White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Cannon
Dingell
Doyle
Gonzalez
Hamilton
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Markey
McDade
Slaughter

☐ 1638

Messrs. HOEKSTRA, EHRLICH and SNYDER and Ms. MEEK of Florida changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, GILMAN, LAZIO of New York, DICKS and TORRES changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPALANTION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 263, the Bass/DeFazio Amendment to Protect Wildlife, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 373, nays 48, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 264]

YEAS—373

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—48

Andrews
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Berry
Campbell
Chabot
Chenoweth
Collins
Crane
Doggett
Dooley
Ensign
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Hall (TX)
Hefley
Johnson (WI)
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lofgren
Lowey
McDermott
Meehan
Menendez
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Paul
Petri
Portman
Ramstad
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Stark
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Taylor (MS)
Tierney

NOT VOTING—12

Cannon
Dingell
Doyle
Emerson
Ford
Gonzalez
Hamilton
Markey
McDade
Miller (CA)
Northup
Slaughter

☐ 1647

Mr. BARR of Georgia changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. BERMAN and Ms. LEE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, due to the death of a family member, I was unavoidably absent on the afternoon of Wednesday, June 24, 1998, and as a result, missed rollcall votes 260 through 264.

Had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall 260, yes on rollcall 261, yes on rollcall 262, yes on rollcall 263, and yes on rollcall 264.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 264, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2646) ''An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes.''.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4103, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 484 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 484

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4103) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI, clause 7 of rule XXI, or section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and

ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. Consideration of section 8106 for amendment under the five-minute rule shall not exceed one hour. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 484 is a modified open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4103, the FY99 defense appropriations bill. The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failing to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI requiring a 3-day layover of the committee report, clause 7 of rule XXI requiring printed hearings and reports to be available for 3 days prior to consideration of a general appropriations bill, and section 306 of the Budget Act of 1974, prohibiting consideration of legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget unless reported by that committee.

This pertains to scoring provisions which have in the past been carried by the DOD bill, and which have been signed off on by the Committee on the Budget.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule provides that amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important appropriations bill. This is a somewhat complicated rule. I am trying to explain it. I would appreciate the Members' attention.

The amendments about which I expect we will have significant debate throughout this hour, based on our conversations yesterday in the Committee on Rules, pertain to two distinct issues.

The first is an amendment brought forward by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, addressing a deplorable circumstance involving the sale by a contracting firm of the congressional Medal of Honor. We applaud the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) for taking this on, and I note there is no disagreement with self-executing this provision into the legislation to take care of this matter.

The second issue addressed through this provision of the rule pertains to the year 2000 issue. The shorthand is Y2K. Members should get used to it, we are going to hear it a lot, the matter of preparing the Defense Department's computer systems to deal with the so-called millennium bug, which will occur as the year 2000 begins.

Our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. STEVE HORN) of the committee on Government Reform and Oversight has for some time, in fact, quite some time, been pushing the entire executive branch to become more aggressive in preparing for this problem, the Y2K problem. The gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) recently issued a report card on the progress being made by Federal agencies, a report card full of Cs and Fs that would cause any parent real alarm if it were brought home from school by their child.

The fact is that the administration has been woefully, if not negligently, slow in coming to grips with this Y2K problem. It has consistently underestimated the needs of all agencies in ensuring that mission critical computer systems across the board do not fail come January 1, 2000, and particularly those systems upon which our national security depends.

The truth is, no one can credibly say that they did not see this problem coming. Most of us have known for some time that the year 2000 will begin and that our computer-oriented society needs to prepare for the change. In fact, some of us have repeatedly engaged the administration on this issue as it applies to the intelligence field.

Likewise, the defense appropriators, frustrated by the fact that there were no additional funds requested for the DOD's FY99 budget to meet the Y2K need, sought to force the administration to face facts by including additional monies in this spending bill for the Y2K fix.

However, because the administration adopted what could be described as a head-in-the-sand approach to this problem and abdicated its responsibility to identify the true need and target a source for the necessary funds, the money as of now does not have an offset. In other words, there is a problem and no money to fix it.

While I strongly support efforts to boost the intensity with which we tackle the Y2K problem, I do not believe that poor planning and a lack of willingness on the part of the administration to face this problem head on should justify our abdication or any abdication of the principles of fiscal discipline.

For that reason, I have opposed using an emergency declaration in this bill to bail the administration out of the mess it has created. Therefore, what we are doing in this rule is striking that emergency declaration, with the knowledge that we fully intend to come back in the coming weeks with a separate bill, hopefully one that is paid for, to address the Y2K problem government-wide.

In addition to self-executing out this emergency provision for Y2K, the rule also removes the emergency designation for the $20 million allocation in the bill relating to the tragic cable car incident in Italy, leaving the funds intact and fully offset from the Navy operations and maintenance account.

Mr. Speaker, the rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill which do not comply with clause 2 of rule XXI prohibiting unauthorized or legislative appropriations in a general appropriations bill, and clause 6 of rule XXI, prohibiting reappropriations in a general appropriations bill. This is not unusual for an appropriations bill.

The rule provides priority in recognition for those amendments that have been previously printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it provides that the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone recorded votes on any amendment, and may reduce voting time on postponed questions to 5 minutes, providing that the voting time on the first in a series of questions is not less than 15 minutes. Nothing new there.

The one provision of this rule that makes it a modified open rule, rather than a fully open rule, is that one which limits debate under the 5-minute rule on amendments to section 8106 of the bill to 1 hour. This debate centers on the highly controversial substantive issue of the War Powers Act, a matter of critical importance to all Members, but also one with the potential to become bogged down in extended debate. If memory serves me right, the author of this amendment agreed that an hour would be sufficient.

In the interest of ensuring that the underlying appropriations bill is not unnecessarily sidetracked, we have acceded to the request of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to limit debate on this one matter.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the traditional motion to recommit, with or without instructions. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I would like to briefly extend my thanks to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for their efforts to rebuild our Nation's defense capabilities, including particularly the critical needs of the intelligence community.

