

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

Supplemental Appropriations for FY2000: Plan Colombia, Kosovo, Foreign Debt Relief, Home Energy Assistance, and Other Initiatives

Updated July 5, 2000

Larry Nowels, Stephen Daggett, Curt Tarnoff, and Nina Serafino
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Melinda Gish
Domestic Social Policy Division

Supplemental Appropriations for FY2000: Plan Colombia, Kosovo, Debt Relief, Home Energy Assistance, and Other Initiatives

Summary

Early in each new session of Congress, the Administration routinely submits requests for supplemental appropriations for the current fiscal year. By late April 2000, through several submissions to Congress, President Clinton had requested \$5 billion in FY2000 supplemental appropriations, including \$955 million for a counternarcotics initiative in Colombia and the Andean region, about \$2 billion for DOD peacekeeping operations in Kosovo, \$600 million for diplomatic support and economic aid related to Kosovo and the Balkans, \$210 million for poor country debt relief, \$600 million for home energy assistance to low income American families affected by high home heating oil prices and weather emergencies, and \$426 million for domestic disaster relief that mostly involves ongoing post-1999 hurricane cleanup efforts. The Administration designated nearly all as emergency requirements for FY2000, thereby eliminating the need to reduce existing appropriations to offset the costs of additional spending. The White House proposed a limited number of offsets, rescissions, transfers, and delays in funding obligations totaling about \$750 million.

The FY2000 supplemental request continues a pattern of the past few years in which the President has asked, and Congress has approved large supplementals generally focusing on defense, foreign policy, and domestic natural disasters and farm relief initiatives. In most cases, Congress has increased the President's proposed supplementals, adding funds especially for domestic programs and defense. A continuing controversy, however, has been the extent to which new appropriations should be offset by cuts in existing funds. Since FY1997, Congress has agreed to declare most supplementals as emergencies, adding a small amount of offsets.

The House and Senate took different legislative approaches during consideration of the supplemental requests. On March 30, 2000, the House passed a \$12.8 billion FY2000 supplemental appropriation measure (H.R. 3908), about \$7.5 billion higher than the President's \$5 billion request. Senate leaders decided not to consider H.R. 3908, but to attach portions of it to regular FY2001 appropriations for Military Construction (S. 2521), Foreign Operations (S. 2522), and Agriculture (S. 2536). As reported in mid-May, these bills provided about \$8.6 billion in supplemental funding, well below the amount in H.R. 3908.

In June, congressional leaders agreed to merge all House and Senate-passed FY2000 supplemental funds into the pending FY2001 Military Construction measure (H.R. 4425) and resolve differences during conference committee negotiations on H.R. 4425. As approved on June 30, FY2000 supplemental funding totals \$11.2 billion, more than double the President's request. The enacted bill increases the Colombia counternarcotics initiative to \$1.3 billion, fully funds peacekeeping costs in Kosovo and low-income home energy assistance, adds about \$4.6 billion for other Defense Department requirements, and triples the amount requested for U.S. natural disaster relief and other domestic programs. H.R. 4425, however, rejects funding for poor country debt relief and most Balkan assistance.

Key CRS Policy Staff

Issue	Name	Telephone
Agriculture programs	Ralph Chite	7-7296
Colombia counternarcotics	Nina Serafino	7-7667
Debt relief and HIPC	Larry Nowels	7-7645
Defense programs	Steve Daggett	7-7642
Low Income Home Energy Assistance	Melinda Gish	7-4618
Kosovo peacekeeping (DOD)	Steve Daggett	7-7642
Kosovo reconstruction aid	Curt Tarnoff	7-7656

Contents

Most Recent Developments	1
Background	1
Major Funding Elements of the Supplemental and Congressional Action	3
Congressional Debate Overview	3
House Consideration	3
Senate Consideration	4
Conference Committee consideration	6
Counternarcotics for Colombia	6
Congressional Action	7
Kosovo Peacekeeping and Economic Aid	10
Defense and Peacekeeping Costs	10
Reconstruction and Other Economic Aid	11
HIPC Trust Fund Contribution	12
Congressional Action	13
Low Income Home Energy Assistance	14
Congressional Action	14
Hurricane and Other Related Disaster Relief	15
Congressional Action	15
Other Defense and Foreign Policy Supplementals	15
Congressional Action	15
Other Domestic Supplementals	16
Pay Date Adjustments	16
Paying for the FY2000 Supplemental	17
Congressional Action	17

List of Tables

Table 1. FY2000 Supplemental Summary	4
Table 2. Supplemental Appropriations, FY2000	19
Table 3. Rescissions, Offsets, Deferrals, and Transfers	23
Table 4. Supplemental Appropriations Summary: Emergency, Non-Emergency, Rescission, and Offset Totals	24

Supplemental Appropriations for FY2000: Plan Colombia, Kosovo, Debt Relief, Home Energy Assistance, and Other Initiatives

Most Recent Developments

On June 30, the Senate passed and cleared for the White House H.R. 4425, the FY2001 Military Construction Appropriation bill that includes \$11.2 billion for FY2000 supplemental spending needs. As enacted, H.R. 4425 provides \$1.3 billion for the Colombian counternarcotics initiative (about the same as requested by the President for FY2000/FY2001 combined), \$2 billion, as proposed, for DOD peacekeeping costs in Kosovo, about \$4.5 billion for other defense requirements, \$1.5 billion for Hurricane Floyd, Cerro Grande fire, and other natural disaster relief, and \$600 million for the Low Income Heating and Energy Assistance Program. H.R. 4425, however, rejects funding for poor country debt relief and most Balkan assistance. The legislation further includes a change in the payment dates for Social Security and Veterans benefits that will result in \$4.2 billion higher spending in FY2000 rather than FY2001. Some Senators oppose this switch in payment schedules, and reportedly obtained Senate leadership agreement to attempt to rescind these provisions legislation considered in July.

Earlier, the House and Senate took different legislative paths in considering the President's \$5.7 billion supplemental request. The House took up a single FY2000 supplemental bill – H.R. 3908 – passing a \$12.8 billion measure on March 30. The Senate, however, decided to attach supplemental money to regular FY2001 appropriation bills: S. 2521 (Military Construction, passed by the Senate on May 18); S. 2522 (Foreign Operations, passed by the Senate on June 22); and S. 2536 (Agriculture, reported by the Committee on May 10). Combined, the three Senate measures recommended \$8.6 billion in FY2000 supplemental spending. Ultimately, congressional leaders decided to use H.R. 4425 – the House-passed Military Construction Appropriation – as the vehicle for all supplemental issues.

Background

Early in each new session of Congress, the Administration routinely submits requests for supplemental appropriations for the current fiscal year. Such proposals may include items rejected or deferred during congressional consideration of regular appropriations requests the previous session, new requirements arising since enactment of appropriations for the current fiscal year, or more routine matters that are anticipated and generally non-controversial. The President may also ask that Congress rescind, or cancel, funds previously appropriated. Often these rescissions

are proposed to offset some of the costs of the new supplemental proposals. Part or all of a supplemental request may be deemed as an “emergency,” thereby avoiding the requirement under budget laws to find equivalent savings to offset the added costs of new initiatives. The President may submit the supplementals and rescissions in multiple packages over the course of several months.

During the final months of the first session of the 106th Congress, congressional leaders and Administration officials had informally discussed additional funding requirements for two major foreign policy and defense issues: a major counternarcotics initiative to assist Colombia in fighting its growing drug production problem and Kosovo peacekeeping operations and economic aid. Although neither became part of end-of-the-session budget negotiations that culminated in passage of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY2000 (P.L. 106-113) in mid-November, it was widely anticipated that additional funding proposals for these two activities would form the core elements of an FY2000 supplemental appropriation. In February, March, and April 2000, President Clinton sent Congress several supplemental proposals totaling \$5.7 billion. In addition to the large requests for Colombia (\$955 million) and Kosovo (\$2.6 billion), the White House also seeks \$210 million for a U.S. contribution to the Heavily Indebted Poor Country Initiative (HIPC), \$620 million to help Americans cope with the impact of rapidly increasing home heating oil prices, roughly \$426 million for domestic disaster relief programs, mostly related to post-1999 hurricane cleanup efforts, and (after House debate) \$200 million for flood relief in Mozambique and southern Africa.

The FY2000 supplemental request continues a pattern of the past few years in which the President has asked, and Congress has approved large supplementals generally focusing on defense, foreign policy, and domestic natural disasters and farm relief initiatives. Last year, Congress enacted a \$15.2 billion supplemental (P.L. 106-31; H.R. 1141) providing funds for Kosovo military and humanitarian aid operations and military readiness (\$12 billion), farm assistance (\$609 million), and Central American aid for victims of Hurricane Mitch (\$1 billion). In 1998 Congress passed two supplemental measures. The first, a \$5.4 billion package enacted in early May (P.L. 105-174; H.R. 3579), included funding largely for defense operations in Bosnia and Iraq and various domestic natural disasters. The second, debated in the final days of the 105th Congress and incorporated into the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 105-277; H.R. 4328), totaled \$20.8 billion in new spending for, among other things, farmers affected by low commodity prices (\$5.8 billion), U.S. embassy security overseas in the wake of terrorist attacks in Kenya and Tanzania (\$2.4 billion), American forces in Bosnia and other defense readiness requirements (\$6.6 billion), and Y2K computer conversion efforts (\$3.4 billion). One of the most controversial issues during each of these debates was over the question of how to pay for the additional spending: to declare most of the items as “emergency” requirements or offset new funds with cuts in existing appropriations, frequently targeting domestic programs.

Normally, when seeking supplemental funds for the current fiscal year, the Administration recommends prompt congressional action — within a few months — to meet what are either unanticipated requirements or needs that cannot wait until the regular appropriations cycle. Congress generally begins action on early-year supplemental requests in March, and completes debate by May. It is not unusual for

Congress to expand significantly the President's supplemental proposal, as occurred for each of the three supplementals cited above, adding funds for a host of additional programs that were not anticipated at the outset of the debate.

Major Funding Elements of the Supplemental and Congressional Action

The President's supplemental request included five major spending initiatives for counternarcotics programs in Colombia, peacekeeping and reconstruction aid for Kosovo and the surrounding region, debt relief for poor developing countries, home energy assistance for low income families affected by rising home fuel oil costs and weather emergencies, and cleanup and repair operations remaining from hurricanes that struck the United States in 1999. House and Senate bills added a sixth major element concerning additional Defense Department needs for FY2000.¹ **Table 1** summarizes the components of the supplemental while **Tables 2 and 3** found at the end of this report provide more detailed information of new spending and offsets.

Congressional Debate Overview

House Consideration. During its March 9 markup, the House Appropriations Committee agreed to a \$9.1 billion FY2000 supplemental appropriation measure (H.R. 3908), adding about \$3.8 billion to the President's then-\$5.5 billion request. The House panel increased funding for the counternarcotics initiative in Colombia and the Andean region, added \$2.4 billion for DOD petroleum cost increases and health programs, and raised the President's request for domestic natural disaster relief by about \$1.1 billion. The Committee supported the full \$2 billion for DOD peacekeeping operations in Kosovo but pared back by over \$350 million economic aid to Kosovo and the Balkans. H.R. 3908, as reported, recommended the requested \$600 million for low-income home energy assistance but rejected \$210 million for poor country debt relief.

During two days of debate, the House approved an amendment by Representative Lewis adding \$4 billion for various Defense Department activities, focusing on "quality of life" and readiness-related programs such as recruiting, advertising and retention; health care programs; and weapons maintenance. The House further adopted an amendment by Representative Weldon that provides \$100 million for local community fire company assistance. The House also approved a proposal by Representative Toomey to appropriate from the on-budget surplus \$4 billion to reduce the public debt. The House rejected (108-315), however, a Representative Sanford amendment that would have cut \$1.6 billion from the bill by deleting all non-emergency appropriations and removing each emergency designation for other accounts. This would have had the affect of triggering a sequestration by whatever amount the bill exceeded the budget caps or requiring the insertion of

¹ Three weeks after House debate on H.R. 3908, the White House submitted another supplemental request: \$200 million for relief of flood victims in Mozambique and southern Africa.

offsets to avoid a sequestration. The Sanford amendment exempted defense and disaster relief funds from a sequester, if one occurred.

In many respects, the Administration supported the House-passed measure, especially funding included for military operations in Kosovo, counternarcotics activities in Colombia, victims of Hurricane Floyd, and energy aid for Americans affected by rising oil costs. The White House, however, was also concerned about areas that are not funded in H.R. 3908: embassy security for U.S. diplomatic personnel in Kosovo; U.N. peacekeeping operations in East Timor and Kosovo; and debt relief for poor developing nations. Officials further expressed alarm that the growing price tag of the supplemental would generate opposition and delay final enactment, something they said would begin to erode U.S. military readiness if the Kosovo money was not approved. In particular, the Administration opposed the Lewis amendment adding \$4 billion for defense “quality-of-life” activities that officials contended were not needed until next year.²

Table 1. FY2000 Supplemental Summary
(\$s – millions)

	Request	House	Senate	Conf.
Counternarcotics for Colombia*	955.0	1,418.5	1,167.9	1,319.1
Kosovo Peacekeeping/Aid	2,633.9	2,272.1	1,825.4	2,075.4
Debt relief for poor countries	210.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Home Energy Assistance	620.0	619.0	600.0	600.0
Domestic Disaster Relief	426.4	1,428.3	1,152.7	1,467.5
Critical Infrastructure Protection	9.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Other Defense & Foreign Policy	314.0	6,548.6	2,243.7	4,638.1
Other Domestic	531.4	903.5	2,274.0	1,552.8
TOTAL, Supplementals	5,699.7	13,190.0	9,264.7	11,652.9
Offsets/Rescissions	(706.5)	(440.6)	(663.6)	(422.8)

Note: Totals exclude amounts in title V of Division B of H.R. 4425. Title V repeals several provisions enacted in 1999 that shifted the final FY2000 pay date for military and civilian employees so that the cost would occur in FY2001. Title V further adds two new provisions concerning the payment dates of Social Security and Veterans benefits. The net effect of these actions is the addition of \$3.946 billion in new budget authority in FY2000 that is not reflected in the totals in this or other tables included in this report.

Senate Consideration. Partially because of the rising levels of funds added to H.R. 3908, the Senate did not schedule consideration of the supplemental bill. Senate leaders decided instead to include elements of the FY2000 supplemental request during debate on three of the first regular FY2001 appropriation bills considered by

² See Statement by the President, March 30, 2000; and Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 3908, March 29, 2000; each is available at the White House web site: [<http://www.whitehouse.gov>].

the Senate: Military Construction, which included DOD supplementals; Foreign Operations, where Plan Colombia, Kosovo aid, debt relief, and Mozambique assistance was considered; and Agriculture, which included domestic disaster relief and other supplementals.³

During the week of May 8, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported three FY2001 bills – Military Construction (S. 2521), Foreign Operations (S. 2522), and Agriculture (S. 2536) containing FY2000 supplement spending. Following amendments adopted during Senate debate and passage of Military Construction on May 18, the combined amount recommended by the Senate bills for FY2000 totaled about \$8.6 billion. The level was about \$3.55 billion more than the President's request but \$3.8 billion less than the consolidated \$12.8 billion House bill. Senate measures (S. 2521 and S. 2522) recommended about \$1.2 billion for Plan Colombia, a level somewhat less than the House and the Administration's combined request for FY2000/FY2001 of \$1.36 billion.⁴

S. 2521 cut funding to \$1.825 billion for DOD operations in Kosovo, raising objections from Administration officials who said it would result in transfers from regular Army programs to Kosovo costs and reduce Army readiness. S. 2522 deferred all additional reconstruction aid to the region until FY2001. The most controversial issue concerning Kosovo peacekeeping was a Senate Appropriations Committee amendment that cut off spending for U.S. forces in Kosovo after July 1, 2001, unless an extension was authorized by Congress. The White House threatened to veto S. 2521 because of the Committee amendment. During floor debate of S. 2521 on May 18, however, the Senate adopted a Levin amendment (53-47) deleting the funding cut off provision from the bill.⁵

For other Defense Department spending items, S. 2521 added about \$2.2 billion, mainly for health programs and oil price increases, but did not include the roughly \$4 billion additional funds included in H.R. 3908 for DOD "Quality of Life" activities. In S. 2536 and S. 2521, the Senate increased the President's request for domestic natural disaster relief by about \$700 million and recommended the requested \$600 million for low-income home energy assistance. Like the House, however, S. 2522

³ Although Senate leaders hoped this would speed up final enactment of supplemental spending, differences in House and Senate schedules for taking up the 13 appropriation bills complicated swift consideration of the Foreign Operations measure. The Senate committee reported its Foreign Operations bill (S. 2522) on May 9, but the House Appropriations panel did not consider its bill until June 27. Because of disputes unrelated to the appropriations issue, Minority Leader Daschle objected to the Senate proceeding with consideration of Foreign Operations, citing Senate regular order that calls for debate on appropriation bills only after House passage. Consequently, the Senate could not pass and schedule conference meetings on the three FY2001 funding bills that included supplemental appropriations.

⁴ S. 2521 further provides \$809 million for Coast Guard drug interdiction and other requirements under the counternarcotics and Plan Colombia title. The Coast Guard funds, however, are not directly part of Plan Colombia.

⁵ The House has adopted a related amendment to the Defense Department authorization bill H.R. 4205 requiring the President to certify by April 1, 2001, that European allies had met their specified pledges of assistance for Kosovo. If not, the President would prepare a plan for the withdrawal of American forces.

rejected most assistance for Kosovo and other regional countries as well as the \$210 million for poor country debt relief.

Conference Committee consideration. Following lengthy discussions between House and Senate leaders on how to proceed with conference meetings on the various supplemental bills, conferees considered all supplemental items as part of the FY2001 Military Construction bill (H.R. 4425/S. 2521). On June 28, House and Senate conferees reached agreement on an \$11.2 billion FY2000 supplemental spending package. Conferees included \$1.3 billion for the Colombian counternarcotics initiative (about the same as requested by the President for FY2000/FY2001 combined), \$2 billion, as proposed, for DOD peacekeeping costs in Kosovo, about \$4.5 billion for other defense requirements, \$1.5 billion for Hurricane Floyd (\$421 million), Cerro Grande fire (\$661 million) and other natural disaster relief, and \$600 million for the Low Income Heating and Energy Assistance Program. The House passed H.R. 4425 on June 29 (306-110), followed by the Senate on June 30.

Counternarcotics for Colombia

In considering a dramatic increase in U.S. funding to Colombia, U.S. policymakers must grapple with the potential consequences of greater U.S. involvement there. Colombian President Andres Pastrana is struggling to combat a more than 30-year conflict with leftist guerrillas, deal with human rights violations in the Colombian army, control the corrupting influence of drug trafficking, and recover from an economic decline. Members of Congress are facing the issue of whether and under what circumstances U.S. assistance can ameliorate the country's problems.⁶

In this context, the President's request for \$955 million in FY2000 emergency supplemental assistance for counternarcotics and related initiatives in Colombia and other Andean countries has proved highly controversial. Much of the controversy has revolved around the conditions that should be attached to Colombian aid, some \$500 million of which would be spent on (1) helicopters intended to transport Colombian army counternarcotics battalions to conduct counternarcotics (CN) operations in Southern Colombia, where coca cultivation is expanding rapidly; (2) training and equipping two new CN battalions, which would join the CN battalion trained by the United States in 1999 in conducting such operations, and (3) logistics and intelligence support for Colombia.

Because of reports documenting ties between Colombian army units and illegally armed rightist "paramilitary" groups, which U.S. officials state engage in drug trafficking and killing those that they suspect of collaborating with leftist guerrillas, some Members argue that the assistance should be conditioned on the prosecution and trial of members of the military who assist paramilitary groups, preferably by civilian courts. Some argue that the Army should not receive any U.S. assistance, either on the grounds that U.S. aid should continue to target special counternarcotics police forces (which would receive some \$68 million in support from the

⁶ For more detailed discussion of the supplemental package and the situation in Colombia, see CRS Report RS20451, *Colombia: Fact Sheet on U.S. Assistance and Legislation*; and CRS Report RL30541, *Colombia: U.S. Assistance and Current Legislation*.

supplemental), or that assistance to the army will inevitably draw the United States into Colombia's decades-long counterinsurgency effort against two leftist guerrilla groups. Others wonder whether the United States should be providing any assistance at all, fearing that the United States will inadvertently be drawn into a Vietnam-like quagmire; still others favor still greater assistance designed to combat guerrillas.

Other issues are whether the proposal's \$74 million in FY2000 support for alternative employment and economic development programs outlined for Colombia is sufficient, and whether the proposal includes enough funding for other Andean nations. Under the proposal, Brazil, Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela would receive about \$76 million in funding for their own counternarcotics and alternative development programs. Some \$38 million would be allotted for the improvement of a "Forward Operating Location" (FOL) in Manta, Ecuador, from which U.S. planes fly counternarcotics surveillance missions over the Andean region.

Congressional Action. The House Appropriations Committee recommended \$1.4 billion for Plan Colombia, combining the Administration's separate \$1.27 billion FY2000/FY2001 requests into the supplemental. H.R. 3908 strengthened regional elements of Plan Colombia by increasing economic assistance to Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador by \$61 million above the Administration's FY2000/FY2001 proposal. The Committee's bill further shifted \$26 million for the purchase of two Blackhawk helicopters from funding for Colombian Army Counternarcotics Battalions to the Colombian National Police.

During House floor debate, lawmakers rejected several amendments to cut Plan Colombia funding. A Representative Obey amendment would have cut \$552 million from the counternarcotics section, a sum representing the entire budget for the Push into Southern Colombia initiative. The Obey amendment also would have provided for a subsequent vote in July under expedited procedures to restore these funds (186-239). A Representative Pelosi amendment would have deleted \$51 million from Department of Defense funding, the cost of the DOD element of the Push into Southern Colombia initiative. A proposal by Representative Ramstad would have deleted the entire \$1.4 billion Plan Colombia funding, plus the \$300 million for DEA domestic drug-related activities (158-262); and a Representative Paul amendment would have cut counternarcotics and other Kosovo and East Timor funding (45-367).

The House, however, adopted two amendments pertaining to Colombia. One, offered by Representatives Gilman, Goss, Delahunt, and Farr (approved 380-39), attaches four conditions to Plan Colombia funding. For military aid to be distributed, the President must certify that Colombia (1) has implemented a strategy to eliminate coca and opium production by 2005; (2) allowed the head of its military to dismiss personnel found violating human rights; (3) assured cooperation between the military and civilian authorities in the investigation and prosecution of human rights violators; and (4) developed a Judge Advocate General Corps for the Colombian military. The amendment also earmarks funding for monitoring the armed forces, guerrillas, and paramilitary groups and provides that any supporters of the latter two should be denied visas to the United States. The President can waive the four conditions if "required by extraordinary circumstances;" he can waive the visa prohibition if it is "in the national interest." In addition, the House approved by voice vote an amendment offered by Representative Sawyer earmarking \$50 million for assistance

to displaced persons. The House Appropriations Committee version of the bill had allocated \$24.5 million to assist currently displaced persons.

A Representative Taylor amendment to limit the number of U.S. troops in Colombia to 300 at any one time, except those present on an emergency rescue mission or stationed as an attache or part of the Marine guard at the U.S. Embassy, was ruled out of order.

In the **Senate**, Plan Colombia supplemental funding was split between FY2001 Military Construction (S. 2521) and Foreign Operations (S. 2522) appropriation measures. Together, the two bills provided \$1.17 billion, about \$190 million less than the Administration's combined two-year request of \$1.36 billion. The Senate legislation reflected continuing congressional concern over the prospect of incremental American entanglement in Colombian counter-insurgency activities, shifts funding priorities in several key ways and restricts the involvement of U.S. personnel in the region:

- S. 2522 provided \$118 million for 60 Huey II helicopters in lieu of the Administration's proposed \$388 million for 30 Blackhawk helicopters.
- S. 2522 provided \$138 million for human rights, governance, and judicial programs, about three times the level requested by the President. The Senate measure placed special emphasis on the creation of Colombian National Police/Fiscalia Human Rights Units (\$10 million), witness and judicial security (\$10 million), and oversight capacity by the U.N. Human Rights Office (\$1 million) and U.S. government monitors (\$1.5 million).
- S. 2522 increased from \$76 million to \$205 million funds for interdiction and alternative development in Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, and other regional nations.
- S. 2522 imposed a cap of 250 U.S. military personnel and 100 civilian contractors that can be in Colombia in support of the counternarcotics initiative.
- S. 2521 added \$809 million (not requested and not part of the Plan Colombia total) for Coast Guard activities, out of concern that the shortage of personnel, spare parts, and aging equipment has severely eroded Coast Guard drug interdiction and other operational capabilities.

The Administration, in particular, opposed the helicopter provision and the cap placed on U.S. personnel working in Colombia. Believing that Committee steps to strengthen oversight of Plan Colombia, slow U.S. involvement with the military, broaden regional assistance, and limit the presence of American advisors were not enough, Senator Gorton proposed an amendment during Committee mark up on May 9 to reduce funding in S. 2522 from \$934 million to \$100 million. Although the

amendment failed 11-15, supporters said they might offer similar proposals during Senate floor debate.

In June 21 floor action on S. 2522, the Senate either tabled or rejected three amendments to reduce or condition funding for Colombia. These were:

- a Senator Wellstone amendment to cut the \$225 million provided for the Push into Southern Colombia program and use the funds instead for domestic substance abuse and mental health services, tabled 89-11;
- a Senator Gorton amendment to reduce total Plan Colombia funding to \$200 million, which could be spent in Colombia and other Caribbean, Central and South American countries at the discretion of the Secretary of State, rejected 19-79;
- a Senator Dodd amendment to provide not less than \$110 million for procurement and support of helicopters, but to permit the Department of Defense to decide in consultation with the Colombian military which model or models should be purchased, rejected 47-51.

By voice vote, the Senate approved a variety of amendments on Colombia. These included a Senator Shelby amendment to exempt certain intelligence and intelligence-related activities from the limitation on the assignment of U.S. personnel in Colombia; a Senator Inhofe Sense of the Senate condemnation of the presumed FARC kidnaping of three Americans; Senators Sessions and Leahy amendments providing for and clarifying reporting and certification requirements; and a Senator Harkin clarification of an earmark for child soldiers. On June 22, the chair tabled a Senator Boxer amendment to prohibit the use of funds from the act and from Department of Defense funds for four purposes related to U.S. support for and participation in counterinsurgency, law enforcement, and counternarcotics operations in Colombia.

Senate-House **conferees** on H.R. 4425 agreed to \$1.32 billion for Plan Colombia, roughly the same amount, but with a different mix of program priorities, than the President's request. Major elements of the agreement include:

- \$315 million for helicopters, including 18 Blackhawks and 42 Huey II aircraft.
- \$116 million for support of the Colombian National Police.
- \$122 million for human rights and justice programs.
- \$185 million for counternarcotics battalion training and intelligence.
- \$117 million to establish three Forward Operation Locations.

The conference agreement further caps the number of U.S. military personnel permitted to be in Colombia supporting the counternarcotics initiative at 500 and the number of U.S. civilian contractors at 300. The President may waive these limitations for a 90-day period if he determines that U.S. forces are or are about to be involved in hostilities in Colombia. Conferees also incorporated various certification and reporting requirements largely focused on human rights observance of the Colombian

military and government strategies to eliminate coca and opium poppy cultivation by 2005.

Kosovo Peacekeeping and Economic Aid

Supplemental funding for Kosovo was divided into two components: one supporting the U.S. military contribution to the peacekeeping operation (KFOR), and the other providing mostly reconstruction assistance for Kosovo and economic stabilization programs throughout the Balkans region.

Defense and Peacekeeping Costs. Of the \$2.29 billion Defense Department (DOD) supplemental, just over \$2 billion would cover costs of U.S. contributions to the peacekeeping operation in Kosovo (KFOR). This amount is intended to support 6,200 U.S. personnel in Kosovo and about 1,000 more supporting the operation in surrounding countries, and enforcing international sanctions against the government of Yugoslavia. Actual KFOR costs were somewhat uncertain – because of recent tensions in Kosovo, NATO was considering whether to increase troop levels.

Congressional Action. The **House**-passed measure fully supported the \$2.025 billion request for U.S. military operations as part of KFOR. During debate, the House rejected an amendment by Representative Kasich (200-219) that would have withheld half of the KFOR funds until the President certified that EU and NATO member states had obligated or contracted a significant amount of the financial and personnel assistance they had pledged for Kosovo.

The **Senate** Appropriations Committee in S. 2521 trimmed Defense funding for KFOR to \$1.825 billion, raising objections from Administration officials who say it would result in transfers from regular Army programs to Kosovo costs and reduce Army readiness. But most debate centered on congressional oversight of U.S. forces in Kosovo. The panel approved an amendment by Senator Byrd (23-3) that would terminate funding for the deployment of U.S. troops after July 1, 2001, unless Congress authorizes an extension. The Byrd amendment further required the President to develop a plan under which European militaries would assume the lead role for ground forces in Kosovo and withholds 25% of supplemental money until the Administration certifies that European nations are fulfilling their funding commitments. The Administration strongly opposed the Byrd/Warner amendment, threatening a presidential veto because the provision would “damage U.S. credibility overseas, undermine our position as the leader of NATO, and inflame the situation in Kosovo.”⁷ During floor debate of S. 2521 on May 18, the Senate adopted a Levin amendment (53-47) deleting the Byrd/Warner provision from the bill.⁸

House-Senate **conferees** on H.R. 4425 approved \$2.025 billion, as requested, for U.S. military operations as part of KFOR.

⁷ White House, *Statement of Administration Policy, S. 2521*, May 16, 2000.

⁸ The House has adopted a related amendment to the Defense Department authorization bill H.R. 4205 requiring the President to certify by April 1, 2001, that European allies had met their specified pledges of assistance for Kosovo. If not, the President would prepare a plan for the withdrawal of American forces.

Reconstruction and Other Economic Aid. The war in Kosovo since 1998 and the NATO air campaign in 1999 caused immense physical destruction — of housing and electric, water, sewage, transport and other infrastructure — and eliminated social, public safety, and other government services. In mid-1999, a U.N. mission assumed administration of the province while NATO began to deploy a peacekeeping force there.⁹ The Administration's supplemental request sought to expand on-going programs to assist Kosovo's economic and political development, help fund continuing peacekeeping efforts and the U.N. civilian administration, and help secure the U.S. diplomatic presence in the province. The supplemental also responded to needs of countries in the Balkan region that were forced to provide for refugees and whose trade routes and markets were disrupted as a result of the war.

The Administration's remaining \$624.5 million Kosovo-related proposal supported a number of accounts, normally funded under both the Foreign Operations and the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations. Key features included:

- \$195 million under the SEED (Support for East European Democracy) account, for economic and political reform programs in Kosovo, Montenegro, and Croatia. Kosovo would receive \$92.8 million to help expand the U.N. civilian police force, establish a local police service, and support Kosovo administrative and policy reforms.
- \$31 million in Foreign Military Financing and \$2.9 million in military training (IMET) to help regional countries implement defense reforms, professionalize their militaries, and improve security cooperation.
- \$239 million for construction of secure diplomatic facilities in Kosovo, Albania, and Bosnia.
- \$91 million in U.S. assessed contributions for international peacekeeping activities. (An additional \$16 million would support peacekeeping in East Timor.)
- \$27.6 million for diplomatic and consular programs, and Fulbright exchanges in Kosovo, Albania, Macedonia, and Montenegro.

Congressional Action. Unlike DOD-related costs associated with Kosovo, the House-passed bill rejected much of the \$624.5 million request for economic and diplomatic programs. H.R. 3908 provided only \$246.7 million for these activities, 40% of the request. The bill deleted all funds for assessed international peacekeeping contributions, regional diplomatic and consular programs, and Fulbright and other exchanges. Of the \$239 million requested for secure embassy facilities, H.R. 3908 provided \$104 million for a new facility and Marine guard quarters in Sarajevo. In reporting the bill, the House Appropriations Committee noted that unallocated funds from this account remain from FY1999 and FY2000 appropriations that could be reprogrammed for other needs. The House bill fully met the Administration's request for FMF and IMET assistance for the Balkan region and provided \$13 million of the \$22 million requested for additional USAID operating costs.

⁹ For detailed discussion of Kosovo reconstruction aid, see CRS Report RL30453, *Kosovo: Reconstruction and Development Assistance*. For information on political developments in Kosovo, see CRS Issue Brief IB98041, *Kosovo and U.S. Policy*.

Of the Administration's \$195 million SEED account request, H.R. 3908 provided \$95.8 million, \$12.4 million of which is for Kosovo and limited to support of American officers in the international police force. In rejecting most of the \$92.8 million requested for direct use for Kosovo reconstruction, the House Appropriations Committee pointed to a provision in the FY2000 Foreign Operations Appropriations that places a 15% limit on the proportion of total donor pledges for Kosovo that the United States may provide. This limitation, which applies only to the FY2000 funds provided in that Act, reflects the view of many who believe that because the United States bore the heaviest burden in pursuing the Kosovo war, European allies should lead the reconstruction effort. To date, the United States has pledged \$150 million of FY2000 SEED funds, accounting for 15% of the total pledged by donors at the November 1999 donor conference. Increased donor pledges since November, however, would allow the Administration to provide an additional \$31 million and stay within the 15% range. The Committee, however, suggested that it was reluctant to provide additional funds for Kosovo because of Europe's failure to meet commitments in a timely fashion, including funds pledged for the U.N. administration of the province and the international police force. During House floor debate, Representative Kasich offered an amendment that would have withheld 50% of funds for U.S. military operations in Kosovo until the President certified that EU and NATO member countries followed through on financial commitments. The Kasich amendment failed, however, 200-219.

S. 2522 provided no supplemental appropriations for Kosovo assistance or other Balkan economic, military, or diplomatic funding. The **Senate** bill, however, increased FY2001 spending above the President's request so that Montenegro would receive \$89 million, the same as proposed for FY2000/FY2001. Croatia would receive \$60 million, slightly below the \$65.7 million sought over two years. But the Administration's request for Kosovo – \$92.8 million in FY2000 supplemental and \$175 million for FY2001 – would likely fall short under S. 2522 because of the continuation of a congressional limitation that U.S. funds for Kosovo reconstruction cannot exceed 15% of total contributions from all donors.

As **enacted**, H.R. 4425 includes \$50 million in economic assistance only for Croatia, Montenegro, and up to \$12.4 million for Kosovo. The Kosovo funds can only be used for police activities.

HIPC Trust Fund Contribution

Last year, in response to an international campaign led by non-governmental development and religious organizations, the United States, Great Britain, and other major foreign aid donors agreed to expand significantly the Heavily Indebted Poor Country Debt (HIPC) Initiative. HIPC, which was first implemented in 1996, is an effort to lower the debt burden of the world's most severely indebted countries – many of which are in Africa – to sustainable levels and stimulate economic policy reforms and poverty reduction efforts in debtor nations. Previously, HIPC had been criticized for providing too little debt relief over a lengthy qualification period for a limited set of countries. HIPC expansion, first endorsed by the G-7 in June 1999 and later approved by the World Bank and the IMF in September, also resulted in

substantial cost increases for creditor nations and international financial institutions (IFIs) to which the debt is owed.¹⁰

The HIPC Initiative has two major components: cancellation of bilateral debt owed to the United States and other creditor governments, and reduction of debt owed to the World Bank, the IMF, and other regional IFIs. Creditor governments cover their own expenses individually for the forgiveness of bilateral debt at the Paris Club, an informal arena for negotiating debt reschedulings and reduction of publically held loans. To finance the cancellation of multilateral debts, the World Bank and IMF created the HIPC Trust Fund into which IFIs and aid donor governments would deposit contributions. The Bank and the Fund will cover their own costs, but other IFIs – especially the African Development Bank – do not have enough resources to cover the losses of cancelled loan repayments. Donor governments have agreed to make up the gap for those IFIs with insufficient funds.

Following agreements to expand HIPC, President Clinton amended in September 1999 his pending FY2000 foreign aid request, increasing debt relief from \$120 million to nearly \$1 billion over four years. Congress agreed to \$123 million for bilateral debt cancellation at the Paris Club in 2000 but rejected the \$600 million proposed for HIPC Trust Fund contributions, FY2000-FY2003. The Administration is now asking Congress in the FY2000 supplemental to approve \$210 million for the Trust Fund. Officials say that the absence of a U.S. contribution has convinced other creditor governments to hold back their own pledges until the U.S. acts. They argue that while most of the existing pledges are earmarked for African nations that will be among the earliest qualifiers, resources for Latin American debt relief – for Bolivia, Nicaragua, and Honduras – are not available. Without a U.S. contribution, they contend, debt workouts for these countries will be delayed. Critics of multilateral debt relief, including some in Congress, believe that before the U.S. contributes to the Trust Fund, IFIs should agree to suspend for a period of time new lending to HIPC countries once they receive debt relief so that they do not return to a severely indebted state.

Congressional Action. The House and Senate bills rejected all supplemental funding for the HIPC Trust Fund. Although S. 2522 provided \$75 million for debt relief in FY2001 – money that could be used as an HIPC Trust Fund contribution – the amount falls significantly below the President’s \$472 million combined FY2000/FY2001 debt reduction proposals.

In June 22 floor action on a modified Chafee amendment to S. 2522, the Senate endorsed by voice vote a fully-funded HIPC concept, but provided no additional funding. Instead, in a Sense of the Senate statement, it instructed the “relevant committees” to report legislation authorizing “comprehensive debt relief” under the enhanced HIPC initiative, and setting forth specified conditions under which such assistance would be provided. Among the conditions, it stated that the authorizations “should ensure that no country should receive the benefits of debt relief if that country does not cooperate with the United States on terrorism or narcotics enforcement, is

¹⁰ For a full discussion of the HIPC initiative, see CRS Report RL30214, *Debt Reduction: Initiatives for the Most Heavily Indebted Poor Countries*. See also, CRS Report RL30449, *Debt and Development in Poor Countries: Rethinking Policy Responses*.

a gross violator of the human rights of its citizens, or is engaged in military or civil conflict that undermines poverty alleviation effort [sic] or spends excessively on its military...”

The **conference** committee on H.R. 4425 denied all funding for HIPC. The Sense of the Senate provision concerning HIPC was not included in the final bill.

Low Income Home Energy Assistance

Following a decision last year by the world’s leading oil producers to decrease output, prices for gasoline and home heating oil have soared in the United States. To limit the impact, especially on low and moderate income families, the President has requested \$620 million in additional funds for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP),¹¹ the Dept. Energy’s (DOE) Weatherization Assistance Program, and the Small Business Administration (SBA) to help provide SBA loans to those affected by high home heating oil and diesel fuel prices. Included in the supplemental request was:

- \$600 million to replenish the LIHEAP contingency fund, an account depleted by recent disbursements of \$295 million. Congress appropriated \$300 million in FY2000 emergency funds; due to cold weather and increased fuel costs, all of these funds have been released. The \$600 million supplemental request would be available for emergency heating or cooling assistance during the remainder of FY2000.
- \$19 million in additional resources for DOE Weatherization Assistance Programs. These funds would meet the President’s original request for weatherization and help increase the energy efficiency of homes, thereby reducing homeowners’ energy burden and cost.
- \$1 million for an SBA program to support \$86 million in loans for small businesses affected by rising oil prices. This would allow home heating oil dealers, for example, to extend flexible payment terms to their customers.

Congressional Action. House and Senate (S. 2536) bills fully supported the \$600 million for LIHEAP. H.R. 3908 further provided \$19 million for DOE Weatherization Assistance Programs (the latter as an advance appropriation for FY2001). Both bills deleted the \$1 million for SBA loans. The conference agreement on H.R. 4425 includes the \$600 million for LIHEAP.

¹¹ For more information about LIHEAP, see CRS Report 94-211, *The Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)*.

Hurricane and Other Related Disaster Relief

The supplemental request included over \$300 million in direct assistance to individuals and facilities damaged as a result of Hurricanes Dennis, Floyd, and Irene that struck the United States in 1999. Programs targeted a broad range of relief activities including those for farmers, fishermen, displaced families, small businesses, defense department facilities, and national parks. In addition, the President requested \$100 million in contingency funds for the Interior Department to respond to wildland firefighting needs. Major fires in the western States during the summer of 1999 consumed more resources than were expected to be needed during an average firefighting season and depleted the Interior Department's emergency funds.

Congressional Action. The **House**-passed bill added about \$1 billion to the President's request for hurricane-related and other natural disaster relief. The largest add-ons included those for DOD facilities damaged by last year's hurricanes, a \$600 million appropriation for the Federal Highway Administration's emergency relief program, \$150 million for the Agriculture Department's Wildland Fire Management Program, and about \$140 million more for a range of USDA farm relief programs. The **Senate**, in S. 2521 and S. 2536, also increased the President's disaster relief funding recommendations, approving \$1.15 billion, or about \$700 million higher than the request. Like H.R. 3908, S. 2521 significantly increased funds for military facilities damaged in the 1999 storms. S. 2536 further added money for several new farm-related emergencies, including \$130 million for USDA's Rural Community Advancement program, \$58 million for various crop disease and insect assistance, and \$450 million in livestock aid.

Conferees meeting on H.R. 4425 approved a total of \$1.47 billion in domestic disaster relief funding, including:

- \$421 million for hurricane-affected areas;
- \$661 million for damages and claims resulting from the Cerro Grande fire in New Mexico;
- \$200 million for wildland fire management; and
- \$148 million in disaster aid for damage at U.S. military bases.

A number of agriculture relief provisions added by the House and Senate were dropped in conference, including livestock assistance crop disease and insect aid, and USDA's rural community advancement program.

Other Defense and Foreign Policy Supplementals

The President proposed \$314 million for several additional defense and foreign policy requirements, including: a new Air Force aircraft for an interagency counter-terrorism task force called the Foreign Emergency Support Team (\$73 million), DOD peacekeeping operations in East Timor (\$25 million), U.S. contributions to a U.N. peacekeeping mission in East Timor (\$16 million); and disaster relief for victims of heavy flooding in Mozambique and southern Africa (\$200 million).

Congressional Action. **H.R. 3908** significantly increased DOD funding for several additional requirements: petroleum cost growth (\$1.556 billion), defense

health programs (\$854 million), and DOD “quality of life” programs (\$4 million). The House bill fully supported DOD procurement of an aircraft for the Foreign Emergency Support Team and East Timor peacekeeping costs but deleted funding for a U.N. peacekeeping contribution in East Timor. The House had not yet received the Mozambique request, so it took no action. **Senate** bills – S. 2521 and S. 2522 – also added more funding for higher DOD oil costs and health programs but did not include roughly \$4 billion for defense “quality of life” activities as in the House. S. 2521 inserted a few new items, including those for Patriot missile enhancement (\$125 million) and DOD humanitarian assistance in Mozambique and East Timor. During floor debate, the Senate further added \$220 million for Navy ship depot maintenance and \$5.7 million for testing by the Army of its Tactical High Energy Laser program. S. 2522 approved \$25 million of the \$200 million requested for USAID emergency relief to flood victims in Mozambique.

House-Senate **conferees**, meeting on H.R. 4425 agreed to roughly \$4.5 billion in other defense and foreign policy needs, including:

- \$1.56 billion to address DOD’s growing fuel costs;
- \$1.3 billion for military health care programs;
- \$1.1 billion for unfunded personnel and readiness requirements;
- \$40 million for development programs for Vieques, Puerto Rico;
- \$125 million for Patriot missile reliability;
- \$25 million for DOD peacekeeping costs in East Timor;
- \$61.5 million for DOD humanitarian assistance in Mozambique and East Timor; and
- \$25 million of the \$200 million southern Africa flood relief assistance.

Other Domestic Supplementals

The President also proposed about \$530 million in supplemental spending for a wide range of domestic activities. House and Senate bills supported many of these recommendations and added several additional items reflecting congressional priorities. H.R. 3908 provided \$903 million for domestic programs, including \$283 million for Drug Enforcement Agency domestic intelligence and investigation requirements; Senate bills included \$2.27 billion. A major Senate add-on provided \$800 million for the Coast Guard. **Conferees** approved \$1.55 billion in domestic supplemental, including \$700 million for the Coast Guard and \$181 million for the DEA. (See **Table 2** below for a complete list of all domestic programs affected.)

Pay Date Adjustments

Last year, during consideration of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY2000, Congress modified the final salary payment date for military and Federal civilian employees so that the costs would fall in FY2001 rather than FY2000. As approved by conferees, H.R. 4425 repeals these provisions so that the payment will occur in FY2000. H.R. 4425 further includes new sections that modify existing payment dates of Social Security and Veterans benefits and claims. The net result of these payment date modifications will increase FY2000 spending by \$3.95 billion. Senate opponents of these changes had threatened to delay passage of H.R. 4425

because conferees had included the pay date modifications. Reportedly, however, they obtained Senate leadership agreement that when the Senate returns in July, legislation to rescind these provisions will be considered.

Paying for the FY2000 Supplemental

A continuing controversy during the recent consideration of supplemental appropriations is whether to cover the costs of the additional spending through offsets or to declare the requirement as an “emergency,” a practice that has received widespread criticism.¹² The emergency designation allows Congress to approve the supplemental funds without offsetting the amounts with rescissions in previously enacted discretionary appropriations or finding cuts in mandatory spending programs. But if Congress agrees with the President to define all or part of the supplemental as an “emergency” and not offset the amounts, discretionary spending rises and the size of the budget surplus for FY2000 declines. Between 1994 and 1997, Congress usually enacted budget authority offsets for supplementals. Reversing that practice during the past two years, Congress has mostly declared supplemental appropriations as an emergency. Some lawmakers have strongly objected to this action, arguing that fiscal discipline requires Congress to fully offset new spending so as not to reduce the surplus, especially if it utilizes surpluses generated by Social Security. In January 2000, the Congressional Budget Office projected that there will be a \$23 billion non-Social Security surplus in FY2000.

The Administration designated nearly all – \$4.8 billion – as emergency requirements for FY2000, while proposing a limited number of offsets, rescissions, transfers, and delays in funding obligations totaling \$706 million that covered the costs of non-emergency spending. The largest offset requested by the Administration was \$438 million of information technology funds provided for Y2K requirements that are no longer needed by several federal agencies. **Table 3**, below, provides a complete listing of offsets, rescissions, transfers, and delays in obligations.

Congressional Action. The **House**-passed bill, like the Administration, termed nearly all of supplemental funding as an emergency. H.R. 3908 included \$441 million in rescissions and offsets. Also like the Administration, the House panel’s largest rescission was the \$235 million in un-needed Y2K funds. After reporting H.R. 3908 on March 9, the House Appropriations Committee encountered opposition among some Members who wanted more – or all – of the new spending offset by cuts in existing appropriations. House leaders delayed debate on H.R. 3908 until after the House passed the FY2001 budget resolution. Representative Sanford proposed an amendment during House floor debate that would have cut back significantly on the size of the supplemental appropriation and removed emergency designations. The Sanford amendment failed, however, on a 108-315 vote.

¹² For a discussion of the debate over emergency supplemental appropriations for defense programs since FY1993, see CRS General Distribution Memo, *Emergency Appropriations for the Department of Defense*, by Stephen Daggett, August 18, 1998.

Senate bills designated \$8.6 billion of the \$9.3 billion recommended in supplemental appropriations as emergencies. S. 2522 and S. 2536 further rescinded \$664 million, an amount that more than covered the \$493 million of non-emergency appropriations. In addition to the Y2K technology rescissions, S. 2536 proposed a number of rescissions for various Department of Justice programs.

Conferees agreed to define all but \$406 million of the \$11.2 billion as emergency appropriations. They further rescinded \$423 million to cover non-emergency spending, including \$287 million, \$35 million, and \$11 million in prior-year appropriations for the Defense Department, Military Construction, and the Coast Guard, respectively. (See **Table 3** for details.)

Table 2. Supplemental Appropriations, FY2000
(\$ in millions)

	Request	House	Senate	Enacted
Plan Colombia:				
Dug interdiction & eradication (DOD)	98.4	185.8	115.7 ^a	184.1
Drug interdiction (State Dept)	52.0	59.4	62.0 ^b	59.4
Drug interdiction (Treasury Dept)	70.0	70.1	70.0 ^b	70.0
Drug interdiction (ONDCP)	1.0	1.0	0.5 ^b	0.0
Forward operating location for DOD drug ops	38.6	116.5	116.5 ^a	116.5
Drug eradication/law enforcement (State Dept)	543.0	600.5	397.0 ^b	506.1
Drug eradication/law enforcement (DEA)	3.0	17.2	6.7 ^a	–
Economic aid (USAID)	104.0	269.5	261.5 ^b	261.0
Human rights/governance (multiple agencies)	45.0	98.5	138.0 ^b	122.0
TOTAL, Plan Colombia	955.0	1,418.5	1,167.9	1,319.1
Kosovo Peacekeeping & Balkans Aid:				
DOD Peacekeeping Ops	2,025.4	2,025.4	1,825.4 ^a	2,025.4
State Dept. Peacekeeping contributions	91.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Balkan economic aid (incl USAID costs)	217.0	108.8	0.0	50.0
Balkan military aid	33.9	33.9	0.0	0.0
US Embassy construction in the region	239.0	104.0	0.0	0.0
US diplomatic and exchanges in the region	27.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL, Kosovo & Balkans	2,633.9	2,272.1	1,825.4	2,075.4
HIPC Trust Fund*	210.0	0.0	0.0	–
Other Defense & Foreign Policy:				
State peacekeeping contribution-East Timor	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
DOD peacekeeping-East Timor	25.0	25.0	25.0 ^a	25.0
Foreign Emerg. Support Team (counter terrorism)	73.0	73.0	73.0 ^a	73.0
DOD Working Capital Fund (petroleum \$ growth)	0.0	1,556.2	964.3 ^a	1,556.2
Defense Health Programs (TRICARE contract costs)	0.0	854.5	695.9 ^a	615.6
Defense Health Program (other)	0.0	750.0	0.0	695.9
DOD “Quality of Life Programs”	0.0	231.0	0.0	27.0
DOD recruiting and retention	0.0	600.6	0.0	357.3
DOD depot maintenance and repair	0.0	1,205.6	220.0 ^a	220.0
DOD priority support to deployed forces	0.0	1,212.7	0.0	503.9
Assistance to Vieques, Puerto Rico	[40.0]	40.0	40.0 ^a	40.0
DOD/Air Force F-15 aircraft	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.0
DOD/Army M1A2 tank upgrades	0.0	[125.0]	0.0	163.7
DOD biometrics technologies	0.0	0.0	7.0 ^a	7.0
DOD Patriot missile enhancement program	0.0	0.0	125.0 ^a	125.0
DOD “Operation Walking Shield	0.0	0.0	0.3 ^a	0.3
DOD military construction for Natl Missile Defense	0.0	0.0	1.0 ^a	1.0
DOD Military Construction - Blount Is., Florida	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.0
DOD Tactical High Energy Laser program	0.0	0.0	5.7 ^a	5.7
DOD Cavalese, Italy accident	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
DOD humanitarian aid-Mozambique & East Timor	0.0	0.0	61.5 ^a	61.5
Mozambique/southern Africa flood relief	200.0	**	25.0 ^b	25.0
TOTAL, Other Defense and Foreign Policy	314.0	6,548.6	2,243.7	4,638.1

	Request	House	Senate	Enacted
Home Energy Assistance:				
Low Income Home Energy Assistance (HHS)	600.0	600.0	600.0 ^c	600.0
Business Loans Program (Small Bus Admin)*	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Weatherization Asst Programs (DOE)(FY2001)*	19.0	19.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL, Home Energy Assistance	620.0	619.0	600.0	600.0
Domestic Disaster Relief:				
Hurricane-related relief:				
USDA CCC-marketing loan forgiveness	81.0	81.0	81.0 ^c	81.0
USDA Rental Asst Program	13.6	13.6	13.6 ^c	13.6
USDA Rental Housing Insurance	15.9	15.9	15.9 ^c	15.9
USDA Rural Utility Service	0.0	1.0	1.0 ^c	0.0
Commerce Economic Development Asst	32.9	25.8	8.3 ^c	55.8
NOAA fisheries	50.1	19.4	10.0 ^c	30.7
NOAA-North Carolina research lab & other items	0.0	0.0	5.5 ^c	0.0
HUD Housing Certificate Fund	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HUD HOME Investment Partnership Fund	0.0	36.0	25.0 ^c	36.0
DOD Corps of Engineers	19.2	27.9	35.0 ^c	0.0
DOD facilities	27.4	115.9	128.2 ^a	128.2
DOD Military Construction	0.0	19.0	26.2 ^a	19.0
Fish & Wildlife Service	5.0	5.0	8.5 ^c	0.0
US Geological Survey	1.8	1.8	1.8 ^c	0.0
National Park Service	4.0	4.0	5.3 ^c	0.0
Fed. Highway Admin.-Emergency Relief Program	0.0	600.0	0.0	0.0
Small Business Administration	50.5	60.9	0.0	40.9
Subtotal, Hurricane-related relief	313.4	1,027.2	365.3	421.1
Management of Land & Resources (Interior Dept)	0.0	0.0	17.2 ^c	0.0
Wildland Fire Management (Interior Dept)	100.0	100.0	100.0 ^c	200.0
Wildland Fire Management (USDA)	0.0	150.0	1.6 ^c	150.0
USDA Forest Service	0.0	0.0	7.6 ^c	2.0
USDA Federal Crop Insurance Corp. Fund	13.0	13.0	13.0 ^c	0.0
USDA Single Family Housing	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
USDA Housing Repair	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0
USDA Pierce disease control	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0
USDA Rural Community -Water and Waste grants	0.0	28.0	0.0	0.0
USDA Rural Community Facilities grants	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0
USDA Rural Community Advancement program	0.0	0.0	130.0 ^c	0.0
USDA Mutual and Self-Help Housing grants	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0
USDA Rural Housing Assistance grants	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0
USDA Farm Labor Program account	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
USDA CCC Citrus Canker Control	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0
USDA CCC Crop Disease & Insect Asst	0.0	0.0	58.0 ^c	0.0
USDA Livestock Assistance	0.0	0.0	450.0 ^c	0.0
USDA Livestock Price Reporting Program	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
Fisheries assistance	0.0	0.0	0.0	32.0
Cerro Grande Fire assistance - FEMA	0.0	0.0	0.0	500.0
Cerro Grande Fire assistance - USDA	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.0
Cerro Grande Fire assistance - DOE	0.0	0.0	0.0	138.0

	Request	House	Senate	Enacted
Cerro Grande Fire assistance - Interior Dept	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.0
DOD Corps of Engineers-flood control	0.0	0.0	10.0 ^c	0.0
TOTAL, Domestic Disaster Relief	426.4	1,428.3	1,152.7	1,467.5
Critical Infrastructure Protection Initiative				
Natl Institute of Standards & Technology*	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
General Services Administration*	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
National Science Foundation*	1.0	0.0	1.0 ^c	0.0
Office of Personnel Management*	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL, Critical Infrastructure Protection	9.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Other Domestic Supplementals:				
DEA domestic drug-related intelligence & invest.	0.0	282.5	11.2	181.0
USDA Inspector General	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
USDA Farm Service Agency	0.0	77.6	39.0 ^c	77.6
USDA CCC Conservation/Wetlands Reserve progs.	0.0	35.0	35.0 ^c	0.0
USDA Foreign Ag Service-international food aid	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
USDA Peanut Assistance	0.0	0.0	7.0 ^c	7.0
USDA Dairy Market Loss Payments	0.0	0.0	443.0 ^c	0.0
USDA Milk Price Support extension	0.0	0.0	-14.0 ^c	0.0
Fire Departments Aid-FEMA & Forest Service	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Interior-Office Surface Mining Reclamation/Enforce	0.0	0.0	9.8 ^c	9.8
Interior-Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.0	0.0	1.2 ^c	0.0
Interior-Fish & Wildlife Management	0.0	0.0	6.5 ^c	0.0
Interior-Lewis & Clark project, S. Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Interior-land acquisition in Maryland	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
DOD Corps of Engineers-Johnson Creek, Texas	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
DOD Corps of Engineers-Saxon Harbor, Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
DOD Corps of Engineers-General Investigations	8.1	1.5	4.5 ^c	3.5
DOD support for 2002 Winter Olympics	0.0	0.0	8.0 ^a	8.0
Fed Highway Admin support for Winter Olympics*	0.0	0.0	35.0 ^c	0.0
Gen. Services Admin-support for Winter Olympics*	0.0	0.0	3.3 ^c	3.3
NTSB-Egypt Air 990/Alaska Air 261 investigation	25.1	24.7	24.7 ^c	19.7
Commerce- Asst to Vieques, Puerto Rico*	40.0	[40.0]	[40.0]	[40.0]
Civil Rights Commission*	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Federal Maritime Commission*	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
DOE-Uranium Enrichment Decontamination Fund*	16.0	16.0	58.0 ^c	58.0
DOE Weapons Production Facilities*	55.0	55.0	221.0 ^a	96.5
DOE Safety Issues & Cyber-Security	14.0	59.0	12.0 ^a	38.0
HHS Foster Care Independent Living*	35.0	35.0	35.0 ^c	35.0
HHS Food & Drug Admin-Los Angeles lab	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
HHS-Abstinence Education for Adolescents (FY01)*	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0
HHS-Health Care Financing Administration	0.0	0.0	15.0 ^c	0.0
HHS-Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act*	100.0	**	0.0	0.0
HHS/CDC-International HIV/AIDS	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.0
HHS-Bioterrorism	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.2
HHS-Little Flower Children's Services, N.Y.	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
Dept of Education-Higher Education	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8

	Request	House	Senate	Enacted
HUD FHA General & Special Risk Program*	49.0	49.0	49.0 ^c	0.0
HUD Inspector General (delay until FY2001)*	-6.0	-6.0	20.0 ^c	0.0
HUD-Community Development Block Grants	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.5
Coast Guard operating expenses	[18.0]	37.0	264.4 ^a	77.0
Coast Guard - C37A aircraft	0.0	0.0	0.0	45.0
Coast Guard improvements	0.0	0.0	542.9 ^a	578.0
Internal Revenue Service*	39.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Javits-Wagner-O'Day Products (Blind & Disabled)*	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
NASA Human Space Flight*	0.0	25.8	25.8 ^c	0.0
NASA Aeronautics and Technology	0.0	29.0	0.0	1.5
NASA Mission Support*	[20.2]	20.2	20.2 ^c	0.0
Capitol Police*	0.0	1.9	14.6 ^c	0.0
Capitol Buildings and Grounds*	0.0	11.3	13.6 ^c	13.6
National Garden-private donations*	0.0	0.0	3.0 ^c	0.0
Botanic Gardens*	0.0	0.1	0.1 ^c	0.1
Library Buildings*	0.0	3.9	3.9 ^c	3.9
Corporation for National & Community Services	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
DOL-Youth activities, Workforce Invest. Act*	40.0	**	40.0 ^c	0.0
Social Sec Admin-repeal retirement earning test*	35.0	**	50.0 ^c	35.0
DOT-Federal Aviation Administration*	77.0	**	[77.0] ^c	75.0
Pres Advisory Commission on Holocaust Assets*	1.4	**	1.4 ^c	0.0
Dept of Justice-Radiation Exposure Compensation*	0.0	0.0	7.2 ^c	0.0
Dept of Justice-FBI Natl Domestic Preparedness*	0.0	0.0	13.5 ^c	0.0
Dept of Justice-FBI S&E*	0.0	0.0	3.0 ^c	0.0
Dept. of Justice-U.S. Attorneys salaries	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.0
Dept. of Justice-Justice Assistance	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Railroad Retirement Board*	0.0	0.0	0.5 ^c	0.0
Telecommunications Carrier Compliance Fund*	0.0	0.0	100.0 ^c	0.0
Appalachian Regional Commission	0.0	0.0	11.0 ^c	0.0
Dept of Treasury-S&E, W. Va. firearms training fac.	0.0	0.0	24.9 ^c	24.9
Dept of Treasury-BATF, gun law enforcement	0.0	0.0	93.8 ^c	0.0
Dept of Transportation-EPA telecommuting	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Dept of Transportation-Highway Trust Fund	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5
Secret Service-National Special Security events	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
Executive Office of the President-email restoration	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.4
State Department-Intl Commission	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
U.S. Commission on Religious Freedom	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Libby, Montana-asbestos illness treatment	0.0	0.0	11.5 ^c	11.5
District of Columbia Police	0.0	0.0	4.5	4.5
TOTAL, Other Domestic Supplementals	531.4	903.5	2,274.0	1,552.8
GRAND TOTAL – SUPPLEMENTALS	5,699.7	13,190.0	9,264.7	11,652.9

* = Non-emergency appropriation.

** = Supplemental requested on March 27 after the House Appropriations Committee had reported H.R. 3708.

^aAppropriated in S. 2521.

^bAppropriated in S. 2522.

^cAppropriated in S. 2536.

Table 3. Rescissions, Offsets, Deferrals, and Transfers
(\$s in millions)

	Request	House	Senate	Conf.
Commerce-Emerg Oil/Gas Guarantee Prog (offset)	-20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Commerce-Emerg Oil/Gas Guarantee Prog (offset)	-42.8	**	0.0	0.0
USDA-Fund for Rural America (rescission)*	0.0	-6.0	0.0	0.0
USDA-Future Ag & Food Systems (offset)*	0.0	-100.0	0.0	0.0
DOE-Defense Environ. Restoration/Waste (resc)*	-13.0	-13.0	0.0	0.0
Interior-Natl Park Service Construction (rescission)*	-5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
DOE-US-Russia Plutonium Disposition (rescission)	-40.0	-40.0	0.0	0.0
DOE-Strategic Petroleum account (rescission)*	-12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HUD-Housing Certificate Fund (rescission)*	-128.0	0.0	-128.0 ^c	0.0
HUD-IG (rescission)*	0.0	0.0	-20 ^c	0.0
Dept of Transport.-Info Technology systems (offset)	-26.6	-26.6	0.0	0.0
Dept of Transportation-Maritime Admin (offset)	-7.6	**	0.0	0.0
HHS-Public Health & Social Services Emergency Fd	0.0	0.0	0.0	-43.2
HHS-General Dept Management (FY01 rescission)*	0.0	-20.0	0.0	-20.0
HHS-Y2K funds (offset)	-163.8	**	-124.5 ^c	0.0
Information Technology, Y2K funds (offset)	-235.0	-235.0	-235.0 ^c	0.0
Other agencies Y2K funds (offset)	-12.7	**	-2.4 ^c	-26.6
Natl Institute of Standards & Tech (rescission)*	0.0	0.0	-4.5 ^c	0.0
Dept of Justice-General Admin. S&E (rescission)*	0.0	0.0	-2.0 ^c	0.0
Dept of Justice-US Parole Commission (rescission)*	0.0	0.0	-1.1 ^c	0.0
Dept of Justice-Legal Activities S&E (rescission)*	0.0	0.0	-2.0 ^c	0.0
Dept of Justice-Asset Forfeiture Fund (rescission)*	0.0	0.0	-13.5 ^c	0.0
Dept of Justice-FBI S&E (rescission)*	0.0	0.0	-15.0 ^c	0.0
Dept of Justice-Immig & Naturalization (rescission)*	0.0	0.0	-15.0 ^c	0.0
Dept of Justice-Justice Assistance (rescission)*	0.0	0.0	-0.5 ^c	0.0
Dept of Justice-State Criminal Alien Asst Program*	0.0	0.0	-82.4 ^c	0.0
Dept of Justice-State & Local Law Enforcement*	0.0	0.0	-7.9 ^b	0.0
Small Business Administration (rescission)*	0.0	0.0	-6.5 ^c	0.0
DOD prior year appropriations (rescission)*	0.0	0.0	0.0	-286.6
DOD Military Construction FY1996 approps (resc.)*	0.0	0.0	0.0	-35.0
Coast Guard prior year appropriations (rescission)*	0.0	0.0	0.0	-11.4
Fed Drug Control Prog.-Forfeiture Fund (resc.)*	0.0	0.0	-3.3 ^c	0.0
TOTAL, Offsets, Rescissions, Delays, Transfers	-706.5	-440.6	-663.6	-422.8

* = Rescission or offset of non-emergency appropriations.

** = Requested on March 27 after the House Appropriations Committee had reported H.R. 3708.

^aAppropriated in S. 2521.

^bAppropriated in S. 2522.

^cAppropriated in S. 2536.

Table 4. Supplemental Appropriations Summary: Emergency, Non-Emergency, Rescission, and Offset Totals

	Request	House	Senate	Conf.
Appropriations – Non-Emergencies	737.2	251.0	493.2	406.7
Appropriations – Emergencies	4,191.1	10,075.8	4,223.6	6,845.7
Appropriations – Contingent Emergencies	771.4	2,824.2	4,592.2	4,387.3
Appropriations – Advance	0.0	39.0	0.0	20.0
Rescissions – Non-Emergencies	(158.0)	(13.0)	(281.7)	(383.2)
Rescissions – Emergencies	(40.0)	(40.0)	0.0	(26.6)
Rescissions – Advance Appropriations	0.0	(20.0)	(20.0)	(20.0)
Offsets – Non-Emergencies	(500.9)	(106.0)	0.0	0.0
Offsets – Emergencies	(7.6)	(261.6)	(361.9)	0.0
TOTAL, New Budget Authority	4,993.2	12,749.4	8,645.4	11,229.9

Note: Totals exclude amounts in title V of Division B of H.R. 4425. Title V repeals several provisions enacted in 1999 that shifted the final FY2000 pay date for military and civilian employees so that the cost would occur in FY2001. Title V further adds two new provisions concerning the payment dates of Social Security and Veterans benefits. The net effect of these actions is the addition of \$3.946 billion in new budget authority in FY2000 that is not reflected in the totals in this or other tables included in this report.