounded fears of terrorism, illegal immigration and drug smugglers. In fact, just this week there was a poll taken in Canada that for the first time ever showed that immigration concerns, particularly in regard to illegal immigration, was now the number two priority of Canadian citizens. In that case, I think that they join American citizens in being concerned about a legitimate problem. This section 110 will in fact enable us to stop terrorists, reduce illegal immigration and reduce drug smugglers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL).

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct and simply would compliment the conferees for hopefully keeping in section 110.

We are all aware of the illegal immigration problem on our southern border, but we are also becoming increasingly aware of the problem on our northern border. We have read the stories of the boatloads of Chinese who are landing there with the hopes of crossing the Canadian border into the United States.

For those who simply say it is an illegal immigration problem, the 2 million or more of the 5 million illegally in this country are estimated to be overstays of visas that were lawfully granted to them. So overstaying is a problem because they recognize that once they get here, the INS has no effective way of being sure that they leave.

To those who say that they do not like section 110, I would simply say provide us with a better alternative. The answer is not simply to abolish what is now in the law, waiting for its implementation, and that has been extended by the way, but to simply say, "Okay, if you don't like our solution to it, give us a better one." Do not just simply throw up your hands and say we cannot do anything about it. The American public wants us to solve the problem.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. I just want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE). He has been a leader in this effort, helping to line up cosponsors in our effort to repeal this on our bill, more than 114, I believe, at this point. We certainly have appreciated his work on that side of the aisle and with our friends on this issue. We thank him for that time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF).

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed section 110 in 1996, I do not believe most Members knew exactly what the effect would be. Perhaps it was necessary on the southern border. But if we allow this provision to take effect on the northern border, the delays at border crossings could be disastrous. The Immigration and Naturalization Service simply lacks the technology to carry out the requirements of section 110 without causing unmanageable congestion at the border due to the border checks.

□ 1900

Already plans are being made to develop and destroy huge and large portions of the historic Peace Arch Park in my district in order to make way for the infrastructure necessary for the implementation of section 110. Congress needs to repeal this provision as soon as possible.

Now, I understand the need to control immigration. In fact, I believe that protection of our borders ought to be one of our Government's highest priorities. But section 110, as it stands, is not the answer. It will create needless delays and provide no law enforcement in return.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this motion.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this proposal.

First of all, I was a cosponsor of the Illegal Immigration Reform Act of 1996, and what we are hearing tonight is a proposal to gut that very important piece of legislation. This should be called the "open border legislation." This is what this vote is all about. This vote, all the horror stories that we have heard tonight about what is going to happen if section 110 is implemented are all conjecture. This is all conjecture. It is one thing to come to the floor of the House and say, vote a certain way based on a horror story of something that's happening, some piece of legislation that's gone astray. It is another thing to come to the floor and conjecture that there is going to be some sort of problem.

Let me tell my colleagues what is going to happen if we do eliminate section 110. What is going to happen is millions of people are going to be coming into our country illegally who would not otherwise be able to come into this country. Colleagues, tell me what the horror story is. That is not conjecture. That is, if we take a look at what is going on at the border, what we can predict from what is happening to immigration in this country.

I do not know what is happening in my colleagues' States, but in California we have still have a massive flow of illegal immigration that is undermining our education system, taking our health care system apart, our criminal justice system is going down; all of these things because we have a flood of illegal immigrants coming into this country.

There is nothing wrong with strengthening our borders and trying to find a technological way of doing it so that we do not disrupt traffic, and that is what 110 says. It simply says let us develop technology so we can control the flow of illegals into our borders, but at the same time try to find a technological answer so it does not disrupt the flow of honest traffic between the countries.

What is wrong with that? I will tell my colleagues what is wrong with that. We got a bunch of people in this country for one reason or another who want to have illegals come into this country, perhaps as a profit for the low wages they can pay these people.

Let us not vote for a provision that will open our borders to every kind of illegal immigrant, whether it is from Canada or Mexico. Yes, if there are more delays at the Mexican border, all right, let us try to make it efficient at both borders, but for Pete's sake let us not open it up so that those many, many illegal aliens from China that are landing in Canada can just surge down into the United States, and that is what will result if we take 110 out. We are not going to have any hope, we are not going to have any chance of getting control of our borders because we are saying do not even try to find a technological answer to this problem.