The headlines in recent days and weeks have been full of instances where the eyes, ears, and brains of our intelligence capabilities have come under sharp focus. The truth is that we need good, timely, and well-analyzed intelligence now more than ever for our decision-makers as we grapple with the 21st century and the host of new threats and uncertainties confronting our national security, to say nothing of the technology we now face.

□ 1700

Now is not the time to become complacent and let down our guard. Good intelligence requires a long-term, steady commitment of attention, oversight and resources. The lesson we keep learning when something goes wrong in this arena is that we need to rebuild our capabilities to produce better and more focused intelligence, not further cut back on the tools in the tool box we make available to our policymakers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this rule and for the underlying bill.

[From the Washington Post, May 21, 1998]

FOR GORE, LOW PROFILE ON A HIGH-TECH HEADACHE

(By Stephen Barr and Rajiv Chandrasekaban)

When it's time to talk technology, Vice President Gore never seems to be at a loss for words. Wiring schools to the Internet. Celebrating the virtues of electronic mail. Using computers to streamline government.

But when it comes to the Year 2000 computer glitch, arguably the nation's most pressing technological problem, Gore has been strikingly silent. There have been no public speeches, no ''town hall'' meetings, no photo ops with programmers.

For Gore, that may be because the Year 2000 glitch isn't just a technological worry, it's also a political one that could be potentially damaging to him, political analysts say. Industry experts contend that the federal government has been slow to address the issue, raising worries that crucial computer systems—from those that control airplane traffic to ones that process payments to schools, farmers and veterans—could grind to a halt on Jan. 1 2000. That's right when Gore might find himself campaigning across Iowa and New Hampshire, seeking the Democrat presidential nomination.

''It's very much a factor in his positioning for the 2000 race,'' suggested Andrew L. Shapiro, a fellow at the Berkman Center for Internet and Society at Harvard University. ''Al doesn't want it to be Al's mess.'' Gore spokesman Lawrence Haas said the vice president receives regular briefings on the government's progress in fixing Year 2000 computer problems, Haas personally directed the Cabinet to make the fixes a high priority and has spoken about the potential crisis to the President's Management Council, a group of senior political appointees.

''He is not avoiding the issue,'' Haas said.

Asked to point out speeches in which Gore has talked about the so-called millennium bug, Haas could not identify one.

The Year 2000 problem stems from the fact that many computer systems use a two-digit dating system that assumes that 1 and 9 are the first two digits of the year. Without specialized reprogramming, the systems will recognize ''00'' not as 2000 but 1900, a glitch that could cause computers to either stop working or start generating erroneous data.

Virtually every Cabinet department and federal agency promises it will have fixed and tested its computer systems and links before the 2000 deadline, but any significant airline delay, power outage or telecommunications breakdown could give Gore's political opponents an opening to question his credibility or mock his efforts to ''reinvent'' government.

Republicans, in particular, appear ready to try to pin any problem on him. In a recent memo to ''members of Congress and conservative leaders'' on the Year 2000 problem, would be GOP presidential contender Steve Forbes recently asked, ''What has the administration's technology point may, Vice President Al Gore, been doing for the past five years?''

Rep. Stephen Horn (R-Calif.), a House Government Reform subcommittee chairman who has held hearings on the Year 2000 problem since April 1996, said, ''All of us have wondered where he is, since he is supposed to be the expert on all the good things in the 21st century—telecommunications, computers, technology.''

Administration officials noted that President Clinton created a special White House council in February to lead the government's effort to prevent widespread computer problems in 2000 and said Gore was personally involved in recruiting John A. Koskinen, who has specialized in crisis management, to lead the council.

The vice president, Koskinen said, has ''provided the support and leadership that we need at this stage. It doesn't do us a lot of good just to have people talking. My sense is to try to figure out the points of leverage, what are the issues that need to be raised and at what time.''

Greg Simon, Gore's former chief domestic policy adviser and now a technology policy consultant in Washington, said public speeches by the vice president could ''give out the impression that he's promising to fix everyone's [Year 2000] problem.

''It's more effective for him to work behind the scenes,'' Simon said.

Rep. Constance A. Morella (R-Md.), who called on the White House last year to designate a Year 2000 czar, said she hopes Koskinen can spur the government to work faster on computer fixes. Like some other lawmakers, she said the White House has not used its bully pulpit enough to educate the public about possible economic consequences or inconveniences.

''Ignoring this problem is a bigger risk than addressing it,'' Morella said.

Sen. Robert F. Bennett (R-Utah), who heads a special Senate committee and Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman Ted Stephens (R-Alaska) recently called for $2.25 billion to be set aside to deal with the computer fix.

White House officials said Clinton is doing his part too. The president is planning an address on the issue in the next month or so, aides said. Clinton raised the Year 2000 problem with Latin American leaders at their summit and worked with British Prime Minister Tony Blair to ensure that the communique issued at the end of the recent meeting of the Group of Eight major industrialized nations called attention to the computer challenge.

Asked about the Year 2000 problem at a Rose Garden event earlier this week, Clinton said the government plans to share information with other countries ''and do everything we can do to make sure that when the new millennium starts, it's a happy event and not a cyberspace headache.''

Gore is taking the issue seriously, Haas said.

''The other party has been quite open about its political strategy of tying any problems that occur specifically to the vice president,'' he said.

On the Year 2000 computer front, Haas said, ''We have the right people in place, we have the right process in place and we do not expect major problems.''

YEAR 2000 QUOTES FROM NATIONAL JOURNAL

''Gore has said virtually nothing about it. Indeed, he has rejected pleas by industry leaders and legislators to play a larger role. Back in January, Morella buttonholed Gore at a White House photo-op and urged him to lead the nation's repair effort. But Gore balked, saying it would take too much of his time. Morella recounted. And then, according to Morella, 'he paused and said, 'maybe you should do it.'' Neil Munro, National Journal 6/20/98.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET: STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY, JUNE 23, 1998

(This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 1999

(Sponsors: Livingston (R); Louisiana, Young (R); Florida.)

