This would make an American citizen who has any kind of dealing with someone that some bureaucrat thinks is a drug kingpin a criminal if that citizen has some dealing with him even if that citizen thinks that this person is perfectly innocent, and there is no opportunity in court to dispute whether that person is innocent or in fact a drug kingpin. That is not the American way.

Yes, we should crack down on drugs; yes, we should protect ourselves, but we should not do so by eliminating all our Anglo-Saxon traditions of due process and fair play. Someone accused of a crime always is entitled to a day in court. Someone the President says is a drug kingpin is entitled to say in court, ''No, I'm not, you've got the wrong man.'' This bill goes against that.

As I said, the people who passed Magna Carta would understand why this bill is pernicious and destructive of our Constitution and on our system of values in this country and why this bill should be rejected.

Let me say one other thing. We never saw this bill in the Committee on the Judiciary. It has not been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. I spoke to the Deputy Attorney General at 9 o'clock last night. He had never heard of it.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, I want to make a point about this bill, and that is that it deals with foreign drug kingpins who are killing and poisoning our kids. The bottom line is it deals with the worst of the worst. It deals with people who have already been indicted in our court system but probably have never come here and never will come here for trial. It deals with freezing their assets, choking their ability to get the rewards of money and property out of the drug dealings they have been doing. And, yes, it does provide a support level for an already existing and already court-tested process whereby under national security guidelines, the President of the United States may designate these foreign drug kingpins as people whose property will be frozen and who cannot have financial dealings and business transactions in the United States.

It is perfectly constitutional, it is perfectly appropriate and the Administrative Procedures Act once they are designated does govern the process itself in the seizure of property and the disposition of it. Fifteen thousand of our fellow citizens died last year from illegal drug overdoses. Hundreds of thousands of American families had to cope with the challenges posed by addictions to their loved ones. It seems to me that it is long overdue that we have a bill like this. Sadly, we have discovered in this Congress that we are not insulated from the efforts of the kingpins to buy influence and corrupt our political institutions. Their narco-lobbyists were paid well to try to shape and gut this bill through this process. Well, they have not succeeded, fortunately.

An overwhelming vote of this House in favor of this bill, H.R. 3164, will send the kingpins an unmistakable message: We do not fear their power, we cannot be bought, and we will not rest until they are jailed and their organizations disrupted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3164.

The question was taken.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

TERRE HAUTE FEDERAL BUILDING TRANSFER ACT

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2513) to direct the Administrator of General Services to acquire a building located in Terre Haute, Indiana, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2513

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

SECTION 1. ACQUISITION OF BUILDING.

(a) ACQUISITION.—The Administrator of General Services shall acquire by transfer from the United States Postal Service the real property and improvements located at 30 North Seventh Street in Terre Haute, Indiana.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT.—The transfer under subsection (a) shall be made without reimbursement, except that the Administrator shall provide to the Postal Service an option to occupy 8,000 square feet of renovated space in the building acquired under subsection (a) at no cost for a 20-year term.

SEC. 2. RENOVATION OF BUILDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of General Services shall renovate the building acquired under section 1, and acquire parking spaces, to accommodate use of the building by the Administrator and the United States Postal Service.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subject to the requirements of section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 606(a)), there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2513, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE), would require a no-cost transfer of a Postal Service building located in downtown Terre Haute, Indiana, to the General Services Administration. In return for the building, the Postal Service would be granted an option to remain in a portion of the building, 8,000 square feet, rent-free for 20 years.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of $5 million to renovate the building and to acquire parking spaces to accommodate use of the building by the Postal Service and the General Services Administration.

The subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology marked up this bill and reported it to the full Committee on Government Reform on September 22, 1999. At the request of the ranking member of the full committee the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the subcommittee's ranking member the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), the subcommittee held a hearing on September 30, 1999 to further consider the legislation.

Witnesses at the hearing included the sponsor of the bill the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE); Terre Haute's mayor, Jim Jenkins; and representatives from both the Postal Service and the General Services Administration. Witnesses at the hearing testified about the building's historical significance and the need to maintain a post office and a Federal presence in the downtown area of this Indiana community. A representative of the General Services Administration testified the agency needed additional time to explore other alternatives to conveying this property, including the possibility of a no-cost conveyance to a public entity or a sale to a private buyer. An agreement was reached at the hearing to postpone further consideration of this bill for an additional 30 days to enable the General Services Administration to find a viable alternative to H.R. 2513. The 30 days have elapsed and the General Services Administration has been unable to achieve a viable option for conveying this property.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill.

Attached is the ''Statement of Administration Policy,'' dated November 2, 1999.

Also included are the letters between the chairmen of Government Reform and Transportation and Infrastructure.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, November 2, 1999.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2513—TO DIRECT THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES TO ACQUIRE A BUILDING LOCATED IN TERRE HAUTE, INDIANA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES. (PEASE (R) IN)

The Administration opposes House passage of H.R. 2513. The bill would:

Compel the General Services Administration (GSA) to accept into its inventory, and fully renovate, a building that has not been reasonably marketed for use by other entities. Further, GSA does not have the Federal tenancy in the Terre Haute community to sustain this building.

Lead to certain losses in GSA's budget, since the appropriations authorized are not guaranteed and would only cover renovation costs, while GSA would certainly suffer continuing shortfalls in rental income from the building. These losses are particularly likely in light of the bill's requirement that the United States Postal Service, in lieu of payment for the building, receive an option to occupy 8,000 square feet of renovated space rent-free for 20 years.

The Administration appreciates and shares the desire to preserve historical and architectural landmarks such as that currently housing the Terre Haute Post Office, but believes this preservation can and should be done in a financially prudent fashion. GSA believes the Post Office should remain in the Postal Service's inventory while all interested parties, including GSA, continue to survey the market for potential users.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, October 26, 1999.

Hon. DAN BURTON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in H.R. 2513, a bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to acquire a building in Terre Haute, Indiana.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 2513 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over certain provisions of the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

With warm personal regards, I remain

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, November 1, 1999.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of October 26, 1999 regarding H.R. 2513 a bill directing the Administration of General Services to acquire a building located in Terre Haute, Indiana.

I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, as you requested, this exchange of letters will be included in the record during floor consideration of this bill.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, October 29, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In the interest of expediting floor consideration of H.R. 2513, a bill to direct the Administrator of the General Services to acquire a building located in Terre Haute, Indiana, and for other purposes, the Committee on Government Reform does not intend to exercise its jurisdiction over this bill.

Originally, the bill was scheduled to be marked up by the committee on September 30th. Congressman Horn and Congresswoman Waxman, however, agreed to give GSA another thirty days before passing H.R. 2513. After thirty days, both resolved that the bill could be considered on the House floor.

As you know, House Rule X, Establishment and Jurisdiction of Standing Committees, grants the Government Reform Committee with jurisdiction over ''government management and accounting measures, generally.'' Our decision not to exercise the Committee's jurisdiction over this measure is not intended or designed to waive or limit our jurisdiction over any future consideration of related matters.

Thank you for your assistance, and I look forward to working with you throughout the 106th Congress.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON,
Chairman.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill attempts to deal with a problem in Terre Haute, Indiana, represented by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE). This problem he faces is not unlike a problem that many of us have or will experience in our own districts. Many of us have Federal buildings within our districts that oftentimes were built during the Depression era, buildings that are no longer up to current standards and are having difficulty being leased. These buildings, I think, are many times located in prime areas of our communities, in downtown locations, in commercial areas and many times these buildings have historical significance that warrant preservation.

H.R. 2513 by the gentleman from Indiana deals with such a building located in his hometown of Terre Haute and it is a building that is currently owned by and partially occupied by the Postal Service. I have committed to helping the gentleman from Indiana with this bill not only because of my personal respect and admiration which I hold for him but also because I know that any one of us can and do face the same problem in our own districts. I am aware of the fact that the gentleman from Indiana has worked diligently for over 2 years to try to find a solution to this problem.

This bill would transfer the Postal Service building from the Postal Service to the General Services Administration. The General Services Administration as consideration for the transfer would be obligated to permit the Postal Service to continue to occupy approximately 8,000 square feet of the building that has about 45,000 square feet of rentable space for free for a period of 20 years. The bill would also authorize an appropriation of $5 million to the GSA to renovate the building and to acquire parking.

I fully appreciate the value of this building to the community of Terre Haute. This structure, which was constructed through a public works project during the Depression, is listed on the National Register of Historical Places. Aside from its historical significance, the building goes a long way toward enhancing the value of downtown Terre Haute by providing citizens a host of services that are easily accessible to the public. Citizens like to be able to walk across the street to visit the post office, visit the Social Security Administration. Time, however, has taken its toll on this building. It is deeply in need of repair and diminishing standards have made it difficult to keep the building operational. As I said, it is estimated by the GSA that the building would require between $4 million and $5 million in renovation. The citizens of Terre Haute under the leadership of the gentleman from Indiana have joined together to keep the Postal Service building as a viable part of the downtown area.

In my opinion, the Federal Government has a clear duty to act as a responsible property owner and should be a partner in finding a solution to the future of this building. The building's historical significance and its importance to preserving the economic viability of the downtown area must be acknowledged by the Federal Government. However, I am deeply concerned about one provision of the bill, that provision which allows the Postal Service to occupy 8,000 square feet of space for 20 years at no cost. I recognize that the purpose of the free rent provision under the bill is to compensate the Postal Service for the value of the building. Yet without the whole building generating revenue, I anticipate that the expense of providing the Postal Service with free rent will greatly reduce the fair market value of the building. The free rent provision will amount to an encumbrance which will diminish the building's economic value for the next 20 years.

As we all know, a lot can change in 20 years. All future prospective owners of the building may be discouraged from acquiring the building because of the heavy burden of free rent for the Postal Service. And the Postal Service has acknowledged that it intends to stay in

the downtown area. They even acknowledged to us in a conference call that were they not in this building, they would move to another building a few blocks away where they would be required to pay rent. Why then should the Postal Service not continue to pay rent in the Postal Service building? That is a question that I do not know that we have a clear answer to. The Postal Service simply says that if they are going to transfer a building to the General Services Administration, they are due some consideration, that it has some value. This argument certainly is a sound one, if the building does in fact have economic value. But the estimates provided by the GSA indicate that the building in its current condition has little if any economic value and will require an expenditure of over $4 million to bring it up to a standard to attract tenants at market rates. And then, of course, the payout over the years of $4.2 million perhaps would make the building less attractive not only to the government but to any private investor considering such an investment.

So having expressed my concern about the particular provision of the bill, I want to say again that I commend the gentleman from Indiana for his diligence in trying to deal with a problem common to all of us. I think that the proper thing for us to do is to support this bill, to move it forward, and in fact when we had a hearing on this bill, the gentleman from Indiana delayed moving the bill forward for 30 days to allow the GSA to come up with any viable option that they may have. Their efforts thus far have been unsuccessful, but he kept his commitment to do so and our commitment on this side of the aisle was to allow this bill to move forward and perhaps to move it to a point where some of the suggestions that I have made could be incorporated in the bill. We are supportive of the effort that the gentleman from Indiana has made. I commend him for what he is attempting to do for his community. I would urge adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very thorough proposal of this particular building. As I noted, the Congressional Budget Office said this is a negligible cost in terms of the amounts involved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE).

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of time, I will submit a written statement for the RECORD.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for their tremendous support and assistance in an effort that is very important to my hometown and the citizens who reside there.

As the gentleman from Texas has said, we have spent almost 2 years trying to resolve this situation in a fashion that meets the needs of the community but is also responsible in its stewardship of limited financial resources.

□ 1245

We believe we have the best possible option before us at this time, though we understand that there are still points in the agreement that need to be negotiated, and obviously will be, between the GSA and the Postal Service and our colleagues in the other body.

The staff of the subcommittee and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and many members of the Postal Service staff and GSA staff have been extremely helpful to us. I want to acknowledge their work in what is admittedly a difficult area and thank each of them for their cooperation in bringing this proposal forward. We believe it provides the basis for a constructive resolution of a difficult matter.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2513. I represent the Seventh District of Indiana, which includes the city of Terre Haute where the building which is the subject of this bill is located. In September 1935, the Federal Building, which is located at the intersection of Seventh and Cherry streets in Terre Haute, IN, opened its doors to the public. Its original tenants included a Federal court, a post office, the Social Security Administration, and the Internal Revenue Service. This grand structure is a product of the Works Progress Administration during the Depression under the Roosevelt Administration and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It is a fine example of Art Deco architecture, utilizing Indiana limestone, marble, and ornate decor.

Pursuant to the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, some of the buildings in the Federal inventory were conveyed to the U.S. Postal Service (USPS). The postal facility located in downtown Terre Haute, IN, is one such building that was included in the transfer. Since the transfer, numerous Federal agencies have leased space in the Terre Haute facility for their operations. However, the building is currently in need of modernization, and many of these agencies, including the Social Security Administration and the Internal Revenue Service, have relocated to other locations in the city of Terre Haute under private leases.

According to the most recent figures from GSA and the USPS, the total rentable space for the Terre Haute facility is approximately 41,300 square feet. Of this space, 30,902 square feet are currently occupied by the USPS and other Federal agencies, thus placing the current overall occupancy rate at 75 percent. Currently, the building houses several Federal offices, including a U.S. District Court, a U.S. Bankruptcy Court, the U.S. Marshals Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a U.S. Attorney's office, Federal Probation, and one of my district offices. In addition to this Federal presence, space is also leased by two private attorneys and Jelene Kennedy, a blind senior citizen who operates a concession stand for the building.

In 1997, a new postal processing and distribution center was opened in Terre Haute, IN. Due to the construction of this new postal facility, the presence of the USPS in the Federal building has been reduced to box and window services only. For a time, there were indications that the USPS might terminate its presence at this facility.

H.R. 2513 would transfer the Terre Haute facility to GSA at no charge, providing the USPS with an option to remain in a portion of the building (8,000 square feet) rent-free for 20 years. In addition, the bill would authorize $5,000,000 for necessary renovations to the building and to acquire parking spaces to accommodate existing and future offices.

H.R. 2513 has many merits for both the city and the Federal Government. It would help maintain the presence of the USPS in downtown Terre Haute, which is a high priority with the community and numerous interest groups. Anticipated renovations would make the facility more attractive to public and private lessees, including Federal agencies seeking to relocate when their leases in other Terre Haute locations expire in the next few years. At this time, the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of Agriculture, and armed forces recruiting offices operate outside the facility, but within the city of Terre Haute. Ideally, these Federal agencies would move into the building, thus occupying, at a minimum, 16,095 additional square feet, increasing the occupancy rate to 90 percent. Under this plan, the moneys currently being paid under private leases would be paid to the Federal Government, thereby saving taxpayers money. In addition, a central location for Federal agencies and their services would provide improved accessibility for the Terre Haute community.

Two additional aspects that should be considered when examining H.R. 2513 are the demand for additional space by those Federal agencies currently in the Terre Haute facility, as well as the demand for space in the facility by state and private entities. The FBI and the U.S. District Court, both of which currently occupy space in the building, have indicated that additional space is necessary for their operations. In addition, a private lessee has expressed interest in leasing approximately 1,800 square feet. The Governor of Indiana has indicated his interest in this project and his willingness to work in filing vacant spaces in the building with state agencies if there is space remaining after other Federal agencies relocate to this property. Moreover, Mayor Jim Jenkins, Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, STAMPS Downtown, Indiana State University, Downtown Terre Haute, Inc., Terre Haute Chamber of Commerce, the Deming Center, and others have expressed their willingness to assist in finding tenants to occupy any vacancies in the building.

One final factor that should be taken into consideration is the recent decision by the United States Bureau of Prisons to designate the Federal Penitentiary in Terre Haute as the sole location in the United States for the execution of Federal death sentences. The potential impact of this designation on the Federal court at Terre Haute is currently unknown, but is likely to be substantial.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2413 was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives on July 14, 1999. The bill was subsequently referred to the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for consideration. On September 22, 1999, the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology of the

Committee on Government Reform marked up H.R. 2513 by a voice vote. On September 29, 1999, a hearing on H.R. 2513 was conducted by the subcommittee, and testimony was presented by representatives of the Terre Haute community, myself, and representatives of the USPS and GSA. At the hearing, concerns about H.R. 2513 were raised by GSA officials and Representative HENRY WAXMAN, ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform.

H.R. 2513 was scheduled to be marked up by the Committee on Government Reform on September 30, 1999. However, at my request, H.R. 2513 was withdrawn form the Committee's agenda for that day. Ranking Member WAXMAN and I agreed to allow GSA 30 days to review whether there were realistic alternatives for management of the Terre Haute facility, other than ownership by GSA. Under this agreement, if GSA failed to move forward and provide a viable option in the 30-day period, then the ranking member agreed to moving the bill forward in its current form on the House suspension calendar. To date, GSA has been unable to provide a viable option, though it has worked diligently on the project and has been in regular communication with my staff, committee staff, and representatives of various government entities in Terre Haute.

For more than 2 years, my staff and I have been working with GSA, the USPS, and the Terre Haute community to resolve this matter. Though we have made progress, a comprehensive solution has not yet been reached, but this bill helps us advance the negotiations toward the only viable option yet discovered. To expedite this matter, Representative DAN BURTON, chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, with the concurrence of Ranking Member HENRY WAXMAN, agreed to waive the committee's consideration of H.R. 2513. In addition, Representative BUD SHUSTER, chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure agreed to forego his committee's sequential referral on the bill.

In conclusion, it makes sense to transfer its property from the USPS to GSA. The General Services Administration is familiar with building management and better suited to properly manage this multitenant facility—a historic structure architecturally and structurally similar to facilities managed by GSA in other cities. I believe that the figures clearly indicate a strong federal presence, as well as a strong demand, for space in the Terre Haute facility. For many reasons, the transfer of the facility to GSA is a sound transaction which will prove to be an asset to the Federal Government and to the citizens of the Terre Haute area. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2513.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will support this legislation because I entered into an agreement with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. PEASE, and the gentleman from California, Mr. HORN. Under our understanding, I agreed to support moving this legislation through the House if the General Services Administration did not find a viable alternative for the postal building in Terre Haute within 30 days. The 30 days are up, and although GSA is continuing to analyze and investigate the property, it has not yet found an entity interested in buying or taking the property.

Nevertheless, although I am supporting moving this legislation through the House, I continue to have genuine reservations about H.R. 2513. I hope Mr. PEASE will work to resolve these issues as this legislation moves forward.

H.R. 2513 provides that the postal services building in Terre Haute will be transferred to GSA. It also provides the U.S. Postal Service with an option to remain in the building rent-free for 20 years. In addition, this bill authorizes $5,000,000 for necessary renovations to the building and to acquire parking space to accommodate existing and future offices.

I am not sure that this is the best policy. It ordinarily does not make sense to force GSA to own a building it does not want or need. GSA has explained the many difficulties it will have in leasing space in the facility. The building has a 55 percent vacancy rate, and it is not clear that this rate will increase enough to cover the costs of the renovations. In addition, there now appears to be little justification for allowing the Postal Service to have office space rent-free for 20 years.

In essence, I fear that this bill could require GSA to sink millions of dollars into a property when there is little chance that the Federal Government will be able to recoup those costs.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to my concerns about the substance of this bill, I am also troubled by the inconsistent information that has circulated regarding this bill.

During a September 29, 1999, subcommittee hearing on H.R. 2513, which was held at my insistence, the parties concerned came to an agreement to postpone a decision on how to proceed with the Terre Haute Post Office building for 1 month. During that month, GSA was to review the potential options for the building, including a directed sale, and report to us no later than October 29, 1999, regarding those options. If GSA did not report in that timeframe or failed to report a viable alternative to H.R. 2513, I agreed to move H.R. 2513 to the floor under suspension of the rules.

On October 29, 1999, GSA reported to us that there was a potential purchaser, the Vigo County School District. My staff also contacted the treasurer of the Vigo County School District about their interest. The treasurer indicated that the school district was interested and that it needed more space. The treasurer also said that the school district needed another month in which to do a cost-benefit analysis. It thus appeared that there was a viable alternative for the property.

Mr. PEASE's staff disputed this point, however, and by the end of the day the school district's interest appears to have evaporated. Late in the day, my staff received a call from the superintendent of the Vigo County School District. With Mr. PEASE's chief of staff present in his office, the superintendent indicated that the school district was not a viable alternative and that its interest was just lukewarm.

In addition, I have received conflicting information regarding the Postal Service's intentions. It was my understanding initially that the provision in the bill giving the Postal Service free rent for 20 years was justified because but-for the free rent, the Postal Service had no intention of staying downtown. On October 29, however, we learned that Postal Service had always intended on keeping a presence in downtown Terre Haute, just not in the Federal building in question. As the gentleman from Texas, Mr. TURNER, has rightly pointed out, it doesn't seem necessary to give free rent to the Postal Service. This is especially true if it intended on paying rent in another building.

This point has significant ramifications. The fact that the Postal Service must receive space rent-free detracts from the building. In fact, it may be the reason that GSA has to date been apparently unable to find a viable alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to vote against this bill. However, I hope that Mr. PEASE and my colleagues in the Senate will take my comments into consideration as this bill moves through their Chamber.

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and urge the adoption of this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2513.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3137) to amend the Presidential Transaction Act of 1963 to provide for training of individuals a President-elect intends to nominate as department heads or appoint to key positions in the Executive Office of the President.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3137

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENTS TO PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT OF 1963.

Section 3(a) of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''including—'' and inserting ''including the following:'';

(2) in each of paragraphs (1) through (6) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(8)(A) Payment of expenses during the transition for briefings, workshops, or other activities to acquaint key prospective Presidential appointees with the types of problems and challenges that most typically confront new political appointees when they make the transition from campaign and other prior activities to assuming the responsibility for governance after inauguration, including interchange with individuals who held similar leadership roles in prior administrations, agency or department experts from the Office of Management and Budget or an Office of Inspector General of an agency or department, and relevant staff from the General Accounting Office.

''(B) Activities funded under this paragraph shall be conducted primarily for individuals the President-elect intends to nominate as department heads or appoint to key positions in the Executive Office of the President.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from