This is an open border vote, and I would say vote against it. We want to

control illegal immigration, not encourage it.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I, too, rise in opposition to this measure, and I suggest, to use an oft-quoted phrase and to paraphrase that anyway that it does seem that the supporters of this proposal doth protest too much. They bring to our attention what they believe to be the calamitous events that would occur if we actually simply began to check people when they come into this country and when they leave this country; and they suggest enormous calamities would occur as a result of that. Our economy would essentially shut down, businesses would end, there would be lines at the borders for thousands of miles.

I mean it goes on and on and on. But I really do not think that is their real problem.

I have to tell my colleagues that surely there are people who are concerned about the impact of it, but I also believe frankly what the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) suggested here a minute ago, and that was that there are other reasons that people are concerned about this, and that is that it would have the effect of limiting illegal immigration into the United States. That is the real issue here we are dealing with. It is not just how much problem there would be infrastructurally at the borders, Mr. Speaker. It is whether or not we are going to be able to control our own borders.

Is that not the responsibility of every country on the planet? Do we not, should we not be able to determine who comes into this country and for how long? And if the answer to that is yes, in my colleagues' hearts if it is yes, then is it not appropriate to do so in the manner in which it is described in 110? It is the least intrusive manner. It is the best we can possibly do to make sure that there is an objective way of analyzing who comes and who leaves, and it is just the opposite of the gentleman's concerns about being subjective.

This applies a technological fix to this problem. It is not just leaving it up to someone at the border to determine what they think this person looks like and whether they should be checked. This actually provides the objective determination.

So, Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues really are concerned about that, if that is truly in their hearts what they are trying to do is to make sure we provide objective analysis to people coming and going, then they must support this proposal and oppose the motion to instruct.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would just like to respond to the gentleman from Colorado that in Michigan we have more traffic that

crosses the Ambassador Bridge than goes to Japan in terms of exports, and in fact at the Ambassador Bridge some 24,000 vehicles cross that bridge every day, over a thousand vehicles an hour, and giving an optimistic estimate of about 2 minutes per border crossing if this system became implemented. It has been estimated that this would result in 17 hours of delay for every hour's worth of traffic. We cannot stand that, and the Midwest cannot stand that, and that is one of the reasons why we are pursuing this motion to instruct the conferees to try and repeal section 110 and allow a vote to do so.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, let me just sort of make an outreach to my colleagues along the Canadian border. I know their concern. I have business people that are concerned about the possible impacts of 110, and that is something we should work together to make sure does not cause a calamity, does not block commerce; but to retreat at this time from a commitment that we have made to the American people that this is an issue that needs to be addressed, that this country should know who is in the country and who has left the country and who has entered this country, that is not too much to ask for.

Now I know the gentleman from Michigan is worried about this adverse impact of immigration control along the border, and I ask all of us to work together in addressing the issue that right now people get jobs, get social benefits, and can vote in the United States without ever having to prove that they are legally in the country or a U.S. citizen, and in fact there is no way for a local official to be able to check on that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for all of my colleagues along the Canadian border who are so upset about the possibility of border control to join with us at having some internal enforcement. But I am saying that our port of entry has problems. We have 45 minutes to an hour wait sometimes when it is outrageously during a weekend; but the fact is that technology is the answer in many of these situations and before, and I ask my colleagues the next time they drive to Dulles to look off to their right and see people driving through.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to conclude by reading reports that point to some of the immigration problems we have on our northern border and also point to why we need an immigration system that includes an entry-exit system.

USA Today reported on July 20 in a front page story about the northern border several recent arrests have brought home the possibility that terrorists are establishing themselves in Canada because of that government's

easy-going attitude toward asylum, then slipping into the U.S.A. There has been an upswing in alien smuggling and drug crimes. Also the INS has testified that as southwest border enforcement continues to stiffen and the price charged for smuggling escalates, many choose the alternative of illegally entering the United States from Canada. Entry controls will make alien and drug smuggling along our northern border much more difficult.