Year 2000 Reserve Funds

The Administration appreciates the emphasis that the Committee has placed on Year 2000 (Y2K) computer conversion activities. In the FY 1999 Budget, the President requested $364 million for Y2K computer conversion. We recognize, however, that ensuring DoD compliance may require the flexibility to respond to unanticipated requirements. As such, we would intend to employ the contingent reserve set aside by the Committee only to the extent necessary, in order to ensure funds are available to address emerging needs.

The Administration would strongly oppose efforts to strike the emergency contingency fund from this bill. The value of the emergency mechanism approved by the House Appropriations Committee is the flexibility it provides in the event that we determine that additional resources are required. We have only 556 days until January 1, 2000. We want to solve this problem as soon as possible. Be delaying approval of emergency funding and reopening the issue of the use of the emergency spending authority, the House will create controversy and delay. We hope the House will reconsider.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET: STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY, JUNE 23, 1998

(This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.)

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 1999

(Sponsors: Livingston (R); Louisiana, Kolbe (R); Arizona.)

Year 2000 Computer Conversion

The Administration appreciates the emphasis that the Committee has placed on year 2000 (Y2K) computer conversion activities. OMB will continue to assist all agencies

in ensuring that adequate resources are available to address this critical issue. In the FY 1999 Budget, the President has requested more than $1 billion for Y2K computer conversion. In addition, the budget anticipated that additional requirements would emerge over the course of the year and included an allowance for emergencies and other unanticipated needs.

At this time, we believe that the resource levels included in the President's budget will fully address Y2K computer conversion requirements Government-wide. However, as we learn more about how to address this problem, we expect that ensuring Government-wide compliance will require flexibility to respond to unanticipated requirements. To the extent such unanticipated requirements are identified, it will be essential to make that funding available quickly. It will truly be emergency funding. The emergency mechanism recently approved by the House Appropriations Committee provides such flexibility.

It is our understanding that when the House Rules Committee meets today to take up the Defense and Treasury/General Government appropriations bills, it will consider rules that would strip the emergency funding mechanism from both bills. This regrettable action will not help agencies move forward in addressing this problem. We note that the Committee bill allocates funds from the emergency reserve for Treasury and other agency Year 2000 (Y2K) needs. If the emergency reserve is not funded, the Congress will need to find other ways to fund Treasury's critical Y2K needs.

The value of the emergency mechanism approved by the House Appropriations Committee is the flexibility it provides in the event that we determine that additional resources are required. We have only 556 days until January 1, 2000. We want to solve this problem as soon as possible. Delaying approval of emergency funding and reopening the issue of the use of the emergency spending authority would create controversy and delay. We hope that the House will reconsider.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have a case here of Alice in Wonderland. The Republican Majority has decided that two wrongs do make a right. They do not like the fact that the administration has not asked for enough money for the year 2000, so they are not going to give the administration any money to fix the year 2000. This is an extraordinary result.

Mr. Speaker, let me state from the outset that it is my intention to oppose this rule. As my colleagues know, I am a consistent supporter of a strong national defense and it is not my practice to oppose rules dealing with defense matters. But in this case I must oppose this rule because I believe the Committee on Rules has made a very serious error, perhaps one of the most irresponsible actions they will ever take, by stripping all the funds for the year 2000 computer problem and for information systems security at the Department of Defense.

This is one of the most reckless actions my Republican colleagues have taken in the 3½ years that they have had control of this body. And for those of us who do concern ourselves with national security, the ramifications of this action are quite frankly very disturbing.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations said in the report to accompany this important bill that there are only 18 months remaining before we are faced with the possibility that our military may not be mission capable because of the year 2000 date change.

The report states, and I quote from the committee report:

> The committee believes it would be irresponsible not to make available as soon as possible additional funding which could be used during fiscal year 1999 to implement and test essential fixes to national security-related information systems, as well as to develop contingency plans to assure continuity of essential operations in the event needed fixes are not in place.

The Republican majority on the Committee on Appropriations did exactly the right thing by making available $1.6 billion for the year 2000 fix for the Department of Defense and intelligence agencies and by designating those funds as emergency spending.

But after the committee had reported this bill, the Republican leadership instructed the Republican majority on the Committee on Rules to strip this critical funding from the bill and, in doing so, ignore the importance of making these monies available as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are going to say, and we just heard them say that they have removed these funds because the President did not request enough money, because they are budget-busting funds, and because we can come back later this year and consider a supplemental appropriation that will include money for the year 2000 fix.

My answer to the Republican majority is as follows: It does not matter if the President did not request enough money. We need these funds to fix the well over 2 million computers and over 25,000 distinct computer systems within the Department of Defense that are embedded in weapons systems, are integral parts of command and control systems, satellite systems, the Global Positioning System, and on and on.

So I would ask, how can this money be considered budget-busting? I think this money is needed to fund a true emergency that will address the critical issue of ensuring that the 2,800 mission-critical computer networks within the Department of Defense and the intelligence community that contain an estimated 30 billion program instructions are, in fact, fixed.

During the hearing on this rule yesterday, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) announced that the funds for the Defense Department year 2000 fix, as well as year 2000 funds for every other department and agency of the Federal Government, would be included in a supplemental appropriation to be considered later in the year. He stated that those supplemental funds would be offset with domestic spending cuts.

Mr. Speaker, the plan announced by the gentleman from New York for addressing the year 2000 problem is a recipe for disaster.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we may not be able to consider a supplemental appropriation at a later date, because the date is June 24 and we are adjourning tomorrow for 2 weeks, and we have for all intents and purposes only 30 days or so in which to complete all the business required of us before we go home to face the voters. I, for one, do not want to face the voters in my Congressional District having failed to address this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I want every Member to be perfectly clear what is going to happen because the Republican leadership has stripped year 2000 money from this bill and from the Treasury-Postal appropriations legislation. If such a supplemental as the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) envisions ever sees the light of day, it should be understood that the money in the supplemental will not necessarily be designated as emergency spending. This is an important point because as non-emergency spending, year 2000 funds totaling $3.85 billion will have to be offset, and they will be offset from domestic spending.

What the gentleman from New York has offered is a no-win proposition, because $3.85 billion in additional domestic cuts cannot easily happen. The gentleman's plan, which I assume is the Republican leadership's plan, is a plan for failure. The Republican leadership is playing a dangerous game by stripping these funds from the Defense and Treasury-Postal appropriations bills, and for that reason, I intend to oppose this rule.

We have an opportunity in this rule to make the funds available now to the Department of Defense and to the intelligence community which will allow them to find the programmers that can be trusted to work on these systems so that we will know that we have done our part in protecting our national security as the clock ticks towards January 1, 2000. But we can only do so, Mr. Speaker, by restoring the funds to the bill under an emergency designation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of this body to act responsibly and to vote ''no'' on this rule.

The Republicans are telling this body, ''Trust us. Trust us.'' Now, what we know as the Defense appropriations bill has to pass. We are not going to leave here without a Defense appropriations bill. We are not going to leave here without a Treasury appropriations bill. But we can leave here without a supplemental bill. There is no reason a supplemental bill has to pass prior to October 1, 1998. And there is no reason to believe that a supplemental bill constructed with additional domestic offsets is going to pass this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, excusing the expression, our colleagues on the other side are

playing Russian roulette, Russian roulette with our national security, because they are not willing to fund in this bill the money to repair and to make sure that our computer systems are adequate and are ready for the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, otherwise. And it is one that deserves the support of every Member. We have a commitment to our military forces to ensure that they have the best equipment available today and that work proceeds to ensure that they will have the best available in the years to come. Equipment, pay raises, operation and management, planning and logistics are all part of this bill that is designed to ensure that our Nation is strong and that our Nation is secure.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not do all of the job. By deleting the emergency funding for the year 2000 fix, my Republican colleagues have stuck their head in the sand. They may say the President has stuck his head in the sand, but he has got a Republican ostrich standing right next to him, deep, deep in the sand.

This bill will leave us exposed, and it is for that reason that I oppose this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am ready to concede that it is clear that the majority is a lot better at responsibility than it is at rhetoric. For that reason we are taking a fiscally responsive approach to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Glens Falls, New York (Mr. SOLOMON), chairman of the Committee on Rules, to demonstrate that point.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I seldom get upset, and even when I do, I smile about it. I am trying not to smile about it, because there is nothing more than politics being played here today.

Mr. Speaker, we have a problem with the computers in 2000. And, yes, it has to be dealt with and it has to be dealt with in a timely manner. But the truth is, after I hear the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) my good friend, and my very good friend, stand up here and start blaming Republicans, turning this into some kind of a political debate over this issue, I just get terribly upset.

Now, if they were sincere on that side of the aisle, the President of the United States, whether we like him or do not like him, would have asked for this. And when we read the administration's position on this bill, they never asked for it because they know it is part of an ongoing process that we are putting together, not only with the Defense Department but with every other department of government where we have 25 million computers out there. So to stand up here and try to make it a political issue in my opinion is just irresponsible nonsense.

Now, the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), I see him over there, is one of the most outstanding and respected Members of this body who has done yeoman's work on this, one of the most important bills that will come before this Chamber in any given day in any given year.

Even though we are severely underfunded in the Defense appropriations bill, as we are in the Defense authorization bill this year, we are probably $40 billion a year short if we are going to provide adequate research and development and procurement for our young men and women who, God forbid, ever have to go into combat, we ought to give them the very best we can. And we are not doing that, and we should all be severely criticized for it. But under the budgetary constraints that the gentleman from Florida has to live with, this is a very, very important measure.

Let me also thank him for adopting and agreeing to have me self-execute into the bill a Solomon amendment which would prohibit the Department of Defense from contracting or subcontracting with people who have been convicted of unlawful manufacture of the sale of Congressional Medals of Honor.

That has been happening in this country. There has been an industry that is actually manufacturing and selling these to people who do not deserve them, and they are running around flashing their Congressional Medals of Honor around this country. That is outrageous.

The fact is that my amendment would prohibit that company and any other company which is convicted of manufacturing these medals and then selling them on the public market from doing any business with the Department of Defense over the next 15 years.

Right now, there is no law against it. There is a very, very minor fine. This particular industry was fined a very small amount, something like $5,000. Well, it ought to be a serious offense for doing that. And this amendment would prohibit it. I thank the gentleman for accepting my amendment.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, sometimes Members of the minority have to take time to spell out what the majority is doing, because it appears that the thought police in the majority caucus prevent many people on the majority side from expressing what it is that they are really doing, even those who disagree with what they are doing.

The committee originally decided that this computer 2000 problem was so severe that it justified being handled as an emergency, and they put the money in this bill and in the Treasury-Postal bill to deal with it. Now, because of an internal revolution once again in the Republican Caucus, this emergency money is being taken out and we are being told: ''Well, do not worry, we are going to gather it all together in some supplemental bill. We will deal with it at some future time. We do not know how we will pay for it, but it will be out of mandatory programs.''

They leave us wondering, number one, whether they will ever be able to pass that emergency legislation at all. Secondly, they leave us wondering if they do target mandatory programs, whether it will be Medicare or whether it will be Social Security or what programs they will go after in order to fund this emergency when they get around to feeling that it is really an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that there was a very good reason why the committee put this money in in the first place. It is a ''little'' problem if all of a sudden in the year 2000 our FAA computers go dark. I would not want to be in a plane flying around the country that day. It is going to be a ''little bit'' of a problem if Social Security cannot write its checks. It is going to be a ''little bit'' of a problem if the veterans all of the sudden do not get their checks. It is going to be a problem if the health care providers do not get their Medicare checks from the government.

And as far as the Defense Department is concerned, we are talking about missile-critical systems. The NORAD ballistic missile early-warning system relies on computers and they could have a serious problem. The Global Positioning System is another system that could be in trouble.

□ 1715

The military pay system could be in trouble. As Deputy Defense Secretary Hamre testified, ''failure of a microchip in a critical, large or dangerous piece of machinery, loss of air pressure in an F–15 or submerged submarines can be devastating or even life threatening.''

And I would ask, what happens about Russian concerns over the year Y2K problem? What happens if the Russians' early warning attack system goes haywire on January 1, 2000? How will they respond? Will they think that we caused the problem? Are their offensive nuclear systems safe from computer malfunction? Well, I tell my colleagues, we do not know. Because we do not know, this money should stay in this bill, and that is why the responsible vote for national security is to vote against this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS).

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me the time.

When we get into the discussion of this bill, one provision that will come up for review, I think, is section 8106, which will limit the expenditure of funds in this bill for offensive military purposes except when taken in accordance with Article I, section 8 of the

Constitution. Members probably realize this is the War Powers Clause, which vests in Congress the authority to decide when the United States commences, initiates offensive military action.

I believe the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) in his remarks suggested this section was referred to the War Powers Act. It is, in fact, the constitutional provision—the War Powers Clause.

I just wanted to take a minute on the rule to lay a bit of the groundwork for this in light of recent practices by Presidents of the United States.

Members have said, why do we need to do this? We are sort of restating the Constitution. I think it is very instructive about the need for this body and this Congress to reassert its position regarding war powers, if we review what this administration's and the preceding administration's positions have been with regard to the really unrestrained authority, as they see it, of the President of the United States to initiate military action in behalf of the Nation.

For example, when I pressed the Secretary of State during her appropriations hearing earlier in this year for an explanation of the authority that the administration believed it had then to initiate further attacks against Iraq, we were provided, finally, last week with the Secretary's explanation.

A very telling provision in that submission for the RECORD reads as follows:

> These provisions should be understood in the light of the President's constitutional authority as Commander in Chief to use armed forces to protect our national interests.

This is about as expansive a definition of presidential authority under the Constitution as is imaginable and, I suggest, is a very dangerous assertion by the executive, if left unchallenged by the legislative branch.

Yesterday we received a statement of administration policy threatening a veto of this bill if section 8106 remains in it. And in that statement of administration policy, the following statement appears. And I quote: ''The President must be able to act decisively to protect U.S. national security and foreign policy interests.''

In other words, the administration is asserting that it has authority to use the military forces of the United States according to its definitions of national security and foreign policy interests.

I think Members will understand that this runs afoul of the limitation on the Commander in Chief's powers and those war powers reserved to the Congress by the Constitution.

Finally, we cite frequently President Bush's actions before the Persian Gulf War, in coming to Congress and the vote that we took at that time. Then, President Bush said, and I quote, ''I feel I have the authority to fully implement the U.N. resolutions.''

As he signed the resolution authorizing the Persian Gulf War, he said,

> My request for congressional support did not, and my signing this resolution does not constitute any change in the longstanding positions on either the President's constitutional authority to use the armed forces to defend vital U.S. interests.

So this is a recurring problem. It is past time that the legislative branch reasserted its constitutional authority.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Greater San Dimas, California (Mr. DREIER), very distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Sanibel for yielding me this time.

I am very pleased that the chairman of the Committee on Rules is still here in the Chamber because I would like to rise in very strong support of this rule, because I think that if one were to look at the preamble of the U.S. Constitution, it is very clear that this appropriation bill that we are going to consider is the single most important appropriation bill that we will ever consider here.

Why? Because providing for the common defense, as stated in the preamble, is our top priority. We know that there are a wide range of issues with which we deal in this institution, ranging from health care, education, a wide range of things, all of which, all of which can be dealt with by local and State governments and individuals in many cases. But when it comes to our Nation's security, there is no level of government, city, county, State, and individuals cannot unilaterally provide for our common defense. So that is why the measure which the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will be bringing forward as this rule is passed is the single most important appropriation bill that the Congress considers.

Having said that, I believe that there are a number of things that need to be brought to light. I know that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), have spent a great deal of time working, thoughtfully, in a bipartisan way on this. But I am one who believes that as we have looked at national security threats that have come to the forefront just over the past several months, whether it was the potential transfer of technology to the People's Republic of China, the nuclear proliferation and testing that has taken place in India and Pakistan, if we look at the very, very dangerous Korean peninsula, we look at developments in the Middle East, it is obvious that we need to do what we can to enhance our defense capabilities.

As was said by the ranking minority member of the subcommittee before the Committee on Rules, he has talked time and time again with the President. The President calls for the deployment of troops to deal with very serious situations throughout the world, and yet we do not always provide the necessary resources for those troops.

I was told not long ago that we have troops in 65 countries throughout the world. Yet since we have seen the demise of the Soviet Union, we have cut back, we have cut back dramatically.

We all are very pleased that the Soviet bear is now history, but we do still live in a very dangerous world. That is why I strongly support the work of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and then some.

I hope very much that we will recognize that we can do more. But as we look at this very important question that has come to the forefront on the so-called Y2K problem and the argument that was provided that funding that was necessary was going to be in the defense appropriations bill and the Treasury/postal appropriations bill, it is obvious that the problem is a very, very serious one.

If we look at the statement of administration policy that came out, first on the DOD appropriation bill, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has provided me with this; it is very important in looking at the Y2K issue. The statement from the administration is: The administration appreciates the emphasis that the committee has placed on Year 2000, the Y2K computer conversion activities.

And so obviously there is recognition and support for that. But then when one looks at the Treasury and general government appropriations bill for fiscal year 1999, on this same issue the administration says: At this time we believe that the resource levels included in the President's budget will fully address Y2K computer conversion requirements governmentwide.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that we have made the decision that we want to do this in a supplemental is that most everyone has acknowledged that the governmentwide problem impacts all 13 of the appropriations bills. This is a very, very far-reaching issue. There are reports coming right now that a particular airline will in fact not fly any aircraft on the first day of the year 2000. There are reports that we could potentially see, we know all kinds of very dangerous things that could happen, but possibly we could see a blockage of the flow of fuel throughout this country and other parts of the world.

Then, of course, as came up during the discussion on the DOD appropriations bill in the Committee on Rules, the potential problem that could exist with computers in other parts of the world, in fact, with countries that have nuclear capability. This is a very, very serious and frightening issue, and that is why, while we see this statement made in the Treasury report of administration policy that they are satisfied with what was there in the administration's budget, we believe very strongly

that this needs to be looked at governmentwide in an even more serious way and a more intense way.

Now, a statement was made earlier by one of my colleagues that it has been decided that funding for this will come from mandatory spending, that decision has not yet been made.

I will say that while the President has said that he wants every nickel of the budget surplus to be expended on Social Security, the thing that concerns us greatly is that some who are looking to deal with this issue simply want it to come from the surplus. We do not know exactly how it is going to be paid for yet, whether it is mandatory or discretionary. But it seems to me that we will be doing everything that we possibly can to deal as responsibly as possible with this.

I thank my friend for yielding me this time, and I urge support of this rule and the measure.

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

I, of course, was quoting the chairman of the Committee on Rules when I said this was going to come out of mandatory spending. My friends over there, I guess, have adopted the ostrich as the official bird of the Republican Party because they want to stick their head in the sand. They do not want to appropriate any money for this problem. It is a very, very interesting position.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW).

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote no on this DOD rule because of the serious omission of funding for the Year 2000 problem.

We cannot provide for our common defense if the DOD computers do not work on January 1, 2000. At the DOD, we have computers and microchips that operate everything from elevators to guided missiles. DOD relies on computers to do payroll processing, retirement benefits, operate weapons systems, order supplies, the list goes on and on. This is just in one important department. The list goes on throughout the Federal Government as well as the private sector.

If computer systems were to fail, it would not only compromise the DOD's ability to run its day-to-day operations but it would compromise the Nation's security as well.

DOD is currently on OMB's watch list of agencies which must do a better job in fixing their Y2K problem. This rule, this budget, without necessary funding, does not help.

We need to be focusing on tackling the problem instead of playing games. And I am very concerned. This issue affects each and every one of the men and women and children in this country. At this point in time, what we have are folks playing games on the issue and not being willing to address it.

□ 1730

This should not, Mr. Speaker, be a partisan issue. It is an issue that affects all of us. We will all suffer the consequences if we do not address it. It is irresponsible to proceed on this rule without the necessary funding for the year 2000 problem. I would urge very strongly a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HEFNER), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, we have got an excellent defense bill. Our chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), has done a tremendous job.

But the chairman of the Committee on Rules made a statement a while ago that we are playing politics with the Nation's defense, but this goes back beyond this bill. This goes back to when we were considering the budget. We had a rule that came in here on a budget, that there were two budgets that were offered, and they eliminated one of the budgets that could be offered because they were afraid it was going to pass.

Then we beat our chest and said we have balanced the budget. We have sent out press releases. We have finally accomplished a balanced budget.

Now here we are. We set caps. We put caps on this budget, and we are trying to find ways to break the caps. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Neumann) over here who is a strong supporter of the Kasich budget, they are trying to break the agreement that they made on the balanced budget and the Kasich budget.

If this is a problem that has to be fixed, it has to be fixed. It is something that is going to come. We do not know the exact day, but it is coming. My colleagues talk about playing politics with it. This is an unfortunate situation.

I plan to vote for the budget because I believe that this is a good bill. But we have played too many games with this budget, and it is going to come back to haunt us because we are not going to be able to maintain a balanced budget and stay within these caps unless you cut some of the programs that are so vital to the American people.

I do not believe that the American people want to cut Medicare. I do not believe they want to cut lunch programs for kids, and Medicaid. It is just not going to happen. We are going to find ourselves in a situation where we are either going to have to have a tremendous continuing resolution or close the government down.

Unfortunately, this debate has to come on this defense bill, but it is what you get into when you play games with big numbers. It is like the old saying goes: Figures do not lie, but liars figure.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire what the allowances of time might be for both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule. Striking the bill's provisions providing $1.6 billion in emergency funding for the year 2000 computer crisis is truly a very dangerous move. Unless corrected on time, the year 2000 date change will cause malfunctions or the total shutdown of the Pentagon's computer network, with devastating consequences.

The communications system linking United States forces together across the globe so that they can respond to threats to our security at any time that is at risk. The basic navigational system used by U.S. military and civilians around the world involved in commercial trade and travel are jeopardized. The payroll system that ensures that millions of soldiers and military retirees receive compensation for the sacrifices that they have made to protect our freedom, these are threatened.

The GAO reports said that at the current rate it will take 3½ years for the Pentagon to correct its year 2000 problems. But there are only 18 months until the first day of the year 2000. We need to speed up the progress.

This should not be a political issue. Once again, my Republican colleagues do not seem to get the message. Once again, they play politics with a deadly serious issue. To appease the right wing of their party, they are truly willing to compromise. Compromise on what? The future safety of the entire Nation.

Stop the games. Protect our Nation. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by way of introduction, I want to read a quote from the National Journal. And I am quoting. It may possibly be of interest to some of our guests in the room.

''Gore has said virtually nothing about it. Indeed, he has rejected pleas by industry leaders and legislators to play a larger role.'' We are talking about year 2000 here. ''Back in January, Morella buttonholed Gore at a White House photo op and urged him to lead the Nation's repair effort, but Gore balked, saying it would take too much of his time, Morella recounted. And then, according to Morella, he paused and said 'Maybe you should do it.' ''

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I know the Vice President was joshing when he put it all in my hands. On the other hand, it has been well over 2 years that we in Congress, on two subcommittees in particular, have been having hearings.

When you take the number of hearings that we have had on the mother of

all computer glitches, the year 2000 need for compliance in all of our computers, then with all of the committees that have had hearings, I think the total is something like 25 hearings.

In January I had the honor of giving the radio address in response to the President's address, in which I asked the President to use the bully pulpit, to issue an executive order to appoint a year 2000 computer czar. Finally, in February, John Koskinen was appointed. He started in March. He is trying very hard to spend his time getting government compliance as well as looking at the private sector, State and local government, as well as internationally.

But, my friends, we are moving too slowly. We have legislatively, in Congress, had on bills the idea of quarterly reports, a CIO, a national strategy, and now we are going to accelerate it with monthly reports. But the point is this has been in the offing. The President has not requested the money for this.

