

He knew the great history of the House of Representatives. He was dedicated. He is a very humble person, who helped many of us when as newcomers we sought this advice. And anyone that did not ask his advice should have because they would then have learned what kind of fine institution is the House of Representatives. He provided good advice to those who wanted to become effective legislators.

It is good to see Ron back. I hope that he will take these various encomiums with the respect and affection of his elected friends as he retires from the House that was his home for so long.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Chair of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking member for allowing us to disrupt the proceedings.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks regarding consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4516 and that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4516, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 565, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of legislative day of July 26, 2000 at page H7095.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to bring this conference report to the House. It was ready for consideration by the House before we recessed for our respective political conventions. But because of the schedule, we are just now getting to it today. The conference

report includes three bills that have already been passed by the House.

As my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, the House has passed all 13 of our appropriations bills. We also passed the major supplemental that was requested by the President this year. We have already considered the conference report on that supplemental and on the Defense appropriations bill and the Military Construction appropriations bill. And so, we are on the move here.

I am happy to report that this conference report includes the Legislative Branch appropriations bill and also the Treasury Postal bill, which funds in part the executive offices of the Executive Branch of Government, including the White House.

It also includes a bill that was passed in the House by a vote of 420-2 on repeal of the Spanish-American War tax on telephone services.

And so, we have those three bills that passed the House with substantial votes included in this conference report. Even the Treasury Postal bill passed the House by a vote that could be considered a landslide relative to previous votes. We passed that bill by a vote of 216-202. That is a lot better vote than we usually get on that bill. Nevertheless, we have worked hard with our counterparts in the other body, and we bring this conference report today.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following table for the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Bill, 2001:

H.R. 4985 - TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001

(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2000 Enacted | FY 2001 Request | House | Senate | Conference | Conference vs. enacted |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY | | | | | | |
| Departmental Offices | 134,034 | 161,006 | 149,437 | 149,610 | 156,315 | +22,281 |
| Contingent emergency supplemental..... | 24,900 | | | 502 | | -24,900 |
| Department-wide systems and capital investments programs | 43,448 | 89,279 | 41,787 | 37,279 | 47,287 | +3,839 |
| Office of Inspector General..... | 30,599 | 33,608 | 31,940 | 32,899 | 32,899 | +2,300 |
| Inspector General for Tax Administration..... | 111,781 | 118,427 | 115,477 | 118,427 | 118,427 | +6,646 |
| Treasury Building and Annex Repair and Restoration | 22,700 | 31,000 | 31,000 | 22,700 | 31,000 | +8,300 |
| Expanded Access to Financial Services..... | | 30,000 | 2,000 | 400 | 2,000 | +2,000 |
| Money Laundering Strategy..... | | 15,000 | | | | |
| Financial Crimes Enforcement Network..... | 27,818 | 34,694 | 34,694 | 37,576 | 37,576 | +9,758 |
| Counterterrorism Fund (emergency funding) | | 55,000 | | 55,000 | 55,000 | +55,000 |
| Violent Crime Reduction Programs..... | 130,081 | | | | | -130,081 |
| Federal Law Enforcement Training Center: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and Expenses | 84,027 | 93,483 | 93,483 | 93,198 | 94,483 | +10,456 |
| Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, & Related Expenses..... | 21,175 | 17,331 | 17,331 | 29,205 | 29,205 | +8,030 |
| Total | 105,202 | 110,814 | 110,814 | 122,403 | 123,688 | +18,486 |
| Interagency Law Enforcement: Interagency crime and drug enforcement | 60,502 | 103,476 | 103,476 | 90,976 | 103,476 | +42,974 |
| Financial Management Service..... | 200,555 | 202,851 | 198,736 | 202,851 | 206,851 | +6,296 |
| Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms: Salaries and Expenses | 564,773 | 760,051 | 731,325 | 724,937 | 768,695 | +203,922 |
| United States Customs Service: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and Expenses | 1,698,227 | 1,887,866 | 1,822,365 | 1,804,687 | 1,863,765 | +165,538 |
| Harbor Maintenance Fee Collection | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | |
| Operation, Maintenance and Procurement, Air and Marine Interdiction Programs | 108,688 | 156,875 | 125,778 | 128,228 | 133,228 | +24,540 |
| Automation modernization: | | | | | | |
| Automated Commercial System..... | | 123,000 | 123,000 | 123,000 | 123,000 | +123,000 |
| International Trade Data System..... | | 5,400 | 5,400 | 5,400 | 5,400 | +5,400 |
| Automated Commercial Environment..... | | 210,000 | 105,000 | | 130,000 | +130,000 |
| Subtotal..... | | 338,400 | 233,400 | 128,400 | 258,400 | +258,400 |
| Customs Services at Small Airports (to be derived from fees collected) | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | |
| Offsetting receipts..... | -2,000 | -2,000 | -2,000 | -2,000 | -2,000 | |
| Total | 1,809,915 | 2,386,141 | 2,184,543 | 2,064,315 | 2,258,393 | +448,478 |
| Bureau of the Public Debt..... | 177,143 | 182,901 | 182,901 | 182,901 | 182,901 | +5,758 |
| Payment of government losses in shipment..... | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | |
| Internal Revenue Service: | | | | | | |
| Processing, Assistance, and Management | 3,280,250 | 3,699,499 | 3,487,232 | 3,506,939 | 3,567,001 | +286,751 |
| Tax Law Enforcement | 3,336,838 | 3,443,859 | 3,332,676 | 3,378,040 | 3,382,402 | +45,564 |
| Earned Income Tax Credit Compliance Initiative..... | 144,000 | 145,000 | 145,000 | 145,000 | 145,000 | +1,000 |
| Information Systems..... | 1,455,401 | 1,583,565 | 1,488,090 | 1,505,090 | 1,545,090 | +89,689 |
| Information technology investments | | 71,751 | | | | |
| Advance appropriation, FY 2002..... | | 422,249 | | | | |
| Total, FY 2001..... | 8,216,489 | 8,943,674 | 8,452,998 | 8,535,069 | 8,639,493 | +423,004 |
| Advance appropriation, FY 2002..... | | 422,249 | | | | |
| United States Secret Service: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and Expenses | 667,312 | 824,500 | 823,800 | 778,279 | 823,800 | +156,488 |
| Title II general provisions (P.L. 106-113) | 10,000 | | | | | -10,000 |
| (By transfer) | (21,000) | | | | | (-21,000) |
| Contingent emergency supplemental..... | 10,000 | | | | | -10,000 |
| Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, & Related Expenses..... | 4,185 | 5,021 | 5,021 | 4,283 | 8,941 | +4,756 |
| Total | 691,497 | 829,521 | 828,821 | 782,562 | 832,741 | +141,244 |
| Total, title I, Department of the Treasury | 12,352,437 | 14,520,692 | 13,200,949 | 13,161,407 | 13,597,742 | +1,245,305 |
| Current year, FY 2001..... | 12,352,437 | 14,098,443 | 13,200,949 | 13,161,407 | 13,597,742 | +1,245,305 |
| Appropriations | (12,317,537) | (14,043,443) | (13,200,949) | (13,105,905) | (13,542,742) | (+1,225,205) |
| Emergency funding..... | (34,900) | (55,000) | | (55,502) | (55,000) | (+20,100) |
| Advance appropriations, FY 2002 | | 422,249 | | | | |
| TITLE II - POSTAL SERVICE | | | | | | |
| Payment to the Postal Service Fund | 28,620 | 29,000 | 29,000 | | 29,000 | +380 |
| Advance appropriation, FY 2002..... | 64,438 | 67,093 | 67,093 | 67,093 | 67,093 | +2,657 |
| Total | 93,058 | 96,093 | 96,093 | 67,093 | 96,093 | +3,037 |

H.R. 4985 - TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2000 Enacted | FY 2001 Request | House | Senate | Conference | Conference vs. enacted |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| TITLE III - EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT | | | | | | |
| Compensation of the President and the White House Office: | | | | | | |
| Compensation of the President..... | 250 | 390 | 390 | 390 | 390 | + 140 |
| Salaries and Expenses | 52,243 | 53,288 | 52,135 | 53,288 | 53,288 | + 1,045 |
| Executive Residence at the White House: | | | | | | |
| Operating Expenses | 9,225 | 10,900 | 10,286 | 10,900 | 10,900 | + 1,675 |
| White House Repair and Restoration..... | 808 | 5,510 | 658 | 5,510 | 968 | + 160 |
| Special Assistance to the President and the Official Residence of the Vice President: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and Expenses | 3,609 | 3,673 | 3,664 | 3,673 | 3,673 | + 64 |
| Operating expenses | 330 | 354 | 354 | 354 | 354 | + 24 |
| Council of Economic Advisers..... | 3,825 | 4,110 | 3,997 | 4,110 | 4,110 | + 285 |
| Office of Policy Development | 4,017 | 4,032 | 4,030 | 4,032 | 4,032 | + 15 |
| National Security Council..... | 6,970 | 7,165 | 7,148 | 7,165 | 7,165 | + 195 |
| Office of Administration | 39,050 | 43,737 | 41,185 | 43,737 | 43,737 | + 4,687 |
| Contingent emergency supplemental..... | 8,400 | | | | | -8,400 |
| Office of Management and Budget..... | 63,256 | 68,786 | 67,143 | 67,935 | 68,786 | + 5,530 |
| Office of National Drug Control Policy: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 22,823 | 25,400 | 24,759 | 24,312 | 24,759 | + 1,936 |
| Title II general provisions (P.L. 106-113) | 3,000 | | | | | -3,000 |
| Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center..... | 29,052 | 20,400 | 29,750 | 29,052 | 29,053 | + 1 |
| Total | 54,875 | 45,800 | 54,509 | 53,364 | 53,812 | -1,063 |
| Federal Drug Control Programs: | | | | | | |
| High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program | 191,271 | 192,000 | 217,000 | 196,000 | 206,500 | + 15,229 |
| Special forfeiture fund | 215,297 | 259,000 | 219,000 | 144,300 | 233,600 | + 18,303 |
| Unanticipated Needs | 996 | 1,000 | | | | -996 |
| Elections Commission of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico..... | | 2,500 | | | | |
| Total, title III, Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President | 654,422 | 702,245 | 681,499 | 594,758 | 691,315 | + 36,893 |
| TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.... | 2,664 | 4,158 | 4,158 | 4,158 | 4,158 | + 1,494 |
| Federal Election Commission | 38,008 | 40,500 | 40,240 | 39,755 | 40,500 | + 2,492 |
| Federal Labor Relations Authority..... | 23,737 | 25,058 | 25,058 | 25,058 | 25,058 | + 1,321 |
| General Services Administration: | | | | | | |
| Federal Buildings Fund: | | | | | | |
| Appropriations | -20,022 | 681,871 | | | 464,154 | + 484,176 |
| Advance appropriation, FY 2002-2004 | | 477,484 | | 374,345 | 276,400 | + 276,400 |
| Limitations on availability of revenue: | | | | | | |
| Construction and acquisition of facilities | (74,979) | (779,788) | | (3,000) | (472,176) | (+ 397,197) |
| Rescission of funds in P.L. 104-208 | (-20,782) | | | | | (+ 20,782) |
| General provisions (sec. 410) | | | | (2,500) | (2,500) | (+ 2,500) |
| Repairs and alterations..... | (598,674) | (721,193) | (490,592) | (671,193) | (671,193) | (+ 72,519) |
| Installment acquisition payments..... | (205,668) | (185,369) | (185,369) | (185,369) | (185,369) | (-20,299) |
| Rental of space..... | (2,782,186) | (2,944,905) | (2,944,905) | (2,944,905) | (2,944,905) | (+ 162,719) |
| Building Operations..... | (1,580,909) | (1,624,771) | (1,580,909) | (1,524,771) | (1,624,771) | (+ 43,862) |
| Subtotal..... | (5,242,416) | (6,256,026) | (5,201,775) | (5,431,738) | (5,900,914) | (+ 658,488) |
| Repayment of Debt..... | (100,000) | (70,595) | (70,595) | (70,595) | (70,595) | (-29,405) |
| Total, Federal Buildings Fund, FY 2001..... | -20,022 | 681,871 | | | 464,154 | + 484,176 |
| (Limitations) | (5,342,416) | (6,326,621) | (5,272,370) | (5,502,333) | (5,971,509) | (+ 629,093) |
| (Rescission of limitations)..... | (-20,782) | | | | | (+ 20,782) |
| Policy and Operations | 116,223 | 136,980 | 115,434 | 123,420 | 123,920 | + 7,697 |
| Contingent emergency supplemental..... | 3,300 | | | | | -3,300 |
| Disposal of property | | 8,000 | | | | |
| Office of Inspector General..... | 33,317 | 34,520 | 34,520 | 34,520 | 34,520 | + 1,203 |
| Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents..... | 2,241 | 2,517 | 2,517 | 2,517 | 2,517 | + 276 |
| General provision (P.L. 106-113, Title II)..... | 2,000 | | | | | -2,000 |
| Expenses, Presidential transition | | 7,100 | | 7,100 | 7,100 | + 7,100 |
| Total, General Services Administration, FY 2001 | 137,059 | 870,988 | 152,471 | 167,557 | 632,211 | + 495,152 |
| Advance appropriations, FY 2002-2004 | | 477,484 | | 374,345 | 276,400 | + 276,400 |
| Merit Systems Protection Board: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and Expenses | 27,481 | 29,437 | 28,857 | 29,437 | 29,437 | + 1,956 |
| Limitation on administrative expenses | 2,430 | 2,430 | 2,430 | 2,430 | 2,430 | |
| Federal payment to Morris K. Udall scholarship and excellence in national environmental policy foundation..... | 1,992 | 3,000 | 2,000 | 1,000 | 2,000 | + 8 |
| Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund | 1,245 | 1,250 | 1,250 | 500 | 1,250 | + 5 |

H.R. 4985 - TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2000 Enacted | FY 2001 Request | House | Senate | Conference | Conference vs. enacted |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| National Archives and Records Administration: | | | | | | |
| Operating expenses | 179,674 | 209,393 | 195,119 | 209,393 | 209,393 | +29,719 |
| Reduction of debt | -5,598 | -5,598 | -5,598 | -5,598 | -5,598 | |
| Repairs and Restoration | 22,296 | 99,560 | 5,650 | 4,950 | 95,150 | +72,854 |
| Advance appropriation, FY 2002 | | | | 88,000 | | |
| Records Center Revolving Fund | 22,000 | | | | | -22,000 |
| National Historical Publications & Records Commission: Grants program | 6,250 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,450 | 6,450 | +200 |
| Rescission | -2,000 | | | | | +2,000 |
| Total | 222,622 | 309,355 | 201,171 | 215,195 | 305,395 | +82,773 |
| Advance appropriation, FY 2002 | | | | 88,000 | | |
| Office of Government Ethics | 9,080 | 9,684 | 9,684 | 9,684 | 9,684 | +604 |
| Office of Personnel Management: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and Expenses | 90,240 | 100,558 | 93,471 | 94,095 | 94,095 | +3,855 |
| Limitation on administrative expenses | 95,124 | 101,986 | 101,986 | 99,624 | 101,986 | +6,862 |
| Office of Inspector General | 956 | 1,360 | 1,360 | 1,356 | 1,360 | +404 |
| Limitation on administrative expenses | 9,608 | 9,745 | 9,745 | 9,708 | 9,745 | +137 |
| Government Payment for Annuity, Employees Health Benefits | 5,105,395 | 5,427,166 | 5,427,166 | 5,427,166 | 5,427,166 | +321,771 |
| Government Payment for Annuity, Employee Life Insurance | 36,200 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | -1,200 |
| Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund | 9,120,558 | 8,940,051 | 8,940,051 | 8,940,051 | 8,940,051 | -180,507 |
| Total, Office of Personnel Management | 14,458,081 | 14,615,866 | 14,608,779 | 14,607,000 | 14,609,403 | +151,322 |
| Office of Special Counsel | 9,703 | 11,147 | 10,319 | 10,733 | 11,147 | +1,444 |
| United States Tax Court | 35,045 | 37,439 | 37,305 | 35,474 | 37,305 | +2,260 |
| Total, title IV, Independent Agencies | 14,969,147 | 16,437,796 | 15,123,722 | 15,610,326 | 15,986,378 | +1,017,231 |
| Current year, FY 2001 | 14,969,147 | 15,960,312 | 15,123,722 | 15,147,981 | 15,709,978 | +740,831 |
| Appropriations | (14,967,847) | (15,960,312) | (15,123,722) | (15,147,981) | (15,709,978) | (+742,131) |
| Rescissions | (-2,000) | | | | | (+2,000) |
| Advance appropriations, FY 2002-2004 | | 477,484 | | 462,345 | 276,400 | +276,400 |
| Grand total | 28,069,062 | 31,756,826 | 29,102,263 | 29,433,584 | 30,371,528 | +2,302,466 |
| Current year, FY 2001 | 28,004,626 | 30,790,000 | 29,035,170 | 28,904,146 | 30,028,035 | +2,023,409 |
| Appropriations | (27,968,426) | (30,735,000) | (29,035,170) | (28,848,644) | (29,973,035) | (+2,004,609) |
| Emergency funding | (38,200) | (55,000) | | (55,502) | (55,000) | (+16,800) |
| Rescissions | (-2,000) | | | | | (+2,000) |
| Advance appropriations, FY 2002-2004 | 64,436 | 966,826 | 67,093 | 529,438 | 343,493 | +279,057 |
| (Limitations) | (5,342,416) | (6,328,621) | (5,272,370) | (5,502,333) | (5,971,509) | (+629,093) |
| (Rescission of limitations) | (-20,782) | | | | | (+20,782) |
| Scorekeeping adjustments: | | | | | | |
| Bureau of The Public Debt (Permanent) | 142,000 | 145,000 | 145,000 | 145,000 | 145,000 | +3,000 |
| Federal Reserve Bank reimbursement fund | 128,000 | 131,000 | 131,000 | 131,000 | 131,000 | +3,000 |
| Limitation on admin expenses adjustment to BA | -1,561 | | | | | +1,561 |
| US Mint revolving fund | 11,000 | 14,000 | 14,000 | 14,000 | 14,000 | +3,000 |
| Sallie Mae | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | |
| Federal buildings fund | -119,368 | 63,000 | -309,000 | -79,000 | -74,000 | +45,366 |
| Advance appropriations: | | | | | | |
| Postal service, FY 2000/2001 | 71,195 | 64,436 | 64,436 | 64,436 | 64,436 | -6,759 |
| Postal service, FY 2001/2002 | -64,436 | -67,093 | -67,093 | -67,093 | -67,093 | -2,657 |
| IRS, FY 2002 | | -422,249 | | | | |
| GSA, FY 2002-2004 | | -477,484 | | -374,345 | -276,400 | -276,400 |
| National Archives, FY 2002 | | | | -88,000 | | |
| Conveyance of land to the Columbia Hospital for Women (sec. 410) | -8,000 | | | | | +8,000 |
| NOAA retirement provision (sec. 654), FY 1999 | 5,650 | | | | | -5,650 |
| Government-wide early buyout (sec. 651) | 30,000 | | | | | -30,000 |
| GSA early buyout (sec. 411) | -1,000 | | | | | +1,000 |
| FY 1999 supplemental (sec. 654) | -5,650 | | | | | +5,650 |
| Across the board cut (0.38%) | -73,000 | | | | | +73,000 |
| OMB/CBO adjustment | 72,153 | | | | | -72,153 |
| OMB/CBO adjustment (mandatory to discretionary) | (-408) | | | | | (+408) |
| Total, scorekeeping adjustments | 187,985 | -548,390 | -20,657 | -253,002 | -62,057 | -250,042 |
| Total mandatory and discretionary | 28,257,047 | 31,208,436 | 29,081,606 | 29,180,582 | 30,309,471 | +2,052,424 |
| Mandatory | 14,532,995 | 14,679,607 | 14,679,607 | 14,679,607 | 14,679,607 | +146,612 |
| Discretionary | 13,724,052 | 16,528,829 | 14,401,999 | 14,500,975 | 15,629,864 | +1,905,812 |

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as of this point, we have 2 of the 13 appropriation bills which must pass by October 1 actually through the system. Both of those bills fund the same department. Other than that, we have a lot of bills that are still caught midstream at various points between the two Houses.

This bill is, unfortunately, part of an unfortunate process under which decisions have evidently been made to send yet more bills down to the President which will be veto bait rather than bills that will be likely to become law.

That does nothing to put us any closer to getting our work done by the end of the fiscal year. And I regret that.

The legislative appropriations bill started out as a bill which every single Member of the minority side was willing to sign and send on to the other body and the President. Unfortunately, it was been packaged with a number of other unrelated items, other appropriations bills, as well as tax provisions which have no business in the bill.

In essence, at this point, this dog has three tails and no legs. It is not going anywhere. And the sooner we dispose of it, the sooner we can get back to reality.

I do not expect, unfortunately, that we are going to see many Members on this side voting for this bill because it, unfortunately, is another exercise in futility at this point.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), who chairs the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, which is the primary vehicle for this conference report.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank again our staff and ranking members for the cooperation in the Legislative Branch bill.

The conference agreement appropriates \$2.53 billion for fiscal year 2001.

Compared to FY 2000, including supplementals, the conference report is an increase of \$40 million, about 1.6 percent.

In personnel, the conference report cuts 47 equivalent jobs. There are no layoffs or RIFs, and all COLAs are funded.

Since 1994, we have cut 4,222 jobs throughout the legislative branch. That is a reduction of 15.2 percent. No other branch of the Federal Government comes close to that amount of downsizing undergone by the legislative branch.

The conference report includes funds for the further development of the National Digital Library program with the Library of Congress. This project is laying the foundation for integration of the Internet and our educational system.

There is also a provision requiring penalty clauses to be placed in the Ar-

chitect's construction projects. Without the ability to hold contractors to schedules and funding limitations, we are totally vulnerable to mismanagement and lax supervision. This provision is aimed at improving the Architect's control over his construction responsibilities.

The conference report does not include merger of the Capitol, Library, and GPO police, nor does the report include the human resources legislation for GAO.

The GAO matter may surface again at a later date. A few matters need to be worked out, and I am confident we can accomplish that in the future. We have asked the Comptroller General to concentrate on that.

The agreement includes an emergency FY2000 supplemental appropriation of \$2.1 million for congressional and Library of Congress security and \$9 million for urgent repairs at the Cannon garage.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the bill provides \$2.53 billion. It is 7.3 percent below the request of the President's budget. And FTE levels have been reduced by 47.

The bill maintains a smaller legislative branch as established by the policies set in the 104th Congress, and it provides stability to those operations that must support our legislative needs.

I include for the RECORD the following table that tabulates the funding agreement:

H.R. 4516 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 2001

(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2000 Enacted | FY 2001 Request | House | Senate | Conference | Conference vs. enacted |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-------|---------|------------|---------------------------|
| TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS | | | | | | |
| SENATE | | | | | | |
| Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress | | | | | | |
| Gratuities, deceased Members..... | | | | | 141 | +141 |
| Expense Allowances | | | | | | |
| Expense allowances: | | | | | | |
| Vice President..... | 10 | 10 | | 10 | 10 | |
| President Pro Tempore of the Senate..... | 10 | 10 | | 10 | 10 | |
| Majority Leader of the Senate..... | 10 | 10 | | 10 | 10 | |
| Minority Leader of the Senate..... | 10 | 10 | | 10 | 10 | |
| Majority Whip of the Senate..... | 5 | 5 | | 5 | 5 | |
| Minority Whip of the Senate..... | 5 | 5 | | 5 | 5 | |
| Chairman of the Majority Conference Committee..... | 3 | 3 | | 3 | 3 | |
| Chairman of the Minority Conference Committee..... | 3 | 3 | | 3 | 3 | |
| Chairman of the Majority Policy Committee..... | | | | 3 | 3 | +3 |
| Chairman of the Minority Policy Committee..... | | | | 3 | 3 | +3 |
| Subtotal, expense allowances..... | 56 | 56 | | 62 | 62 | +6 |
| Representation allowances for the Majority and Minority Leaders..... | 30 | 30 | | 30 | 30 | |
| Total, Expense allowances and representation..... | 86 | 86 | | 92 | 92 | +6 |
| Salaries, Officers and Employees | | | | | | |
| Office of the Vice President..... | 1,721 | 1,785 | | 1,785 | 1,785 | +64 |
| Office of the President Pro Tempore..... | 437 | 453 | | 453 | 453 | +16 |
| Offices of the Majority and Minority Leaders..... | 2,644 | 2,742 | | 2,742 | 2,742 | +98 |
| Offices of the Majority and Minority Whips..... | 1,634 | 1,770 | | 1,722 | 1,722 | +88 |
| Committee on Appropriations..... | 6,525 | 6,917 | | 6,917 | 6,917 | +392 |
| Conference committees..... | 2,264 | 2,350 | | 2,304 | 2,304 | +40 |
| Offices of the Secretaries of the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority..... | 590 | 732 | | 590 | 590 | |
| Policy Committees..... | 2,302 | 2,508 | | 2,342 | 2,342 | +40 |
| Office of the Chaplain..... | 277 | 288 | | 288 | 288 | +11 |
| Office of the Secretary..... | 14,202 | 14,738 | | 14,738 | 14,738 | +536 |
| Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper..... | 34,794 | 35,341 | | 34,811 | 34,811 | +17 |
| Offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority..... | 1,246 | 1,292 | | 1,292 | 1,292 | +46 |
| Agency contributions and related expenses..... | 21,332 | 22,337 | | 22,337 | 22,337 | +1,005 |
| Total, salaries, officers and employees..... | 89,968 | 93,253 | | 92,321 | 92,321 | +2,353 |
| Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 3,901 | 4,046 | | 4,046 | 4,046 | +145 |
| Office of Senate Legal Counsel | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,035 | 1,069 | | 1,069 | 1,069 | +34 |
| Expense Allowances of the Secretary of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, and Secretaries for the Majority and Minority of the Senate | | | | | | |
| Expenses allowances..... | 12 | 12 | | 12 | 12 | |
| Contingent Expenses of the Senate | | | | | | |
| Inquiries and investigations..... | 71,604 | 74,136 | | 73,000 | 73,000 | +1,396 |
| Expenses of United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control | 370 | 370 | | 370 | 370 | |
| Secretary of the Senate..... | 1,511 | 2,077 | | 2,077 | 2,077 | +566 |
| Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate..... | 66,261 | 101,228 | | 71,261 | 71,511 | +5,250 |
| Miscellaneous items..... | 8,655 | 8,655 | | 8,655 | 8,655 | |
| Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account..... | 245,703 | 273,591 | | 253,203 | 253,203 | +7,500 |
| Official Mail Costs | | | | | | |
| Expenses..... | 300 | 300 | | 300 | 300 | |
| Total, contingent expenses of the Senate..... | 394,404 | 460,357 | | 408,866 | 409,116 | +14,712 |
| Total, Senate..... | 489,406 | 558,823 | | 506,406 | 506,797 | +17,391 |
| Across the board cut (0.38%)..... | -2,036 | | | | | +2,036 |
| Net total, Senate..... | 487,370 | 558,823 | | 506,406 | 506,797 | +19,427 |

H.R. 4516 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 2001 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2000 Enacted | FY 2001 Request | House | Senate | Conference | Conference vs. enacted |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------------------------|
| HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | | | | | | |
| Salaries and Expenses | | | | | | |
| House Leadership Offices | | | | | | |
| Office of the Speaker | 1,723 | 1,798 | 1,759 | 1,759 | 1,759 | +36 |
| Office of the Majority Floor Leader | 1,888 | 1,761 | 1,726 | 1,726 | 1,726 | +38 |
| Office of the Minority Floor Leader | 2,050 | 2,140 | 2,096 | 2,096 | 2,096 | +46 |
| Office of the Majority Whip | 1,404 | 1,500 | 1,466 | 1,466 | 1,466 | +62 |
| Office of the Minority Whip | 1,042 | 1,121 | 1,096 | 1,096 | 1,096 | +54 |
| Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities | 406 | 417 | 410 | 410 | 410 | +4 |
| Republican Steering Committee | 755 | 779 | 765 | 765 | 765 | +10 |
| Republican Conference | 1,225 | 1,289 | 1,255 | 1,255 | 1,255 | +30 |
| Democratic Steering and Policy Committee | 1,324 | 1,381 | 1,352 | 1,352 | 1,352 | +28 |
| Democratic Caucus | 657 | 687 | 668 | 668 | 668 | +11 |
| Nine minority employees | 1,218 | 1,251 | 1,229 | 1,229 | 1,229 | +11 |
| Training and Development Program: | | | | | | |
| Majority | 284 | 290 | 278 | 278 | 278 | -6 |
| Minority | 284 | 290 | 278 | 278 | 278 | -6 |
| Subtotal, House Leadership Offices | 14,060 | 14,704 | 14,378 | 14,378 | 14,378 | +318 |
| Members' Representational Allowances Including Members' Clerk Hire, Official Expenses of Members, and Official Mail | | | | | | |
| Expenses | 406,279 | 422,894 | 410,182 | 410,182 | 410,182 | +3,903 |
| Committee Employees | | | | | | |
| Standing Committees, Special and Select (except Appropriations) | 93,878 | 99,242 | 92,196 | 92,196 | 92,196 | -1,682 |
| Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations) | 21,095 | 22,530 | 20,628 | 20,628 | 20,628 | -467 |
| Subtotal, Committee employees | 114,973 | 121,772 | 112,824 | 112,824 | 112,824 | -2,149 |
| Salaries, Officers and Employees | | | | | | |
| Office of the Clerk | 14,881 | 15,862 | 14,590 | 14,590 | 14,590 | -291 |
| Office of the Sergeant at Arms | 3,746 | 3,858 | 3,692 | 3,692 | 3,692 | -54 |
| Office of the Chief Administrative Officer | 57,289 | 64,180 | 58,550 | 58,550 | 58,550 | +1,261 |
| Office of Inspector General | 3,926 | 4,040 | 3,249 | 3,249 | 3,249 | -677 |
| Office of General Counsel | 840 | 877 | 806 | 806 | 806 | -34 |
| Office of the Chaplain | 136 | 139 | 140 | 140 | 140 | +4 |
| Office of the Parliamentarian | 1,172 | 1,256 | 1,201 | 1,201 | 1,201 | +29 |
| Office of the Parliamentarian | (1,011) | (1,086) | (1,035) | (1,035) | (1,035) | (+24) |
| Compilation of precedents of the House of Representatives | (161) | (170) | (166) | (166) | (166) | (+5) |
| Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House | 2,045 | 2,130 | 2,045 | 2,045 | 2,045 | |
| Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House | 5,085 | 5,140 | 5,085 | 5,085 | 5,085 | |
| Corrections Calendar Office | 825 | 851 | 832 | 832 | 832 | +7 |
| Other authorized employees | 205 | 213 | 213 | 213 | 213 | +8 |
| Technical Assistants, Office of the Attending Physician | (205) | (213) | (213) | (213) | (213) | (+8) |
| Subtotal, Salaries, Officers and Employees | 90,150 | 98,546 | 90,403 | 90,403 | 90,403 | +253 |
| Allowances and Expenses | | | | | | |
| Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims | 2,741 | 3,381 | 2,235 | 2,235 | 2,235 | -506 |
| Official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House | 410 | 410 | 410 | 410 | 410 | |
| Government contributions | 128,704 | 138,355 | 138,726 | 138,726 | 138,726 | +10,022 |
| Miscellaneous items | 676 | 676 | 393 | 393 | 393 | -283 |
| Special education needs | | | | | 215 | +215 |
| Subtotal, Allowances and expenses | 132,531 | 142,822 | 141,764 | 141,764 | 141,979 | +9,448 |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 757,993 | 800,738 | 769,551 | 769,551 | 769,766 | +11,773 |
| Total, House of Representatives | 757,993 | 800,738 | 769,551 | 769,551 | 769,766 | +11,773 |
| JOINT ITEMS | | | | | | |
| Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 2001 | | 1,000 | | 1,000 | 1,000 | +1,000 |
| Joint Economic Committee | 3,200 | 3,315 | 3,072 | 3,315 | 3,315 | +115 |
| Joint Committee on Taxation | 6,431 | 6,747 | 6,174 | 6,686 | 6,430 | -1 |
| Office of the Attending Physician | | | | | | |
| Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances | 1,891 | 1,835 | 1,835 | 1,835 | 1,835 | -56 |
| Capitol Police Board | | | | | | |
| Capitol Police | | | | | | |
| Salaries: | | | | | | |
| Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives | 37,582 | 51,952 | 45,683 | 51,350 | 47,053 | +9,471 |
| Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate | 40,776 | 54,118 | 47,086 | 51,350 | 50,089 | +9,313 |
| Subtotal, salaries | 78,358 | 106,070 | 92,769 | 102,700 | 97,142 | +18,764 |

H.R. 4516 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 2001 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2000 Enacted | FY 2001 Request | House | Senate | Conference | Conference vs. enacted |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------------------------|
| General expenses..... | 6,549 | 9,960 | 6,549 | 6,884 | 6,772 | +223 |
| Subtotal, Capitol Police..... | 84,907 | 116,030 | 99,318 | 109,584 | 103,914 | +19,007 |
| Security enhancements..... | 2,102 | 2,750 | | | | -2,102 |
| Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office..... | 2,293 | 2,371 | 2,201 | 2,371 | 2,371 | +78 |
| Statements of Appropriations..... | 30 | 30 | 29 | 30 | 30 | |
| Total, Joint items | 100,854 | 134,078 | 112,629 | 124,821 | 118,895 | +18,041 |
| OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 1,992 | 2,095 | 1,816 | 2,066 | 1,820 | -172 |
| CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 26,121 | 28,493 | 27,403 | 27,113 | 28,493 | +2,372 |
| ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL | | | | | | |
| Capitol Buildings and Grounds | | | | | | |
| Capitol buildings, salaries and expenses | 53,697 | 60,036 | 44,234 | 44,191 | 43,689 | -10,008 |
| Capitol grounds..... | 5,406 | 6,120 | 5,217 | 5,512 | 5,362 | -44 |
| Senate office buildings..... | 66,109 | 66,628 | | 63,974 | 63,974 | -2,135 |
| House office buildings..... | 50,350 | 53,269 | 32,750 | 32,750 | 32,750 | -17,600 |
| Capitol Power Plant | 41,897 | 45,272 | 43,551 | 43,989 | 43,815 | +1,918 |
| Offsetting collections | -3,985 | -4,400 | -4,400 | -4,400 | -4,400 | -415 |
| Net subtotal, Capitol Power Plant..... | 37,912 | 40,872 | 39,151 | 39,569 | 39,415 | +1,503 |
| Total, Architect of the Capitol | 213,474 | 226,927 | 121,352 | 185,996 | 185,190 | -28,284 |
| LIBRARY OF CONGRESS | | | | | | |
| Congressional Research Service | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 70,973 | 75,640 | 73,810 | 73,374 | 73,592 | +2,619 |
| GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE | | | | | | |
| Congressional printing and binding | 73,297 | 80,800 | 69,626 | 73,297 | 71,462 | -1,835 |
| Total, title I, Congressional Operations | 1,732,074 | 1,907,594 | 1,176,187 | 1,762,624 | 1,756,015 | +23,941 |
| TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| BOTANIC GARDEN | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 3,438 | 4,916 | 3,216 | 3,653 | 3,328 | -110 |
| LIBRARY OF CONGRESS | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 265,803 | 292,174 | 269,864 | 267,330 | 282,838 | +17,035 |
| Authority to spend receipts..... | -6,850 | -6,850 | -6,850 | -6,850 | -6,850 | |
| Net subtotal, Salaries and expenses..... | 258,953 | 285,324 | 263,014 | 260,480 | 275,988 | +17,035 |
| Copyright Office, salaries and expenses..... | 37,485 | 38,903 | 38,771 | 38,332 | 38,523 | +1,038 |
| Authority to spend receipts..... | -26,254 | -26,783 | -31,783 | -26,783 | -29,283 | -3,029 |
| Net subtotal, Copyright Office..... | 11,231 | 12,120 | 6,988 | 11,549 | 9,240 | -1,991 |
| Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses | 47,802 | 48,983 | 48,507 | 48,711 | 48,609 | +807 |
| Furniture and furnishings | 5,394 | 6,020 | 5,394 | 4,892 | 4,892 | -502 |
| Total, Library of Congress (except CRS) | 323,380 | 352,447 | 323,903 | 325,632 | 338,729 | +15,349 |
| ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL | | | | | | |
| Library Buildings and Grounds | | | | | | |
| Structural and mechanical care | 19,857 | 20,278 | 15,837 | 16,347 | 15,970 | -3,887 |
| GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE | | | | | | |
| Office of Superintendent of Documents | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 29,872 | 34,451 | 25,652 | 30,255 | 27,954 | -1,918 |
| Government Printing Office Revolving Fund | | | | | | |
| GPO revolving fund..... | | 6,000 | | | | |
| Total, Government Printing Office | 29,872 | 40,451 | 25,652 | 30,255 | 27,954 | -1,918 |

H.R. 4516 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 2001 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2000 Enacted | FY 2001 Request | House | Senate | Conference | Conference vs. enacted |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------------------------|
| GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 378,961 | 402,918 | 371,896 | 387,867 | 387,867 | + 8,906 |
| Offsetting collections | -1,400 | -3,000 | -3,000 | -3,000 | -3,000 | -1,600 |
| Total, General Accounting Office | 377,561 | 399,918 | 368,896 | 384,867 | 384,867 | + 7,306 |
| Total, title II, Other agencies | 754,108 | 818,010 | 737,504 | 760,754 | 770,848 | + 16,740 |
| Grand total | 2,486,182 | 2,725,604 | 1,913,691 | 2,523,378 | 2,526,863 | + 40,681 |
| TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS | | | | | | |
| Senate | 487,370 | 558,823 | | 506,406 | 506,797 | + 19,427 |
| House of Representatives | 757,993 | 800,738 | 769,551 | 769,551 | 769,766 | + 11,773 |
| Joint Items | 100,854 | 134,078 | 112,629 | 124,821 | 118,895 | + 18,041 |
| Office of Compliance | 1,992 | 2,095 | 1,816 | 2,066 | 1,820 | -172 |
| Congressional Budget Office | 26,121 | 28,493 | 27,403 | 27,113 | 28,493 | + 2,372 |
| Architect of the Capitol | 213,474 | 226,927 | 121,352 | 185,996 | 185,190 | -28,284 |
| Library of Congress: Congressional Research Service | 70,973 | 75,640 | 73,810 | 73,374 | 73,592 | + 2,619 |
| Congressional printing and binding, Government Printing Office | 73,297 | 80,800 | 69,626 | 73,297 | 71,462 | -1,835 |
| Total, title I, Congressional operations | 1,732,074 | 1,907,594 | 1,176,187 | 1,762,624 | 1,756,015 | + 23,941 |
| TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| Botanic Garden | 3,438 | 4,916 | 3,216 | 3,653 | 3,328 | -110 |
| Library of Congress (except CRS) | 323,380 | 352,447 | 323,903 | 325,632 | 338,729 | + 15,349 |
| Architect of the Capitol (Library buildings & grounds) | 19,857 | 20,278 | 15,837 | 16,347 | 15,970 | -3,887 |
| Government Printing Office (except congressional printing and binding) | 29,872 | 40,451 | 25,652 | 30,255 | 27,954 | -1,918 |
| General Accounting Office | 377,561 | 399,918 | 368,896 | 384,867 | 384,867 | + 7,306 |
| Total, title II, Other agencies | 754,108 | 818,010 | 737,504 | 760,754 | 770,848 | + 16,740 |
| Grand total | 2,486,182 | 2,725,604 | 1,913,691 | 2,523,378 | 2,526,863 | + 40,681 |

NOTE: FY 2000 enacted includes 0.38% rescissions and legislative supplemental actions pending in H.R. 4516. Excluded from totals is a \$40,000,000 contingent emergency FY 2000 supplemental for FHA.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for being so kind in yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the chairman, for the manner in which he conducted business with the ranking member on the minority side of the subcommittee. He was very inclusive, and we were able to work out the differences as we proceeded with this bill and at conference had a very good bill.

I also want to thank Ed Lombard, who was assisted by Kit Winter and Tom Martin, for the professionalism that was displayed in developing this bill.

On the minority side, I would like to thank Mark Murray, who worked with my assistant, Eve Young. They provided countless hours of guidance and assistance to the minority.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill started, it had a very bad allocation. There was a concern about the security, the safety of the House, of the Capitol. As we proceeded with this bill, it got better.

At conference, we had restored many of the cuts that were initially in the bill. We were able to maintain security by providing enough money to have the required two policemen at every door.

□ 1445

We were able to fund CRS to the level in which it would not have layoffs. We were able to give to the Members' accounts enough money so they could provide cost of living raises for their staff. We worked it out with the Senate, and the conference report was a very good one.

As we were leaving the conference report, we asked the chairman what was going to happen to the bill and he, in his wisdom, said we do not know how many flies are going to be on this dog. That is how we left the conference.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the conference is that today we are here and could have passed a legislative branch bill that would have served this House very well, but the leadership has decided to add the Treasury Postal bill and also the telephone excise tax bill. It will be with great reluctance that the minority side will probably not support this conference bill because of the manner in which the Treasury Postal bill was developed. So I will ask my colleagues on our side of the aisle that even though we have a very good legislative branch bill, the concerns of the Treasury Postal bill that has been tacked on to this bill gives enough concern in which we may not want to support it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman

from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government and the bill that funds the White House, the President's activities.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased this afternoon to rise to talk about that part of this conference report that covers the 2001 Treasury Postal Service and General Government appropriations bill. This is a bill that is strong on law enforcement. It is tough on guns and it supports a policy of zero tolerance on drugs.

Now, the President has said that he will sign all reasonable appropriation bills this Republican Congress sends to him.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what he asked for. It is reasonable in every sense of the word, as I will attempt to describe here. Our part of this conference report is fiscally responsible and it is completely free of any and all controversial legislative riders.

Let me just take a moment to describe a little bit of the nuts and bolts of the measure. First of all, overall it has \$15.6 billion in support of the agencies that are covered by our appropriations subcommittee. It is \$1.9 billion, or 13.8 percent above the 2000 enacted level. It is 5.4 percent or \$900 million below the President's request but it is also \$1.228 billion above what we first initially passed in the House.

Some of the increases over the 2000 enacted levels include these: \$449 million for U.S. Customs Service, including not less than \$258 million for the badly needed Customs automation program, particularly the new one called ACE or Automated Customs Environment; \$204.9 million for the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms; \$423 million for IRS to support ongoing efforts for organizational modernization; \$15.2 million for the HIDTA, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area program, a total of \$206.5 million for that; a \$10 million increase for the Drug Free Communities Act; \$142 million for the Secret Service to support their ongoing protective operations as well as the work that they do with school violence; a total of \$276 million as an advance appropriation for fiscal year 2002 for four new courthouses for a total of \$472 million in fiscal year 2001 for four new courthouse projects, two new border stations, the continuation of FDA consolidation and the construction of ATF headquarters.

Lastly, let me just mention that there is \$88 million to begin the work and restoration of the National Archives headquarters and protection of our charters of freedom.

In terms of legislative items as compared to the House-passed bill, this agreement does not include any provisions related to the Cuban sanctions. It does not include provisions related to the prohibition on the use of funds to

implement regulations clarifying what constitutes a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics for Federal contractors, also known as the black listing provision. It does not include the provision prohibiting the use of funds to provide preferential treatment for the acquisition of firearms or ammunition. It does not include any provisions relating to reforms of the Federal Elections Commission, including the provision on the use of government aircraft by House and Senate candidates.

Conversely, this agreement does include current law from both the prohibition and use of funds for abortion as well as a requirement that health benefit plans provide contraceptive coverage. It does include a 1-year extension of the pilot project for child care and it does include current law as enacted in 1999 for the Kyoto protocol.

Mr. Speaker, I know that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to cry foul about this bill. They are going to claim the conference agreement was put together in the dead of night without their participation.

Well, we did work long hours and indeed some of those hours were in the middle of the night in order to put together this responsible bill, but the truth is, and my colleagues know this, that they were invited to participate at every step of the way. For every meeting that was scheduled with the Senate, they and their staffs were invited to attend.

The fact is, they declined to participate. They declined our invitation to participate.

Now, I also suspect my colleagues will claim, as they already have, this bill is headed for a veto because it fails to fund must-have items requested in the President's budget. The fact is, we do not know if the President will veto this measure. Through the grapevine we have heard several variations of the position of the White House.

First, they thought this was a reasonable bill, albeit somewhat short when it came to funding new employees in the IRS. We were led to believe the administration wanted to add back or add an additional \$100 million. Then we heard the White House wanted \$300 million, some for IRS, some for Archives, some for Treasury law enforcement. Finally, we heard the White House does not really have a specific list of must-have programs they believe are underfunded but rather there is a general list of must-have items that now totals between \$729 million and \$783 million, more than half of which would go to courthouse construction.

Regardless of courthouses, this conference agreement funds 8 projects, one more than the President requested. Now, some will say that we are playing games with the numbers because we forward funded four projects. The fact is of those four projects, one of them, the largest one, in Miami at \$122 million, has a lot of controversy about it

and it has a difficult time in the authorization process. It made sense to actually forward fund this one.

Let us be honest about who is playing games and using gimmicks. It is not the Committee on Appropriations. There is one fact and one fact only that has kept us from passing this bill sooner. The White House will not give us a position on the bill. They will not specify what items which might cause them to veto this measure. They will not sit down and negotiate with us. In all my years on appropriations, I have not seen a time when the White House outright refused to give a position on the bill, but this is apparently the year where they simply refuse to come to the table and negotiate in good faith on this appropriation bill. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report so we can get on with the business of Congress.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and I are not managing this conference report, as was noted. In fact, it is being managed by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). That is a testimony to the process, the convoluted process, that has brought us to this floor today.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) rose and said that this was never considered in the legislative bill to be added. As far as I know, it was never considered in the legislative conference, not the conference that I participated in. At no time did the legislative conference meet and add this as a part of its bill.

I am on the legislative committee, at least as far as I was invited to. I do not know whether the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was invited to a conference of the legislative committee or the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), but I think the answer to that is no.

Notwithstanding that, I and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) have tried to work together to try to bring this bill to a point where we could all support it. Very frankly, I think that that is possible. I think it is still possible.

I talked to the Speaker about it just an hour and a half ago. I am sorry that we are here today in a mode of not being in agreement on this bill.

So, first of all, the process has been very convoluted. The Senate, of course, has not considered this bill on the floor and there was no real conference on a Senate bill and a House bill and the differences.

This process, from the very beginning, has been a difficult one, if not incorrect one. In the committee's report when we came to the floor on this bill, the committee said we needed \$1.3 billion more, I think they were correct, at least \$1.3 billion more, to meet the responsibilities of our committee and of the agencies that we fund.

That was the majority's observation, not mine. But they brought a bill to the floor which was \$464 million low on IRS. I am going to talk about that in a second. It ended up being more than that because we cut \$25 million on the floor to add to HDTAs. So it was \$491 million low on IRS when it left this House.

Now, we did not have convened a conference in the sense that we had two bills. There were meetings. That is correct. There were invitations to come to meetings, some of which were attended. The final conference or whatever conference occurred, I was not at. The perception of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is that is by choice. I think that is from his standpoint. I understand that perception. But it was also a choice that was made in the context that we really did not know what was going on, and there were no discussions with us as to exactly what was to be added. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) represents there were discussions with the White House. The White House is not for these numbers in this bill, still thinks they are substantially low, as I think the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) knows.

Now, the legislation bill comes back to us \$1.2 billion over what the House passed, mostly Republicans but some Democrats as well.

That \$1.2 billion was added essentially without participation of a full conference. That should not happen. There were an additional \$18.8 million that included projects and priorities of various Members, none of whom were Democrats on this side of the aisle. That should not happen.

Let us deal now with the IRS within the time frame that we have, because that is really the most important issue that we deal with in this bill. It is, after all, the agency that collects all the revenue that allows all of us who support a ready and appropriate national defense to fund it. Education, health services, law enforcement, all the other items for which government is responsible, IRS has to collect the money.

Now, we adopted a vision of a new IRS and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and others, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a lot of others, brought this to the floor. We had a bill. We passed that bill.

The budget recommendations of the Portman report were, and I quote, the commission recommends that Congress provide the IRS certainty in its operational budget. We recommend the IRS budget for tax law enforcement and processing assistance and management be maintained at current levels.

Why? Because they said in order to carry out our responsibilities in passing this reform and restructuring bill, we need to have consistent and appropriate budget levels.

Now, around that time we hired a gentleman named Rossotti, Charles Rossotti. I think the chairman respects

Mr. Rossotti. I know I do. Furthermore, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) does, and Mr. ROTH does. They believe he is doing the kind of job that they expected to be done if we were going to meet our responsibilities under the Reform and Restructuring Act and have an IRS that was taxpayer friendly; that is to say that answered questions in a timely fashion, responded to taxpayers and were able to go personally over tax returns with taxpayers who had a particular problem.

□ 1500

After the conference was brought back to the floor and I expressed my concern that I had not seen the conference, had not talked about the conference, I asked Mr. Rossotti, I said does this allow you to do what we expect you to do? Here was his comment in a letter to me of September 8, 2000: "Please recognize that this level of funding, that is the funding level, that is provided for in this conference report, would lead to a further decline in the already low levels of compliance activity."

I have an article which indicates that some people are saying that there is \$300 billion in uncollected but due revenues. Why is that? Because compliance levels are so low and audit levels are shamefully low. I think the chairman knows that.

Mr. Rossotti, who is a Republican, hired as a manager, a business manager to carry out reform and restructuring and taxes modernization, says without funding for the Staffing Tax Administration for Balance and Equity Initiative, otherwise known as STABLE, the IRS effort to provide increased service to taxpayers and reduce the decline in audit coverage are at risk.

Substantively, the administration has a problem with this bill unrelated to politics. I share that view. So that in sum on the IRS title of this bill, we are dangerously low in providing services to the American taxpayer, and I had a discussion with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) on this. I think he shares my view that it is insufficient to carry out their duties.

Mr. Speaker, courthouses, the chairman mentioned the courthouses. The administration asks for seven courthouses to be funded. The conference report, frankly without discussion as to what courthouses we were talking about, came back and funded four courthouses. Now, that courthouse list is an interesting list: California, Washington, Virginia and ends with Mississippi; the next, D.C., Buffalo, Springfield, Miami. There is a list of 19 courthouses that are in the mix and deemed not by any politicians for pork purposes, but by the GSA and by the court administration as being priority needs.

We are not going to do all of those, but the conference, the so-called conference, again, without any discussion with me or other members on our side of the aisle, decided that we were going

to fund four and forward fund for others. Now, forward funding adopts the premise that these are necessary, but we are going to fund them next year. So, in effect, we are using next year's money this year. That is what forward funding means.

That is somewhat of a gimmick, a budget gimmick; and I know many of the conservative action team has decried budget gimmicks. But now guess what, and I hope that my conservative action team friends are listening, in addition to that, we have now moved the dates for paying veterans compensation, SSI, and other pensions from one year to another.

The problem with doing that is we changed it in the supplemental the other way just a few months ago. Now, I do not know how many people know that that is in this bill. It surely was not in the bill when it left here. It was never discussed in any conference in which I participated, and it was never informed to me that this was happening.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is probably a Member on the floor that knows that that has happened; maybe the chairman does, it has not been discussed.

In addition, we shift \$2 billion in this bill out of defense into nondefense domestic discretionary spending so that we can solve a firewall problem in the United States Senate. I cannot believe that the Contract With America that wanted to have a pristine process open and cleared to all without gimmicks that, of course, Democrats were alleged to perpetrate on the Congress, would support these provisions in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, one could go on for a long time and talk about the necessity of these bills; but one of the items that is not in this bill that the administration feels very strongly about and may well veto this bill on alone is the absence of the response to the counterterrorism initiative included in the administration's request.

There was some response in the conference report, but we left out the largest part of the administration's counterterrorism request. We think that is a problem.

The last thing I would indicate again in a process that is supposed to be an appropriations process, we have added a tax provision to this bill that was never discussed in the legislative conference. It was never discussed in any Treasury Postal conference, and anybody who gets on this floor and says that was a conferenced item that was agreed to by any conferees on the Democratic side in an open way is simply incorrect. It was never, ever discussed.

I would hope that my chairman would not make such a representation, because he knows that would be not true. I do not know how that provision became an emaculate conception on this bill, but it is now on this bill.

So for all of those reasons, I would hope that we would either recommit

this bill to conference and sit down and discuss it and come up with a bill on which we could all agree or, in the alternative, defeat this conference report.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to a few of the things said by my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend, who I have a great deal of respect for. We just happen to disagree about this bill and the way it has come to the body. I wished we could be in more complete agreement about it.

First, with regard to the funding for IRS. Let us be clear. We have an agency that has 95,000, that is 95,000 employees. It is not a small agency. It is also one in which I think most of us have recognized over the years, that is why we passed the modernization legislation, it has been one that has been too bureaucratic, too hard to move around, too difficult in order to get a handle on it. So I do not think that the issue really is adding more employees. It is making better use of the dollars, better use of technology, better use of management techniques more than anything else.

Mr. Speaker, I would also note with regard to the employees that were suggested to be added, that the President originally asked for this in the emergency supplemental. Now, they were not in there. He signed that bill. They were not in there, so all of this plan that is being asked for, the so-called program of STABLE, was going to be for annualizing these employees.

Since they were not there to begin with, we cannot be talking about analyzing them; but we cannot get a handle on what it is we really need. They will not tell us how much it is we really have to have. So we know that the amount that is requested for this program is wrong. It is not the correct amount, because it was to annualize a program that has not even begun.

We cannot start off with everybody on board in the first day.

Let me just talk about IRS accounts overall, and I think one of the things that I have learned as Chair of this committee, it is the biggest agency that we have. It is one of the hardest agencies to get your hands around and your arms around in terms of understanding it.

Mr. Speaker, now I think we have done a pretty good job in the information technology. We have had some bad times in the past, but we have been able to get a pretty good handle on the information technology account. But I do not think we are there yet with the personnel account, those that fund things such as processing and management and the enforcement.

We do not have a real good handle. We need to do better in that regard,

and that is why I think we need to work with Mr. Rossotti and managers at the IRS to get a better handle on exactly how this money they are asking for, this STABLE, for this new large number of 2,500 new employees would actually be used, and what they would actually do. We have not been able to really get a clear understanding of what this would be all about.

On construction, the gentleman from Maryland talked about forward funding and what a gimmick this is. Mr. Speaker, the President had in his request \$477 million of forward funding requested for the FDA consolidation mostly, but for some other GSA projects. So please, do not tell us that forward funding is a gimmick. It is a commitment by this body that we are going to do the next set of four courthouses.

And as I suggested, the one that is the largest by far in there is one that has not been authorized, has not been approved by the authorizing committee, and so it is not really in a position to go forward during the coming year anyhow.

Lastly, with regard to counterterrorism, in the emergency supplemental bill, we had \$55 million for counterterrorism. There is a request now for some additional amounts of money, but I do not think that this Congress has failed to step up to the plate, has failed to understand the need to have a strong effort in counterterrorism. Once again, we need to have a better idea of how this money is being used. We need to see where it is going before we just simply give a blank check to this administration or any other administration. That is our job as appropriators to do that.

I believe that this bill is a very responsible one. I believe it is one that Members of this body can and should support. And I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say again the record is clear the administration wants additional money for the IRS. This bill provides and wants additional money to deal with the Puerto Rican elections, and it wants additional money to deal with antiterrorism.

This bill makes a substantial reduction in our antiterrorism appropriations. We had a lot of talk last year around New Year's about whether or not we expected terrorists activities. Those, in fact, did not occur. It is no accident that they did not occur.

We cannot talk in public about some of the things that the administration is trying to deal with in this category, but it would seem to me that before anyone considers reducing this account, they ought to have the briefing that the administration is asking to

provide, because I think it will bring into substantial question the decision made in this bill to cut that account.

Mr. Speaker, I would also simply say, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has already referred to this, I want to insert in the RECORD at this time an article entitled "Taxfree Millionaires by Donald Bartlett and James B. Steel."

[From the Washington Monthly, Sept. 2000]

TAX FREE MILLIONAIRES—HOW THE SUPER RICH GET AWAY WITHOUT PAYING ANY TAXES (By Donald L. Bartlett and James B. Steele)

Tax fraud is exploding in the United States. In ways large and small, Americans are cheating like never before. One of every three people, perhaps as many as one of every two, is doing it. It's one of Washington's dirty little secrets, a ticking time bomb with the potential to destroy the country's tax system and to undermine essential government programs like Social Security. Disguised by a robust economy and record tax collections, fraud is growing at an exponential pace among all groups, with more and more income concealed from the IRS each year.

How bad is it? No one can put a precise number on lost tax revenue. But it's bad, and getting worse. Even the IRS, which doesn't like to acknowledge this problem for fear it will only encourage more taxpayers to cheat, admitted in 1999 that the "tax gap," its euphemism for fraud and error, is now up to \$195 billion a year. But that is based on data from the 1980s. A more reasonable count of the revenue lost every year is \$300 billion.

If Tax Dodging Inc. were a business, it would be the nation's largest corporation, eclipsing General Motors, which sits atop the Fortune 500 with revenue of \$189 billion.

How do people escape paying the taxes they owe? They inflate their itemized deductions for everything from medical bills to charitable contributions. They manufacture deductions to cover expenses never incurred. They understate their income. Or they do both. They ship their money to foreign tax havens. They claim illegal refunds. They speculate in the stock market and don't report their gains. They charge off their personal living costs as business expenses. And many don't even bother to file tax returns at all.

How many nonfilers are there today? The IRS doesn't have a clue. In part, that's because Congress has slashed the agency's budget, halting the kind of audit that would make even crude projections possible. Informally, government tax authorities say there are 10 million nonfilers. In truth, there are many more, and here's why:

The IRS identifies a nonfiler as a person who fails to submit a tax return even though a third party has filed an earnings statement (W-2) or information return reporting interest or dividends (Form 1099) that shows the person received income during the year. This narrow definition ignores all those who leave no paper trail. These are the people for whom there are no W-2s, or 1099s, no record of wages, annuities, gambling winnings, pensions, interest, dividends, or money flowing in from foreign trusts and bank accounts.

In addition to these people who deal only in cash, there is another larger group whose numbers have soared. They are wealthy Americans and foreign citizens who live and work in the United States and in other countries—multinational wheeler-dealers, independent businesspeople, entertainers, fashion moguls and models. They have multiple passports or global residences and therefore insist they are exempt from the U.S. income tax.

People like the Wildensteins of New York City. That would be Alec and his former wife Jocelyne, who became a staple of the New York tabloids during an unseemly divorce that raged from the fall of 1997 until the spring of 1999.

Alec, born in 1940, is an heir to his family's century-old, intensely-private, multibillion-dollar international art business. Jocelyne, four years his junior, is best known for having undergone countless plastic surgery procedures that make her look more feline, permanently, than any member of the cast of Cats. Her bizarre appearance inspired the tabloids to dub her "The Bride of Wildenstein."

For the Wildensteins, the once impenetrable curtain that had protected the family from prying eyes for generations was unexpectedly pierced on the night of September 3, 1997, when Jocelyne returned to the couple's opulent Manhattan home after a visit to the family's 66,000-acre ranch in Kenya. Walking into the six-story townhouse on East 64th Street, next door to the Wildenstein gallery, a few minutes after midnight, she found her husband in bed with a nineteen-year-old, long-legged blonde.

Alec hastily wrapped himself in a towel, grabbed a 9mm handgun and pointed it at his wife and her two bodyguards. "I wasn't expecting anyone," he screamed with a touch of understatement. "You're trespassing. You don't belong here." The bodyguards summoned the police, who arrested Alec and charged him with three counts of second-degree menacing.

So it was that the French-born, aristocratic Alex Nathan Wildenstein, having traded his towel for an Armani suit and a monogrammed shirt, spent the night in the Tombs prison with some of New York's low life. If nothing else, the incarceration gave him time to plot his revenge. When he got out the next day, he moved quickly. He canceled his wife's credit cards. He cut off her telephone lines, locked all the rooms in the townhouse except for her bedroom and sitting room, shut off her access to bank accounts, directed the chauffeur to stop driving her around, fired her accountant, and, in one final act of retribution, ordered the household chefs to stop cooking for her, which proved a major inconvenience because she had never learned how to operate the stove.

Jocelyne responded by turning up the temperature a few hundred degrees on what had been one of the quietest divorce proceedings ever among the rich and discreet. As a result, life among the Wildensteins—a family that for more than a century had guarded its privacy with a pathological obsession—went on public display.

Jocelyne demanded a \$200,000 monthly living allowance, payment of her personal staff's salary and expenses, and a \$50 million security deposit pending distribution of the marital property. Alec pleaded poverty. He insisted he had no money of his own and that the millions they spent came from his father.

The Wildenstein Family Circus that followed established conclusively, one or more time, that the rich are very different from the rest of us, beyond the fact that they often pay comparatively little or no taxes. But first, some background on this intriguing family.

Alec is the son of Daniel Wildenstein, the patriarch of the enormously rich French clan. Daniel, born in 1918, controls the Wildenstein billions through a web of secret trusts and intertwined corporations. The Manhattan townhouses, for example, are owned in the name of the Nineteen East Sixty-Fourth Street Corporation, which in turn is controlled by "intermediate entities

held in trust." He continues to operate the private, secretive art business started by his grandfather in the nineteenth century, with galleries in New York, Beverly Hills, Tokyo, and Buenos Aires, catering to private collectors, museums, and galleries. And while he spends a lot of his time in Paris, a good chunk of his money resides in secret Swiss bank accounts.

Tucked away in family storerooms, notably in New York, is reportedly the world's largest private collection of the works of the masters—valued at \$6 billion to \$10 billion. The inventory includes thousands of paintings and drawings by Renoir, Van Gogh, Cezanne, Gauguin, Rembrandt, Rubens, El Greco, Caravaggio, da Vinci, Picasso, Manet, Bonnard, Fragonard, Monet, and others. Many have never been displayed publicly.

In 1990, Daniel's sons Alec and Guy took over management of the New York gallery. Their families maintained separate living quarters in the East 64th Street townhouse. They shared the swimming pool in the basement, the informal and formal dining rooms, the foyer, elevator, and the entrance to the townhouse. Alec and Jocelyne lived on the third floor, their two children had bedrooms on the fifth floor, and Jocelyne used the sixth floor as an office. In addition to the Manhattan townhouse, they maintained a castle, the chateau Marienthal, outside Paris, an apartment in Switzerland, and the Kenya ranch.

Wherever they happened to be, the Wildensteins pursued a lifestyle that was lavish even by the standards of the rich and famous. The details, as they poured from Jocelyne's lips in the divorce proceeding, told the story of a family of seemingly unlimited wealth and no hesitation about spending it. According to her, she and Alec "routinely wrote checks and made withdrawals" from their Chase Manhattan Bank checking account "for \$200,000 to \$250,000 a month." Jocelyne said that over the last 20 years they did "millions of dollars worth of renovations on the Paris castle and Kenya ranch," and she directed the management, hiring, and staffs of those properties. The routine operating costs of the ranch alone ran \$150,000 a month.

In New York, Jocelyne's staff payroll at the 64th street townhouse included \$48,000 a year for a chambermaid; \$48,000 for a maid who tended the dogs; \$60,000 each for a butler and chauffeur; \$84,000 for a chef; \$102,000 for an assistant with an MBA; and \$102,000 for a secretary.

In Kenya, their vast Ol Jogi ranch, with its two hundred buildings spread over an area five times the size of Manhattan, required nearly four hundred employees to look after the grounds and the animals.

In France, the resident staff at the chateau, "the largest private home of its type within a fifteen-minute drive of Paris," included five gardeners, three concierges, and three maids.

Talk did not come cheap for the Wildensteins. The annual telephone bill in Manhattan alone sometimes ran as high as \$60,000. And then there were all the other necessities, like \$547,000 for food and wine; \$36,000 for laundry and dry cleaning; \$60,000 for flowers; \$42,000 for massages; pedicures, manicures, and electrolysis; \$82,000 to insure here jewelry and furs, and \$60,000 to cover the veterinarian bills, medication, pet food, beds, leashes, and coats for their dogs. As for miscellaneous professional services, \$24,000 went for a dermatologist, \$12,000 for the dentist, and \$36,000 for pharmaceuticals. Her American Express and Visa card bills for one year totaled \$494,000.

Some of these bills were paid out of the couple's Chase Manhattan account. Some were paid out of "other bank accounts in

New York, Paris, and Switzerland." And some bills, Alec confirmed, were paid from "the Wildenstein & Co." account, "the Wildenstein & Co. Special Account, and family businesses." Sort of like having your employer pick up the cost of your clothing, pets, and vacations.

And then there were Jocelyne's personal expenditures. Over the years, she accumulated jewelry valued at \$10 million, including a thirty-carat diamond ring and custom pieces from Cartier. She attended fashion shows in Paris. Her annual spending on clothing and accessories ran to more than \$800,000. She once spent \$350,000 for a Chanel outfit that she helped to design. Al told, according to papers filed in the divorce case, the couple's personal and household expenditures added up to well over \$25 million in 1995 and 1996 alone.

With all those tens of millions of dollars flowing out over the years to maintain a lifestyle beyond comprehension to most people—\$60,000 in dog bills exceeds the annual income of three-fourths of all working Americans who pay taxes—you might think that Alec and Jocelyne also forked over millions of dollars to the Internal Revenue Service. But you would be wrong.

They didn't pay a penny in U.S. income tax.

In fact, they never filed a federal tax return.

These admissions by a family accountant are spelled out in records of the acrimonious divorce and also entered into court opinions. They lived the tax-free life even though, by Jocelyne's account, they resided in the Manhattan townhouse for nineteen years, from shortly after their Las Vegas marriage in 1978 until the rancorous divorce proceedings began in 1997. Their children were born in New York and went to school in New York. Alec conducted the family art business through Wildenstein & Co., Inc., a New York corporation, from the gallery next door. He had a U.S. pilot's license. He sued and was sued in the courts of New York and other states. He signed documents moving millions of dollars between Wildenstein companies, some located in the tax havens of the world. He transacted business in New York and other states. He was vice-president of Nineteen East Sixty-Fourth Street Corporation, which owns the townhouse, gallery, and other properties. His New York pistol license identified him as an officer of Wildenstein & Co. And following his arrest for pointing the weapon at Jocelyne and her bodyguards, he insisted that he should be released on his own recognizance because of his substantial ties to the community.

Nonetheless, he filed no federal tax returns. And no one in Washington or New York noticed. Or cared. Under ordinary circumstances, even the complex tax returns of the very wealthy that are filed go unchecked. That's due to a deliberate decision by Congress to starve the IRS, both in operating funds and in manpower and expertise to conduct such audits. So forget about ferreting out serious nonfilers among the rich and prominent. That task doesn't even register on the tax fraud radar screen. Not surprisingly, representatives of Alec Wildenstein declined to discuss his tax affairs. Jocelyne's lawyer said she doesn't know anything about taxes, since Alec controlled the money. And the IRS can't comment on the tax matters of private citizens. Or in this case, the non-tax matters.

In the divorce case, Alec argued that he was not a resident of the United States, that he had a Swiss passport and visited this country on a tourist visa, and that he did not have a green card permitting him to work. Furthermore, he contended that he had "less than \$75,000 in bank accounts" and that "my

only earnings are approximately \$175,000 per year." On a net-worth statement, Alec listed his occupation as "unpaid personal assistant to father Daniel Wildenstein." That stirred the ire of State Supreme Court Judge Marilyn G. Diamond, who presided over the hostilities. "He fails to explain why he is unpaid," said Diamond, adding that "this contention insults the intelligence of the court and is an affront to common sense."

Judge Diamond was also angered that Alec never bothered to attend the divorce hearings. Shortly after Jocelyne began unveiling intimate details of the couple's private life, he fled the country. He ignored repeated court dates, failing to appear to answer either the gun charges or his wife's allegations. At one hearing, an irritated Diamond excoriated Wildenstein in absentia for his refusal to obey court orders and to attend depositions. His attorney, Raoul L. Felder, the New York celebrity divorce lawyer, offered an explanation for his client's behavior:

"It may not be his disinclination to appear before the court. You are aware there are substantial tax problems we believe created by the plaintiff."

Judge Diamond agreed. "There are going to be more substantial tax problems," she said. "There are more substantial potential tax problems by people continuing to take certain positions. Make no mistake about it."

If this conjures up visions of battalions of vigilant IRS agents engaged in a relentless search to identify tax scofflaws and, when they do so, dun them for the taxes they owe, assess interest and penalties, seize their bank accounts and cars, freeze their assets, and auction off their possessions, well, that's what they are, visions—at least when it comes to the very rich. For the double standard is to tax-law enforcement what rock is to roll.

Suppose you earn \$40,000 a year and don't file a return. When the IRS catches up with you it prepares a substitute return, estimates your income, calculates the tax you owe, tacks on interest and penalties, and sends you the bill. If you don't like their numbers, you must prove that the IRS is incorrect. What's more, the agency may seize your bank accounts, your car, and whatever else you have of value.

Not so with the truly prosperous. First, the agency mails out a computer-generated letter asking the nonfiler to submit a return. When the reluctant recipient fails to respond, a second letter goes out. And then another. And another. If the silence persists, IRS resorts to another tactic: The telephone. It tries to find the number of the missing nonfiler and place a series of calls. When all that proves futile—it generally does nothing. Nothing?

That was a finding of a 1991 study by the General Accounting Office (GAO), the investigative arm of Congress, that examined IRS' handling of affluent nonfilers:

"The IRS does not fully investigate high-income nonfilers, which creates an ironic imbalance. Unlike lower income nonfilers in the Substitute for Returns program, high-income nonfilers who do not respond to IRS' notices are not investigated or assessed taxes. Even if high-income nonfilers eventually file tax returns, their returns receive less scrutiny than those who file returns on time."

What's the IRS's explanation for the double standard? Incredibly, it told GAO that it does not prepare a substitute return for rich nonfilers, as it does for middle-income people, because it fears that it might "understate taxes owed." In other words, no loaf is better than half-a-loaf. So do nothing. Second, GAO said, "to pursue more high-income

cases, IRS would need additional staff." Which, of course, is precisely what Congress refuses to provide.

But things have changed since the critical 1991 audit that tried to prod the IRS to act, right? Indeed they have. With each passing year, the number of affluent nonfilers has gone up while Congress has slashed the service's auditing capabilities. There is no better evidence of the agency's breakdown than the fact the Wildensteins went two decades without filing a tax return, and the IRS knew nothing about it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the article points out that tax fraud is a ticking time bomb in this country, probably approaching up to \$300 billion in lost revenue. It tells the story of one family worth billions of dollars, one family that holds, in art collections alone, over \$6 billion in assets. They have a town house, a swimming pool. They have property in Kenya and France. They spend tens of millions of dollars each year.

They spend \$65,000 just in dog bills. They have not even filed a tax return for the last 20 years, and the IRS did not even know about it. That is the kind of tax avoidance which the IRS ought to be able to track, and so as long as they do not have adequate resources, will not be able to track.

If you are some taxpayer paying \$30,000 a year and they caught you, you would get womped with a bill in a hurry. But here is an example of a family that has lived like kings, international multinational kings, for years, in full view; and they have paid not one dime in taxes and never even bothered to file.

□ 1515

This is no laughing matter, when the administration is asking for more money to fund the IRS. So I would suggest that for those two reasons alone, this bill still falls far short of where it ought to be.

I also do not see why we should continue to play a flip-flop game with SSI. Last year we decided, the Congress decided, it was going to move the date for the payment of SSI checks into one fiscal year. The Congress moved it back to a different fiscal year in the supplemental this year. Now it is trying to flip it back again, moving it to a different fiscal year again, not for substance purposes, but for political purposes. All that does is create confusion and bring into question whether or not those SSI checks are going to be able to be cut. We ought not do that. That is another reason why this bill ought not to be considered in this fashion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to a couple things that the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations said. He used the word "cutting," that this bill is cutting. But I think we should be clear that we may not be adding as much as he would like in terms of new spending, but at 13.8 percent over last

year's spending, it is hardly a cut. There are not cuts in this in virtually every account, there are additions, and most of them are very much needed, and we acknowledge that. But this is not cuts.

The second point, with regard to the matter of IRS law enforcement or enforcement that the gentleman from Wisconsin talked about, the President's proposal would have transferred \$43 million out of law enforcement into other areas. We did not permit him to do that. So if there is inadequate law enforcement, I think the problem is to be found in the White House and in the administration and their plans to try to reduce the enforcement part of the Internal Revenue Service.

The third point, with regard to counter-terrorism, the additional monies, as I mentioned, we have \$55 million in this bill that is emergency spending so it can be spent immediately, above and beyond the budget caps. We offered in our discussions with the minority as we were trying to get agreement on this, we offered to put an additional \$37.2 million, which is more than two-thirds of what the President thought was additionally required in this area. That offer was rejected.

Again, we have not heard, other than that just absolutely everything is needed, there is no negotiation to be done except to give us 100 percent, that has been the bottom line of everything we have had in the discussions here, and that is not what I would call a serious negotiation.

So I think we have been very, very generous, and certainly are going to be prepared to look at additional amounts as we go forward from here. But certainly this conference report deserves support.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman indicated that they offered to put back additional money. They may have offered, but the fact is they have not put it back. So we are not voting on some ethereal offer; we are voting on the legislation before us at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say to my colleagues, I really think had we had the opportunity to work on this bill a little longer, I know we have been working on it for 10 days, but, very frankly, we could have done this 8 months earlier had we had real numbers at the start and not been told this is the 1st inning and there are 8 innings left to go. I do not know whether it is the 6th or 7th inning, but, very frankly, this is premature consideration, if you will, because we could work this out. I think we are pretty close to working this out, but we are certainly not close, as the ranking member indicated, with not having added what has been offered by your side to add. That is not added here. We are not close to funding IRS.

Let me say something about the chairman's comment about the level of employees of IRS. Let me remind you, he said there were 95,000 IRS employees. In 1992 there were 116,000 IRS employees. What has happened since 1992? Obviously, as the gentleman points out, they have been reduced 20 percent in the level of employees. That happened.

Number two, we have millions of additional taxpayers.

Number three, the complexity of the returns has increased as a result, very frankly, of some of the tax bills offered by the Republican majority which have become law.

Fourthly, we adopted a Restructuring and Reform Act which said we want you to be more customer friendly; that is to say, we want you to give more services, we want you to answer questions more quickly, we want you to be more available for taxpayers to come in to regional offices, all of which were positive things. But then we turn around and we say, guess what though? You do not have any people to do it.

That is a shell game. It is dishonest. That is why I voted against the Reform and Restructuring Act the first time around, and it is one of the best speeches I ever gave, and it was a very short speech. I got up and I said if you want to be for taxpayer IRS reform, you need to be for IRS reform at tax writing time and at budget time.

That is what this report ultimately said. In this bill, we are \$305 million under what Mr. Rossotti, not the administration, asked for. Frankly, Mr. Rossotti asked for more money than this to do his job. So do not go home and tell your taxpayers, boy, we are providing the kind of service that you need, because we are on your side, we are taxpayer friendly, and then pretend that you can go from 116,000 IRS employees to serve 270 million Americans, and, sure, it sounds like a big number, until you decide that there are 270 million Americans that are covered. They do not all pay taxes, some are kids, some do not make enough money, but they are all in the mix. And you go down to 95,000, and then expect to say, oh, well, you can do it.

I agree with my chairman, and he and I are good friends and respect one another, and I respect the big chairman, the chairman of the full committee. I think we can work this out. I think we can get pretty close, and I think we can get the administration on board. We did not participate in most of this. Yes, we discussed it, yes, I know the chairman is frustrated by the fact that we have not reached agreement. But you should not have brought this bill forward today, because it would have served the process and our committee if in fact we had worked this bill out and come to the floor together and said we have done what we should have done on IRS, we have done what we should on counter-terrorism, we have done what we should on court houses, and very frankly, we may stay

where we are on court houses, with some additional discussion the chairman and I have had.

But I would urge my colleagues, this is not the bill we ought to pass. In my opinion, and the President has not told me this, it is not going to be signed. And why do we continue in the 7th or 8th inning, or the 10th or 11th inning, wherever we are in this inning process, Mr. Chairman, I do not know where we are, but wherever we are, we should bring it to closure through agreement, and we are prepared to do that. We want to do it, I think we can do it, I would hope we would do it. I would hope we would send this bill back to a conference, that is a strange conference, because the Senate has never considered this bill. To that extent there was really nothing in the conference other than our bill, and in fact we did not conference our bill, it was added to the Legislative bill, which is why it is there.

So, my colleagues, I ask you to reject this. We can do better, and we will do better, and, when we do better, this bill will be whole, all of it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I hope this may conclude my part of the debate, but I do feel I need to respond to a few of the things that have just been said in this debate.

A few moments ago we had the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pointing out that the counter-terrorism dollars were not in here, that we are not voting on something hypothetical, we have to be voting on the substance of this. In the next moment the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is talking about how the process was not good. So we are talking about the process, not the substance of it. We are kind of getting whipsawed on both sides of this thing here.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have concerns about both the process and the substance, which is why we mentioned both.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the bottom line is is this a responsible bill? The question that we should ask is not does this bill have exactly everything in it that I want, because that is not the way the legislative process works; it is is this a responsible bill? And nobody can look at this bill and say that this is not a responsible bill. It does not do everything that I would like, because in the process of being chairman, I have to give on some things. It does not do everything that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) would like, it does not do everything that the White House would like, but it is a responsible bill. It funds in an adequate way the agencies that we are responsible for.

The gentleman from Maryland has told us that this bill will not be signed

by the President. That is somewhat news to us, because we have never been able to get a definitive statement from the White House about that. I do not want to be in the business of passing legislation, these appropriations bills, and going through this process of having them vetoed. I want to get bills that can be signed. But, as I said at the outset, our problem is the White House will not tell us. They have said in no uncertain terms, they will not tell us what it is that they need in order to pass this, other than, of course, give us everything in the request.

So we have to at some point pass a bill so we can get in writing from the White House some kind of a definitive statement about what it is. Perhaps we can do that before we send it to the White House. After we pass it and send it to the White House, perhaps we can work that out, because there are going to be other appropriations bills and other parts of this could be worked out in supplemental or omnibus bills at the end, other appropriation bills and conference reports.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a bill that is responsible. I believe we have a conference report that should be supported. I believe that the White House, and I hope the minority, would join us in passing this, so we can move forward and get this legislation enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the work of the staff of my subcommittee: Michelle Mrdeza, the clerk; Kurt Dodd, Jeff Ashford, and Tammy Hughes, and Patricia Schlueter of the minority staff. I would also like to thank Kevin Messner of my personal staff, and Scott Nance, on the staff of Mr. HOYER.

In addition to acknowledging the work of staff who have contributed to getting this Conference Report before the House today, let me give a special thanks to Doug Burke, a special Agent with U.S. Secret Service who is detailed to the Subcommittee as a congressional fellow. Doug came to this assignment after serving for a year as a fellow in the office of my distinguished ranking member, Mr. HOYER. He has brought considerable skill and energy to bear on our legislative work, to include preparing for hearings, conducting detailed oversight analysis, and coordinating two important Committee oversight trips to Miami and the West Coast, where his secret skills as a jazz pianist were exposed. In addition to serving as a full working staff member for the subcommittee, Mr. Burke did extra duty in doing Secret Service advance duty for the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia during the last recess.

Mr. Burke, who grew up in the Washington Virginia suburbs as the son of a former Secret Service Assistant Director, began his government service in the U.S. Navy, and went on from there to graduate from Penn State University. His subsequent career in the Secret Service has included investigative field work in Miami, protective service on the Presidential Detail, and teaching assignments at the Secret Service's Rowley Training Center in Beltsville, Maryland and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Georgia.

I would like to thank Mr. Burke for his contributions to the work of the Subcommittee and

wish him well in his future career as he returns this fall to the Secret Service. I would also wish him especially the best as Doug, the father of three, prepares with his wife Sarah to bring a new Burke into the world next year.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to simply say it is simply not true that the White House has not indicated what they want to see with this bill. They have indicated they want to see more funds for the IRS, they have indicated they want to see more funds for counterterrorism, they have indicated they want additional funds in order to deal with the Puerto Rican election.

They have indicated that they also do not want to have a non-germane separate tax provision which has no business in this bill being considered in this kind of a three-headed package. They have suggested that if indeed that tax package is going to be considered, then it ought to be considered along with other tax items, including some of the tax items that the administration is interested in several other appropriation bills. So they made it very clear what they regard to be the deficiencies in this bill, and I do not think it ought to be asserted otherwise.

Secondly, I would simply say I think the gentleman from Arizona has negotiated in absolute good faith, but I think he has had the rug pulled out from under him, just as we have on this side of the aisle, by the decision of his leadership to proceed in partisan fashion to pass this bill with votes on that side of the aisle alone. I regret that, but that, nonetheless, is apparently what has happened today, and until the substance of the bill is fixed, we do not intend to participate.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me say, so the Members understand where we are going to be I think at the end game, if we had continued our discussions about how to resolve this, and so the public understands as well, our constituents understand, I believe we can agree, I believe the White House can agree, on a number for this bill that will still be more than one-half billion dollars under the President's request.

□ 1530

I hope my colleagues heard that. I believe the White House is prepared to sign a bill that is half a billion, almost \$600 million under what they submitted to this Congress. So it is not that they are asking, gee, we ought to include all of these additional dollars.

It was, and I want to repeat, in the committee report issued by the majority in the Congress, the Republican majority. It says that their allocation was \$1.3 billion too little to meet the priorities. Now, that was still, we understand, \$800 million less than the President asked for, which was 2.2.

They are adding 1.2 back. So there is still \$100 million under what the committee report said they thought, the Republicans thought, was necessary to adequately fund this bill.

I repeat again to the chairman, for whom I have great respect, as everyone on this floor knows, we work together closely, I think we can work this thing out; and I know he is frustrated that we have been at it for 8 or 9 days and have not been able to work it out. There are a lot of interests here. The tax provision that was added to this bill, totally extraneous to our bill, has caused us a problem. That is not of the making of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) or my making or the making of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) or the making of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG); but it is causing us a problem, and that needs to be worked out. But we ought not to go up the hill just to be shot down and have to go back up it again.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can reach an agreement that is almost \$600 million under the President's request, and I would urge us to do that. Reject this conference report and approve the motion to recommit to conference. Let us sit down at the table, reason together and come up with a reasonable, positive, productive bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, this conference report included, as I said in my opening remarks, three different sections. One is the repeal of the Spanish-American War excise tax on telephone costs which passed this House by a vote of 420 to 2. So I take it that the substance of this portion of this legislation is not an issue. The Legislative Branch appropriations part of this package passed the House 373 to 50.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me make clear, that is an issue, because the administration indicates that if that tax is to be considered, and it ought to be considered in conjunction with other changes in the tax law which the administration also wants, not unilaterally in a privileged position, without any of the administration's tax preferences being taken into account. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his comments, but I think a vote of 420 to 2 is a pretty good indication of how the Members of this House feel about repealing that Spanish-American War tax.

Most of the debate has centered around the other bill that I indicated earlier passed by a landslide, relatively speaking, because it had 14 more votes for it than it had against it. Now, on this Treasury Postal, General Government bill, that is almost a landslide, based on previous votes procedural problems were mentioned because of the adding of the Treasury Postal bill

to the Legislative Branch conference report. That is probably not the best procedure, but we are a bicameral legislature. We have to work with the other body at the other end of the Capitol, as well as working with the President when we complete our conference reports.

The Senate was of the opinion that they needed to add the Treasury Postal bill into the Legislative Branch conference report, so that is what we did. I would not have done that if the House had not passed the Treasury Postal bill. I would not agree to taking any bill and putting in another conference if the House had not already passed it, except under the most unusual circumstances. I just believe I owe that to the Members of the House to give them that protection. So I would not do that. However, if that is what has to be done on the part of the other body to get a bill through the process, then that is what we will do.

It had been suggested that the IRS issue is a big issue, but I want the Members to know that we spent quite a bit of time talking about that. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is my dear friend and I have tremendous respect for him and his abilities, he is great; and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who is also my friend and has great ability and talent; and I know a lot of people that watch these debates might wonder, well, how do these guys ever get along together? Just because we have different opinions does not mean that we do not respect each other, because I respect both of those gentlemen. We work together.

In fact, we sat down with the Speaker of the House before we brought this conference report to the floor and one of the issues we discussed was the issue of the additional money for the Internal Revenue Service. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, gave his word to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that if we pass this bill, that he would be willing to guarantee that the additional money for the Internal Revenue Service would be added to a subsequent appropriations bill.

Now, we talked a lot about that; and we were unable to come to a conclusion, so we made the determination to move ahead with this bill. We have talked a lot, and I know it was mentioned that maybe we should keep on talking. Well, unless the plan is just to delay the legislation and delay it and delay it, eventually we get to the point that it is time to end the talking, and it is time to take some action, and we think we are at that point.

When we went to the subcommittee on the Treasury Postal bill back in July, 2 months ago, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and myself, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) sat down and we talked with each other about several

issues that were important to Members and had those conversations before we did the subcommittee markup.

Again, prior to the time that we took the subcommittee markup to the full committee, the joint leadership, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader; the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader; the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and myself, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and some of the other leaders sat down together in the Speaker's Office, and we talked about some of the issues in this bill. And we talked for a long time, and we decided to proceed with marking up that bill in the full committee. We have done that. We have brought it to the floor and we passed it. We have done a lot of talking. It is now time to take some action.

This is a bill that I think meets the requirements, as we see them today. Should there be some adjustments? The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) had made a firm commitment to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and I know the Speaker of the House to be an honorable man, a man whose word can be taken as truth. If he gives his word, he keeps his word. He made a commitment to the gentleman from Maryland of what he would be willing to do on a subsequent bill to make this bill more attractive to the minority party.

So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we would reject the motion to recommit, and I am told it will be a clean motion to recommit; there will be no instructions. I would say to the gentleman from Maryland I appreciate that, because I believe that that does save us some time here today, and we do have some other appropriations issues to deal with, such as appointing conferees on other bills that we can get into conference and bring back to the House. But reject the motion to recommit the bill, and then let us pass the bill.

Now, if it goes to the White House and the President decides he wants to veto it, so be it. We will deal with that. But as of today, the President and no one in the White House has been willing to tell the subcommittee chairman of this bill that he would veto the bill. Neither the President nor any of his staff has told the chairman of the full committee, this Member, that he would veto this bill. Just this morning, the Speaker of the House communicated with the White House. He was not told that the President would veto this bill. So we are proceeding in good faith. We think that we have worked out a bill here that meets our responsibilities and does it in a very effective way.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can get on to passage of this bill, and then get to work on the other conference reports that have to be considered and get them to the President so that he

has adequate time to consider them before the fiscal year expires at the end of September.

So I ask all of my colleagues to vote for this bill.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin and I have had suggestions and in the interest of time, I think we will not, in light of the fact that the motion to recommit is probably redundant in terms of the vote on passage, we will not offer the motion to recommit so that we do not take the additional time of Members.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for that, and I think that helps us expedite the business which needs to be expedited.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I just ask the Members to seriously consider this package, and let us vote it out of the House, get it through the Senate, and send it down to the White House and let the President make his decision once he sees the bill in its final form.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, while there are still areas of this bill that need to be revised, I would like to commend the Conference Committee Members for including in this report \$5 million for the Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act's Interagency Working Group. This funding is vital to the work of the Interagency Working Group responsible for diligently reviewing documents regarding the atrocities of World War II and making those records available to the public. I applaud Senator DEWINE for successfully securing this funding in the Senate version of the bill and then working with the Conference Committee to retain this funding.

In 1994, I introduced the Nazi War Crimes and Disclosure Act with Chairman STEVE HORN in the House and with the leadership of Senator DEWINE in the Senate. After several hearings held by the Government Reform Committee and wide community support, this bill became law in 1998.

Recently the Government Reform Committee, under the leadership of Chairman HORN, held a hearing to announce some of the findings from the Interagency Working Group's efforts. At this hearing, we heard firsthand how critical funding is to the future efforts of the Interagency Working Group as they begin reviewing classified documents regarding Japanese War Crimes.

The Interagency Working Group has successfully released more than 1.5 million documents to the public. While this is an impressive accomplishment, the IWG has succeeded without the support of Congress. This has led to inadequate staff support and the inability to preserve and protect the deteriorating and crumbling documents.

This conference report before us will be the first time Congress has stepped up to fully support the work of the Interagency Working Group. Already, significant new information about the Holocaust has been revealed in the more than 400,000 Office of Strategic Services records released by the Interagency Working Group at the National Archives this past June, but that is only the beginning. Without the support of historians and trained staff,

we only have a small glimpse of the information contained in those documents.

It is essential that the Archivist use all of the earmarked \$5 million dollars which is authorized in this legislation for the explicit purpose of supporting the efforts of the Interagency Working Group so that they may restore decaying documents, afford historians and trained staff, and to help the Archives make these documents available to the public. The report before us contains \$14 million more for the National Archives than the previously passed House version. It is my understanding that this increase was included to provide adequate funding for this expenditure.

I therefore urge my colleagues to preserve this provision in the bill and support the vital work of the Interagency Working Group.

While there is still a lot of debate surrounding the Legislative Branch/Treasury Postal Appropriations conference report before us today, and there are many issues that must still be resolved, I rise to highlight two specific provisions in this bill that I strongly support.

First, I am proud that this conference report contains a provision I authored which requires the Office of Personnel and Management to study the positive impact of providing federal employees with paid paternal leave.

This study means progress!

In May, I, along with Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HOYER of Maryland, and Mr. GILMAN of New York, introduced H.R. 4567, the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2000. This bipartisan bill would give federal employees 6 weeks of paid parental leave for the birth or adoption of a child—a benefit that the majority of private sector employers already give their employees.

Since we introduced the bill in May, I have heard from men and women across the country who have relayed their stories to me about the great impact this legislation would have on their families. They have told me that they will no longer be forced to make a choice: whether to stay home with an ill newborn or to put food on the table.

In response to this overwhelming support, we have asked OPM to conduct a study to understand the importance of providing paid parental leave to federal employees. This study will help us understand and quantify why H.R. 4567 is so important. It will also likely reveal that the federal government will become more competitive with the private sector by offering paid parental leave. It may also show that the government's recruitment efforts will be boosted and that the costs related to turnover and replacement will be greatly reduced. Finally, this study will conclude that the federal workforce can win back dedicated and qualified workers to the government if we offer a benefit that is already being offered by the majority of private sector companies.

Everyone always says that the federal government should be run more like a business. This study will lay the foundation for the federal government to do just that.

Let's keep this provision in the bill and show our federal employees that we care about them and support their families.

I am also extremely pleased that we were able to find additional resources for this conference report to adequately fund the activities of the General Accounting Office. The funding included in this appropriation will guarantee that the GAO will be able to continue to produce the high quality, objective reports that we have come to expect.

In recent years, the GAO has experienced severe budget cuts even as the demand for their services has grown. Since 1992, the GAO has been forced to reduce its workforce by 40%. Nonetheless, the quality of their work has never wavered. As a Member of the Government Reform Committee, I have frequently had the opportunity to see the GAO in action and have been constantly impressed by the quality and professionalism of their reports and testimony. Recently, the GAO's oversight of the decennial census has reminded me again of the fantastic, impartial work that the GAO consistently provides. I commend them for their work.

I strongly believe that this agency is one of our best resources in the quest to make government run more efficiently. In fact, for every dollar invested in the GAO, taxpayers save more than \$57.

The funding included in this legislation will guarantee that the GAO will be able to hire necessary personnel to meet ever-increasing Congressional demands and continue to provide the services we have come to expect.

I applaud the inclusion of these resources and hope that next year we can find the resources for the GAO without hurting the funding of the other agencies we rely on every day.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support these provisions included in the Conference Report. Even though other measures in this particular report will prevent me from supporting this bill, I look forward to working with my colleagues to retain these provisions and work toward a conference report that will have full support.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report which contains language that seeks to close a loophole regarding the safety of child care in Federal facilities throughout this country. I would like to thank Mrs. MALONEY and Mrs. MORELLA for their support of this issue and their dedication to improving the quality of child care for all children.

Congress passed the Crime Control Act in 1990 which included a provision calling for mandatory background checks of employees hired by a Federal agency. However, some agencies have interpreted the law in such a way that many child care employees are not subjected to these background checks.

Currently, Federal employees across the country undergo, at the bare minimum, a computer check of their background which includes FBI, Interpol and State police records. However, some child care workers who enter these same buildings on a daily basis do not. Federal employees who use federally provided child care should feel confident that these child care providers have backgrounds free of abusive and violent behavior that would prevent them from working with children.

Moreover, this amendment helps to ensure the overall safety of our Federal buildings. Child care workers step into Federal buildings each day and look after children of Federal employees. Without performing background checks, the children in day care, as well as the employees in Federal facilities, are exposing themselves to possible violent attacks in the workplace. A child care worker with a history of violent criminal behavior has the opportunity to create a terrorist situation the likes of which have not been seen since the tragedy in Oklahoma City.

Child care providers working in Federal facilities throughout the country have somehow

fallen through the cracks and have become exempt from undergoing a criminal history check. This amendment corrects this situation. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4516, the FY 2001 Legislative Branch/Treasury-Postal Conference Report.

This mini-omnibus appropriations bill is business as usual and I did not come to Congress to engage in business as usual. The people of Kansas' third district expect and deserve more of us. As Congress has done for too many years, today it will be voting on a bill that violates both the rules of the House and the Senate in the name of political expediency.

Under these rules, Congress is supposed to consider 13 appropriations bills for each fiscal year. Under normal procedures, those bills should come before the House and the Senate individually, with opportunities for amendment and debate. After a conference report is negotiated, the House should then have the opportunity to vote on each bill, standing alone. Unfortunately, Congress has refused to follow its own rules. The majority party has combined two appropriations bills in this so-called conference report—one of which has yet to be considered by the full Senate.

I have only been a Member of this body for 18 months, but I understand that these rules and procedures were put in place to protect the rights of all Members to represent fully the interests and concerns of our constituents. We cannot do so when we are confronted with an omnibus conference report which rolls together a number of provisions, that one of our two deliberative bodies has not had the opportunity to fully consider.

While the process under which this bill has been considered is unacceptable, it does contain many programs which I have fought for and for which I would vote under normal circumstances. I am pleased that this bill contains provisions that strongly support law enforcement efforts in this country. Fully funding the administration's gun-law-enforcement initiatives, including a proposal to add 600 employees to the agency to more fully enforce existing gun laws, suggests that this Congress is finally getting serious about stopping the scourge of gun crimes that have crippled this nation.

This bill also contains a provision that I strongly support which would roll back the 0.5 percent surcharge on Federal employee retirement contributions. This increase was mandated by the 1997 balanced budget law and has disproportionately affected Federal employees by taxing more of their gross income for retirement than their private sector counterparts contribute. Mr. Speaker, the budget is balanced: it is time to stop funding surpluses at the expense of our hard working Federal employees.

Finally, I strongly support the provision in this bill that would repeal the 3 percent telephone excise tax that was levied as a luxury tax over 100 years ago to fund the Spanish American War. Mr. Speaker, the war is over and, with over 94 percent telephone ownership, this service is no longer a luxury. It is past time to repeal this tax and I voted to do so back in May when the House first considered this issue. I am disappointed that the majority party chose to hold this important issue hostage by marrying it with this controversial

measure. While I support many of the priorities in this bill, I remain concerned about one provision in this bill that suggest this Congress is not serious about holding the line on spending.

Mr. Speaker, about a decade ago, through legislative slight of hand, Congress passed a law to allow for the automatic annual increase in Members' salaries. This was a politically motivated move to shield Congress from casting embarrassing votes to increase their own pay. While we were technically afforded the opportunity to vote against an increase by casting a no vote on a procedural issue, the fact remains that by voting in support of this legislation, we will be voting for our own pay raises.

This will be a vote that comes at the expense of other mandates an earlier Congress created: Two years ago the House voted overwhelmingly for the IRS Reform and Restructuring Act which followed recommendations of a commission that studied the IRS and stated that IRS budgets "should receive stable funding for the next three years so that the leaders can . . . improve taxpayer service and compliance."

Mr. Speaker, this bill, contrary to the recommendations of a bipartisan commission and contrary to the will of this House, cuts \$465 million from the administration's request. If this Congress is serious about holding the line on spending, we would not hold our other priorities hostage to our desires of a larger paycheck.

I will be voting against this bill and I will be voting against a pay increase—I urge my colleagues to put their money where their mouth is and reject final passage of this legislation.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, the Treasury-Postal Service-General Government Appropriations Bill and repeal of the telephone excise tax, H.R. 4516. The Appropriations Committee has agreed to hire 600 ATF agents and to fund DNA ballistics technology that will assist law enforcement in arresting criminals. The conference report extends the Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative to 12 additional cities. My ENFORCE bill authorizes the same programs. The funding levels of this legislation are a victory for gun enforcement.

It is the first time gun safety and pro-gun Members have decided to give law enforcement the tools necessary to enforce existing gun laws. Now we all agree gun enforcement equals more ATF agents and funding for ballistics technology. It is particularly gratifying that the conferees dropped the language that would have prohibited local law enforcement agencies from giving a buying preference to gun manufacturers which have agreed to make safer guns and to sell only to distributors that conduct background checks.

Now, communities from Long Island to Hawaii will be able to purchase guns for their police officers that are safe and marketed through responsible dealers. This legislation contains the repeal of the Federal telephone tax. As a life-long resident of Nassau County, I know first-hand that our taxes are too high. I am grateful that the House of Representatives has recognized that the time has come to put an end to this unnecessary tax, which was originally imposed as a temporary luxury tax to help finance the Spanish-American War.

Since the telephone is a necessity I am delighted the House is acting to remove this regressive tax that disproportionately affects lower income Americans.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 209, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—212

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Archer | Goss | Pease |
| Armey | Graham | Peterson (MN) |
| Bachus | Granger | Peterson (PA) |
| Baker | Green (WI) | Petri |
| Baldacci | Greenwood | Pickering |
| Ballenger | Gutknecht | Pitts |
| Barrett (NE) | Hansen | Pombo |
| Bartlett | Hastert | Porter |
| Barton | Hastings (WA) | Portman |
| Bass | Hayworth | Pryce (OH) |
| Bereuter | Hefley | Quinn |
| Biggert | Herger | Radanovich |
| Bilbray | Hill (MT) | Rahall |
| Bilirakis | Hilleary | Ramstad |
| Bliley | Hobson | Regula |
| Blunt | Hoekstra | Reynolds |
| Boehlert | Holden | Riley |
| Boehner | Horn | Rogers |
| Bonilla | Hostettler | Rohrabacher |
| Bono | Houghton | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Brady (PA) | Hulshof | Roukema |
| Brady (TX) | Hunter | Royce |
| Bryant | Hutchinson | Ryan (WI) |
| Burr | Hyde | Ryun (KS) |
| Burton | Isakson | Salmon |
| Buyer | Istook | Saxton |
| Callahan | Jenkins | Scarborough |
| Calvert | Johnson (CT) | Sessions |
| Camp | Johnson, Sam | Shadegg |
| Canady | Kasich | Shaw |
| Cannon | Kelly | Shays |
| Castle | King (NY) | Sherwood |
| Chambliss | Kingston | Shimkus |
| Coble | Knollenberg | Shuster |
| Collins | Kolbe | Simpson |
| Combest | Kuykendall | Skeen |
| Cooksey | LaHood | Smith (MI) |
| Cox | Larson | Smith (NJ) |
| Crane | Latham | Smith (TX) |
| Cubin | LaTourette | Souder |
| Cunningham | Leach | Spence |
| Davis (VA) | Lewis (CA) | Stearns |
| Deal | Lewis (KY) | Stump |
| DeLay | Linder | Sununu |
| DeMint | LoBiondo | Sweeney |
| Diaz-Balart | Lucas (OK) | Talent |
| Dickey | Martinez | Tancredo |
| Dicks | Mascara | Tauzin |
| Doolittle | McCarthy (NY) | Taylor (NC) |
| Doyle | McCrery | Terry |
| Dreier | McHugh | Thomas |
| Dunn | McInnis | Thornberry |
| Ehlers | McKeon | Thune |
| Ehrlich | Metcalfe | Tiahrt |
| Emerson | Miller (FL) | Traficant |
| English | Miller, Gary | Upton |
| Everett | Mollohan | Vitter |
| Ewing | Moran (KS) | Walden |
| Foley | Moran (VA) | Walsh |
| Fossella | Morella | Wamp |
| Fowler | Murtha | Watkins |
| Frelinghuysen | Myrick | Watts (OK) |
| Gallegly | Nethercutt | Weldon (FL) |
| Gekas | Ney | Weller |
| Gibbons | Norwood | Whitfield |
| Gilchrest | Oxley | Wicker |
| Gillmor | Packard | Wilson |
| Gilman | Pascrell | Wolf |
| Goodlatte | | Young (AK) |
| Goodling | | Young (FL) |

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Goode | Obey |
| Ackerman | Gordon | Oliver |
| Aderholt | Green (TX) | Ortiz |
| Allen | Hall (OH) | Owens |
| Andrews | Hall (TX) | Pallone |
| Baca | Hastings (FL) | Pastor |
| Baird | Hayes | Paul |
| Baldwin | Hill (IN) | Payne |
| Barcia | Hilliard | Pelosi |
| Barr | Hinchey | Phelps |
| Barrett (WI) | Hinojosa | Pickett |
| Bentsen | Hoeffel | Pomeroy |
| Berkley | Holt | Price (NC) |
| Berman | Hooley | Rangel |
| Berry | Hoyer | Reyes |
| Bishop | Inslee | Rivers |
| Blagojevich | Jackson (IL) | Rodriguez |
| Blumenauer | Jackson-Lee | Roemer |
| Bonior | (TX) | Rogan |
| Borski | Jefferson | Rothman |
| Boswell | John | Roybal-Allard |
| Boucher | Johnson, E. B. | Rush |
| Boyd | Jones (NC) | Sabo |
| Brown (FL) | Jones (OH) | Sanchez |
| Brown (OH) | Kanjorski | Sanders |
| Capps | Kaptur | Sandlin |
| Capuano | Kennedy | Sanford |
| Cardin | Kildee | Sawyer |
| Carson | Kilpatrick | Schaffer |
| Chabot | Kind (WI) | Schakowsky |
| Chenoweth-Hage | Klecza | Scott |
| Clayton | Kucinich | Sensenbrenner |
| Clement | LaFalce | Serrano |
| Clyburn | Lampson | Sherman |
| Coburn | Lantos | Shows |
| Condit | Largent | Sisisky |
| Conyers | Lee | Skelton |
| Cook | Levin | Slaughter |
| Costello | Lewis (GA) | Smith (WA) |
| Coyne | Lipinski | Snyder |
| Cramer | Lofgren | Spratt |
| Crowley | Lowey | Stabenow |
| Cummings | Lucas (KY) | Stark |
| Danner | Luther | Stenholm |
| Davis (FL) | Maloney (CT) | Strickland |
| Davis (IL) | Maloney (NY) | Stupak |
| DeFazio | Manzullo | Tanner |
| DeGette | Markey | Tauscher |
| Delahunt | Matsui | Taylor (MS) |
| DeLauro | McCarthy (MO) | Thompson (CA) |
| Deutsch | McDermott | Thompson (MS) |
| Dingell | McGovern | Thurman |
| Dixon | McIntyre | Tierney |
| Doggett | McKinney | Toomey |
| Dooley | McNulty | Towns |
| Duncan | Meehan | Turner |
| Edwards | Meek (FL) | Udall (CO) |
| Engel | Meeks (NY) | Udall (NM) |
| Etheridge | Menendez | Velazquez |
| Evans | Millender- | Visclosky |
| Farr | McDonald | Waters |
| Fattah | Miller, George | Watt (NC) |
| Filner | Minge | Waxman |
| Fletcher | Mink | Weiner |
| Ford | Moakley | Wexler |
| Frank (MA) | Moore | Weygand |
| Frost | Nadler | Woolsey |
| Ganske | Napolitano | Wu |
| Gejdenson | Neal | Wynn |
| Gephardt | Northup | |
| Gonzalez | Oberstar | |

NOT VOTING—13

| | | |
|----------|-----------|-------------|
| Becerra | Gutierrez | Vento |
| Campbell | Klink | Weldon (PA) |
| Clay | Lazio | Wise |
| Eshoo | McCollum | |
| Forbes | McIntosh | |

□ 1614

Messrs. ROEMER, DELAHUNT, STENHOLM, TURNER, ROGAN and Ms. KILPATRICK and Mrs. NORTHUP changed their vote from "yea" to "nay".

Messrs. RAHALL, METCALF, MASCARA, CRANE and HILL of Montana changed their vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1615

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 654

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 654.

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

There was no objection.

RE-REFERRAL OF H.R. 4975, FRANK R. LAUTENBERG POST OFFICE AND COURTHOUSE, TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4975, and that H.R. 4975 be re-referred to the Committee on Government Reform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4733, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4733) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PACKARD, ROGERS, KNOLLENBERG, FRELINGHUYSEN, CALLAHAN, LATHAM, WICKER, YOUNG of Florida, VISCLOSKY, EDWARDS, PASTOR, FORBES, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4475, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4475) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4475, be instructed to insist on no less than \$43,144,000, the amount provided in the Senate amendment, for the pipeline safety program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this motion to instruct conferees is very straightforward. It is a motion to help make our communities safer and cleaner by providing increased resources to protect them from the dangers of and damage from pipeline explosions, failures, and leaks.

As the conference on the differences between the House and Senate versions of the fiscal 2001 transportation appropriations bill begins, we now have an opportunity to provide these additional resources to the Office of Pipeline Safety that the Office of Pipeline Safety needs.

For fiscal year 2001, the Secretary of Transportation has requested \$47 million for pipeline safety activities, an increase of \$10 million more than last year. And while neither the House nor the Senate transportation appropriations bills provide the full increase requested, we ought to get as close to that mark as we possibly can in the final conference agreement.

This motion to instruct directs the House conferees to agree to no less than \$43 million that is included in the Senate amendment for the Office of Pipeline Safety. The Senate level would provide \$3 million more than the House level of \$40 million and \$6 million more than last year. This is the minimum amount that we should provide.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on a warm summer, predawn day on August 19 of this year, several families were sleeping at a campsite 20 miles south of Carlsbad, New Mexico. Without notice, a 30-inch diameter natural gas pipeline blasted through the earth, sprouting a 350-foot high fireball and causing a 20-foot-deep, 86-foot-long and 46-foot-wide blast crater.

This accident tragically killed a total of 12 people, including five children camped near the site of the explosion. Examination of the broken pipe determined that corrosion had eaten away one-half of the 50-year-old pipeline's wall in places.

Mr. Speaker, in order for Americans to be assured that the oil and gas pipeline industry is properly regulated and the communities have the opportunity to oversee these operations, we must fully fund the Office of Pipeline Safety. Fully funding of the Office of Pipeline Safety is a proper start to regulating an industry that has gone too far and too long without proper oversight.

The bill I have cosponsored with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), H.R. 4792, the Comprehensive Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2000, emphasizes increased pipeline inspections and public notification of where pipelines are located. It also would require stricter certification for pipeline operators and employees.

This issue is a matter of community and worker safety. We must be at the forefront of this topic by providing full funding for the Office of Pipeline Safety so that we can better protect our citizens from natural gas catastrophes.

I urge all Members to support the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand here to say that our national oil and gas pipeline safety standards are a national disgrace. They are more like Swiss cheese than safety standards. And as a result of those wholesale failures to inspect pipelines, we had three young people die in Bellingham, Washington, and we have entire families being incinerated in New Mexico. And while these tragedies occur, indeed Congress fiddles.

For every one safety inspector in this country, we have almost 50,000 miles of pipeline. We have a wholesale failure to do these inspections. And this will take one step forward to increase probably 30 inspectors so we can move on with these inspections.

Let me say that giving resources to the Office of Pipeline Safety is not enough. It is not simply a matter of resources. It is a matter of will and statute. We have wholesale failure of having an adequate statute, as well.

We are calling upon this House in this Congress to adopt meaningful, aggressive, comprehensive revisions of our oil and gas pipeline standards. We have several bills pending in the House. We are calling for the leaders of the House of both parties in this Chamber to adopt a comprehensive inspection standard.

Let me advise the House there is a bill that has come from the other Chamber. It is woefully inadequate. It does not require inspections by statute. It again goes down that rose-colored path of giving discretion to the Office of Pipeline Safety. That is the path of