On May 21, 1999, the Detroit News reported the growing problem of illegal immigrants flying to Toronto and then crossing the border into Michigan. A 1998 report from the National Drug Intelligence Center, quote, "warned that marijuana exports from Canada to the U.S. were becoming a significant problem and the drug smugglers in the U.S. are exchanging British Columbian marijuana pound for pound for cocaine. U.S. officials believe that the vast majority of drug smugglers make their way into the United States without detection." "If we are getting 1 to 2 percent at the border, we are being lucky," said Tom Kelly, who worked as a resident in charge of the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency in Blaine, Washington.

And on June 8, 1998, the United Press International reported that a joint investigation between U.S. and Canadian law enforcement officials culminated in the seizure of \$3.7 million worth of drugs. And finally on August 14, the Toronto Globe and Mail reported that the United States is considering placing Canada on the illicit drug black list because, quote, "Canada has assumed a major role in the global trade and illicit drugs, and substantial amounts of marijuana and heroin are being smuggled into the United States via Canada."

Mr. Speaker, I also could go on for a long time on examples of over-stayers and terrorists, but let me very briefly say that two of the aliens convicted in the World Trade Center bombing overstayed their non-immigrant visas. Those convicted in the CIA employee killing have done the same thing. Several terrorists entered the United States without inspection coming across the Canadian border, for example, the individual who was later arrested in New York City for planning to bomb the city subway system and so forth.

In fact, the Justice Department's Office of Inspector General concluded that his easy entry into Canada and his ability to remain in Canada despite at least two criminal convictions and repeated attempts to enter the United States illegally highlight the difficulty in controlling illegal immigration into the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we have agreement on two subjects tonight. One is that we want to stop illegal immigration, reduce drug smuggling, and stop terrorists. The other is that we do not want to do anything to impede trade or traffic with our neighbor to

the north, Canada, and that is exactly why last year under suspension I inserted language in the bill to make sure that we would not impede trade or traffic.

So all this fear, all these straw men, all these red herrings, everything else about that we are going to delay entry into the United States from Canada is simply no factual basis simply because we have language to protect against that. Again, the debate is not about trade. We all agree that we need trade with Canada. The debate is about how best to reduce illegal immigration, drug smuggling and terrorists; and we have expert testimony saying that we have just the proper system to do that.

Finally, I want to make the point that when we talk about illegal immigration, we are never going to be able to get a handle on almost half the problem of illegal immigration, visa over-stayers, unless we have an entry-exit system. We are never going to have a workable visa waiver system unless we have such an entry-exit system, and we are never going to be able to have a guest worker program unless we have an entry-exit system.

So let us not be fearful. Let us look for ways to implement a system that is not going to impede trade or traffic and that will benefit both countries.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I would also like to ask my friend for sure, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), that I would love to add his name as a cosponsor of our bill because in fact what it does is that it replaces section 110 with a feasibility study, and when and if a feasibility study could be proven that would work, we will be glad to take a look at it, but until then this section 110 will shut down traffic, particularly in the border that I know best, the Canadian-U.S. border. And as I have been a member of the U.S.-Canadian Interparliamentary Group the last number of years, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), my colleague who spoke in favor of my motion earlier tonight, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), a number of other Members, this is the number one issue. We know, our two countries know, that we cannot exist as we do today with the trade opportunities that both countries are having and have this section 110 come into place.

□ 1915

Therefore, it needs to be refined in a major way, and that is why we are suggesting it be repealed.

I would also thank my Senator, SPENCER ABRAHAM, the leader of this effort in the Senate. He has done a terrific job in making sure that that is passed, as my colleague from New York indicated, five times, I believe, by unanimous vote. My governor, John Engler, has led the effort of the National Governors Association in drafting this strong letter in support of what we are trying to do tonight and has certainly helped the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers and lots of groups around the country that are very interested in this.

At the end of the day here, we are going to be denied a vote on a procedural effort and that is sad, because I do believe that we could win on this issue had we been allowed to have a vote of the full House on this issue that would certainly be bipartisan. Though they have been able to have the vote in the Senate, we have not been able to have the vote in the House. Unless by some chance, as I look to my friend from Kentucky, they do not file today or tomorrow; we would love to have this vote. We have alerted the leadership that this cannot stand, that this has to be resolved, that we need a vote to repeal this. Again, I think our side can win.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in instructing the conferees before they report this bill out to join with us in repealing section 110 and receding to the Senate.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Motion to Instruct Conferees which seeks to include the Senate language of the Commerce Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations Act of 1999 that would end exit controls at land borders and seaports. This provision of controls, known as Section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Act of 1996, would likely place an undue burden on trade at our nations' borders. For South Texas, which has emerged as the premier gateway to trade not only to Mexico, but also to the Americas, this extra step of gathering data and inspecting records could hamper needed growth and economic development without providing a commensurate level of security or law enforcement value.