What will be happening is not that the year 2000 will be forgotten, because it cannot be. It is an unrelenting deadline that we are going to have to face. We are going to have to face it also with contingency plans.

So being crafted will be a supplemental appropriation to cover not only Department of Defense and its needs for compliance, which are very critical, but to cover all of the other agencies of government. We will be able to look at that and know that this is the money that is going to be going, probably $5 billion, to cover what is needed with all of the agencies.

One final point is that, when the original request of the agencies was made in terms of what will the cost be of putting us into compliance, $2.3 billion was the estimate; and now the estimate, my friends, is $5 billion. I will submit that that still is probably not going to cover the total costs.

So we need to move on it, but please do not think that Congress has not been there on the forefront time and time again, over and over again, urging that we face this problem and that we expeditiously lead the world in terms of going into compliance. It also is going to affect computer chips, which may mean high-rise buildings, elevators, security systems, as well as our major DoD systems, too.

So I would submit it is not forgotten. It will be coming up in a supplemental appropriations bill, and Congress can say we have been leading the way.

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

Mr. Speaker, this reminds me of the white rabbit in Alice in Wonderland. ''I'm late. I'm late. I'm late for a very important date. Hello. Good-bye. Hello. Good-bye. I'm late.'' The Republicans are saying they are late, but they do not want to put any money in the bill to take care of the problem. This is extraordinary.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule which I do not think moves us forward, but in fact takes us a step backwards in addressing an issue that is vital to our national security.

The year 2000 problem is a far cry from some Orson Welles spoof. Rather, the inability of many government and in fact private sector computers to correctly recognize the date after the year 2000 is a problem that can have dramatic impacts on our financial markets, payments of Social Security, Medicare benefits, and certainly our national defense system.

The Committee on Appropriations wisely made the decision to provide $1.6 billion for the so-called Y2K reprogramming in this legislation for a very good reason. If the computer problems are not remedied, the change could cause total shutdown of many systems upon which the defense community relies.

There are approximately 2,800 critical computer networks and systems at DoD. So far, less than 30 percent of those systems have had the year 2000 problem fixed, including those that control the Global Positioning System, the ballistic missile attack early warning system. We have heard all of these before.

Some of my colleagues have suggested that we repackage these funds into a so-called emergency spending bill much like the one introduced earlier this year that, frankly, has been sitting untouched for 6 months. We cannot wait 6 months. We cannot wait 6 weeks. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we need to address this problem now. The GAO estimates at current pace it will take more than 3½ years for DoD to fix the problem in the remainder of its systems.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule. We cannot wait. This critical problem needs to be addressed now. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the subcommittee, who is going to perform on this and I hope to tell us the merits of this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to address the issue of the rule. Following adoption of the rule, we are going to be debating a lot of the issues about the bill itself.

When we get into the bill itself shortly and, hopefully, my colleagues will hear from me and others that this is a good bill as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. There are many, many requirements for our own national security effort that we are not meeting in this bill because of the lack of funds. But we need to get this rule adopted so that we can get to this bill, get it into conference, and do the best we can to provide for a strong national security.

I want to note with appreciation the gentleman on the minority side who has presented their case on this rule today, because he has always been a strong supporter of national defense. Some of those votes were fairly close on occasion. I appreciate that support.

But now to have this fuss on this rule about the Y2K problem I think is maybe just not ''I'm late, I'm late, I'm late,'' as the gentleman from Texas said, but the fact is that maybe someone else is late, but not necessarily us.

When the subcommittee met, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and I worked together for weeks and weeks and weeks to present a bill that we thought met the requirements of the national security requirements with the few dollars available.

We decided that the Y2K problem was important. We were, frankly, amazed that we had no requests from the administration for the Y2K solution. We do not know what the solution is today, but we know we better get started sooner rather than later, or we are really going to be ''I'm late, I'm late, I'm late'' as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has suggested.

So we did this. The full committee agreed to this. There was some debate about it. The full committee agreed to it. But subsequently the Committee on Rules decided, along with the leadership of the majority party, that the Y2K problem in the Defense bill, and the Y2K problem provided for in the Treasury, Postal bill and other defense issues should be taken from the respective bills and put into one freestanding bill that would call attention to the fact that there was a serious problem with the Y2K issue. At the stroke of midnight on December 31, 1999, we are going to encounter a serious problem, if in fact we do not solve the problem prior to that time.

□ 1745

I listened to the speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). It was basically the same speech that I made in the committee and at the Committee on Rules and at other places, and I agree. The gentleman from Wisconsin and I do not agree all that often, but I agree with the things that he said, because he said the same things I had been saying.

I will make it a little more of a concern for Members. In the Defense Department, there are approximately 2 million computers. There are 25,000 computer systems in the Defense Department. Two thousand eight hundred of those computer systems are mission critical. Only about a third of those are able to deal with the Y2K problem. So we do have to move ahead and settle this issue. What we need to do is adopt this rule, get this bill passed in the House, get in the conference and make way for the freestanding bill that is going to provide the money for Y2K and other emergency issues.

Let us not make this a political football. This defense bill has not been political since I have been here, since the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

MURTHA) was chairman, since I have been chairman. It has never been political. National defense, national security, and intelligence should never be political. The interest of the Nation has got to be above the interest of the politicians.

Mr. Speaker, I say, let us pass the previous question, let us pass the rule, let us get into the bill and let us move along so that we can then get to the freestanding bill that will provide for the emergency funding that we need to address this emergency issue.

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

Mr. Speaker, people watching this debate must be scratching their heads and saying, now, these people on the other side of the aisle, they say there is a big problem here, there is a real big problem but they do not want to vote any money to correct it. What is going on here? I sympathize with folks who are viewing this debate. There is something very missing. What is missing is money to solve this problem now that we all recognize.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on National Security and one of the true experts and champions of defense in this House.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the ability to address what I consider one of the serious problems that we face in defense. The chairman just said, and I agree with him completely, we are far short of the amount of money we need in order to address the tempo of operations that the President has set for this country. I agree with the fact that we have to deploy troops, that we have to lead throughout the world. But, on the other hand, I worry when we do not have enough money in order to fund the tempo of operations, and consequently our readiness is slipping. But we are even shorter than that. We are $10 billion short in procurement. Technology is what did so well in the Gulf War. We have trucks that are out of date, we have airplanes that are out of date, we have helicopters out of date. So we have real problems. But one of the most serious problems that we face today is the Y2K problem if we do not address this problem. We have, as the chairman just stated, 2,800 mission critical systems in the Defense Department. It would take them 3 years at the rate we are going in order to correct those problems. We sat down in subcommittee, and I do not believe we have had a vote for 5 years in that subcommittee. We have always worked it out, unanimously, so that everybody agreed. We listened to new members, we listened to members that had been there and we have always come to an agreement without a vote over the 5-year period. In this particular case, the President did not ask for this money, and I think he made a mistake. He should have asked for the money. But we believe, as we have many times in the past, that we not only need the money that is there, we need more money, and one of the things that has to be done is to fix this problem.

How do we fix the problem? We do not have any extra money. We could not take money out of recruiting. They are 7,000 short in the Navy. The Army is having trouble recruiting. They are paying a bonus to the Air Force of $100,000 now over a 5-year period in order to recruit. There is no money anyplace else. So we believe it was enough of an emergency that we should declare an emergency and make the request, as we have done in the 20 something years that we have been on the committee many, many times, we have made emergency decisions, declared emergencies and put extra money in because we felt it was important to the security of this great country. We unanimously agreed to that. We went to the full committee, and the full committee almost unanimously agreed.

What worries me is that if we pass this rule, we will then be in a position where we have to depend on somebody else later on solving the problem. I have heard it was not going to be offset and I have heard it is going to be offset.

I think we ought to have a freestanding vote, and I think we ought to let the Committee on Rules go back and give us a rule where we can vote on whether this should be an emergency, and I think we would find a majority of the Members in this House would agree, Republicans and Democrats, in a bipartisan manner would agree that this should be an emergency situation, that we should vote the almost $2 billion for Y2K and for computer security, both those being essential to the many mission critical systems that we have available in this country today.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Members of the House to think hard, to vote this rule down, to let the Committee on Rules go back and set up another rule and give us a vote, let us make a decision without voting this down and then later on having to depend on somebody else to maybe offset it from programs that we do not like so the Defense Department does not get what it wants and we offset things that are already cut to the bone. I would request the Members to vote this rule down, and then consider a separate vote on the extra money.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. We have heard the very articulate statement of the ranking member of the Subcommittee on National Security, one of the truly bipartisan members when it comes to defense. It is a travesty, it is ridiculous that this bill does not include money to address the year 2000 problem. Republicans should join with Democrats in rejecting this rule. Vote ''no'' on the rule and fund the year 2000 problem now.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that the ranking member has indeed made a point of view about the urgency of the need for dealing with the Y2K problem. In my opening remarks, I stated that we indeed have plans to provide dollars to deal with those issues despite the fact that the administration seems to have overlooked this matter. So I guess I would simply say that the lack of planning on the part of the administration should not precipitate a crisis on the majority side of the House, or in the House at all, and it will not. We have an orderly and fiscally responsible way to proceed to deal with Y2K, and I would daresay our track record on Y2K is a whole lot better than the administration's so far, and I think that that has been carefully articulated and accurately articulated by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the vice chairman of the Committee on Rules reading from the administration's statement, and from the distinguished chairman of the appropriations subcommittee who is the coauthor of this legislation.

So it seems to me that we all agree that there is a need to deal with a problem that the administration has overlooked and we have indeed said that we are going to do it in a thoughtful, orderly and responsible way; and, therefore, there is no reason at all to vote against the rule.

There is, however, a problem. But the dime is not the problem. Getting off the dime is the problem. Those who would like to help the majority on this side might like to communicate with the White House about getting off the dime and helping us deal with Y2K, because indeed it is a serious problem. Behind all of the Y2K issue which has come up, we know that there is a very serious, necessary piece of legislation for this body, and that is appropriating sufficient funds for the defense of our Nation and our national security, and that includes our intelligence capabilities as well. This bill, I believe, does that well. I believe the rule is certainly an appropriate rule for the circumstances that we have that deal with the issue. I think that all parties have understood that we have a plan to deal with the money issue for the Y2K on a governmentwide basis that will solve not only the problem for the Defense Department but for those other computers that run those elevators and airplanes and other things that have been talked about.

All of this having been said, I believe that the right statement, that we cannot wait, is correct. We cannot wait. We should pass this rule right now, and get on with the debate, and then pass the defense appropriations bill. Therefore, I urge support for the rule.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest the political game this rule plays on this most crucial of deadlines: the Year 2000.

We can fix this problem. There is a winning solution. But we must address it today.

The American people have seen us hold emergency bills hostage, even shut down the government over certain disputes.

This is one area where America can no longer tolerate delay. This is a critical emergency, as important as any natural disaster. It is a matter of national security that we directly appropriate money to fix the Year 2000 problem.

In addition to the technical problems, we have a perception problem. If the American people think there is a problem, they will react accordingly and we could face a national panic.

I urge opposing this rule, unless we allow the immediate appropriation of funds to fix this problem as soon as we can. We are already almost out of time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 201, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

YEAS—221

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mink
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—201

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Baesler
Cannon
Dingell
Fawell
Gonzalez
Hamilton
Hutchinson
Markey
McDade
Slaughter
Solomon

□ 1814

Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. ABERCROMBIE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 259 through 265 yesterday and today. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall votes 259, 263 and 264, and would have voted ''no'' on rollcall votes 260, 261 and 265.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my statement appear in the permanent RECORD immediately following each vote.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). The Chair wishes to remind Members that in order to maintain decorum and dignity in the Hall of the House, proper dress for male Members should include the wearing of a coat and tie. The Chair encourages Members to adhere to this historic standard.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4112, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–601) on the resolution (H. Res. 489) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4112) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2676, THE IRS RESTRUCTURING AND REFORM ACT OF 1998

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–602) on the resolution (H. Res. 490) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2676) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restructure and reform the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes,