Collins	Johnson, Sam	Regula
Combest	Jones (NC)	Reynolds
Cook	Kanjorski	Riley
Cooksey	Kaptur	Roemer
Costello	Kildee	Rogan
Cox	King (NY)	Rogers
Crane	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Crowley	Klink	Ros-Lehtinen
Cubin	Knollenberg	Royce
Cunningham	Kucinich	Ryan (WI)
Danner	LaFalce	Ryun (KS)
Davis (VA)	LaHood	Salmon
Deal	Largent	Sanford
DeLay	Latham	Saxton
DeMint	LaTourette	Scarborough
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Schaffer
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Sessions
Doyle	Linder	Shadegg
Dreier	Lipinski	Shimkus
Duncan	LoBiondo	Shows
Ehlers	Lucas (KY)	Shuster
Emerson	Lucas (OK)	Simpson
English	Manzullo	Skeen
Everett	Mascara	Skelton
Ewing	McCollum	Smith (MI)
Fletcher	McCrery	Smith (NJ)
Forbes	McHugh	Smith (TX)
Fossella	McInnis	Souder
Gallegly	McIntosh	Spence
Ganske	McIntyre	Stearns
Gekas	McKeon	Stenholm
Gibbons	McNulty	Stump
Gillmor	Metcalf	Stupak
Goode	Mica	Sununu
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Sweeney
Goodling	Moakley	Talent
Goss	Mollohan	Tancredo
Graham	Moran (KS)	Tauzin
Granger	Murtha	Taylor (MS)
Green (WI)	Myrick	Taylor (NC)
Gutknecht	Nethercutt	Terry
Hall (OH)	Ney	Thornberry
Hall (TX)	Northup	Thune
Hansen	Norwood	Tiahrt
Hastings (WA)	Nussle	Toomey
Hayes	Oberstar	Traficant
Hayworth	Ortiz	Upton
Hefley	Oxley	Vitter
Herger	Packard	Walsh
Hill (MT)	Paul	Wamp
Hilleary	Pease	Watkins
Hobson	Peterson (MN)	Watts (OK)
Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (FL)
Holden	Petri	Weldon (PA)
Hostettler	Phelps	Weller
Hulshof	Pickering	Weygand
Hunter	Pitts	Whitfield
Hutchinson	Pombo	Wicker
Hyde	Portman	Wilson
Istook	Quinn	Wolf
Jenkins	Radanovich	Young (AK)
John	Rahall	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Brown (CA)	Kasich	Stark
Hinchey	Sherwood	Visclosky

□ 2033

Ms. MCKINNEY changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT TO REPORT ON H.R. 1000, AVIATION INVESTMENT AND REFORM ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be permitted to file a supplemental report to report number 106–167, which accompanied the bill (H.R. 1000) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

The supplemental report contains the CBO cost estimate for the bill.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. 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 H.R. 1401.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KIND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONTROLS ON EXPORTATION OF TECHNOLOGY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a very important policy issue in this country and that is the policy of export controls and specifically the controls that we place on the exportation of technology.

There has been a lot of talk about this issue today on the national defense bill, a lot of concerns about the exportation of technology. And I want to make a national security argument for changing some of those controls and allowing actually for the greater exportation of technology.

We heard a lot of talk today about the dangers of technology and what it can do to our national security. I think this is a misguided policy based on Cold War philosophies that fail to recognize the changes that have taken place in our economy and the emergence of a new information-based economy and what that means for all manner of policy decisions, particularly in the area of exportation of technology.

The situation we have right now is we have very strict restrictions on exportation of certain technology, most notably encryption software and any sort of so-called supercomputer. I say ''so-called'' because, basically, the laptops that we have on our desks today just a couple of years ago were considered supercomputers. That shows how fast computers advance and how much our policy fails to keep up with it.

The national security argument that I wish to make is based on the fact that our national security is best protected by making sure that the United States maintains its leadership role in the technology economy, maintains a situation where we in the U.S. have the best encryption software and the best computers.

If we place restrictions on the exportation of that technology, that will soon fail to be the case. We will cease to be the leaders in this technology area and we will cease to be able to provide that very important R&D to the military that enables them to be the leaders in technology.

Our current policies are creating a situation where more and more countries of the world have to go elsewhere to get access to either encryption software or computers of any kind. And that is a very important point in this debate.

The limitations that we place on the exportation of technology is based on two premises. One is correct but misinterpreted, and the other is incorrect. The one that is correct but misinterpreted is that technology matters in