The stated goals of Section 110 are to increase immigration enforcement and security through better record keeping. While advocating what appears to be a worthy system, policy makers failed to provide us the resources we would need to implement this new law. To implement this law properly would require an immigration data base for comparing records; technology for rapid implementation of the law; and new facilities for inspection of out bound traffic. None of these currently exist. The result: without these new resources, we are left with unprecedented gridlock at Texas border crossings, disrupting trade, commerce, tourism, and other legitimate cross-border traffic.

Although Section 110 was supposed to be put in place on September 30, 1998, the Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) put off implementing the new system for land and sea ports because it recognized it did not have the resources to do it. They have now

set a new target date for March 2001, but I doubt they will be able to start by then either. The task is too enormous.

We need to step back and examine our priorities. First, we must check people and goods seeking to enter the United States. We do not have adequate resources now to check who comes in, let alone who goes out. Let's address this priority before creating new, unworkable requirements. Second, we need to work toward a seamless border that fosters international trade. We need to provide the US Customs Service with more and better high tech equipment and increase the number of Customs agents.

I recently testified before the Ways & Means Trade Subcommittee, urging them to give Customs the resources it needs to address these priorities. To help solve the Section 110 problem, I joined on a bill that would give the INS two more years before starting the out-bound checks at airports, eliminate the requirement for land and sea ports, and require the Attorney General to study what it would really cost to implement this new system.

Beyond the rhetoric, Section 110 would cost us too much at a time when other high priority needs are unmet. Let's solve one problem before creating another. We need to get back on track before we become our own trade and economic growth enemy.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the immigration reform bill in 1996, no one in this body thought they were voting for a bill that would tie up our borders with Mexico and Canada.

But that's exactly what happened.

Section 110 of the bill was interpreted as requiring Canadian and Mexican citizens to obtain entry and exit documents when traveling to the United States—even though the authors of the bill acknowledged that was not its purpose.

For communities at the border, Section 110 of the immigration bill is a disaster waiting to happen: clogged bridges, tunnels and roads, impacting commerce and tourism.

I know that at the Blue Water Bridge at Port Huron in Michigan, delays can already lead to hours waiting in line at our border with Canada. But improvements are being made to relieve the congestion.

All the efforts that have been made to improve our borders will be for naught if the visa requirement is implemented.

We don't need an onerous, unnecessary requirement that will further congest our borders.

That's why we should repeal Section 110.

The Senate version of the Commerce Justice State bill does just that. It should be included in the conference report.

Tourism, trade, and border communities will be devastated if Section 110 is not repealed. This is our chance to make it right.

We can patrol our border effectively if we give the INS and Customs Service the resources they need to do their jobs well. But Section 110 will not help.

Let's use the opportunity we have today to correct this major flaw. Support the Motion to Instruct.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. UPTON, for yielding me the time, and I rise in strong support of this motion to instruct conferees. Section 110 of the 1996 Immigration Reform Act mandated the implementation of an entry-exit control system at our land borders. While this sounds

like a good idea in theory, I believe that this provision was inserted with little or no examination of the possible consequences. This year the Senate included common sense language that would repeal section 110 in its version of the fiscal year 2000 Commerce, Justice State Appropriations bill. This motion would instruct the House conferees to accept the Senate language.

I am very concerned that section 110, if implemented, would cause massive delays and gridlock at the US-Canadian border, causing massive disruptions of tourism, commerce and traffic in Western New York and throughout the United States. Some studies have shown that implementation of section 110 would cause such massive delays that border crossings would be reduced by 50 percent or more. Border delays of an hour could be increased to upwards of 17 hours. Ladies and gentleman, I submit to you this would have a devastating impact on the US economy, as Canada is our largest trading partner.

While I am sensitive to the concerns of the proponents of section 110, who believe that this provision is necessary to stem the tide of illegal immigrants and illegal drugs into the United States, I do not believe that section 100 would be a solution to either of these problems.

Section 110 would have serious adverse impact on the United States economy and specifically, the economy of the Western New York and Northern border regions. I urge my colleagues to support this motion which is vital to the well-being of my congressional district.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion to instruct.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed to a time later designated by the Speaker.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. ROGERS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

##### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106-398)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2670) "making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal

year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

*That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:*

##### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

###### GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

###### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

*For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice, \$79,328,000, of which not to exceed \$3,317,000 is for the Facilities Program 2000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed 43 permanent positions and 44 full-time equivalent workyears and \$8,136,000 shall be expended for the Department Leadership Program exclusive of augmentation that occurred in these offices in fiscal year 1999: Provided further, That not to exceed 41 permanent positions and 48 full-time equivalent workyears and \$4,811,000 shall be expended for the Offices of Legislative Affairs and Public Affairs: Provided further, That the latter two aforementioned offices may utilize non-reimbursable details of career employees within the caps described in the aforementioned proviso: Provided further, That the Attorney General is authorized to transfer, under such terms and conditions as the Attorney General shall specify, forfeited real or personal property of limited or marginal value, as such value is determined by guidelines established by the Attorney General, to a State or local government agency, or its designated contractor or transferee, for use to support drug abuse treatment, drug and crime prevention and education, housing, job skills, and other community-based public health and safety programs: Provided further, That any transfer under the preceding proviso shall not create or confer any private right of action in any person against the United States, and shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act.*

###### JOINT AUTOMATED BOOKING SYSTEM

*For expenses necessary for the nationwide deployment of a Joint Automated Booking System, \$1,800,000, to remain available until expended.*

###### NARROWBAND COMMUNICATIONS

*For the costs of conversion to narrowband communications as mandated by section 104 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 903(d)(1)), \$10,625,000, to remain available until expended.*

###### COUNTERTERRORISM FUND

*For necessary expenses, as determined by the Attorney General, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, to reimburse any Department of Justice organization for (1) the costs incurred in reestablishing the operational capability of an office or facility which has been damaged or destroyed as a result of any domestic or international terrorist incident; and (2) the costs of providing support to counter, investigate or prosecute domestic or international terrorism, including payment of rewards in connection with these activities: Provided, That any Federal agency may be reimbursed for the costs of detaining in foreign countries individuals accused of acts of terrorism that violate the laws of the United States: Provided further, That funds provided under this paragraph shall be available only after the Attorney General notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in accordance with section 605 of this Act.*

#### TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER COMPLIANCE FUND

*For payments authorized by section 109 of the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. 1008), \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended.*

#### ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

*For expenses necessary for the administration of pardon and clemency petitions and immigration related activities, \$98,136,000.*

*In addition, \$50,363,000, for such purposes, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.*

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

*For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$40,275,000; including not to exceed \$10,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and for the acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of motor vehicles, without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: Provided, That not less than \$40,000 shall be transferred to and administered by the Department of Justice Wireless Management Office for the costs of conversion to narrowband communications and for the operations and maintenance of legacy Land Mobile Radio systems.*

#### UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

###### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

*For necessary expenses of the United States Parole Commission as authorized by law, \$7,380,000.*

###### LEGAL ACTIVITIES

###### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

*For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed \$20,000 for expenses of collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia, \$346,381,000; of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 for litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: Provided, That of the funds available in this appropriation, not to exceed \$36,666,000 shall remain available until expended for office automation systems for the legal divisions covered by this appropriation, and for the United States Attorneys, the Antitrust Division, and offices funded through "Salaries and Expenses". General Administration: Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$1,000 shall be available to the United States National Central Bureau, INTERPOL, for official reception and representation expenses.*

*In addition, \$147,929,000, to be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, to remain available until expended for such purposes.*

*In addition, for reimbursement of expenses of the Department of Justice associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, as amended, not to exceed \$4,028,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.*

###### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

*For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, \$81,850,000: Provided, That, notwithstanding section 3302(b) of title 31, United States Code, not to exceed \$81,850,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected in fiscal year 2000 for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18a) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting*