United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1999 No. 65

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Dr. Ronald F. Christian, Chaplain, Lutheran Social Services, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Together with the Psalmist, we say, ''Hear my prayer, O Lord, and give ear to my cry; . . . for I am a passing guest, a sojourner like all my fathers.''

O God, on the day of national prayer, when people of many traditions and from a variety of national origins speak to You in many languages and address You with many different holy names, we pray,

Withhold not Your kindness from us for our failure to practice mercy to our neighbor while we request and expect Your mercy for ourselves. We pray,

Deliver us from a selfish pride that would allow even our faith in You to be understood as a sign of Your individual favoritism for us. We pray,

Guide us into ways of wisdom which would teach us the value You have for each person, the gift You have given to every human and the hope You have buried deep in the heart of all people. We pray,

Give us joy in our community, satisfaction in our labor, compassion for our neighbor, and peace in our relationships.

This day, O God, we join with many to give You our thanks and to promise again to love You with our whole heart and our neighbor as ourselves.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MURTHA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 432. An act to designate the North/South Center as the Dante B. Fascell North-South Center.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 1 minutes at the end of the business of the day.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 1555, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

(Mrs. MYRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I asked to address the House for the purpose of making an announcement. I rise to inform the House of the Committee on Rules' plans in regard to H.R. 1555, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

The Committee on Rules is planning to meet during the week of May 10 to grant a rule for the consideration of H.R. 1555, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. The Committee on Rules may grant a rule for H.R. 1555 which would require that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, if this type of rule is granted, amendments to be preprinted would need to be signed by the Member and submitted to the Speaker's table. Amendments would still need to be consistent with House rules and would be given no special protection by being printed. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House. It is not necessary to submit amendments to the Committee on Rules or to testify as long as the amendments comply with the rules of the House.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1664, KOSOVO AND SOUTHWEST ASIA EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 159 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 159

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1664) making emergency supplemental appropriations for military operations, refugee relief, and humanitarian assistance relating to the conflict in Kosovo, and for military operations in Southwest Asia 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 4 of rule XIII 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

Printed on recycled paper.

on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment printed in the report may be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report 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 8 of rule XVIII. 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. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill 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. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule for H.R. 1664, the Kosovo Operations Supplemental Appropriations Act. The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4 of Rule XIII requiring a 3-day layover of the committee report and requiring 3-day availability of printed hearings on a general appropriations bill and section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 prohibiting consideration of legislation within the Committee on the Budget's jurisdiction unless reported by the Committee on the Budget.

The rules provide for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The bill waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI prohibiting unauthorized or legislative appropriations in a general appropriations bill.

The rule provides that before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules.

The rule makes in order amendments printed in the report accompanying this resolution which may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified, shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or the Committee of the Whole.

The rule waives all points of order against amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report.

The rule waives points of order during consideration of the bill against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of Rule XXI prohibiting non-emergency designated amendments to be offered on an appropriations bill containing an emergency designation.

The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce votes to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provide for 1 motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 159 is a fair rule. It is an open rule that permits any Member to offer any amendment to the bill as long as the amendment does not violate House rules.

The President's military campaign in Kosovo has put many of us in a tough spot. Like all Members, I support our troops, and I always support a strong national defense. I have strong reservations though about the President's decision to wage an ill-defined and possibly disastrous war in Yugoslavia because this war is draining our military resources, making it harder to meet threats in other areas of the world such as Iraq and North Korea. Our rear flank is exposed, which puts our military in harm's way.

We must replenish our military readiness and supplies. Our young men and women in the military need and deserve that from this Congress. This rule will allow amendments to express Members' concerns about giving the President the tools to continue a never-ending conflict in the Balkans.

Because this Kosovo spending bill is controversial, all Members need to support this rule so we can have an open discussion on the floor. Instead of closing down debate on this important issue, the Committee on Rules has provided for a fair and open amendment process. Members will have the opportunity to vote the Kosovo spending bill up or down, if they wish to do so, but in an hour we are not voting on Kosovo spending, we are voting on an open rule that allows the House to work its will.

That is why we are here, to express our ideas and concerns and the opinions of the people back home whom we represent.

I urge my colleagues to support this open rule which allows any Member to offer any amendment as long as it does not violate the rules of the House.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rule which will allow consideration of H.R. 1664 which is the Defense and Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Bill for Fiscal Year 1999. The bill appropriates $12.9 billion in emergency supplemental funds mostly for military personnel, equipment, pay, retirement benefits and construction. As my colleague has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

□ 1015

Technically, this is an open rule. However, under the Rules of the House dealing with emergency supplemental appropriations, virtually all amendments, except cutting amendments, can be ruled out of order unless the Committee on Rules grants a waiver. Despite the numerous requests from House members, the Committee on Rules granted waivers for only three amendments and one of those was by the ranking minority Member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule does not open the process. This rule does not give the House an opportunity to work its will. Therefore, I will oppose the rule and I urge House Members to defeat it.

The emergency supplemental appropriation bill before us today is a fat, bloated bill, with misplaced priorities. It puts buildings ahead of people. It funds long-term investments but denies money to immediate needs. This rule will not give House Members the chance to correct that.

I am particularly disturbed because the Committee on Rules denied my request to offer a bipartisan Hall-Roukema amendment to provide $150 million in much needed food assistance to the Albanian Kosovar refugees and displaced persons in the Balkans.

Mr. Speaker, last weekend I went to Albania and Macedonia with a House delegation of 20 members, led by Majority Leader DICK ARMEY. We visited Stankovac 1, which is the largest refugee camp in Macedonia, which at that time housed 30,000 who were forced to flee from their homes in Kosovo.

This is only one of many refugee camps in the Balkans housing the victims of President Milosevic genocidal campaign of ethnic cleansing. Thousands more are arriving every day.

There is a critical need to feed these people. A report released last week by the U.N. World Food Programme calculated that 1.4 million refugees and misplaced people will need to be fed in the Balkans and that report estimated the cost of feeding them over the next 17 months to be almost $300 million.

The situation is getting worse. I quote from the World Food Programme report: The situation for displaced and other people inside Kosovo is certain to worsen because the entire food distribution system has ground to a halt.

Without this money, many of the refugees face malnutrition or starvation. If the United States shifted money from other emergency feed accounts to handle this crisis, then we would have to cut our assistance to southern Sudan, North Korea and the Horn of Africa, Bangladesh and other crises.

The bill does include $566 million for general humanitarian aid but this will be used mostly for medicine, shelter, sanitation. It is no substitute for food aid. Astonishingly the administration did not request any emergency funding through PL–480, which is the principal initial food assistance program. This is a sorry oversight. The Committee on Appropriations continued the glaring omission.

I note that PL–480 is one of the few forms of international food assistance that directly benefits hurting U.S. farmers.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that the purpose of NATO air strikes, which I support, are to protect the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo, but there is no point to an air war to save the Kosovars if we leave them to starve and to be malnourished in refugee camps.

Mr. Speaker, this emergency funding bill includes $156 million for military recruiting and advertising. It includes $1.1 billion for construction projects in Europe and Asia. We can, we must, include money to feed the very people this bill is intended to help. Food for the Kosovars is also an emergency.

Adding funding for PL–480 in this bill is supported by the Coalition for Food Aid, which includes World Vision, CARE, the Catholic Relief Service, Save the Children and other groups.

The failure of the world's biggest food producer to provide food to refugees fleeing starvation and brutality inside Kosovo is astounding. The Hall-Roukema amendment would have added about 1 percent to the cost of the bill, about $150 million.

The recent reports of food shortages in Kosovo suggests that Milosevic has added a new weapon in his campaign of ethnic cleansing: Hunger. Just as we are fighting the troops with air strikes, we should fight this new danger with food donations.

I want to thank my colleague the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) for her support of this amendment. Without money to take care of the food needs in the Balkans, the bill is seriously flawed, and by denying an opportunity to improve the bill this rule is fatally flawed. I urge a defeat of the rule.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the honorable chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I merely want to rise in support of this rule. The rule does provide for us an exciting day today in the House because there are a lot of different issues that are going to be addressed.

In many meetings, group sessions and one-on-one meetings that I have had leading up to today, I promised all of my colleagues that I would ask the Committee on Rules for an open rule so that Members could offer their amendments that would be germane and otherwise in order to the bill and let the majority work its will. That is exactly what I did. I did ask for an open rule. The Committee on Rules complied with that request.

The rule today is an open rule and Members will have an opportunity to offer their amendments, and I just ask that we support this rule and get on with the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this rule. I had not intended to. Yes, when we were in discussions with the Committee on Rules and the committee leadership, I had the feeling that with the promises that we had been given that we were going to see a new day in this House with more bipartisan cooperation in the way legislation is brought to the floor and that those promises were, in fact, going to be kept.

Then, after a series of conversations, apparently people behind the scenes decided that that rule was going to be shaped quite differently. Among the things that were done is that the committee put time limits—under what is supposedly an open rule, the committee still put time limits of 40 minutes—on the major amendment that we are going to be debating on this bill.

That amendment is very complicated; yet each side will only have 20 minutes to debate it. The amendment is complicated enough it will take 10 minutes to explain it, which will leave only 10 minutes to discuss the merits. That is not the way to debate questions of war or, for that matter, some of the other serious issues that are in this bill.

Secondly, another amendment is being offered by the majority which is paid for by hijacking items that were in our amendment to pay for the items that we have listed in our amendment. In my view, that is an effort to weaken political support for our amendment. I would simply point out that since the majority has two-thirds of the staffing available or more in this place, to put together their legislation, I do not think they have an operational need to, in effect, steal or highjack our amendments, but that is largely what has been done.

So it just seems to me that this rule is not what it was going to be yesterday and for that reason I am going to oppose it.

I also want to say something else. I think that what happened on this rule is symptomatic of what is happening on this entire bill. I did not vote for the Rambouillet endorsement when it was on the floor.

I do not believe in giving any administration a blank check, but we are now in a war and we have rampant misery which has been brought to the world, to the refugees and to a lot of others. We did not start that war; Mr. Milosevic did.

Now the question is: What will NATO and what will the United States do about it?

I believe we ought to do everything necessary to win. I do not believe the options for ground troops ought to be off the table and in that I very strongly agree with Senator MCCAIN. But to me, that issue right now is beside the point.

The issue is whether this House can come together and debate one of the most fundamental issues that will be before any legislative body, in a manner which is both bipartisan and constructive. I do not think this rule gets us off to a good start.

In my view, if we cannot play this issue straight we cannot play any issue straight, with American lives on the line and with the future credibility of NATO on the line.

What it seems to me is that we are being faced with a shifting understanding of what the rules are supposed to be for debating this legislation at the same time that we see spectacularly shifting positions on the part of the majority.

Last week, the House voted against supporting the operation that is now going on in Kosovo and yet this week we are now asked to more than double the request that the administration made to finance that operation. That makes no sense whatsoever.

I believe the reason that that has been done is that I believe last week's amendment was clearly intended to simply pin the label on the war of being Clinton's war, unfortunately politicizing the situation.

Now, this week I think there is an effort being made to in essence pour all kind of money into this bill so we can free up enough room for $3 billion

worth of pork in the next defense bill. I think that is illegitimate. I do not think we ought to be treating a serious issue like this this way and I would urge a vote against the rule because it is not conducive to finding common ground on the most serious issue we face.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of what I think is a very responsible and open rule that gives Members a chance to consider a very wide variety point of view on what is a critical issue, as we all know. I cannot understand why we are having opposition to an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. operations in Kosovo have exposed the reality that the fabric of our national security has indeed worn very, very thin, at a time when it is still a dangerous world. Over the last several years, the Clinton-Gore administration has demanded more from the military but it has actually provided less resources for the military.

From Somalia to Haiti, Bosnia, Iraq, all those places, our troops are being deployed overseas, more often, for longer periods of time, even as our defense budget has been cut or has been held even.

Well, today the bill has come due. It is simply time to pay up. The supplemental appropriation under consideration under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) will address the immediate needs arising from the U.S. operation in the Balkans, but it will also shore up other critical readiness areas that have been sadly depleted.

Mr. Speaker, last week's debate on the War Powers Act showed that Congress was of many minds on the policy issue, but this debate today is not about policy. I repeat, this is not a policy debate today. It is about money. It is about resources to take care of our troops, and that is something that Congress must pursue with a single-minded intensity.

Who among us would deny our troops in harm's way the best training, the best equipment, the best odds to survive and to win with the least casualties?

I know that some of my colleagues would like to deal with the policy issue by refusing to fund military operations in Kosovo.

□ 1030

They are absolutely right, that policy missteps by the Clinton-Gore administration can have grave consequences, as we have seen vividly and tragically in Somalia when the body of a U.S. soldier was dragged through the streets of Mogadishu.

But failing to fund our troops' needs would invite the same kind of disaster by leaving our men and women on the front lines without the training and resources they need to protect themselves.

I encourage my colleagues to support this rule and vote for the supplemental appropriations bill. Taking care of our troops and our national security are among the most fundamental duties this body has.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has again demonstrated its willingness to try to have things both ways. In some circles, it might be said that railing against a military action and then doubling the money to fight it should be called hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss to explain how a political party can, on one hand, demonstrate its visceral hostility towards the President, and then, on the other hand, turn around and double his request for money for what they call Clinton's war. All I can do is shake my head in disbelief.

Mr. Speaker, now is not the time for political gamesmanship. Today, right now, our military stands in harm's way. Today is the time for Congress to stand up and support them, and not play games with their lives in order to advance a political agenda.

Democrats have, in spite of the divergence of views within our Caucus, gone to great lengths to keep politics out of the debate about Kosovo. How I wish I could say the same thing about the other party.

Mr. Speaker, in all likelihood I will vote for the supplemental made in order by this rule. The rule itself is irresponsible and unfair. It allocates some of the money voted in the original supplemental for agricultural assistance, but it denies a separate vote on the disaster assistance for Central America, and it denies a vote to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) on supplemental food assistance for the refugees in Albania.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are fond of chanting their mantra that the President has underfunded the Armed Forces, but I would like to offer an alternative, and more accurate, perspective. Last year the President asked for $2.9 billion more for defense spending than either the Senate or the House Republican budget resolutions provided. Two years ago the President asked for $12.3 billion more. This year the President asked for $104 billion more in budget authority and $198 billion more in outlays for the next decade than did the Republican budget.

I may not have agreed with all the President's priorities, Mr. Speaker, but the fact is that his budget requests have been significantly higher than what the Republican Congress has agreed to in their budget resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Caucus is divided about the amount of extra military spending in this supplemental, but I would be hard-pressed to find a member of our caucus who does not think that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) was treated unfairly last night by the Republican leadership and the Republican members of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, no one in the House, no one, speaks with more moral authority about the issue of hunger than does my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL). Each and every Member of this House knows full well that the actions of Milosevic in Kosovo have created a humanitarian catastrophe that has sent Kosovar Albanians streaming out of their homeland seeking safety in their neighboring countries of Albania and Montenegro. Mr. Speaker, sadly, no one in the administration anticipated this level of disaster.

The Committee on Rules last night had, in the words of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), the opportunity to do the right thing, but the Republican majority took a pass. Does the hostility of the Republican Party toward the President reach so deep that hungry children are going to be made to suffer? Pardon the pun, but that should be food for thought for all of us.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, passage of this defense spending supplemental is so important to the Republican majority that this rule also makes in order an amendment designed to appease the most conservative wing of their party. That amendment, sponsored by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), would in essence cut domestic non-defense discretionary spending across the board by 5 percent.

So not only will the Republican majority not allow an additional $150 million in spending for food assistance for Kosovar Albanian refugees, the Republicans are willing to cut other domestic programs to fund supplemental military spending.

All I can do, Mr. Speaker, is shake my head in disbelief.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule for the Kosovo emergency appropriations bill. It is an open rule. It is a fair rule. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

The Committee on Rules was given a tough task this week, and I commend them for their hard work. In two important ways the rule provides an opportunity to add a critical component to the underlying bill: specifically, how to pay for it.

First, it protects a provision that I authored to force the President to pursue NATO reimbursements for our costs in Operation Allied Force and report back to Congress on its progress by September 30 of this year.

Second, the rule gives priority to an amendment by myself and two colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from South Carolina. Our amendment uses a combination of NATO reimbursements and across-the-board reductions to ensure that the new, additional emergency spending in this bill will be fully offset.

We give the President to the end of this fiscal year to secure NATO reimbursements, and the remaining amount of offsets, if necessary, would come from small reductions in non-defense discretionary spending in the next fiscal year.

It is important to note that the amendment uses a sequester mechanism already in budget law and would exempt several programs from any reductions.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Committee on Rules, and I urge my colleagues to pass this rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. This bill, along with last week's votes on Kosovo, reveal a fundamental flaw in the majority party's vision of national security.

First, the majority of House Republicans voted against our military's effort to stop genocide in Kosovo. Now that same majority uses funding for the operation as an excuse for $6 billion in non-Kosovo military spending. The majority whip calls us chicken hawks.

The other side complains that the administration's defense policy is ''doing more with less.'' But in rejecting Kosovo while giving the Pentagon $6 billion more, these critics embrace a doctrine of doing nothing with everything. In today's world, we cannot afford to do nothing. With today's budget, we cannot afford to buy everything.

Republicans complain that our military's efforts to bring peace to the Balkans undermines readiness. Ready for what, if not Kosovo? Ready for the Soviet Union to spring to life, or Nazi Germany? Readiness is not an end in itself, it is a means to an end, our military's ability to carry out its mission, a means to ensuring our own security and prosperity.

Ethnic conflict and regional instability, as in Kosovo, threaten our security and prosperity. It makes no sense to build up fortress America and sit inside idle while the world outside falls apart. Congress' decisions on the military must reflect the world as it is and will be, rather than a world of the past.

I urge my colleagues to support this needed funding for our troops over Kosovo, and to resist playing games with it. We are better than that.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. The rule is far from perfect, but it allows adequate debate, and it will certainly allow us who think that it is unwise to increase the spending to vote against the spending. It certainly allows an opportunity for those who think that we should double the spending to explain why we should spend so much money on a war that we have not declared.

Mr. Speaker, we have to realize that this war has been pursued for over a month. We have not appropriated the funds, so whether or not we act today, the war will continue, unfortunately. The war has not been declared, but if we go ahead and fund it, we become partners in this war. I do not think that is a wise policy. We should not provide the funding.

Mr. Speaker, there is a fallacy, that floats around this House that says that if we increase the funding for the military, we will have greater defense. That reminds me of the accusation from the right that always challenges the left that says, if there is a social problem, all you want ever to do is throw more money at it. The worse the problem gets, the more money they want to spend on the social problem.

It seems like the worse our defense gets and the more we get into quagmires around the world and the more we accept the policy of policing the world, all we seem to do is come back and say, well, if we just put more money in it, everything is going to be okay.

But if we are in a quagmire, if we are following a policy that is unwise, the money might just make conditions much worse. I think this is why we must defeat the spending on this program, because the problems with what is happening in Bosnia and Kosovo and Iraq will be compounded as long as the administration has the money to fund the war.

Yes, I am for a strong national defense, but if the policy is wrong, it will undermine all the spending. The money will actually be wasted. Funding encourages a policy that is in error. Funding is an endorsement of the war. We must realize that it is equivalent to it. We have not declared this war. If we fund it, we essentially become partners in this ill-advised war.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of this rule, despite my disappointment with several of my amendments not receiving waivers.

There will be lots of seemingly contradictory statements made during today's debate about this bill. Some will say this bill is about rebuilding our military, which it is. Some will say it is about raising the pay of our courageous men and women in service, which it is. Some will say it gives the administration the dollars which not only will escalate this war, but possibly expand it to a ground war, which it does.

This modified open rule not only restricts amendments that would have moved needed national defense funds to other appropriations categories, but also restricts a number, under House rules, of amendments that could have prohibited the buildup of the war, such as an amendment by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DAN BURTON).

Overwhelmingly, the House had passed an amendment that would have restricted a ground war, but it is not allowed under this bill, where it would have had the force of law. Several amendments of mine that would have reached back were also prohibited.

So while there are a number of waivers, there are not any waivers for those of us who were trying to affect some of the ability of previous funds to be moved around.

However, by allowing a modified open rule, it still gives many of us the flexibility to offer amendments that are within the House rules that will greatly restrict this Administration's ability to escalate and expand this war, and possibly even force the needed peace settlement that is pending. Our House vote last week clearly pushed the administration towards that, along with the work of Reverend Jesse Jackson.

This rule will most likely, and it should, pass. That is quite a difference from the last few sessions of Congress. Quite frankly, in the last few sessions when we had a controversial vote like this, many of us were jammed. That resulted in us coming to the floor and taking down a rule. I learned there were more woodsheds out in this floor than I believed were possible. We were hauled in. We were told our party was collapsing. We were told the whole Congress was going to fold. We were going to lose control of Congress.

But in fact, a lot of this controversy inside our party has been alleviated by our new Speaker, who has at least given us the flexibility to offer different amendments. We as a party need to pull together and pass this rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to reluctantly support this rule because it does allow some amendments that will hopefully force the President to come before this body and the Senate before he would send ground troops into Kosovo. I am not sure it will do it, but I think at least it expresses the will of the Congress that we would like for him to come before this House and the Senate before sending our troops into harm's way.

When President George Bush decided to go into the Persian Gulf, there was great planning involved. We created an

army of 550,000 troops, and before we went in there was a very sound battle plan. When we went into Kosovo, the Joint Chiefs of Staff indicated to the President that they thought it was a mistake to start bombing without more planning.

Nevertheless, the President chose to do it because he thought, in his own wisdom, that he could end this thing in a short period of time. The Nazis could not do it, and we have not done it in the last 30 days. Now they are talking about sending in ground troops.

Hopefully, the discussions that are going on in Germany today will preclude that possibility by getting other U.N. forces in there to deal with this problem. But the fact of the matter is, proper planning has not taken place.

□ 1045

And as a result, if we send ground troops in there, we are going to see a lot of young men and women come home in body bags or being maimed.

What Nazi Germany could not do in years we are talking about doing in months, and we are talking about sending 200,000 or 300,000 ground troops in there. I tell my colleagues, in my opinion, the poor planning, the ineffective leadership out of the White House, the poor foreign policy will lead to a disaster if we do not take proper precautions.

That is why this House, the people's House, and the other body needs to be involved in the decision-making process. The American people need to have all the facts before them through their elected representatives. The case needs to be made before we ever send one young man or one young lady into harm's way into Kosovo.

That is why I think it is extremely important that that point be made today, that it has to be made clear to the White House, do not do this without consulting with this body and the other body. Because if we get into a ground war without proper planning, without all the people working together, with the entire Nation behind it, it is a recipe for disaster. We saw that happen in Vietnam when the country came apart.

We need proper planning. We need the leadership of the Congress to be involved in the decision-making process as well as every Member here voting on it. So I would just urge the White House that after we appropriate this money today, and I am sure it is going to happen and the rule will pass, I urge the White House to consult with this body before ever sending one young man or one young lady into harm's way in Kosovo.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and I also commend Mr. HALL for his tremendous leadership.

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) said earlier, no one has greater standing in this body than the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) when it comes to meeting the needs of the hungry throughout the world. We are blessed to serve with him, and it is a privilege to call him colleague.

Mr. Speaker, we are all very blessed to have the privilege to serve in this body. We speak for the American people. They give us this privilege, and we should deal with it responsibly. We owe them that, to use our best thinking and our arts of compromise to come to agreement on issues for America's future. At no time is it more important that we put our partisanship aside, as when we put our children in harm's way, our young people in harm's way, as they are now in the Balkans.

That is why it was so disappointing to see the rule that came to the floor this morning. Last night I went home fully prepared to come in to vote for the rule. We were told that we had bipartisan cooperation and that it would be an open rule. Indeed, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations heralded it just that way in his remarks just a few moments ago when he said this is an open rule which will allow each Member to bring his or her amendment to the floor.

But what form do those amendments take? Would others consider it their amendment if, as in the case of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the Republican majority altered the amendment? Certainly they knew the appeal of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. It is responsible, it addresses our military needs, it recognizes the increased cost of the huge number of refugees who unexpectedly descended upon Macedonia and Albania, and it has the urgency of Hurricane Mitch contained in it. It also addresses the needs of America's farmers.

They knew that it was responsible. They knew it would appeal to their Republican Members. That is why it was so disappointing to see the illusion of an open rule with a rule that changed the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin, co-opting the provision on agricultural assistance and giving a piece of that amendment to one of their colleagues, hoping to deflect support from the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin by having a separate agricultural vote.

And what they also lost is the success of the Obey amendment, which contains, again, $175 million in humanitarian assistance. Others have said that there is disagreement about the policy and the war and the air strikes and the rest. I myself support President Clinton's action and commend him for his courageous leadership. But one thing we all agree on is that the American people want us to provide humanitarian assistance. They do not want to see the most vulnerable, the children and the elderly, starving and freezing and going without the absolute basic necessities. But unless we have the additional humanitarian assistance, that will be the case.

In addition, in the so-called open rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), as was mentioned, was denied the opportunity to put in $150 million in additional food assistance for the refugees. How can this be called an open rule if the gentleman from Ohio, who is on the committee, has standing on the issue, is present at the table to make his case, is denied the opportunity to present an amendment which will give people food to eat? We are talking about the basics.

I was pleased to join our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), on a visit to the Balkans. We visited the refugee camps. We can speak firsthand as to the needs there and to how those needs have grown since the administration made its request to Congress.

I support the President's request, I support the President's support of the NATO action, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule.

For some reason, between yesterday, when there was a spirit of cooperation for an open rule that we could all support. That rule would give the American people what they should expect of us, which is a reasoned and informed debate on the actions in the Balkans and how much we should be paying for it. Instead we are faced with the choice of voting for twice as much money as the President asked for in his bill on a policy that the Republican majority rejected last week. I guess they are saying, ''We do not agree with you, but we want you to spend twice as much money to pay for it.''

In sadness, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and I would just point out that the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin is printed in the rule exactly as it was offered.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule. The emergency defense appropriations bill is vitally important to our national security, whether we agree with NATO's involvement in Kosovo or not.

I have not been shy in stating my own opposition to the manner in which the President has handled this situation, but this bill is about supporting our troops and making sure they have the tools and the training that they need to return home safely.

This bill is about making sure that our interests are secure on a global basis, and right now I am disheartened to say they are not. In fact, the Pentagon has told us that there will be a readiness crisis if they do not get this funding by Memorial Day. If we ever had a military emergency, it is right now, and that emergency reaches much farther than the endless air raids going on in the Balkans.

Since we started talking about this bill a few weeks ago, I have heard story

after story from my colleagues about the terrible situation our military is facing, about soldiers who have never trained with live rounds and pilots who are not getting flight time because there are no spare parts to repair their planes. This kind of readiness crisis means that our national security is presently at serious risk.

Now, this rule gives us an opportunity to mitigate that risk. We have an obligation to support our troops and refurbish the military that is currently being hollowed out to fund this war effort, and we have the responsibility to do this as expeditiously as possible, which is exactly what this rule does.

Let me say to my friends that I understand they may not agree with the emergency nature of this bill. My colleagues may object to the war in Kosovo on its face, as I do, or to using this kind of vehicle to refurbish our stripped-down Armed Forces. But the process must not be undermined.

I heard a lot last week about the votes we had on the floor over Kosovo. Some folks said that we sent the wrong message to Milosevic. Well, make no mistake about it, while I object to the President's handling of this situation, I know our troops need our support now more than ever. The Congress cannot abandon our troops just because the President deploys them unwisely. We must support our troops even as we disagree with the President. This rule and this bill will convey exactly that message to Serbia and to the Americans stationed there.

Mr. Speaker, our troops are in harm's way. Our national security is at risk. We have an obligation to give our sons and daughters everything they need to protect themselves. We have an obligation not to abandon our troops in the field. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time; and I rise in support of the rule today.

It is very, very important that the farm credit provisions in the amendment that we will be putting forward was made a part of the discussion today, and the amendment will be offered.

As everyone knows, agriculture is in a very difficult situation today. The USDA has not been able to get out the checks that are needed as far as the disaster that we passed last year, the $2.3 billion.

We have a credit crisis in agriculture today, and we have to use every possible means to make sure that we get credit to our farmers this spring. They are in the field today. And we appreciate very much the Committee on Rules allowing us to have this amendment be part of the debate today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I just heard the distinguished majority whip indicate that we cannot abandon our troops in the field. I do not know of a single person in the House who has any intention of doing that. I do think that the interpretation of the vote that occurred last week might, in some people's minds, be interpreted that way, but I certainly do not know of anyone who intentionally intends to do that on either side of the aisle.

I do want to take just a moment to discuss this myth that somehow it is the Clinton administration which has created a military readiness problem. I would point out that for 4½ years the majority party has controlled this Congress. During that time it has added $27 billion to the President's military requests.

□ 1100

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that less than $4 billion of that $27 billion went into readiness items such as operation and maintenance. The rest of the items went into what are largely considered military pork projects: the consolation prize destroyer that was provided in the district of the majority leader in the other body after his contractor was not selected by the Defense Department, the decision of the Congress to fund 10 additional C–130s that the Pentagon did not ask for rather than putting that funding into readiness.

Senator MCCAIN himself has pointed out that there were more than $4½ billion worth of pork items in the military budget last year. They were in charge. If they thought there was a readiness problem, why did they not put the money there rather than where they put it?

I saw a comment in the paper which said that the President was responsible for the fact that there were not enough JDAMs. The fact is they cut those missiles by 17 percent last year in the defense budget they brought to the floor.

So let us keep the record straight.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. It is an open rule, and I believe it is the right thing for us to do. I congratulate my friend from Charlotte, North Carolina, for the very able job that she has done under somewhat difficult circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, military policy by committee does not work. The Constitution gives the President the clear authority to lead in situations like today in the Balkans. It is now his responsibility to ensure that our national interests are protected. Many Americans, including Members of this body, have serious doubts about the President's overall policy in the Balkans, whether vital national interests were on the line at all in Kosovo. Others are deeply concerned with the military strategy to date, namely, whether the current air campaign can prevail.

Mr. Speaker, the price of failure in Kosovo is simply too great at this point. American prestige and power, two of the most positive forces for good in the world today, cannot be abandoned on the field of battle. Developing and implementing a strategy that wins is the President's first responsibility to the American people.

Congress must ensure that the resources are available to carry out that strategy, as well as to ensure that our national security infrastructure around the globe is able to protect our national interests. This bill will, in fact, make sure that that is the case.

Now, as has been said, Mr. Speaker, this is, in fact, an open rule. I do not understand how any Member of this body could conceivably vote against an open rule. What we have done is we have provided the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the opportunity to offer his amendment. It has not been changed. It is the amendment that he submitted to us, and we have made that in order.

We also are addressing a concern that was raised about offsets, and so we have made in order the amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

We also are very concerned about immediately addressing the needs of our agriculture interests across this country, and so we have made in order the amendment by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) which will effectively deal with that.

Now, there are many people who also want us to deal with questions of policy on the Balkans. This open amendment process ensures that that will, in fact, happen. Under the open amendment process, we will be able to consider the Rohrabacher amendment, the Souder amendment. Other questions will come up as to exactly what our role should be and what level of funding should be there for it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong vote in support of this rule. It has been carefully crafted. It should enjoy bipartisan support.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from Ohio has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and in opposition to what I see as the irresponsibility of the Republican leadership in addressing domestic and international emergencies.

We want to send a strong message of support for our troops in Kosovo today, and I hope that we will. But the Republican leadership has a consistently poor

record of leadership when it comes to providing emergency assistance to those in need.

During the last 2 years, Republicans have politicized emergency appropriations bills and delayed, sometimes for months, getting needed assistance to our farmers in California and North Dakota who have experienced disasters. We all remember that in 1997, when the Republican leadership sent the House home for the Memorial Day recess while North Dakotans flooded out of their homes waited for relief.

Today, emergency assistance for our farmers and for critical Central America has waited for months while Republicans use the Kosovo supplemental appropriations bill as a vehicle for their political agenda.

Mr. Speaker, these are the faces and this is the tragedy of what is happening in Central America. But 6 months has passed since Hurricane Mitch killed more than 9,000 people in Central America in the worst disaster in 200 years. Thousands more are missing, and tens of thousands have been left homeless. $5.3 billion in damage to this region has wiped away 50 years of progress and returned the region to the level of development it had in the beginning of the century. Yet the Republicans continue to turn their backs on this tragedy in our own hemisphere.

The emergency supplemental is critical to the reconstruction of this region. If emergency aid is not received soon, it will lead to the political instability of the region and cause mass migration towards the United States. Responsible leadership means support for our troops, and it means helping our farmers in need. But responsible leadership also means that we must help those in the backyard of our own hemisphere.

I support the Obey amendment as a common-sense approach to balancing the many emergency needs that require our attention. The Republican leadership must stop playing political games while American farmers and our troops and our neighbors in Central America continue to suffer.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will just make a few comments in closing.

I believe that this bill is a fat one, and I think it is bloated, and it has a lot of misplaced priorities. It technically is an open rule. But because it comes under the emergency rules, it is very restrictive because it gives tremendous power and ability to the Committee on Appropriations to pretty much decide the fate for the whole Nation here.

It is hard to get at this bill. The bill started at $6 billion, and kind of overnight it went to $12 billion. And a lot of these items, while important, are really not, in my opinion, high priority.

We have got an item in here for $156 million for advertising. Gee, that is really a high priority and exciting, that we are going to give $156 million to some companies on Madison Avenue to advertise, when in fact we do not have any food aid in this bill.

And I find the fact that we cannot amend it to be not only restrictive but very frustrating. Not only did our administration miss it, but the Committee on Appropriations missed it. And because of that and other restrictive rules, we must oppose it.

One of the things that I am reminded of and I keep in the back of my mind is, when the delegation went to Macedonia and Albania this past weekend, one of the things that we kept hearing from our own pilots was the fact that as they flew over Kosovo it was like one great big bonfire, thousands upon thousands of house fires were lit up as they would fly over. It went for miles. The whole country was lit up.

In questioning the refugees in the camps that we were at, there was not one family that I talked to that did not have their house burned down, that were not robbed. And one man has caused this. We are not there because we like being there. We are not there because we are trying to feed people. We are there because one person caused a million people to be affected in such a way that I find it unbelievable.

So when we get a chance to really fund our priorities, one of the highest priorities of being able to feed people, we do not even have that kind of food item in here.

So, for these reasons and others, the fact that it is so restrictive, we must oppose this rule and, hopefully, defeat it and come back with a much better rule and much better bill that really funds what the priority should be according to this crisis that we are in over there.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) has 8 minutes remaining.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House.

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina very much for yielding me time.

Ladies and gentlemen of Congress, I rise in support of this rule and the supplemental. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Let me just say, I have heard some rhetoric since I have been here the last 10 or 15 minutes that there is not enough food aid or refugee assistance in here. There is $600 million in here, as requested by the President, for food and refugee assistance, $600 million. It is in the line. It is there. And to say it is not is just purely false. It is there. It was asked by the President. We put that money in.

But this vote today is probably one of the most important votes we can take as Members of Congress. The issue is simple: Do you support our men and women in uniform as they defend America's interests and will you help us restore our Nation's defense so that our soldiers can do their jobs?

Last week, the House spoke on the President's policies concerning the engagement in Kosovo; and. Clearly, the House had some misgivings about those policies. But today, let there be no mistake, the United States Congress stands with its soldiers, sailors, and airmen as they defend America.

Since the conclusion of the Cold War, the Federal Government has steadily drawn down its defenses. In fact, this administration's budgets have severely reduced those budgets of our military over the last few years, and for good reason. The President did so under the assumption that the world was a safer place in the absence of a Soviet threat.

But, with Saddam Hussein, the instability in North Korea and with the current situation in Kosovo, we have learned a valuable lesson: The world is not a safer place. And, in fact, the threats from terrorist nations have increased, and we must be prepared to defend America's interests.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the persons in the gallery to refrain from conversations. The speaker on the floor deserves to be heard. Visitors are the guests of the House, and the Chair requires your compliance.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, the money we spend today will start the process of giving our soldiers and sailors and airmen the resources they need to do their jobs. It will make certain that they have the training they need to keep them safe. It will give them the livable housing and reasonable wages. It will give them spare parts they need to keep their planes in the air. And it will give them the munitions to allow them to carry out their missions.

To my colleagues who disagree with the President's policy, let me say simply, you had your vote last week. To my colleagues who want to pick this supplemental apart, let me say that this, too, is important for our servicemen and servicewomen to not be subject to partisan politics.

Now is the time to rise above the partisanship and vote for the good of the country as a whole. To my colleagues who feel we should offset this emergency spending, let me say that this bill represents our best efforts to deal with the national emergency. And to my colleagues who worry about the impact of this vote on the Social Security Trust Fund, let me say, we will replenish that money to the Social Security Trust Fund. We cannot replenish the lives of our soldiers that may be lost if we fail to provide adequate resources to them in this time of need.

Let me state again: Every penny of Social Security receipts will be credited to the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, the American people expect the Congress to act responsibly

when it comes to providing for our Nation's security. Let us not fail them. Vote for this rule, vote for this defense supplemental, and vote for our soldiers and sailors and airmen as they defend America.

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we have committed our armed forces to the conflict in Kosovo and now we must pay for it. This unanticipated expense is a classic example of what constitutes emergency spending. I have voted to support our troops and the NATO operation in Yugoslavia. We need to provide emergency funding for our troops in the field.

But the emergency appropriations bill that we will be asked to support, today, spends more than twice the 6 billion dollars requested by our military commanders for Kosovo. It will add billions of dollars in spending for nonemergency items that should be considered during our normal budget process.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I clearly understand that the military has pressing needs, including improved pay and benefits for the troops, military infrastructure, equipment and spare parts. I support a pay raise for the military, pay scale reform, and retirement benefits reform. Our troops have earned a raise and it is the right thing to do.

But I don't believe that an emergency supplemental should be loaded up with spending that is more appropriately considered during the regular budget process. I don't think that today's bill shows a commitment to honest budgeting and spending controls.

□ 1115

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. 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 253, nays 171, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—253

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—171

Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—10

Berman
Brown (CA)
Chenoweth
Cox
Kuykendall
McNulty
Slaughter
Tiahrt
Wilson
Wynn

□ 1134

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1664, making emergency supplemental appropriations for military operations, refugee relief, and humanitarian assistance relating to the conflict in Kosovo, and for military operations in Southwest Asia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

KOSOVO AND SOUTHWEST ASIA EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 159 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1664.

□ 1138

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the

consideration of the bill (H.R. 1664) making emergency supplemental appropriations for military operations, refugee relief, and humanitarian assistance relating to the conflict in Kosovo, and for military operations in Southwest Asia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill we bring to the floor today was approved by the Committee on Appropriations just last week. The bill is designed to meet the emergency requirements of the War in Kosovo and to provide for other readiness-related items that are being exacerbated by the War in Kosovo. Mr. Chairman, this war has stretched our military resources terribly thin.

Mr. Chairman, the President sent his request to the Congress, the committee reacted to that request quite expeditiously, and we made some changes. We provided the items that were identified by the President, but the committee, working in a nonpartisan way with our relative subcommittees, and I want to compliment the chairmen and ranking members of the subcommittees who were involved here in this particular bill, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) from the Subcommittee on Defense, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) from the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) from the Subcommittee on Military Construction, and also the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) who had an important part of this bill relative to embassy security; and these chairmen, plus their ranking members, did really an outstanding job.

I want to call special attention to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) who played such an important role in helping us put this bill together. It was a good bipartisan effort, and I hope that the vote today will reflect the bipartisanship with which we bring this bill.

As we provide for the replacement of the air-launched cruise missiles, or the JDAMs munitions or the various other weapons that have been fired, bombs that have been dropped, aircraft that have been lost, we have a very clean bill that is related strictly to these issues of national defense and specifically relative to the Kosovo war, and, Mr. Chairman, it is a war. At this point it is basically an air war, it is a war, and the sorties are numerous, the targets being hit are numerous, and it is important that we move this bill quickly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that we added to this bill that has made some controversy has to do with pay, pay for those serving in our uniform who are risking their lives today in the Kosovo region and who are prepared to risk their lives in other regions of the world where they have been deployed for whatever their mission might be should something erupt, for example, in Korea with the North Koreans in southwest Asia, with Saddam Hussein and the Iraqis, and the money we put in for this pay raise is subject to authorization by the authorizing committee. It was a commitment that we made to our authorizers that they could write the rules, but we wanted to make the money available today.

Mr. Chairman, I was happy to see the President on TV last night from an air base in Germany telling the American military folks there that we were going to do some good things in this bill including a pay raise, so I suspect what little controversy there might have been about that issue hopefully would have gone away overnight.

□ 1145

Also, we addressed the problem of the redux having to do with retirement. We are having a real problem with retention of forces. We are having a real problem with recruiting. We think it is important to do something for the men and women who wear the uniform and who go to war, many of whom are at war today.

I am going to leave the details of the bill to the subcommittee chairman. After the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) takes his time, I am going to call on our subcommittee chairman to present the details of the bill.

The bill before the House includes $12.9 billion for military operations relating to Kosovo and Operation Desert Fox and for refugee assistance. In developing this bill we consulted with the authorizing committees, the minority, the Pentagon, and our military commanders in the field.

The bill has four parts—the largest of which is with the Defense Subcommittee's jurisdiction. For these activities the bill includes $11.24 billion, $5.8 billion above the President's request. The increases are all in areas of identified shortages (weapons procurement, spare parts, depot maintenance, recruitment, training, and base operations).

In addition, the bill includes funding for increased military pay and retirement benefits at $1.8 billion subject to authorization and a presidential emergency declaration.

The bill includes $1 billion above the President for military construction; $830 million is for mission-related items, $240 million for the NATO security investment program. This funding is directly related to troop readiness. It goes to our European bases. It is executable in 1 year, and it is mission directed. It is not pork.

Third, the bill fully funds the President's request for refugee assistance. These funds are redirected away from reconstruction to refugees only. There is not reconstruction money in this bill for Serbia. There is $105 million in assistance to the front line states: Albania, Bosnia, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Romania, and Montenegro. There is a burden-sharing requirement.

Finally, the bill includes a relatively small amount of money ($70 million) for security at U.S. Balkan missions and for repairs at damaged embassies.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very good bill. Some will say it's too much. Some will say it's too little. But we have developed a bill that does what I believe we should be doing:

(1) We have expeditiously moved to support our troops and fund the administration's request to prosecute the war.

(2) We have addressed critical shortfalls in our defense preparedness: shortfalls that hinder our security and embarrass us for not adequately supporting our military.

(3) We have sent a powerful, morale-boosting signal that we want to increase pay—while giving the authorizers a major role in that decision.

(4) We have met the needs of helpless women and children whose tragedy is our tragedy.

(5) We have provided funds to help meet the security needs of our people in the Balkans.

(6) We have sent a message of support to the front line states whose help we must have it we are to succeed.

(7) Because the funds over the President's request are designated as contingent emergencies—it is the President who must make the decisions about whether or when to spend. But we have given him the tools to succeed.

Mr. Chairman, this is the right bill for this situation. I urge all members to support it and send a strong signal to our troops and to Milosevic.

Mr. Chairman, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a table reflecting the details of the reported bill.

FY 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1664)
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
	FY 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS			
	CHAPTER 1			
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
	Administration of Foreign Affairs			
106-50	Diplomatic and consular programs (emergency appropriations)	17,071	17,071	.....
106-50	Security and maintenance of United States missions (emergency appropriations)	5,000	5,000	.....
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	45,500	+45,500
106-50	Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service (emergency appropriations)	2,929	2,929	.....
	Total, Department of State	25,000	70,500	+45,500
	INDEPENDENT AGENCY			
	United States Information Agency			
106-50	International information programs (by transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(450)	(450)	.....
	Total, Chapter 1:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	25,000	70,500	+45,500
	Emergency appropriations	(25,000)	(25,000)	.....
	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	(45,500)	(+45,500)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(450)	(450)	.....
	CHAPTER 2			
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY			
	Military Personnel			
106-50	Military personnel, Army (emergency appropriations)	2,920	2,920	.....
106-50	Military personnel, Navy (emergency appropriations)	7,660	7,660	.....
106-50	Military personnel, Marine Corps (emergency appropriations)	1,586	1,586	.....
106-50	Military personnel, Air Force (emergency appropriations)	4,303	4,303	.....
	Total, Military personnel	16,469	16,469	.....
	Operation and Maintenance			
106-50	Overseas contingency operations transfer fund (emergency appropriations)	4,591,600	3,907,300	-684,300
106-50	Contingent emergency appropriations	850,000	1,311,800	+461,800
	Total, Operation and maintenance	5,441,600	5,219,100	-222,500
	Procurement			
.....	Weapons procurement, Navy (emergency appropriations)	.....	431,100	+431,100
.....	Aircraft procurement, Air Force (emergency appropriations)	.....	40,000	+40,000
.....	Missile procurement, Air Force (emergency appropriations)	.....	178,200	+178,200
.....	Procurement of ammunition, Air Force (emergency appropriations)	.....	35,000	+35,000
.....	Operational rapid response transfer fund (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	400,000	+400,000
	Total, Procurement	.....	1,084,300	+1,084,300
	General Provisions			
106-50	Sec. 8005 additional transfer authority (sec. 201)	(800,000)	(800,000)	.....
.....	Spare parts (sec. 207) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	1,339,200	+1,339,200
.....	Depot maintenance (sec. 208) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	927,300	+927,300
.....	Recruiting (sec. 209) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	156,400	+156,400
.....	Readiness training (sec. 210) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	307,300	+307,300
.....	Base operations (sec. 211) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	351,500	+351,500
.....	Pay and retirement (sec. 212) (contingent emergency appropriations) (advance appropriations)	.....	1,838,426	+1,838,426
	Total, General provisions	.....	4,920,126	+4,920,126
	Total, Chapter 2:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	5,458,069	11,239,995	+5,781,926
	Emergency appropriations	(4,608,069)	(4,608,069)	.....
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(850,000)	(4,793,500)	(+3,943,500)
	Advance appropriations	.....	(1,838,426)	(+1,838,426)
	(Transfer authority)	(800,000)	(800,000)	.....
	CHAPTER 3			
	BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
	Agency for International Development			
106-50	International disaster assistance (emergency appropriations)	71,000	.....	-71,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	96,000	+96,000

FY 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1664)— Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
	Other Bilateral Economic Assistance			
106-50	Economic support fund (emergency appropriations)	105,000	105,000	.....
106-50	Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States (emergency appropriations)	170,000	75,000	-95,000
	Total, Other bilateral economic assistance	275,000	180,000	-95,000
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
	Peace Corps			
106-50	(By transfer) (emergency appropriation)	(500)	(500)	.....
	Department of State			
106-50	Migration and refugee assistance (emergency appropriations)	125,000	.....	-125,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	195,000	+195,000
106-50	United States emergency refugee and migration assistance fund (emergency appropriations)	95,000	95,000	.....
	Total, Department of State	220,000	290,000	+70,000
	Total, Chapter 3:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	566,000	566,000	.....
	Emergency appropriations	(566,000)	(275,000)	(-291,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	(291,000)	(+291,000)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(500)	(500)	.....
	CHAPTER 4			
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY			
.....	NATO Security Investment Program (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	240,000	+240,000
	General Provisions			
.....	Military construction, Army (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 401)	.....	295,800	+295,800
.....	Military construction, Navy (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 401)	.....	166,270	+166,270
.....	Military construction, Air Force (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 401)	.....	333,430	+333,430
.....	Military construction, Defense-wide (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 401)	.....	35,500	+35,500
	Total, General provisions	.....	831,000	+831,000
	Total, Chapter 4:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	1,071,000	+1,071,000
	Grand total, all titles:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	6,049,069	12,947,495	+6,898,426
	Emergency appropriations	(5,199,069)	(4,908,069)	(-291,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(850,000)	(6,201,000)	(+5,351,000)
	Advance appropriations	.....	(1,838,426)	(+1,838,426)
	(Transfer authority)	(800,000)	(800,000)	.....
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(950)	(950)	.....

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 11 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as I said on debate on the rule, this is one of the most serious votes that we will be casting this year. If we cannot play it straight on this amendment, we cannot play it straight on anything.

This amendment should not be politicized. What we should be doing with this amendment is to provide every single dollar that we need to conduct the operations now going on in Kosovo. We should not provide one dime less and neither should we try to use this to play games on the budget.

I am baffled by the fact that last week this House declined to support the operation that is now going on in Kosovo and yet this week the same people largely who opposed that motion last week are now suggesting that we should double the amount of spending for the operation which last week they said we should not be conducting at all. That gives confusion and inconsistency a bad name, in my view.

I did not vote for the administration's original request on Rambouillet. I did not feel that we knew enough about what the results of that discussion would be in order to cast a vote at that time, and I did not believe in giving any administration a blank check.

I know that there are a lot of people in this House who do not like President Clinton, and I think a number of Members have gone overboard in trying to politicize this war because they have such intense dislike for the President.

I have seen quote after quote in the newspapers saying, ''This is Clinton's war; we do not want our fingerprints on it.'' I think those kind of comments are irresponsible.

This is the West's war. This is NATO's war, and in my view the President is doing the best that anybody can under very difficult circumstances. That does not mean I agree with everything the administration is doing. I agree with Senator MCCAIN. I believe that this war needs to be prosecuted in the most aggressive way possible, and I believe that the best way to assure the success of the air war is to threaten use of a ground war.

So I do not necessarily agree with the administration on the fine points, but he is our commander in chief. He is the elected leader of this country. We are also elected leaders of this country, and we ought to be behaving ourselves in a manner consistent with the honor that has been afforded to each and every one of us by our constituents.

I do not think we do that when we in one week decide that this House is not going to support that operation and again then in the next week decide but, oh, by the way, we are going to use this war as an excuse to move billions of dollars from next year's appropriation into this year's appropriation, put an emergency label on it which will enable the Congress next year to spend $3 billion more on military pork that has nothing whatsoever to do with Kosovo. In my view, that is what is happening today.

So I want to explain the amendment that I will be offering later in debate. The administration has asked about $6 billion to cover the cost of this war, plus they have asked for humanitarian assistance. The amount that they have requested will pay for an 800-plane war, 24 hours a day bombing of virtually every target in Yugoslavia that one could imagine anywhere. That will be sustained on a daily basis through the end of the fiscal year.

In addition, the administration has asked for enough money to fund not just the 24 Apaches which are on the ground now but a contingent of 50 Apaches, over $700 million just to finance that.

The administration has taken the full estimate of what it will cost to run that war for the remainder of the fiscal year and then, on top of that, just to be safe, they have tossed in an extra $850 million in a contingency fund. That is such a large operation that we will run out of targets before we run out of ammunition. We will, in the words of Winston Churchill, be ''bouncing the rubble'' if this continues that long.

Now, the committee has done some other things. The committee has decided that they would raise the spending for that bill by 125 percent. They have asked for $460 million more in munitions. My amendment says, all right, we are not going to argue about that. We will accept it. They have asked for $400 million for procurement; and again we say, okay, we are not going to argue about it. We will accept it.

They have asked for a billion dollars more than the President in order to avoid having to reprogram from low-priority items to high-priority items. We say, okay, I doubt that that is fully necessary, but we will accept that, too.

What we do not accept are two other items in the bill. The budget rules under which we are supposed to operate say that if we want to designate something as an emergency so that it is exempted from the spending caps in our budget, it must meet two tests. It must, first of all, be an unanticipated expense; and, secondly, it has to be an expense which will be incurred immediately for an immediate purpose. There is $3 billion in the committee bill that does not meet those tests.

Example: They have $2 billion in this bill for operation and maintenance, which is nothing but moving forward from next year's budget $2 billion into this emergency supplemental.

There is also $1 billion added for 77 military construction projects in Europe. Thirty-seven of those items are not even on the Pentagon's 5-year plan. We do not have physical plans for them. We do not really know what they are, but the money is thrown at them.

Why? The reason is very simple. There is an agenda on the part of some Members of this House which says let us throw in as much as we can, call it an emergency Kosovo supplemental, even though it is not at all related to Kosovo, and that will enable us to spend $3 billion that we would not have otherwise been able to spend on the regular bill for pork. That is what is going on, in my view.

So my amendment does not accept that $3 billion. The only military construction items that we fund are those directly related to Kosovo, three key items that are fully justified, including one operation at Aviano, and the rest we simply say deal with next year in the regular course of business because they do not relate to Kosovo.

In addition, we do two other things. The committee has $1.8 billion in the bill which they suggest should go for a pay raise and a retirement enrichment package for the troops. I support that. The problem with the committee amendment is that it is subject to authorization, and that means that even though the money is in the bill it cannot actually be delivered to the troops until further legislation is passed. So we remove that impediment.

We remove the language that makes that subject to authorization so that this is not just a potentially empty promise. We actually deliver the money that we say we want to provide. So, in other words, we make that pay raise real.

The second thing we do is to take the supplemental, which the House passed previously, which is languishing in the Senate, which the President asked for it to deal with the largest natural disaster in this hemisphere in this century, Hurricane Mitch, and to deal with the emergency facing many farmers because of weather and because of the collapse of prices, and we include that in this package as well so that we take care of the home front as well as Kosovo.

If we do not deal with that, we face the prospect of 100,000 refugees trying to make their way from Central American countries through Texas, through New Mexico, and it would cost us far more than dealing with it in this bill.

So what I will simply say is, this amendment is an honest effort to reach a compromise position between the administration's original request and the committee's overblown efforts to throw in everything but the kitchen sink in this bill so that they can make more room for military pork in the regular military bill.

I would urge that my colleagues do the responsible thing, adopt the Obey amendment when it is offered. That will send a signal that we are, indeed, going to play this straight. We are not going to abuse the emergency power that we have in the Budget Act but we will make every dime that is necessary to the Kosovo operation available and then some.

We are exceeding what the administration thinks is necessary by almost a billion dollars, just in their own request, plus the additional items that

we are accepting in this package. I would urge support for the amendment when the time comes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to the gentleman as I did in the meeting during the Committee on Appropriations. There is no military pork in this bill. I do not know where he comes up with that argument. There is no pork in this bill. This is as clean a national defense bill as this House has ever seen. There are no Member requests added to this bill, either when we wrote the bill or when we went to the full committee. It is just not the case.

The gentleman says that the way we are spending money we are going to run out of targets before we run out of ammunition. The gentleman is not paying attention to what is happening in Kosovo.

The gentleman should look closely at what General Hawley said just a few days ago when he pointed out that we were running short of not only air launch cruise missiles, we were running short of JDAMs, we were running short of all kinds of ammunition; and if they were called on to do another MRC somewhere in the world they could not do it. This is the general who has the responsibility to get there if we have to get there.

Mr. Chairman, today's message is a real message. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) talks about the votes last week. Those were votes that gave Members an opportunity to voice their opinion in resolutions that were not truly binding. This is the real message. This is a message to Milosevic that we are serious. This is a message to our troops that we are serious in providing them with what they need to accomplish their mission and to give themselves a little protection while they are at it.

This is a good bill. The amendment that the gentleman is talking about is not even before the House yet. It will be later.

□ 1200

It is a good bill. It is a clean bill.

Just one last point, Mr. Chairman. If the President decides that the items that we have recommended in this bill are not truly emergencies, do Members know what he has to do to stop them from being spent? Nothing. Because, Mr. Chairman, unless the President determines that these items are emergencies, they do not get spent. The investment is not made.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is putting up a red herring. I did not say that there was pork in this bill. What I said was they are jamming $3 billion of nonemergency items into this bill to make room for $3 billion worth of pork in the defense bill which will follow this. The gentleman knows that is what I said. He ought to keep it straight.

Secondly, with respect to the JDAMS, the gentleman says there is a shortage of JDAM missiles. I would point out that the gentleman is the chairman of the subcommittee that cut that last year by 17 percent. The gentleman cut the President's request for that item by 13 percent in dollar terms and 17 percent in missile numbers. The President's request provides full funding for the restoration of every missile they need for JDAMS.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the chairman on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and to express my deep appreciation to my chairman for the job he has done in this bill. I must say, in spite of the protest of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), I would like to express my appreciation to him as well for a very cooperative effort on this bill.

The fact is that in terms of dollar amounts both sides are relatively very close to each other, largely because we all recognize that there is urgency in moving this bill forward; that the dollars that are involved are a reflection of the President's views.

Mr. Chairman, the two sides are really not that far apart on the dollar amounts that we are discussing here today. There are differences in the policy.

But before going further, let me express my deep appreciation for my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JACK MURTHA), the ranking member of my subcommittee, who from the very beginning has cooperated with us in developing the defense portion of this $12.9 billion package. There is not a Member of the House who is more concerned about the men and women who are potentially in harm's way that we are attempting to respond to by way of this supplemental.

In developing this bill, we have consulted and worked very closely with not just the members of our subcommittee, but the members of the authorizing committee, as well as the military commanders in the field. My colleagues, this is a clean bill. It contains no special projects.

As I would react to the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) regarding the pay provision of this bill, the $1.84 billion that are involved, we did not provide authorizing language because we were working very closely with the authorizers, who feel that is a centerpart of their own legislation.

Indeed, their willingness to continue to work cooperatively with us in the months ahead are very important to both the committees, the authorizers as well as the appropriators, who are concerned about this matter.

I would like to be very specific about one fact: That is, the vote today will send a very, very clear message to Slobodan Milosevic, who is watching our actions on the floor today. Our saying clearly that we intend to support our troops as long as they have to serve in this region and are faced with this challenge is very, very important, and Milosevic is watching the Members today.

Beyond that, I would like to say to my colleagues, it is very important that while we may disagree on policy, that we come together in the final analysis on this vote. Nothing could be worse than to see sizeable numbers walk away from this very, very important bill. In the final analysis, I am convinced that there will be solid support for the $11.24 billion of this bill that is reflected in the defense portions of the bill.

Like a number of my colleagues, I have had the opportunity to spend many hours at the White House in recent weeks in briefings with the Commander in Chief and his national security team. If there was one message I heard from the President last week, it was this: "Provide the additional funds if you must, but—and this is very important—do not slow this package down." My colleagues, we must act and act now.

Allow me to take just a minute to outline a few of the details of this $12.9 billion emergency spending package.

The bill has four parts—the largest of which is within the Defense Subcommittee's jurisdiction. For these activities, we have included $11.24 billion which is $5.8 billion above the President's request. The increases are all in areas of identified shortages (spare parts, depot maintenance, training and op tempo funding shortfalls, and base operation costs).

I could go on . . . and on about this package and our effort in Kosovo. In the interest of time and moving this bill forward, I want to simply urge my colleagues to support our military, send a strong signal to our troops in the field, and support this supplemental.

In closing, I would like to thank the following people on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee staff, Chairman YOUNG's staff, as well as my own personal staff, for their valuable assistance with this bill: Kevin Roper, Greg Dahlberg, Doug Gregory, Tina Jonas, Alicia Jones, Paul Juola, David Kilian, Jenny Mummert, Steve Nixon, David Norquist, Betsy Phillips, Trish Ryan, Greg Walters, Sherry Young, Harry Glenn, Brian Mabry, Arlene Willis, Leitia White, Grady Bourn, Julie Hooks, and Dave LesStrang.

Mr. Chairman, as we go forward with amendments later, there will be plenty of time for discussions regarding the detail. But between now and then, it is very important that the Members recognize that the entire public is watching our response and our expression of support or lack of support for our troops as they work in harm's way.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding time to me.

First let me say that I agree very much, this is an American, this is a NATO conflict. We in this House should speak with one voice and not be putting it on political terms. I feel very, very deeply about this. I support this

bill. At the end of the day, I support this bill. It is a major step toward my goal of making this the year of the troops, the year in which we recognize the needs of those who serve in uniform.

I also support it because it ensures that our military has more than adequate resources to carry out the Kosovo air campaign. It bolsters the military readiness of our forces in the Balkan theater and the Armed Forces as a whole. It provides the resources to help address the tragic humanitarian situation in Kosovo.

The basis of this bill was a $6 billion administration request in emergency funding. The request was based on four categories, military operations in and around Kosovo, Kosovar refugee relief, munitions and readiness munitions, and Desert Thunder and Desert Fox military operations.

In addition to the administration's original request, our colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations have seen fit to add to the President's request, both to the humanitarian request and the matter request. There are some problems that our colleagues had on the Committee on Appropriations, and they have tried to address them. They have added certain categories.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to comment on two major additions to the original request. First, this bill sends the right signal to our men and women in uniform by providing $1.8 billion to fund the administration's military pay and retirement package, of course, conditioned upon the enactment of authorizing legislation through our Committee on Armed Services.

Second, this bill provides for $1.1 billion in unrequested funds for overseas military construction in Europe and Southeast Asia. The inclusion of these projects is similar to the inclusion of the administration's pay and retirement package.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to state that our Armed Forces have been neglected for too long. It is time we give our troops the supplies and the support that they need.

Without any coherent international blueprint, the White House has bombed its way around the globe, while dropping troops far and wide for ill-defined peacemaking duties. This policy has gutted the American military, which now must be rebuilt.

Last week a bipartisan Congress voted against President Clinton's undeclared war in Yugoslavia. Both Republican and Democrat members are reluctant to commit U.S. forces to a mission that has no strategic plan, no timetable, no definition of victory, and no clear national interests to defend.

While there are many reasons for that vote, lack of support for our troops was not one of them. To the contrary, the leadership in this Congress supports our troops, but does not support President Clinton's frivolous deployment of them and haphazard waste of military resources.

The last 6 years of focusless military use, combined with defense spending cuts, have stretched our forces to the point where serious gaps in our national security are developing. Not only have we left the Pacific without a single carrier to defend our allies and troops stationed in the region, but the carriers we are sending to combat in Yugoslavia and Iraq are drastically undermanned.

For example, the Teddy Roosevelt is 418 sailors short, and the Enterprise is lacking an alarming 495 sailors. In total, the U.S. Navy is 18,000 sailors short, and those that are there are at risk because of it.

Such shortfalls in recruits and equipment have reached crises level. This Congress wants to rebuild our depleted defense and make sure that our troops have the supplies they need while they are deployed wherever they are deployed.

President Clinton has only proposed to cover the basic costs of his war in Yugoslavia. This Congress wants to take this opportunity to bolster our hollowed out military. This emergency spending will provide much needed munitions, spare parts, construction, training, recruiting, and pay increases for our military.

Amid reports that the United States is running out of cruise missiles and cannibalizing some planes for parts, America must not forget that military weaknesses only challenge our enemies to take costly and dangerous risks.

Mr. Chairman, the time is now to deter our enemies by bolstering our military. We have to send a very clear message that while we may not support the President's ill-advised war, we do support our troops wholeheartedly.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chair of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs, I have the responsibility to recommend to the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) the funding level for the programs that come under the jurisdiction of our subcommittee. We have one overwhelming priority, and that is assistance to the refugees who have been driven from their homes and separated from their loved ones.

The President requested a total of $566 million from our subcommittee as part of his supplemental request. We have approved the entire amount of this funding level, but we made some modifications. The funding would be allocated as follows:

—$96 million for international disaster assistance;

—$105 million for support of frontline States, including $5 million to document war crimes;

—$75 million for Eastern Europe assistance to assist refugees within the borders of the frontline States; and

—a total of $290 million for the refugee assistance accounts.

Part of the original request was $170 million for an account normally used for long-term development projects.

We have tried to discover how the funds would be used. We were told that $95 million of this amount would be made available for refugee assistance, but we already have separate accounts for the refugee and humanitarian services. When the administration officials were asked about that, we were told these funds could be used for such things as, and I quote, ''NGO development and microcredit activities.''

I have nothing against either of these programs, but they are part of an ongoing program in Eastern Europe. They are emphatically not part of emergency refugee and humanitarian assistance.

The President and Secretary of State have also discussed plans for a Southeastern Europe initiative. I fear they could use these fund to begin such an initiative, and I do not think they should, without adequate consultation and further approval by the Congress. Therefore we moved $95 million from these vaguely defined activities and made that additional amount available for direct support for refugees and humanitarian assistance.

Indeed, this money, the $566 million, may not be sufficient. The administration is constantly changing its policies. It is difficult to know when enough is enough. One day the President announces that we are going to send 20,000 refugees to Guantanamo Bay. A few days later, the Secretary of State says, no, we are not going to do that, we are going to keep the refugees there because we then would be ethnically cleansing the region.

The next day the Vice President of the United States, Mr. GORE, announces that 20,000 refugees are coming to the United States. At the drop of a hat, the Vice President committed $40 million for the transport and relocation of refugees to our country. I was not consulted about this. Neither was anyone else in Congress. I'm not sure the Secretary knew. Now we're left with a $40 million bill, and we must in good conscience pay for it. It leaves a hole in the request. I strongly encourage Members to vote in favor of this bill. It does not give the Administration a pot of money to begin the reconstruction of Southeastern Europe. If they want to begin a massive new spending program in the region, they need to come back to Congress. They and we also need to win the war.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, there are only 147 days left

in this fiscal year. This ought to be a time when we come together with bipartisan resolve to deal with three urgent crises that we could not have anticipated last September: the agricultural collapse in rural America, the devastation of Central America by Hurricanes Mitch and Georges, and the need to support our troops and the allied cause in Kosovo.

The Republican majority, unfortunately, has sought to politicize the NATO operation in the Balkans, withholding support for it last week, amid well-publicized arm-twisting, and now this week voting to double the funding for it! In so doing, the majority hopes to use the NATO campaign to leverage funding for unrelated military purposes.

We should reject partisan gamesmanship that toys with the lives of our troops and the refugees, that trivializes the dignity of our rural citizens, and that belittles the suffering of the people in Central America.

□ 1215

We should, instead, adopt the Obey substitute.

The Obey amendment is well-crafted. It is responsible. It addresses the military and humanitarian needs in the Balkans, fully funding the Department of Defense's request. It includes the most justifiable of the defense add-ons, particularly those involving military pay and readiness. It addresses the disaster in Honduras and Guatemala, a situation we ignore at our Nation's peril; for if we ignore it, we will surely face a new flood of immigration northward and greater vulnerability to drug trafficking. And the Obey amendment provides desperately needed funding to meet the collapse in the price of agricultural commodities.

Mr. Chairman, the House today has an opportunity to reverse its recent history of politicizing issues that should not be politicized and defaulting on the responsibility of a great power. Support the Obey substitute.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

It is really interesting to me. This bill is not about any political gamesmanship, and it has not been politicized. This bill is a true, clean national defense bill that provides what the national defense establishment needs to protect our Nation and to protect our troops.

The only partisanship that I have heard in this debate today has come from that side, accusing this side of being partisan or of politicizing or of political gamesmanship. I want to assure the gentleman that there is no politics in this at all.

For speakers on the other side to try to create the atmosphere that this is somehow political is just not right. We have gone overboard to make sure over the years that national defense issues were not political and there were no political games being played on them.

I want to call attention just one more time to the fact that the only issue of politicization or political gamesmanship is coming from over there. And the fact that they say it does not make it true, and I insist that it is not true. This is a clean national defense appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and I rise today to speak in strong support of the bill before us.

Voting ''yes'' today is a vote for our troops. It says definitively that their daily sacrifices will not be downsized or neglected any more. It shows that we can transcend our differences and unite for their well-being. Our troops are in harm's way, so it is our duty and responsibility to muster the resolve to keep them safe.

I worked closely with military commanders in the field to make this bill a reality. It is responsible and tightly honed to our most immediate and unanticipated needs in the Balkans and Southwest Asia. Remember that our European infrastructure is a critical staging area. It supports our mission in the Balkans and our training and passthrough for operations in the Gulf and Africa.

The time for leadership is now. There simply has been a failure to support our troops living and working overseas under very dangerous conditions. Let us pass this bill and show our troops that the sacrifices they make are worthy of the support of Congress and the American people.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and I want to again commend him for his leadership in bringing the Obey amendment to the floor because, indeed, it is the responsible approach to the challenge that we have before us.

Let me just first say that it is hard to believe that nearly 7 months ago there was the greatest natural disaster, the worst natural disaster in the history of our hemisphere since they recorded these things in Central America. I do not think the American people know that we have still not passed out of this Congress legislation for the disaster assistance that the American people in their compassion wanted us to do. The assistance is still hung up on budgetary gimmickry and offsets and the rest.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) corrects the situation in his amendment. Mr. OBEY also recognizes the large number of refugees who have come out of Kosovo and puts $175 million more in for humanitarian assistance. Again, whatever we may think of the war effort and the air strikes, the American people, God bless them, want the refugees to have humanitarian assistance. It also addresses the needs of America's farmers here at home, and it is responsible in meeting the needs of our military.

And how proud we are of our people in the military, both for putting themselves in harm's way and their courage, but also for the military's role in humanitarian assistance. They assisted most recently in the Balkans, and they were indeed largely responsible for our initial emergency assistance in Central America, even though we still have not paid the bill on that.

So I ask my colleagues, when the time comes for amendments, to vote and support the Obey amendment and to do so with the knowledge that it is the responsible approach to meeting the needs of our military, to addressing the pay raise issue for the military, to honoring the commitment of the American people for humanitarian assistance and to do it in a fiscally sound way.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG); the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS); the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA); and other members of the Committee on Appropriations for ''leaning forward'' and doing the right thing by addressing some of the most serious readiness and quality-of-life shortfalls facing our military today.

Our Nation's military leaders publicly testified last fall that the President's 6-year defense plan fell about $150 billion short of meeting basic military requirements. Knowing how politics work in this town, we should assume that the Joint Chiefs' estimate of the military shortfalls is understated.

The budget resolution added about $8 billion to the President's underfunded defense request. It is a small but necessary first step. This supplemental adds approximately $6 billion in additional funding to address some of the military's most critical shortfalls.

Our military has the responsibility of being able to fight two multiple theatre wars and conduct multiple concurrent smaller-scale contingency operations throughout the world. We have been cutting back on our military since 1989, to the extent that we could not conduct one at the time.

The Army and the Air Force has been cut back 45 percent, the Navy 36 percent, the Marines 12 percent. At the same time, our operational requirements have increased 300 percent. The problem is past being an emergency, it is critical.

These additional funds will only begin to help our military to properly defend this country with a minimum loss of American lives among our service people.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, it has been more than a month since Milosevic launched his campaign of genocide. His atrocities continue to fill us with horror and revulsion: more than a million people, driven from their homes at gunpoint; entire towns burned to the ground; men and boys forced to kneel by the side of the road and shot dead before their families; grandparents burned alive because they were too feeble to flee.

In the face of such brutal and systematic slaughter, we need to send him a message, an unmistakable message of American resolve, that his campaign of genocide will not stand.

We have to set partisan politics aside. We have to stand united behind our troops. Even as we speak today, our pilots are hurtling off the decks of our carriers, risking their lives to save the Kosovars and see justice done. We have to give them the support that they need in order to win.

Milosevic cannot be allowed to prevail. The scale and the details of his inhumanity ignite our moral indignation. Accounts coming out of Kosovo are shocking: Serbian soldiers knock on the windows of a refugee's car as he and his family wait to cross the border, and they were bearing AK–47s. They demanded $6,000 from the driver or his two daughters in the back seat. The father empties his wallet, but it is not enough. So the soldiers pull the young women from the car, drag them to a nearby garage, where several other soldiers, also wearing masks, were waiting. The gang rape lasted hours.

Last Friday, in the village of Pristina, Serbian troops murdered 44 Kosovars, shooting some and burning others alive. When relatives of the victims went to bury their loved ones, the soldiers told them that they would be shot, too, if they uttered a single prayer for the dead. And as one of the Kosovars said later, perhaps our silence helps them to deal with their shame.

Well, Mr. Chairman, America cannot and we will not be silent as long as Milosevic continues his campaign of terror. As a superpower at the peak of our prosperity and our strength, America cannot look the other way and we cannot be diverted by our partisan differences.

I have been troubled by the procedures that the House adopted today, and we have seen people trying to play politics with the President's funding request for these troops. I would urge my colleagues to unite behind the Obey substitute. It is clean, it is straightforward, it is a strong response to the present emergency, and by all prognostications it will be what we end up with next week on this floor.

In the end, we have to move this process forward; and we have to do it today. Now is the time to accept the responsibilities of leadership. Now is the time to support our troops in the field, who are risking their lives so that this century might end better than it began. Now is the time to send Milosevic an unmistakable message: At the end of the 20th century, the world will not stand for genocide.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Chair how much time the gentleman yielded back?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. No, I asked how much time did the gentleman yield back?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman yielded back 30 seconds, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I think I probably just wasted 20 seconds of my time. I was not prepared for this. Let me be very brief now that my time has been stressed.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask Members to permit the eyes of their minds to see a greater vision here and to not be so narrow to think of this as Kosovo and Kosovo only.

What concerns me most is that this is about funding a national military strategy. Sure, there are discussions of politics. Frankly, I do not mind that, because it is policy that drives all of this. The President's singular responsibility is to lay out the vital national security interests, then we come up with a military strategy as the means to enforce those.

The President has one that is different, and I would not go along with it, but it is for us to transition out of a posture of global engagement in over 135 countries around the world and then fight and win nearly two simultaneous major regional conflicts. The open secret is we do not have the force structure today to do that.

Let me share some facts with my colleagues about the size of the military today. In the Gulf War, we had 18 Army divisions, we had 24 Air Force tactical wings, and in the Navy ships and submarines we had 546 in 1990. Today, we are down to 10 divisions in the Army, 13 tactical wings in the Air Force, and a 315 ship Navy. That is a reduction in the Army by 250,000, in the Air Force 150,000, and in the Navy 200,000.

So what have we done by taking a foreign policy of global engagement? We have taken our military and we have stretched this great military of ours very thin all over the world. Now we find ourselves with depleted munitions. Depleted munitions. And not only in our ammo.

When I hear individuals say, well, we are going to have to cut back or we are only going to have to replace bullet for bullet, do my colleagues realize the risks we are being placed in in other scenarios around the world?

□ 1230

Do not take it from me. Take it from General Shelton. General Shelton, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, ''Suffice it to say that what we have going on right now in Kosovo is a major theater of war with air assets. The fighting in Yugoslavia now means a much higher risk of a second regional conflict, protracted, with significant casualties.''

My colleagues, vote for this.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank my ranking member for yielding me the time, a new member on the committee, for this most important discussion.

It is not whether we support our troops or not. We all do. We support them because they are risking their lives for us as the greatest country in the world. What we do not support at this time is the doubling of appropriations that our President gave us.

We are 2 months away from doing the 2000 budget. We ought to be using this time and the extra $6 billion to put during that time in the appropriations process.

It is important that we take care of education for our children, health care for our seniors, housing for those who need it. It is unfortunate we will not be able to get to that during this budget time because of the caps, the political caps that were set.

Let us not say we do not support the troops, because we do. Let us support the President, our troops, and the Obey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in vehement opposition to H.R. 1664, the Kosovo Supplemental Appropriations for FY 1999. More than half of this bill's $13 billion appropriation is being used for funds that will eventually come from the budget surplus, and only illustrates the collective cowardice of the majority in refusing to consider these military construction projects under normal budgetary procedures. In essence, this bill gives to the military and takes from Social Security and Medicare. What is worse is that the doubling of the increase of this bill, from President Clinton's original request for $6 billion to $13 billion, has not seen a resulting increase in aid to the refugees or in humanitarian aid, ostensibly a key part of this bill's original purpose. As one of the newest members on the House Appropriations Committee, I know that Appropriations are about three things: what you need, what you want, and what you'd like to have. This bill

was half of what we need, some of what members want, and no increase in what the refugees would like to have.

In order to accurately discuss this vote, we must first place these issues into context. After the breakdown of peace talks between Serbian and Kosovar representatives in Rambouillet, France in mid-March, Serb forces entered the Yugoslav province of Kosovo en masse. An estimated one million Kosovar Albanians have since been driven from their homes, most into Albania and Macedonia, thousands of Kosovar Albanian men remain missing, and reports of rape and murder continue to trickle out of the embattled region.

In response, on March 24, 1999, NATO began a massive bombing campaign against Yugoslav forces and installations in Serbia and Kosovo. Close to 1,000 NATO warplanes are now involved in the airwar (with over 80% from the United States). President Clinton recently called up an additional 33,000 reservists to aid in the fight, and asked Congress for $6.0 billion in supplemental funds to pay for current operations. This $6 billion request more than adequately addresses the commitment of the United States to this unified effort.

The Republicans on the House Appropriation Committee drafted a $12.9 billion emergency FY99 supplemental spending bill. On top of the White House's $6.05 billion spending request for the Kosovo mission, Republican appropriators included $1.8 billion to fund a pay raise and retirement package through the remainder of FY99, and the bill includes an additional $74 million in unspecified worldwide ''minor'' construction projects, provides additional funding for munitions purchases and operational readiness needs, such as recruitment, replacement of spare parts, equipment maintenance and military base operations, primarily with additional funds for operational readiness and for a military pay raise and retirement package. The bonus of this additional $6 billion in funding is that it does not have to be offset by similar reductions in spending in other programs.

This is nothing but fiscal legerdemain, a sorry billion-dollar version of the old New York City street con of the three shells and the pea. Unfortunately, the elderly and the poor are the hapless victims of this con job. The majority of the Democratic members on this Committee see this for what it is: nothing but an attempt to fund defense projects that will not fit within the tight spending caps for FY00. I must reiterate one key point: there is not one thin dime of an increase in refugee assistance funding in this bill.

There are certainly many items within this legislation that are probably worthy of the support of scarce taxpayer dollars. Let me make this clear: I do not oppose the hard working and brave persons in our nation's Armed Forces from getting a well deserved pay increase, better housing, a much improved retirement program, or other such items as needed. I object that my Republican colleagues do not have the collective courage to make the hard decisions and difficult choices inherent in being a member of the august House Appropriations Committee. What is becoming abundantly clear is one thing: the budgetary caps on spending will have to be increased. Only then will Congress be able to address our urgent domestic needs, preserve our vital fiscal surplus, and protect our nation's seniors who have already paid the price for the freedom that most of us enjoy but all of us take for granted.

Our colleague, Congressman DAVID OBEY, will offer a sensible amendment that provides a total of $11 billion in funding. Of this sum, funds that do not have to be authorized will go toward an immediate pay increase for the military; an increase in the operations and maintenance in Kosovo, and more importantly, $175 million more for the refugees of Kosovo. If Congressman OBEY's amendment is reasonable, sensible, and deserves the support of the majority of our colleagues.

I would like to paraphrase a recent article in the New York Times, in closing, on this issue: This is nothing but Republican cowardice triumphing over principle; don't vote for the war, don't take responsibility for the war, don't vote to stop the war, but vote to pump more money into a policy we don't like. American taxpayers pay us a good sum of money to make difficult decisions, and it is time that we stepped up to the plate and made them.

It is my hope that the wisdom of Congress will prevail in supporting the amendment of Congressman OBEY. Without the adoption of the Obey amendment, this bill must be rejected by the House of Representatives. Congress must preserve the surplus for Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. We must increase the caps on domestic and defense spending, and do so while maintaining the integrity of our balanced budget. These issues are not mutually exclusive, but Congress must have the courage to make these tough decisions.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Interior.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to pay tribute to the two brave servicemen who lost their lives this week during a training exercise in Albania, Chief Warrant Officer Kevin Reichert of Wisconsin and Chief Warrant Officer David Gibbs from my district.

David Gibbs grew up in Massillon, Ohio, graduating from Washington High School in 1980. I wish to express my sympathy to David's family, his mother Dorothy, his wife and three children. Their pain can only be eased by the knowledge that his country salutes his heroic service.

These two men chose to serve their country in one the noblest traditions and they made the ultimate sacrifice in protecting the principles and freedoms which the United States represents. All our men and women in uniform are to be commended for their service. We must support our troops so they can do the job they so valiantly volunteered to do when they joined the armed services.

And we in Congress have a responsibility to ensure that our troops have the resources they need for the best equipment, the most reliable and advanced technology, and the needed training to make them the most respected military in the world.

I will support this bill, because while we do not yet know the cause of this latest tragedy, the American people need to know that we are adequately supporting our men and women in uniform.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, the reason we are here today is that the President submitted a request for $6 billion for the Kosovo operation, which would bring us to the end of fiscal year 1999; and that was clearly an unforeseen and unforeseeable circumstance that came up because of the actions of Slobodan Milosevic. Those situations ought to be few and far between, outside the caps, without any offsets, a true emergency.

The underlying bill that has come from committee more than doubles the amount from the President's request on a set of premises which are entirely different. It is operating on a premise that goes far beyond, entirely beyond the definition of ''emergency,'' which had been part of the President's request, and much of it is only partly related to Kosovo.

On the other hand, we have before us an amendment that has been offered by the minority ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), which responsibly but narrowly deals with the Kosovo situation and other emergencies along the way.

Who can deny that we look rather foolish in this Congress, and I really am embarrassed by it, that 7 months after what had happened in Central America and 7 months after we truly knew way back in the fall that the problems on our farms were very serious, yet we passed that legislation 3 months ago. It has not moved to a final conclusion, the emergencies relating to Central America and related to the farms, and we have not done anything about it.

The Obey amendment deals with both of those issues and also makes certain that the pay increase for our military personnel is funded now, not uncertain as to when and if it will be authorized, but funded now. So it deals with the emergencies in Kosovo, on the farms, in Central America, and our military personnel.

I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, we have a world crisis and an acute national emergency. I support this $12.9 billion spending package.

I have opposed past defense spending bills because we have failed, in my judgment, to take four difficult but necessary steps to realize savings and modernize our military. We failed to: cancel procurement of expensive, unnecessary weapon systems; close unnecessary military bases and depots at home and abroad; and require our allies, particularly Europeans, to pay

their fair share of stationing U.S. troops in their countries.

And we are still funding a military designed to fight the Cold War, but the Cold War has ended. The world today is different, and it is a more dangerous place.

The war in Kosovo costs money, and lots of money. As a fiscal conservative during my 11 years in Congress with consistently high marks from the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, and other fiscal watch dog organizations, I am on the floor to say we need to appropriate this money. The fact is that we have already spent it.

Over the past 40 years, the United States has deployed troops around the world 41 times, but 33 of these 41 missions have come in just the past 8 years.

We need to realize the tremendous costs we accrue when we deploy our military to troubled spots all over the world. These missions cost money and resources which we have taken from other parts of the defense budget.

Today, our military has a number of acute needs that must be addressed. We need to do a better job attracting new enlistees and maintaining the necessary level of reenlistment. Our soldiers, sailors, pilots and Marines are overworked and underpaid. Our training has suffered. We do not have the necessary munitions for potential new encounters. And we are cannibalizing existing planes, tanks, and other equipment for their parts in order to make other equipment operational.

Mr. Chairman, many of us have not supported the President's decision to use military force in Yugoslavia and did not vote for last week's resolution endorsing air strikes. But the fact is, there is a war in Kosovo and we need to pay for it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the effort being undertaken by NATO in Kosovo and Serbia. I rise in agreement that we must fund our armed services at increased levels to ensure that our security and our ability to join our allies in maintaining international security and stability is maintained.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the President has requested the correct sum for the war until September 30th of this year, $5.9 billion. I believe that war against Serbian genocide and ethnic cleansing is absolutely essential for us to participate in.

But, Mr. Chairman, I also believe we must assist our farmers who find themselves in real crises, and the almost 1 million victims of this hemisphere's worst natural disaster in this century. I therefore, Mr. Chairman, will support the Obey amendment.

I will also, I tell my good friend and the chairman, be supporting increasing the fiscal year 2000 appropriations for our military to ensure the objectives of which I have spoken and of which the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has so eloquently spoken.

Our national interest, our commitment to humanitarian and moral principles, will be served by the passage of the Obey amendment and it will do so in a way more consistent, I believe, with fiscal responsibility and our responsibility to our men and women in the Armed Forces and to our allies in this just war in which we are now involved.

Mr. Chairman, if the Obey amendment fails, I fully intend to support the Young alternative. There is no question but that we must support this effort which is undertaken by NATO and ourselves to defend the principles for which NATO was created, for which this country stands, and which are critically important if the world is to be the place in which we want our children to live and in their future succeed.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), a member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I suspect that history will record our action today on this supplemental as an especially important act of this Congress. As we basically fight two undeclared wars simultaneously, one through humanitarian purposes in the Balkans and the other over Iraq, our actions today help pay for one and indirectly for the other.

This is a replenishment but it is also an investment to keep our young people in uniform, and wars are fought by the young, safe and well-equipped in battle. This bill supports our troops. This bill will make an immediate difference in their lives.

This bill acknowledges what the White House will not, that all of our military and humanitarian missions in the Balkans will cost billions more than the President will admit. This bill will boost morale by providing military pay raises and retirement benefits. It will do things for refugees.

And finally, this bill gives the President control over the use of these emergency dollars that we provide. In other words, the Commander in Chief could use it to meet any crisis.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this emergency supplemental bill for our troops in Yugoslavia under the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILL YOUNG). I think it is a great bill.

President Clinton has created a national security emergency by cutting the defense budget while spreading our troops around the world. In the last 8 years, our military has been reduced by some 40 percent. Look at Yugoslavia. Already the President has had to call up 25,000 reserves and divert planes from the Iraqi ''no fly'' zone to Yugoslavia.

While I have, and many others do as well, strong reservations about the decisions that have led us to this point, I feel that the United States is now confronted by a series of bad options in Yugoslavia. I believe it is important, however, that NATO continue its operation. The credibility of NATO and the United States depends on it.

The $12.9 billion in this bill will ensure that our troops receive the resources they need to carry out their mission and begin to rebuild our national defenses, which have been substantially weakened by Mr. Clinton's neglect.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing and support our troops by voting ''yes'' on this important bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1664. This is not a referendum today on the air campaign against Yugoslavia. It is a first step in restoring the dollars that have been taken out of critical readiness accounts of the Department of Defense and to replenish stockpiles of our critical weapons and munitions.

We have a crisis today in the readiness of our Armed Forces. Two weeks ago, I was out at my Jacksonville Naval Air Station. Twenty-one P–3's sitting on the tarmac. Only four could fly because of a lack of spare parts. I met with the S–3 pilots. They are supposed to be flying 20 to 25 hours a month to keep up their skills. They had only flown 5 hours last month because there were no planes that they could fly.

This Congress needs to send a message to the young men and women serving in uniform in our military that we support them and that we are going to provide them with the resources that they need to do the fine job that they always do for this country. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1664.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, just when we were starting to see evidence of the positive change in the old international mind-set of having the rest of

the world identify a problem at some distant point on the globe and collectively point to the U.S. and say they solve the problem with their troops and their treasury, it appears we are in danger of reverting to the old way.

□ 1245

Several weeks ago we gave conditional approval to the U.S. being part of a NATO international peacekeeping force in Kosovo. Four thousand troops out of the 28,000, 15 percent of the total. Now that we have undertaken the air campaign, instead of a 15 percent contribution, it appears we are shouldering from 60 to 80 percent of that contribution.

The President should seek financial reimbursement from our allies as this bill requires. Moreover, the military campaign will not be the end of the story in Kosovo. Refugee assistance and resettlement will be expensive undertakings. So, too, will rebuilding. There must be equitable burdensharing. Our Nation has not, cannot and will not walk away from our responsibilities. But the burden is not ours exclusively, and our allies must recognize this.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

While our military operations in Kosovo continue with no end in sight, America faces a crisis in military readiness. Our troops are overextended and underfunded. The military is 40 percent smaller now than the successful force of Operation Desert Storm, and operational commitments around the world have increased by 300 percent. More troops are being sent around the world to perform more missions with fewer resources. While Congress has restored some funding to the defense budget, the Joint Chiefs of Staff still estimate that there is a significant shortfall.

The Navy is decommissioning ships faster than they are being replaced. We are literally flying the wings off aircraft that are almost 40 years of age. The Air Force and the Army are running short on missiles. The list goes on and on. An effective military force cannot fight and win in a world where critical weapons systems must be cannibalized to keep other equipment operational.

Task Force Smith paid a high price in Korea in 1950 because the Army was stretched too thin, underequipped and overutilized. We must not allow that to happen again. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the supplemental. Not only is readiness important and the funding we are putting in here will bring the morale of our troops up where it should be and provide them the resources they need, but we are also showing strong support at the same time for our operations in Kosovo. I think that that is particularly important, that we stress that we are fully supportive of what our military is doing at the present time in Kosovo and that we are fully behind the work of our courageous and brave men and women who are out there fighting this battle for all of us.

These humanitarian concerns that we have in this Congress are particularly important. We want to make certain that our military today and tomorrow is going to have the sufficient resources and assets that are so important.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, objection has been heard from the other side of the aisle because I have stated, as have others, that this war is being politicized. Let me tell my colleagues why I say that. A spokesman for your leadership last week, in explaining to the press how they justified voting to double spending for a war which last week they opposed conducting at all, said: ''it is easier for us to support the Pentagon than it is to support this President.''

The distinguished majority whip took the floor just a few minutes ago and said ''This President is bombing his way around the globe.'' That is the same gentleman who was reported in a Washington Post article last week to have called in a series of lobbyists to ask them to lobby for this bill.

One member is quoted in the article, '''We've added a lot in defense money to this,' said one lawmaker who asked not to be identified. 'That helps those lobbyists.'''' That is not my quote. That is a member of the other side.

Another member of the leadership is quoted as saying, ''We want to make clear that this is Clinton's war.''

The majority is suggesting that we ought to, instead of supporting the request that the President has made of almost $7 billion, instead they are pouring billions of dollars, totally unrelated to the war, into this budget bill which is supposed to be an emergency appropriation for Kosovo. And what effect does that have? That gives the public the impression that the war costs a whole lot more than it is actually costing. Then they wonder why I raise objections about the politicization which has gone on.

Then we have heard that Clinton has almost single-handedly weakened the military. I would point out that the other side of the aisle has controlled this House for the last 4½ years. They have spent more than $1 trillion on military spending during that time. They have added $27 billion to the President's request. Yet all but $3.5 billion of that has gone for items other than readiness. If they are so concerned about readiness, why did they not put the money there, instead of spreading it and larding it for pork items all throughout the budget? Pork items which have been amply reported in the press.

I heard one speaker say that it was terrible that we did not have enough JDAM missiles. I would point out, it was the majority party that pushed a bill through this House last year which cut the appropriation for JDAMs from $53 million to $46 million and cut the number of available missiles by 17 percent. If they really believed we needed additional money for readiness, why did they not put the money there in the 4½ years that they have led this institution?

And then, lastly, we hear a speaker say that we have got to have better burdensharing between other NATO countries and the United States. Yet their version of this bill gratuitously pays, 1 year ahead of time, our full military construction dues to NATO. That makes us the only country in the world that provides them money ahead of time. How are we going to get better burdensharing when we are acting like Uncle Sucker doing that?

I would urge Members to vote for my amendment when the time comes. That is the responsible action to take.

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

One of our speakers said that history will record our activities today. I am not so much concerned about history as I am the young Americans who are serving in uniform, those in the Army and the Navy and the Air Force and the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard who go to war when America goes to war. Those are the ones that I am trying to look after today and that this bill tries to look after.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has just raised the issue of JDAMs again. Over the 4 years that I had the privilege of chairing the Subcommittee on Defense, the biggest battle I had on this floor in developing a bill that could be signed was because I added more money than the President asked for.

Mr. OBEY. Not for JDAMs.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. For JDAMs. To show Members how conservative this committee is, JDAMs last year was not ready to go into full production because JDAMs had some technical problems. And so there was a program slip, and we did reduce the amount of money because of the program slip. We are not going to pay for a program that is slipping. JDAMs are being used today, and we are running out of them.

Mr. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for adequate funding for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) military actions in Kosovo. I support the Clinton Administration's request for $6 billion to stop Yugoslavian President Slobodan Milosevic's campaign of terror, but I cannot

support the $12 billion funing package proposed in H.R. 1664.

The U.S. role in NATO must be unflinching. The Administration's $6 billion spending request is too important to be bogged down in political maneuvers of non-urgent defense spending. Let us pass the $6 billion our military needs to continue operating the NATO effort and then debate the merits of additional, non-emergency military funding in another, less urgent forum.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I firmly support H.R. 1664, The Emergency Defense Supplemental Appropriations Bill for FY 1999.

Mr. Chairman, our armed forces are stretched farther around the world today than at any time in our history. Deployments in both the Middle East and the Balkans have revealed a true national defense emergency. Our armed forces are suffering from dangerously low personnel, equipment and muntions.

Our military is under considerable strain and the measures being taken to continue operations cause me great concern. We are converting portions of our critical nuclear arsenal for conventional warheads to address severe cruise missile shortages. We are pulling aircraft carriers out of the Pacific to patrol the Mediterranean, despite potentially dangerous tensions with China and North Korea. We are transferring aircraft and support crews from missions over Iraq to fly sorties over Yugoslavia. Finally, the President has called up 30,000 reservists and enacted orders that prohibit many members of the Air Force from leaving the service until the Kosovo air war is over.

Mr. Chairman, the shell game our military commanders are being forced to play must be stopped. We cannot continue to put our service men and women in harm's way without the support necessary to complete the resources without delay. To do anything less is both irresponsible and morally wrong.

I firmly oppose this Administration's policy in the Balkans. I have repeatedly voted against legislation affirming our participation in Operation Allied Force and continue to believe that American military intervention in the region is not the answer. My vote in support of this emergency supplemental legislation is not an approval of this Administration's foreign policy in Yugoslavia, Iraq, Haiti or any other region of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 1664 because this legislation supports our troops. No matter where our troops are deployed, Congress must never neglect their needs. We have a responsibility to provide our military personnel with the necessary tools and training to complete their missions wherever they are. Congress cannot abandon our troops just because the President deploys them unwisely. I urge my colleagues to support our service men and women by approving this important legislation.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, watching this debate I couldn't help but ask myself a question. Where are the 302B allocations? For those watching at home, 302B allocations set the spending levels that the 13 Appropriations Committees must work with to move forward the federal—nonemergency—spending.

The 302B allocations are nowhere to be found. The federal budget is so tight that the Majority Budget Committee Members can't figure out how they are going to fund the government next year without busting the spending caps. The Majority is having a heck of a time figuring out how to increase military spending without cutting important social initiatives or busting the budget caps.

Then, along comes the Kosovo Emergency Spending bill—which Congress can now use to slide billions of dollars under the budget caps into military spending with little complaint from the Administration. Well, I protest, Mr. Chairman.

The other body has done the right thing with the Kosovo Emergency Spending bill. I support the Obey substitute because it, as well as the bill moving through the other chamber, gets the job done in Kosovo, but is not a giveaway to the special interests here in Washington.

This bill is not an excuse to push through billions of dollars of spending and take the pressure off the federal spending caps. That should be done in front of the American public in the normal Appropriations process.

Support the Obey substitute.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1664, making emergency supplemental appropriations for military operations, refugee relief, and humanitarian assistance relating to the conflict in Kosovo. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to respond to current defense shortfalls. However, I would also like to take this opportunity to highlight a few of my concerns about the bill.

U.S. forces are in harm's way. This is the case no matter what your position was on the debate regarding the Kosovo policy resolutions last week, Therefore, it is imperative for the Congress to stand united in support of this important bill. While I continue to strongly oppose the deployment of U.S. ground troops to the region, it is nevertheless critical that our military commanders and our troops have the necessary military equipment to carry out their current mission and finish the job.

Passing this bill sends a clear message to Slobodan Milosevic that we stand united behind our Armed Forces. A strong, bipartisan vote shows that we will continue to fight Milosevic and his brutal campaign of ethnic cleansing, and that we support NATO's mission to force him to withdraw from Kosovo and return to peace negotiations.

This bill is designed to replenish the current shortages in munitions, equipment and spare parts in the Services. While this bill goes further than the President's initial request, it is still an appropriate response to accelerate funding to meet the critical shortfalls identified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Clearly, the conflict in Kosovo has exposed the fact that our Armed Forces can be overextended. We are involved militarily in Iraq and Bosnia at the same time we pursue our objectives in Kosovo. Our immediate ability to respond to crises in other strategically important areas, such as the Persian Gulf and the Pacific theater, has been eroded considerably. Moreover, if we are going to reverse the alarming rate of decline in recruitment and retention of experienced military personnel, we must also provide adequate pay, quality-of-life and retirement benefits.

I have some concerns that this bill includes more than $1 billion for additional military construction spending. Only a small percentage of these funds have any relevance to the current military activity in Yugoslavia. The 77 projects which are funded in the bill are scattered in locations ranging from Southwest Asia to Northern Europe. It is highly arguable whether they represent the most pressing military construction needs. I question whether they need to be part of this emergency supplemental appropriations bill. I would hope that the House could more appropriately address these military construction add-ons when it is time to consider the regular fiscal year 2000 Military Construction Appropriation bill, which is usually among the first spending bills considered by the House.

However, I strongly support the main thrust and intent of this legislation as an important response to the current defense shortfalls. We must begin the necessary process of correcting that situation now, or it will get worse. I will vote for this bill and strongly encourage my colleagues to support the legislation as well.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to H.R. 1664, the supplemental Emergency Appropriations for Kosovo and Southwest Asia, and I urge the Committee on Appropriations to return to this body with a more fiscally prudent bill to cover the true costs of U.S. military operations against Yugoslavia.

Let me say at the outset that my opposition to this measure does not in any way reflect upon my belief that the President has seriously miscalculated the merits of Operation Allied Force. Last week, as this body debated a series of resolutions dealing with the crises in Kosovo, I expressed my lack of confidence in the military policies pursued by the President and his political advisors.

Today, however, from my humble vantage point, the issue is dramatically different. The men and women of the United States Armed Forces who find themselves in the thick of the Balkan conflict are not allowed to question the merits of the orders given by their commanding officers. By choosing to enlist in the military, they allow themselves to be placed in harm's way in order to defend America's interests even when those ''national interests'' as defined by their Commander-in-Chief are questionable or controversial. I believe Congress must reward their commitment with all of the resources reasonably necessary to successfully carry out their mission.

The issue then before us is as follows: what level of emergency funding is consistent with achieving the objectives of the current NATO military campaign? To put it another way, how much has the Kosovo conflict cost us? It is my opinion that this figure is considerably less than $13 billion.

My colleagues make a somewhat persuasive case that overall military preparedness has suffered as assets, equipment, and manpower are diverted from other regions of the world to cover the conflict in Kosovo. And yet, proponents of this measure are stretching the definition of ''readiness'' to include military projects and equipment not even remotely related to Operation Allied Force.

The bill includes multiple construction items in seven countries: Germany, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom. My colleagues argue that many of the barracks and maintenance shops in those countries were built before World War II and that no significant modernization improvements have been made. Can we not rectify

these shortcomings through the normal appropriations process? Congress necessarily reserves the emergency supplemental bills to pay for unforeseen circumstances like disaster assistance or military conflicts. Do the indoor firing ranges or vehicle wash facilities qualify under such a designation?

The bill further calls for a $1.8 billion increase in military pensions and cost of living adjustments for military personnel not participating in the NATO operation. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, I fully support improvements in the quality of life in the military. I agree with those legislators who claim that this Administration has contributed to the decline in recruitment and retention of experienced military personnel.

However, the situation, while unacceptable, is completely unrelated to the subject of this bill—military operation in Yugoslavia and Southwest Asia. Again, those inequities are better rectified through Congress' annual appropriations process.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the intent of the legislation to restore our military might and return to an era of ''peace through strength''. I have consistently voted in favor of virtually every military appropriation bill that congress has considered. Today, however, I cannot in good conscience support a measure which attempts to reverse several years of military decline by loading up a supplemental appropriations bill and bootstrapping onto a true ''emergency''.

Accordingly, I vote ''no'' on the resolution.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this emergency supplemental appropriations bill for military operations in Kosovo (H.R. 1664). Our military is in fact in an emergency situation, where readiness is dangerously low. I dare say that the two recent Apache (AH–64A) helicopter crashes in the Balkan Theater are a direct result of reduced flying hours for our air crews, which has been precipitated by a constant drain on training dollars. Most regrettably, we have lost the lives of two American patriots.

Mr. Chairman, this state of military un-readiness cannot be allowed to continue, and that is why this $12.9 billion package of military priorities is so important. This appropriations bill includes $3 billion for vital spare parts, depot maintenance backlogs and recruiting, $831 million for neglected overseas military activities that house our forward deployed forces, and $684 million to replenish the all important precision guided munitions (PGM) including cruise missiles, JDAM (joint direct attack munitions), HARM, Maverick, and others. The Administration has allowed the stockpiles of these PGM's to reach a dangerously low level, so we must act now in order to get the production lines running.

In addition, this legislation includes a down payment on needed improvements to military pay and retirement benefits. This $1.8 billion provision will serve as a starting point to increase active duty pay, and the repeal of the REDUX retirement system that has been such a deterrent to recruitment and retention.

My support for this bill should, in no way, be construed as my support for the President's misguided military action in the Balkans. My position in opposition to Operation Allied Force has been clearly stated in previous votes on this floor. This is not a blank check for the President, but a bill to replenish the readiness accounts of the services that have been emptied to carry out this operation. Moreover, we have young Americans serving their country who are in harm's way; they are caught in the middle of this foreign policy dispute, and it would be irresponsible for this Congress not to fully support them in every way possible. This emergency supplemental doesn't begin to fix the long decay of our armed forces, but it provides for their most pressing readiness and equipment needs of today. I urge the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state for the record my position on the Supplemental Appropriation Bill. Last week I voted for a resolution that would have removed our troops from Yugoslavia, pursuant to the War Powers Act. The current mission in Kosovo concerns me tremendously. I am not convinced that our involvement in Kosovo serves our national interest. When the President sends American troops into battle there must be a national interest at stake. There should be a clear goal of the mission, including a realistic exit strategy. In addition, the President should inform the public of the impact on military readiness around the globe.

The operation in Kosovo is extremely perilous. If the President insists on deploying ground troops into Kosovo, many American lives will be lost. The mission in Kosovo is also stripping away valuable military resources from other parts of the world. If the United States continues to engage in peacekeeping missions around the world, our military will be less prepared to respond to true national security threats. Thus, Kosovo presents two real dangers to the United States: one immediate and one long term.

Although I oppose the mission in Kosovo, I understand the need for a strong national defense. The men and women of our armed forces are a treasured asset. No citizen should underestimate the value of the military in protecting our country from foreign threats and defending our national interests abroad. For that reason, I support the efforts of Congress to meet the needs of our armed forces.

Finally, notwithstanding my support for the Supplemental Appropriation Bill, I object to the way Congress pays for emergencies. Currently, Congress is not limited by budget rules or caps when it appropriates money for emergencies. While I agree that Congress needs to be unrestrained when responding to natural disasters, I take exception with the current process of funding emergency situations. Every time Congress attempts to respond to an emergency, Members of Congress use the opportunity to include funding for non-emergency items. Instead, Congress should establish a fund to help pay for emergencies when they arise. That way we can avoid including unrelated items into emergency appropriations bills, and maintain sound fiscal policies at the federal level.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1664. This money is being requested to support the war in Yugoslavia, a war we must exit, not support this ill-conceived conflict has not caused the inadequacies of our defense infrastructure just as surely as these ill-conceived funding requests will not cure the problems that years of fiscal neglect have created.

I believe in a strong defense and I pledge to support funding levels that will strengthen our military. But we must do this properly through the normal FY 2000 appropriations process.

I also believe there are valid humanitarian issues in Kosovo, and I support the humanitarian efforts there. But make no mistake, whether it be 6 or 13 billion dollars, the money will come directly out of the 1999 Social Security budget surplus.

Democrats and Republicans alike have agreed that Social Security needs to be protected, yet we are about to fail our first test of that commitment. I for one refuse to prosecute this war and the pretense for its funding on the backs of the Americans who depend on Social Security.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose this emergency supplemental appropriation to support an undeclared war in Kosovo. Republicans have added a tremendous amount of unnecessary funding to the Administration's request, openly disregarding the integrity of the Congressional budget process and the use of ''emergency spending''.

The bill that we consider today, H.R. 1664, is more than double the Administration's request. Many of the programs loaded into this bill have little to do with the war but rather are individual requests. How do we justify such outrageous spending? Many of these requests have nothing to do with humanitarian efforts to rebuild a country that our bombs are systematically destroying. Let me assure you, I steadfastly support funding for humanitarian efforts—and I would not hesitate to vote affirmatively on a bill specifically targeted to provide such funding. But this bill's major thrust is to support ''pet projects'' and an undeclared war—which I do not support.

Also, I am disturbed by the proposal that social security surpluses could be used to fund this war. Mr. Chairman, I ask you how can this be? Less than two weeks ago this Congress on a bipartisan basis passed the fiscal year 2000 budget resolution vowing to protect social security. How I ask you does a Republican majority extract $6.9 billion out of a program that they argue must be protected by a ''lock box''? I agree with Mr. OBEY's remarks: ''I find it mind-boggling that some of the same members who yesterday voted against the operation will today vote to more than double the amount of spending that the President has asked for to conduct those operations.''

Let me remind you of our obligation to fund programs that support U.S. citizens and taxpayers, our constituents, and our soldiers. Our current discretionary Federal budget allocates a whopping 48.2 percent to national defense, while a mere 5.3 percent is invested in educating our children; an embarrassing 1.5 percent is dedicated to housing our citizens; and worse still, the very soldiers who serve today, and become our veterans tomorrow, are shamelessly allocated just 3.4 percent of the Federal discretionary budget to support their veterans benefits and services.

Mr. Chairman, these are only a few of the significant programs that deserve this Congress' attention and support. I vehemently oppose this supplemental appropriations bill, and more importantly I oppose this war. Instead of voting on this supplemental, let's do something far more meaningful. Let's vote to stop the bombing and direct our attention towards negotiating a diplomatic solution to end the horrific genocide, death and destruction in Yugoslavia. A bill that provides ''true'' humanitarian assistance to the people of Kosovo, and rebuilds the region will get my vote.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, this bill before us today—The Kosovo and Southwest

Asia Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1999—is bringing to the fore front of debate several pressing issues that will have a long-standing effect upon the National Security of the United States.

First, the Kosovo operation, while it may not directly be vital to America's immediate national security interests, it most certainly will have an impact in the long-term. The United States is engaged in the Balkans to combat the forces of inhumanity and aggression. The list of daily atrocities committed by Yugoslavian troops against the ethnic Kosovar Albanians, is all but too well known. We are indeed witnessing a modern day genocide in Europe. Here it is, almost the end of the century, and we almost stood idlely by as President Slobodan Milosevic began a genocidal policy of intimidation, rape and extermination under the name of ''ethnic cleansing.'' However, the United States and NATO did not stand down. Geo-politically, the conflict in the Balkans has the potential to embroil other nearby states, thus creating a destabilizing effect throughout Eastern Europe. America has a vital security interest in a stable, democratic and peaceful Europe. This is why the United States along with its NATO allies have found it necessary to stand up to Milosevic's naked aggression in Kosovo. In order to continue this important mission, the President has requested this emergency spending bill, which will pay for the mission for until the end of the fiscal year.

The second vital element that is included within the President's bill is the international economic, refugee and disaster assistance package for the ''front-line states'' effected by the Balkans crisis. Furthermore, I support the Obey substitute Amendment because it does so much more for the refugees than the Republican add-on in the underlying legislation. This money will go towards fulfilling our long-term commitment to the peoples of the Balkans and demonstrate our extreme desire to sow the seeds of recovery once the conflict is over. Additionally, the Obey substitute measure also places in this emergency bill, the Agricultural and Central American Assistance package from the previous supplemental, H.R. 1141. This is vital to protect and assist America's farmers and our Latin American neighbors who suffered terrible privation after Hurricane Mitch raged across their lands. My own district of Guam would indirectly benefit from this added provision, as some funds dedicated to the Immigration and Naturalization Service would be reprogrammed to assist in Guam's plight with illegal migrant Chinese nationals, of which some 1,100 have been apprehended.

Mr. Speaker, the third issue effecting America's long-term security interests included in this bill have to do with supporting and paying for our Armed Forces. I do support the pay raise included herein as our troops have long had to face a widening gap in pay between themselves and the private sector. America's military men and women are the very embodiment of dedication, ingenuity and ''can-do'' tenacity. They deserve this pay raise and I urge every member to support it. Interestingly, the Republican budget resolution this year did not fund the 5.5 percent raises for certain military personnel critical to maintaining readiness, commonly referred to as ''Pay Table Reform.''

There are other military budget items that are also funded by Congress. These are in the areas of MILCON, spare parts, munitions, readiness, base operations and depot maintenance. These budget accounts are very important and do require our attention. In principle, I support recapitalizing these important accounts. However, my colleagues on the other side of the isle are misconstruing some of the facts regarding the military budget in general and this spending bill in particular. In fact the Republican majority has spent many weeks bashing the President for his supposed lack of concern for our military. For weeks, they have incorrectly stated that the President has been negligent in his responsibility to provide for our military. They maintain that this is demonstrated by the President's many years of inadequate defense budget requests while, at the same time, deploying troops in more world-wide engagements than ever before. What my learned colleagues fail to comprehend is that today's ''readiness crisis'' is actually as result of two simultaneous factors—the post-cold war military draw down and the new multi-faceted security environment. These two components are not any person's fault despite what the majority would have you believe but they are a reality of tighter budgets and an unstable and uncertain international arena. It is glaringly apparent that the Republican majority is using the occasion of the Emergency Spending Bill as an opportunity to politicize and cast blame on certain global realities that our nation's foreign policy experts—on all sides of the political spectrum—still have yet to sort out.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to also point out that the Republicans have conveniently forgotten that the discretionary budget caps enacted into law, which sets the spending levels for the Department of Defense, were part of the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997. The very same bill that was supported by the entire Republican leadership of the House and Senate and the vast majority of Congressional Republicans.

The President requested $198 billion more in defense outlays than the Republican Budget Resolution conference agreement over the 10 year period, 2000–2009. This year the House Democratic alternative provided $48 billion more in defense outlays than the Republican Budget Resolution conference agreement over the 10 year period, 2000–2009.

In their zeal to criticize the Democrats as anti-defense, the Republican's have in fact been creating a mis-information campaign. This year in the House Armed Service Committee hearing cycle on the FY00 budget request, our service chiefs testified about our military's readiness and troop retention problems. One ''quality of life'' benefit that all the chiefs stated was an important factor on declining troop re-enlistment was the retirement system, known as REDUX. A repeal of this program, which would restore military pensions to 50 percent of basic pay after 20 years instead of 40 percent, would go a long way toward reversing the declining re-enlistment rates. Despite the fact that all chiefs noted that the REDUX repeal was a top priority for their troops, the Republican budget did not fund the repeal of REDUX. The Republican resolution rejected the appeals of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to fund this critical personnel initiative.

The Republicans are guilty of not thinking long-term when it comes to defense planning. However, this President does think long-term. This year the President requested $2.9 billion more for defense over five years than the Republicans provided for in their FY 1999 budget resolution. The President, with the support of many Congressional Democrats, have been the moving party for increasing the Defense budget in a responsibly and fiscally prudent manner. While Republicans have been content to follow the President's lead in the short-term, time again, they have shown that in the long-term their holy grail of issues, the tax cut, will always supplant national defense in their budgets.

Mr. Chairman, my dear friends on the other side of the isle are exploiting the Kosovo crisis to make political points against the President and NATO in order to create the impression that Democrats are not strong on defense issues. Their efforts are a political ploy and not a reasoned or responsible effort. I urge all my colleagues to support the Obey substitute amendment.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1664, the Emergency Kosovo Supplemental for Fiscal Year 1999.

My vote today is both a statement of support for our men and women in harm's way and also for addressing the increasingly serious readiness, quality of life, and infrastructure shortfalls.

Last week, Congress fulfilled its duties under the War Powers Act by voting on a resolution calling for the withdrawal of our soldiers from Kosovo and by voting on a resolution to declare war on Yugoslavia. I voted to withdraw our soldiers and against declaring war. In addition, I voted to require the President to obtain congressional approval before deploying ground forces and against authorizing the air strikes.

Despite my votes, the air strikes go on. It is now my responsibility to ensure that our armed forces have the ability to carry out this mission to a successful conclusion. Indeed, H.R. 1664 gives the President precisely what he believes is needed for the Kosovo campaign.

But H.R. 1664 goes further, by addressing the dire emergency that our involvement in Kosovo finally has brought to light. While defense budgets and force structure have diminished, U.S. security commitments have grown. Our soldiers are asked to do more and more with less and less. That is wrong.

The $6.9 billion in H.R. 1664 is merely a down payment on the substantial needs of the military that have for too long been neglected. We will make an immediate difference for our military by providing much needed funds for spare parts, equipment maintenance, and recruiting.

If America wishes to protect its own freedom and security, it must accept the burden of paying for it. This bill advances that cause. I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 1664—support our men and women in the Armed Forces.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, as every Member in this body is well aware, the issue of Kosovo is an extremely difficult one and there is no easy answer.

It would be easier for all of us if this issue were black and white. It would be easier for us if this supplemental spending bill was not mired in politics. And it would be easier if all of the funds in this bill were used for true emergencies.

I supported the Obey amendment today, not because I support further military operations in Kosovo, but because it is the responsible thing to do. The legislation and the current amendment before us, does not address the real

emergencies that need to be dealt with right away.

Regardless of one's perspective on current United States policy and operations in the Balkans, our troops are in harm's way, and we have a responsibility to ensure that they have the resources they need. I do not support continuing the airstrikes and I do not support sending in ground troops.

But we have already spent an estimated $1 billion on this operation. A responsible nation does not commit to something and then refuse to pay for it.

I may oppose the policy that we've committed to, but I am not willing to say that the United States should break the promise America has already made to NATO. It is not that easy. But, I will not refuse U.S. aid for the tens of thousands of refugees expelled from their homeland. That is why I supported the Obey amendment today.

Unfortunately, some Members are using a time of international crisis as an opportunity to load on billions of dollars in pork. No matter what some on the other side of the aisle might say, these additional funds are not going to help the men and women that are stationed in the Balkans.

These funds will not go to the innocent refugees struggling for their very lives throughout the region.

Here's what the pork will pay for: $47 million is going for a bachelor officers' complex in Bahrain; $1.34 billion is earmarked for spare parts unrequested by the Pentagon. Not only are these spare parts unrequested, but the Department of Defense is still overspending for these parts by as much as 618 percent. The Pentagon paid one contractor $76 for 57-cent screws.

None of this wasteful spending is going to bring us closer to peace. Not one pork barrel project is going to end this terrible tragedy or help the innocent Kosovar refugees. And wasteful spending is not going to help the people in Central America or America's farmers hurt by falling crop prices.

If some Members of this Congress are determined to provide additional funds for the military operation not requested by the President, those moneys should come from cuts to wasteful and redundant programs in the current Pentagon budget, through the regular appropriations process.

By weighing this bill down with unrequested pork, we are also jeopardizing aid to our farmers. Our farmers are still faced with declining prices for their crops—threatening their income and their livelihood. It is essential that we rush this aid to American farmers to help them recoup losses resulting from natural disasters and persistently low commodity prices. Farmers need this funding now—but putting unrequested add-ons in this bill could delay and threaten that aid.

We must also take the responsible path and include funding for Hurricane Mitch. Hurricane Mitch left behind a catastrophe of tragic proportions. Thousands died and millions of people were displaced throughout Central America.

This disaster calls for a major humanitarian response from the United States and this Congress has let this issue twist in the wind. That is irresponsible and unacceptable.

We can't turn our backs on our troops, the Kosovar refugees, American farmers, or the victims of Hurricane Mitch. We must address these important issues and be responsible.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of this legislation. I strongly support the funding this bill provides for our troops engaged in the conflict over Kosovo, but I oppose the reckless manner the majority party has taken in bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

As we all know, earlier this year, President Clinton asked Congress for an emergency appropriation to aid disaster relief in the United States and Central America in the aftermath of Hurricane Mitch, provide agricultural relief to U.S. farmers and fund the U.S. commitment to the Middle East peace process. At that time, many Republican members of this body insisted, as is within their rights, that the appropriated funds be offset by finding savings elsewhere in the budget, even though the budget rules don't require offsets.

Now, we have a situation where the President has requested an emergency appropriation to pay for the military operation in Kosovo. Instead of insisting on finding offsets, the Republican members of the House added some $7 billion to this bill in extraneous defense spending unrelated to Kosovo that would usually be considered through the normal appropriations process.

If it is truly an emergency, this bill should provide only the necessary funds for the Kosovo operation, which many Republican members of this body have voted repeatedly against. The willingness of the majority party to increase, by $6 billion, funding for the military effort that most voted against last week is the height of hypocrisy. How can you vote against our engagement in the Kosovo conflict one week, then turn around and vote for a $13 billion increase for that same effort the very next week?

The answer, of course is pork. The majority knows that the increases in this bill won't be offset. This emergency supplemental bill is being used as a tool to pay for billions of dollars worth of defense projects unrelated to the ongoing operation over Kosovo. The majority has, in effect, found a way to fund through the supplemental what their FY 2000 budget resolution won't allow. This bill is being used as a ''free lunch'' card to bypass the appropriations process later this year, while providing the illusion of maintaining the appropriations caps that this body approved in 1997.

As I indicated, I will be voting in favor of this bill because it is the only mechanism we have to provide much needed assistance to the men and women of our armed forces, who are engaged in a dangerous conflict over Yugoslavia. I also happen to support many of the provisions the majority intends to add on to this legislation. And I believe that most of the add-ons in this bill, including a military pay and pension increase, should be considered, but only as part of the normal appropriations process. Unfortunately, the majority has eliminated that option. I fear we are heading down a slippery slope of fiscal irresponsibility lead by the Republican Leadership.

Our troops are engaged in a critical conflict that will have a lasting affect on the stability and future of Europe. We are fighting against the same kind of nationalistic forces that have taken far too many American lives during this century. Let's put partisanship behind us to give our troops the support they need. Let's not sacrifice this bill and fiscal responsibility to the political wishes of a nervous majority.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, with its actions today, the Republican leadership continues its muddle of our Balkan policy. The vast majority of Republicans have already rejected both a declaration of war and a complete withdrawal of our troops, and voted against supporting current troop operations.

However, the Republicans still want to spend twice as much money as requested for Kosovo, thereby surreptitiously busting the budget caps they've pledged to maintain. Ironically, this inflates the cost of the very effort on which they can't figure out their position. Simply being against the President and also claiming 20–20 hindsight on matters of diplomacy is not leadership.

I supported the Democratic substitutes, which would eliminate much of the military spending unrelated to Kosovo. It would also have included the necessary emergency funding for the unprecedented hurricane damage in Central America, and provide much needed aid to the American farmer. It is shameful these funds have languished for months without action.

Our troops deserve a bill that is not one dime less than our military obligations require. The American people deserve a bill that is not one dime more.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support our troops and to express my complete disgust at the process forced on the House of Representatives by the Republican majority.

Today I am faced with a choice. I want to do two things: support our men and women who are in harm's way in Kosovo, and protect the money in the Social Security Trust Fund. Unfortunately, the Republicans have decided that Social Security is not particularly important, and they used the Trust Fund to more than double what the Department of Defense needs to fully fund the military operations in Kosovo. Republicans are willing to rob the Trust Fund to increase the defense budget out of year 2003. I have to ask: how is building a depot in Germany two or three years from now an emergency?

We have an appropriations process. We have budget agreements. It was just three weeks ago that we passed the Republican budget plan that set caps on military spending. The budget sets limit on agriculture spending, education spending, and every other kind of federal spending. Today we are seeing the Republicans bypassing their own budget constraints and undermining the whole process.

Six weeks ago we passed the much needed supplemental spending bill that had money in it to help our farmers get loans they desperately need to begin planting. The situation facing farmers is truly an emergency, and yet the House Republicans decided that the agriculture funding had to be off-set with spending cuts. Six whole weeks have gone by since then and nothing has happpened—no money for farmers, no meetings to get the legislation ready for the President's signature, no apparent concern for American farmers. It is shameful that the Republicans would let our hard-working farmers twist in the wind while we have these petty fights. But now we see these same Republicans stealing from the Trust Fund to spend on pork projects that the Department of Defense has not asked for.

Let me say again, it is a hard choice the Republican majority is forcing on me today. So, while I have no reluctance in supporting our troops, I am only reluctantly voting for this supplemental spending bill.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, this bill is full of pork.

While listening to this debate, I couldn't help but ask myself a question. Where are the 302(b) allocations that the House must use to act on other appropriations bills? For those watching at home, 302(b) allocations set the spending levels that the 13 Appropriations Subcommittees must work with before moving forward the federal—NON emergency—spending.

The 302(b) allocations are nowhere to be found in this Congress.

While federal statute calls on appropriators to put together 302(b) spending levels soon after the budget passes, they have not yet been able to do so. This is because the federal budget is so tight, the Majority can't figure out how they are going to fund the government next year.

Basically, the Majority has been trying to increase military spending under the recently passed federal budget without cutting important social initiatives or busting the budget caps—and under this budget, that was proving impossible.

Then, along comes the Kosovo Emergency Spending bill which Congress can now use to slide billions of dollars under the budget caps into military spending with little complaint from the Administration. Well, Mr. Speaker, I protest.

The other body has done the right thing with the Kosovo Emergency Spending bill. I support the Obey substitute because it, as well as the bill moving through the other chamber, gets the job done in Kosovo, but is not a giveaway to the special interests here in Washington.

The bill we have before us today is not an excuse to push through billions of dollars of spending and take the pressure off the federal spending caps. I urge my colleagues to oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in vehement opposition to the $12.9 billion supplemental appropriations for the military attack on Yugoslavia as well as the $11.7 billion substitute amendment.

Last week, I voted against the bill to authorize the current NATO mission. In fact, the bill failed when two hundred thirteen members of this body also opposed the measure. Why is the majority leadership today requesting $13 billion for a mission they opposed just a week ago. It appears that the majority can't spend enough on a war they refuse to authorize.

The majority is playing partisan politics with Kosovar and U.S. lives.

I will not support a funding request for a mission that has no clear parameters and is laden with pork-barrel defense spending. The Administration asked for $6 billion in the emergency supplemental, not the $12.9 billion to be voted on today. This piece of legislation appropriates funds for some projects that clearly are not urgent in nature.

Instead of giving NATO a war to justify it's purpose, we should be giving our elderly prescription drug benefits, our children better schools, and our workers a Social Security system they can count on when they retire. This bill will divert surplus funds attributable to Social Security in order to pay for military pay raises and retirement as well as military installations abroad that are completely unrelated to Operation Allied Force.

Proponents who support this measure argue that the Pentagon in underfunded. they contend that we must improve our military readiness and quality of life for our military personnel. I disagree but the debate on the appropriate level of defense spending should come in the context of the normal appropriations process where spending caps cannot be broken.

The emergency supplemental should not create an opportunity for ''Christmas at the Pentagon'' with more cruise missiles, laser guided bombs and other munitions added to our arsenal.

Appropriating defense funds for the attack on Yugoslavia gives the President the authorization needed under the War Powers Act to continue the air strikes and allow him to use ground troops if necessary. However, if funds were withheld, the President would be required to remove the troops from their current mission by May 25, 1999. Unfortunately, those same Republicans who voted last week not to authorize the current air strike are essentially giving NATO carte blanche to carry out its air attack through the summer and beyond.

If my colleagues really wanted to support the troops, they would help in the effort to end the NATO bombing. Thirty three thousand reserves have been called up for the Kosovo conflict.

The Cold War is over. The U.S. and NATO must adapt their strategies to reflect this fact. They must learn to deal with regional conflicts and ethnic cleansing in an effective manner, including international diplomatic measures.

I will not vote to spend billions of dollars for a mission that can be accomplished with a smaller price tag through diplomacy. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R.1664, Defense/Kosovo Supplemental Appropriations for FY 1999.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, the President submitted to Congress an emergency spending request of $6.0 billion to fund the current operations in Yugoslavia through the end of fiscal year 1999. The Republican majority then more than doubled the requested amount adding defense spending items that have absolutely nothing to do with the NATO operations or an emergency. For these and other reasons which I will expand upon, I must oppose this bill.

The additional spending on such areas as increased pay and retirement for our military, munitions procurement, spare parts, depot maintenance and additional moneys for recruiting are clearly justified expenditures, but should and must be addressed in the regular appropriation process where the recently passed budget bill reserved $290 billion for such purposes and other priorities. The reason the majority insists on including these items in H.R. 1664 is that the new spending doesn't have to be offset and thus will free up like amounts when they start spending the $290 billion.

Also, many of the other unrequested projects like $115 million for new facilities in Britain including $13 million for a dormitory in Fairlord and $10 million for a control tower in Lakenheath are questionable. Clearly, the $48.3 million for new bachelor housing and $35 million for a control center in Bahrain are not an emergency.

All this additional spending has been declared ''emergency'' spending by the Republicans in order to avoid the need for offsetting cuts in other discretionary accounts. Under this bill, these costs will be taken from the currently projected Federal Budget surplus.

But, Mr. Chairman, the entire surplus is made up of excess Social Security trust funds being amassed to pay Social Security benefits to current and future retirees. It was only a few short weeks ago that you and your colleagues were beating your chests over the myth that you have created a ''lockbox'' to hide the surplus trust funds from those who would seek to spend them! Guess the majority has found the key and now you're doing exactly what you promised the American people you would never do!

Mr. Chairman, I support our men and women bravely serving our country in Yugoslavia. But, I cannot support this bill which circumvents the annual appropriation process and the spending caps and unjustly uses the Social Security Trust Fund surplus.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise with serious concerns regarding H.R. 1664. This bill appropriates a total of $12.9 billion in emergency supplemental funds for fiscal year 1999, some $6.9 billion more than the President's request. Mr. Chairman, Congress needs to resist the temptation to add unrelated expenditures, even important ones, which would further delay the process, because that would undermine the very goals that this funding is intended to meet.

Despite months of allied diplomatic efforts and after forty-three days of a sustained air campaign, the government of Slobodan Milosevic has continued to defy the international community. Instead, Milosevic has pursued a course of repression and terror against the people of Kosovo. The atrocities committed by the government of Milosevic know no bounds, as the Yugoslavian police and military have been bent on the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo.

The NATO alliance could not allow these actions to go uncontested as they represent a threat to European security and stability. The U.S. and NATO objective in Kosovo is to achieve a durable peace that prevents further repression and provides for democratic self-government for the Kosovar people. We know we have a responsibility to the people of Kosovo to respond to the humanitarian crisis.

This past weekend I joined a congressional delegation that traveled to Germany, Albania, Macedonia, Italy and Belgium. While it was indeed disheartening to see the effects of this human tragedy up close and personal, it was reassuring to witness the dedication and selfless dedication of our troops and the humanitarian organizations operating in the region. Our troops are supporting ''Operation Shining Hope,'' a major humanitarian effort to help the refugees. They need our additional help.

Mr. Chairman, it was incomprehensible to imagine the size of this tragedy. While we are all guilty of watching CNN, the scope of this crisis is overwhelming when seen in person. In Albania there are 367,200 displaced refugees, in Macedonia 142,650 refugees, and in Montenegro 63,300 refugees. On the ground and among the refugees, I was able to interact and listen to the stories of this human tragedy. I heard first hand accounts of the systematic killing of innocent men and boys, the senseless destruction of homes, and even the brutal rape of Kosovar women.

In addition to confronting the humanitarian crisis, I had the opportunity to interact with our troops. As is the norm, the U.S. Armed Forces are performing with great skill, extreme attention to detail, and with a strong commitment to achieving the goals of the NATO alliance.

Congress should endeavor to avoid a confrontation with the administration by passing a bill which is not loaded with funding projects total unrelated to the mission. The bill includes funding for construction projects in Germany, Britain, Italy and Bahrain. That's right, Mr. Chairman, a new bachelors housing complex in Bahrain is needed to secure the freedom of Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my disappointment with the refusal to allow debate on Representative TONY HALL's amendment. This amendment would have provided an additional $150 million for food and needed supplies. The refugees in Macedonia, Albania and Montenegro need this additional aid. I wish that all the Members of this body could have seen the faces of the refugees and listened to each family account their personal disaster. We might differ on the status of our military but I can not believe that we can differ on the need for food.

Mr. Chairman, I know that there are issues important to our uniformed service members, including pay, housing, and retirement benefits. As important as these issues are to my constituents and to the constituents of each of my colleagues, we must resist the temptation to add unrelated expenditures which will further delay our ultimate goal.

The Obey amendment pays for the conflict in Kosovo, increased military pay for our troops, money for emergency food assistance to the refugees and provided for the victims of the storm in Central America such as the terrible result of Hurricane Mitch. I support this approach by the Obey amendment and I support the addition to this budget of humanitarian aid to be offered by NANCY PELOSI and TONY HALL. We must include such additional relief to ease this human tragedy of the ethnic Albanians. If we are to establish a lasting peace and assist in the humanitarian effort, we should not fund unrelated projects.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support today for H.R. 1664, the Kosovo Operations Supplemental Appropriations Act. This bill addresses two very critical matters facing our country and our military: overall military readiness and the on-going conflict in the Balkans.

Our military is dangerously underfunded and it time to reverse this injustice to our country and our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. President Reagan was right when he said, ''I believe it is immoral to ask the sons and daughters of America to protect this land with second-rate equipment and bargain-basement weapons. If they can put their lives on the line to protect our way of life * * * we can give them the weapons, the training, and the money they need to do the job right.''

History has spoken that the price of freedom is not cheap. If we fail to improve our nation's military readiness and win the war in the Balkans, we will send a message to every two-bit dictator that the U.S. is no longer a Superpower and is ripe for aggression against its people and soil. As one of the Vice Presidents of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I will meet with our NATO allies in a special meeting in Brussels, Belgium, tomorrow, May 7, 1999. During this meeting, I will stress the fact that our mission in Kosovo cannot fail. The world is a dangerous place and it becomes even more dangerous if the NATO mission in Kosovo fails.

To my colleagues who oppose the conflict in Kosovo, our brave fighting men and women are in harm's way. Their lives are in danger. To withdraw now rewards a brutal tyrant. You may disagree whether we should be there or not but we are past that debate now. It is imperative we all do what we can to win this fight. Ultimately, the survival of NATO and our status as a Superpower is at stake. I urge all my colleagues to support the Supplemental Appropriations Act. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the prompt passage of H.R. 1664, the fiscal year 1999 Kosovo Operations Supplemental Appropriations Act.

While I have some concerns about the level of spending in this measure, I believe we should act promptly to provide our service men and women with the resources they need to carry out their responsibilities in this NATO-led mission.

This legislation, while not perfect, addresses a number of increasingly serious readiness, quality-of-life and infrastructure shortfalls identified by our country's military leaders.

I ask my colleagues to put aside their differences and act in a bipartisan manner to support the prompt release of these funds. Whether you support U.S. participation in this operation or not, I urge you to support this supplemental funding request. We have a responsibility to ensure that our military has the resources it needs to successfully execute this mission.

This legislation appropriates funds for some critical shortfalls in our military spending. For example, it provides much needed funding for spare parts, ammunition, equipment maintenance, and recruiting. All of these areas have experienced shortages and these funds will make the necessary investments in our Operations and Maintenance accounts.

I would also note that this legislation provides $1.9 billion for a military pay increase and for retirement benefits, subject to congressional authorization and a Presidential emergency declaration. I think this provision will send an important message to our troops and their families of the value this nation places on their work.

As I have urged my colleagues before, I believe the United States should continue to support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) efforts in the Balkans. NATO has been principally responsible for the relative stability and economic prosperity that Europe has enjoyed over the last fifty years. Our experience in two world wars clearly demonstrates that a stable Europe is in the national interest of the United States.

There are three reasons why our actions in Yugoslavia should be supported by this Congress: Number one, the strength of NATO; number two, our experience with Milosevic; and number three, the alternative of doing nothing.

It is in our vital interest that there be a strong and resolute NATO. Think of the hundreds of thousands of innocent soldiers, sailors, and airmen that were lost in Europe because we did not have NATO when we needed NATO.

We need NATO now. We need to act with NATO. We need a strong NATO. And if we do, the United States will not have to be the world's peacekeeper in the future.

Secondly, our experience with Milosevic, because NATO did not get involved in Bosnia when it had an opportunity. As a result, 250,000 lives were lost, 2½ million people were displaced, and 40,000 women were raped. It could have been prevented had NATO acted when it had the opportunity.

And thirdly, think of the alternative. This is the fault line, my colleagues, between the Muslim and the Orthodox worlds. This is the fault line that has existed for generations. If we had not gotten involved in a multilateral action with NATO taking the lead, think what would have happened.

We know what Milosevic was going to do, why he had 40,000 troops amassed on the border, why he did not want to compromise at Rambouillet. He knew exactly what he was going to do; and he did it.

But if he had done that and NATO had not gotten involved, do my colleagues really think other nations would have stood by? Of course they would not have. We would have had the Mujahidin getting involved. We would have had Islamic extremists getting involved. And do my colleagues really think Russia then would not have gotten involved if there had not been the strength of NATO taking the leadership here?

My colleagues, we are doing the only responsible thing. This is not the United States acting unilaterally. We are acting multilaterally. We are acting with NATO. We are acting in the long-term interests of this country. We are doing the right thing, for a number of reasons. And the Congress should be supporting it.

Politicizing or slowing the release of these funds to our armed forces could ultimately jeopardize our involvement in the 19-nation NATO operation.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yes'' on this emergency spending bill and support the timely release of these funds.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Before consideration of any other amendment, it shall be in order to consider the amendments submitted for printing in House Report 106–127. The amendments may be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 106–127.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LATHAM

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 submitted for printing in House Report 106–127 offered by Mr. LATHAM:

Page 27, after line 23, insert the following new chapter (and redesignate the subsequent chapter and sections accordingly):

CHAPTER 5

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For additional gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928–1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, $1,095,000,000, as follows: $350,000,000 for guaranteed farm ownership loans; $200,000,000 for direct farm ownership loans; $185,000,000 for direct farm operating loans; $185,000,000 for subsidized guaranteed farm operating loans; and $175,000,000 for emergency farm loans.

For the additional cost of direct and guaranteed farm loans, including the cost of modifying such loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to remain available until September 30, 2000: farm operating loans, $28,804,000, of which $12,635,000 shall be for direct loans and $16,169,000 shall be for guaranteed subsidized loans; farm ownership loans, $35,505,000, of which $29,940,000 shall be for direct loans and $5,565,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; emergency loans, $41,300,000; and administrative expenses to carry out the loan programs, $4,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OFFSETS—THIS CHAPTER

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–118 and in prior acts making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, $40,000,000 are rescinded.

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–277 and in prior acts making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, $17,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL CAPITAL LOAN PROGRAM FOR NURSING

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under the Federal Capital Loan Program for Nursing appropriation account, $2,800,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in section 101(f) of Public Law 105–277, $6,800,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–277, $10,000,000 are rescinded.

MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–277, $25,000,000 are rescinded.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101–130, the Fiscal Year 1990 Dire Emergency Supplemental to Meet the Needs of Natural Disasters of National Significance, $10,000,000 are rescinded.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 159, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment today is merely an effort to recognize and ensure that we provide our Nation's farmers with essential credit. This amendment will provide $105.6 million in appropriations to support over $1 billion in farm loans and an additional $4 million for administrative expenses.

Although the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) Agriculture Committee chairman, asked the Secretary of Agriculture to release about $150 million in unobligated funds to ease the credit gap, the House is again being asked to do the heavy lifting for USDA.

Members may recall, earlier this year, the House voted to release $470 million in funds that could be made immediately available for guaranteed farm loans. As expected, the Senate, the other body, continues to debate among themselves about additional farm spending, further delaying the supplemental that the House passed in March.

In addition, the USDA has delayed disaster payments that were appropriated last October; and the farm credit crunch continues. I think the House should be aware that the $2.3 billion that was made available last year has still not gotten to the farmers, and it may be June until USDA finally figures out how to disburse those funds that we appropriated last year because of the disaster in agriculture.

These loans are important to those who need assistance today. We have farmers in the field that have no credit, have not been able to secure the guarantees that they need at the bank, and it is extraordinarily important that we move and move quickly in this provision. This is the language that was agreed to by the House in H.R. 1141; and it is offset, entirely offset, with unobligated funds.

I would like to remind my colleagues that we have not been given an ironclad assurance from the other body that we will end up with a combined conference report that will include both supplementals, the one that we passed in March and this one today. That is why it is so essential that we have this provision that is needed immediately, that this is the fastest-moving vehicle and we have to get this credit to our farmers as quickly as possible.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to say to the gentleman and to our colleagues that, normally, I would object to this amendment because this is purely a national defense bill. But I would say the reason I would accept this amendment today, the joint leadership of the House and Senate has decided that once this bill has cleared the House that this supplemental as well as the first supplemental that the gentleman mentioned will be conferenced on a parallel track.

□ 1300

So we will be dealing with the issue of the agriculture anyway on the first supplemental.

Incidentally, I would say to the gentleman the President did not ask for anything for agriculture. His amendment finally came as an adjustment to his request for the supplemental, Mr. Chairman, and we did add that money in the first supplemental appropriations bill.

So I accept the gentleman's amendment today, and I would hope that we could in the interests of time move on because I do not think there is much opposition here.

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) had raised a similar issue in the full committee and, I think, did a very good job explaining why this was necessary, and so I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment, and, from our standpoint, we are prepared to accept it.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time.

I thank the gentleman from Florida very much, and I would reiterate that I do not think we need to go on for the full 40 minutes here in debate.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank our distinguished Member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for yielding this time to me, and on behalf of rural America and the real interests of rural America I must rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and urge my colleagues to instead support the Obey substitute that will be offered today after the next amendment to this bill.

Let me thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) for doing the best that he could inside his own caucus. He is a member of our subcommittee, and I know how deeply he feels these issues. But truly I would say to his leadership:

This is not the way for America to deal with the crisis affecting U.S. citizens, our farmers from coast to coast, west to east, north to south. Why should we even consider an amendment here today which deals with such a teensy-weensy portion of a massive problem as part of an emergency supplemental dealing with Kosovo. We considered this bill dealing with rural America in the House several weeks ago, nearly 2 months ago, and then something happened over in the other body, and the leadership of both institutions were not able to get themselves together.

And, Mr. Chairman, I would have to say to my dear friend from Florida (Mr. YOUNG):

This is not his fault either. He has my sympathy because I understand a little bit about Florida, and that I–75 runs between Ohio and Florida, so a lot of our people go down there during the winter and come back. And the gentleman has tried to do the best that he can under constraints that are being applied by the leadership of this House and the leadership of the other body.

Mr. Chairman, it kind of reminds me of that old song by Peggy Lee when I look at this amendment: Is That All There Is? And when we look at the actual content of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), he has been cut back by his own leadership to only include a small portion of agricultural credit that is desperately needed by our farmers to get through this spring planting season. However even the administration's abysmal request to this Congress included funding for the staff to administer that. That is not in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM). Ag credit money that will unleash dollars in the private sector will not help farmers in this crisis because we need people to deliver the assistance, and we know that because of the depth of this crisis in our country the disaster payments from last year have not even been fully processed.

And what has our Secretary of Agriculture been doing? He has been robbing one account over there to pay for another account just to try to keep staff people in place in these farm service agencies around the country, and last week all authority ran out. So the rob-Peter-to-pay-Paul mechanism that has been used because we have not been able to clear a bill because of the backwardness of the leadership of this institution now places the burden on the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a respected member of our subcommittee, who is trying to do the best he can, but I would like to ask: Where is the leadership of this House and where is the leadership of the other body to give the farmers of this country that we owe such a debt of gratitude to for keeping this Nation fed, food security fundamental to any body politic's peace, why can they not get their day in the sun? Why do we get back-doored at the end, in the last file in the cabinet in a bill dealing with Kosovo and we cannot even deal with the enormity of this problem?

What kind of signal does the gentleman's amendment also give to farmers, because in that particular amendment we basically have to offset the $109 million that he is talking about, and why is the crisis in rural America any less of a crisis than what we are facing in Kosovo, in a foreign land, or Hurricane Mitch? What about the people of this country?

I do not think I am xenophobic; I care very much about this country. The people of this country elected me to be here, and I think they should be at the front of the line, not at the back of the file cabinet.

So, Mr. Chairman, I view what is happening in rural America a true emergency. We are now into Day 69 of this Congress, and we cannot even get a debate in here about the dimensions of people who are going bankrupt from coast to coast.

So, with all due respect to the gentleman from Iowa, I think he has done the best job he can do with this amendment, but if people in this body really want to help rural America, we ought to vote no on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and yes on the Obey substitute and truly ask the leadership of this institution to bring up a freestanding bill that is an emergency for the people of this country who are trying to feed us and the world and are being ignored at the highest levels of this legislative body.

Mr. Chairman, I just say that in the Obey substitute that will be offered we not only deal with agricultural credit, the full amount asked for by the administration, we ask for sufficient funds for people to administer that credit at our farm service agencies. We also deal with the three major credit programs in his amendment. We talk about emergency assistance for farm workers. We have special aid to those who produce hogs around this country who literally are on their knees. Also, our emergency conservation programs are attended to, livestock assistance for those affected by disasters. Our watershed and flood prevention programs, our rural water and sewer grants, rural housing and even food aid for Kosovo refugees: $175 million in Mr. OBEY's substitute. With the surpluses we have on our backs here and with hungry people there, what a win-win for everyone.

Why can we not get a freestanding vote on the needs of rural America in this Chamber?

So I know the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) tried very hard, but truly he needs the support of his own leadership, and I ask the House to support the Obey substitute and defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds, and I very much appreciate the gentlewoman from Ohio's comments, and I think what she is expressing is the same sentiments I have and the frustration with the other body because we have done the heavy lifting here in the House, and our frustration really is to getting the conference done and move on.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from the State of South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), an outstanding representative who has been such a strong advocate for agriculture.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me and would simply say that the gentlewoman from Ohio is certainly right about one point, and that is that there is a crisis in agriculture. We are seeing the lowest prices historically in a great many years. We have a credit crunch going on out there, which is what this attempts to address, and we desperately need some solutions. And frankly I hope that as we continue to move through this congressional session that we will take up issues like mandatory price reporting, a piece of legislation that I have introduced, crop insurance reform, which is something that I have joined with the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) in working on, as well as looking at other ways, examining other ways, in which we can support our agricultural producers.

I will, however, take issue with one point, and that is that this body has not been responding. We have tried, which is why we are here today on this supplemental appropriation, to keep this issue in front of the Congress at every opportunity. My colleague is right; it was put on the other supplemental bill, but it is languishing in the Senate. Frankly, we do not have a lot of control of what happens in the Senate as much as we would like to.

But the fact of the matter is that we believe it is important enough, and so a number of us from agricultural states who represent rural districts who are suffering as my colleague's is got together and tried to at least attach this particular piece of legislation, the hundred million dollars plus in loan guarantee authority, to this supplemental bill, and I do not for a minute suggest that that is not going to negate the need that we have to do a number of

other things in the area of agriculture in this Congress. But there is an orderly process underway for doing that. We cannot do everything on appropriations bills, and the authorizing committee on which I serve, the Committee on Agriculture, we are working in an orderly way to address these. We have had hearings on a number of these subjects already. My full expectation is that we will move forward with a number of these initiatives that are so important to the areas of the country that are suffering miserably from an agricultural crisis that does not seem to have any end in sight.

But we want to keep this issue in front of the American public, in front of this Congress, and that is why we are here today, and I think it is very important that we move the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), and I credit him, my neighbor from Iowa, working with us on this and taking the leadership role.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THUNE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. EMERSON. First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for allowing this money to be included in the emergency supplemental. It is absolutely critical for our farmers. In my particular district I have got 26 counties, all of which are dependent on agriculture, and they are hurting and hurting worse than they have in decades, and the fact is that we got to get the money to them immediately.

While this is, as my friend from Ohio says, a paultry sum, it is still better than nothing, at least to start the ball rolling so that the creditors can, in fact, advance the money to our farmers for their spring planting, at least the northern part of my district where they are still doing it. In the southern part they have already done it, but I do want to commend both of my colleagues for their work in getting this included.

I did want to ask the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) a question, and that has to do with the money to administer the loans:

Is there a fact, our FSA office is going to have the ability to administer that $1.1 billion of loan guarantees that this bill would underwrite?

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in the amendment there is $4 million to administer these loans. So this is a package with the administrative funds in there. We will get the money to them, both the dollars and the costs in the offices.

Mrs. EMERSON. So that our FSA offices will get that money together with. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank my neighbor across the border in Iowa for the leadership role he has taken on this, Mr. Latham, and again would simply add that this is critical. We need because of the credit crisis and crunch that we are experiencing in the rural areas of this country to address this issue at each and every opportunity that we can. I will continue to come in front of this body and advocate as strongly as I can that we address what is a very serious crisis in the rural sector of our economy in this country, and we can start today by adding this important amendment on to this legislation.

I would certainly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Latham amendment and move this forward.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak about an issue that this amendment does not directly address. It takes the form supplemental that was dealt with in our March supplemental, but it does not address the other part, which was really the main part of that supplemental, which was the aid, which was a true emergency, dealing with Hurricane Mitch in Central America. The supplemental that we have in front of us now will not just be a defense supplemental, it will be defense and farm supplemental, and it is absolutely, I would use the word tragic, for it not to be a defense farm and Central American supplemental. The devastation caused by Hurricane Mitch is historic in terms of its magnitude.

Now I had the opportunity to travel to Nicaragua when the President went down there to view firsthand some of the damage. Literally entire villages were wiped out. We could not see any trace of what once was thriving communities. The only way that these countries, which really have done an incredible job towards democracy, towards economic viability as we are their major trading partners and major allies, the only way that they are going to be able to get back on their feet and to continue this road is with our support.

□ 1315

This occurred in October.

Let me remind my colleagues in this Chamber of another time in Central America when the United States Congress funded far more than $1 billion in not humanitarian aid but in military activities, and with tragic consequences.

I do not even want to speculate what will happen if these economies in these countries do not get back on their feet, but I think we can speculate what will happen. If we are looking for true emergencies, by the definition of the statute on supplemental bills, this is clearly the case.

I urge that we end up doing this. I will offer an amendment later this afternoon to do just that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) very much for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is an issue that should not be before us. I think our farmers need our help, and we should all support all of our farmers across this country. Agriculture is important to this Nation. Just because in my city there are not a lot of farmers, we certainly drink the milk, eat the meat, fry the chickens, eat the corn. Our farmers are vital to our economy and we should help them all.

I think it is crucial and important, and we all know in our heart of hearts we are not doing enough. Yes, what Milosevic has done in Yugoslavia and the genocide there should be responded to with humanitarian aid, with what is going on in the Balkans and in that hemisphere, but we should also look at Mitch, because if Milosevic is bad, Mitch was devastating to Central America.

It is in our hemisphere. Remember, this is the Americas, North America, Central and South America, and we share a border and an economy. Those people there are waiting for us to respond in Nicaragua and Honduras. They are waiting for us, and if we do not respond we are sending a very clear signal in this hemisphere and we are giving them the back of our hand.

Who are we opening the doors to? We are opening the doors to drug traffickers in Central America. That is what we are saying. We are saying we are not going to be there.

Who do we think is going to fill this void in Latin America? Think about what my colleague the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) just said. Think about those burgeoning democracies.

The Cold War has ended, but there is devastation. There are 1 million people without food and shelter. Mr. Chairman, where do we think they are going to come and search for that shelter and that food? We share borders with them. Let us develop those economies. Let us develop those infrastructures in Central America, or we will build tents and refugee camps here for them in the United States of America.

Let us not do that, and give a hand to them, please.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, we are talking about supplemental emergency spending on very important projects, and there is a moral basis for us to support our farmers. There is a moral basis for us to put the things there that we need for our troops. There is also a moral basis for us to pay for it.

This Congress has passed a budget that said we will protect 100 percent of Social Security. There is no excuse for our body to pass this bill and not pay for it.

Now there are going to be a lot of people that are going to say, but we cannot; we cannot pay for this. When

we say that, what we mean is we do not mind taking the money out of the Social Security system to pay for it because that is what we are going to do. Everybody readily admits that the money that is going to be used to pay for this supplemental is coming directly from the Social Security funds.

So the question that we have to ask ourselves, if it is moral to supply the proper things for our troops and if it is moral to put the things there for our farmers so that they can continue to feed us, so they will be there next year to be able to produce a crop and pay for it and pay the taxes, how is it not moral for us to pay for it?

Ask anybody in their district if they believe the agencies of the Federal Government are efficient. I do not think we will find one, other than a Federal employee working for one of those agencies. If that is what the constituency says, why do we not have the courage to ask the rest of the Federal agencies to become efficient enough to pay for that?

We are going to be having an amendment in a little while that is going to discuss that very issue, and the question, as we leave here today and go back to our homes, are we going to leave here being consistent or are we going to leave here being inconsistent?

We are going to claim a moral high ground and then we are going to duck the issue when it comes to the moral high ground for our children.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we are in the throes of debate on many different and important issues. I rise today to support the proposal of my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

I happen to have been with a delegation that visited Central America. I saw the faces of the men, women and children that had been devastated by Hurricane Mitch.

Part of the process and part of the obligation that we face in this House is to maintain a focus on the issues that are important and to maintain in priority the things that merit attention. Part of the process is respecting the fact that we, as leaders in the world and leaders in this hemisphere, have an obligation to help those in need. That is what I am speaking about today.

It has been almost 6 months since the devastation in Central America; 6 months where people have been without the basic essentials that sometimes most of us take for granted; 6 months that we have been sitting and doing nothing on their behalf.

I was with the President. I saw the work that was being done by the men and women of our Armed Forces, I saw the work that was being done by the relief agencies, but I do not see the same kind of response from this body. I think we can do better. I think we as Americans have an obligation to help those people in Central America.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out here that the amendment that has been offered, and I have the greatest of respect for the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and for the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) for doing the best they possibly can for their constituents, who are desperate people. People who are on the farms these days are living in desperation for their continued livelihood.

I would just like to point out here that the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) is one-fifth, only 20 percent, of the amount that is provided for agriculture under the Obey amendment that will be before us very shortly. Not only that, but it is offset.

We have a true emergency. We have a true emergency of people who are desperate for being able to continue their livelihood, and that sort of emergency ought to be something where we are willing to provide the money as an emergency in the same way that we are for military purposes here in the underlying bill.

In this instance, the Obey bill provides five times as much money, more than what was in the supplemental bill that has already gone over to the Senate and has not been acted on in months. This would move it along, yes, but it ought to be moved on. If my colleagues are not interested in only some sort of a fig leaf, it ought to be moved along with the Obey amendment, because the Obey amendment does something else for other desperate people. It deals with the desperate people in Central America, also an emergency, which happened 7 months ago and which has also been sitting in the Senate for the last several weeks, at least, where the emergency that would allow those desperate people also to get on with their lives and put their lives together, not be immigrating to the United States and such; that they would also be able to move on.

I would urge that if my colleagues are not for a fig leaf that they would defeat the amendment that is before them and instead vote for the Obey amendment.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the frustration we have with the other body as far as trying to get all of these very important provisions moved. I would just say that this is an area where there is absolute consensus with everyone. This needs to be done. It needs to be done quickly.

Why hold things this important up for things that are under discussion and have no consensus?

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have been facing three emergencies. One is with the war in Kosovo, which this bill is supposed to be dealing with; and then we have two others, two other weather-related emergencies; one in Central America which has created such a disastrous situation because people are not able to make a living after Hurricane Mitch in Central America. We are going to see a flood of immigrants coming into this country unless we do something about it. Second is the emergency in rural America, which is caused in part by natural disasters and in part by the collapse of farm prices for a number of commodities.

When this all first began, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, tried to do the right thing. He produced a proposal to deal with the first emergency in Central America and in rural America, and he had a bipartisan approach to it which we were fully willing to support. Then his party leadership intervened and said, ''no, we do not want to do it that way.''

So they reversed course, and they attached a number of pay-for provisions to the supplemental, which were terribly risky for the national security interests of the United States. Among other things, they would have paid for the supplemental by pulling $175 million off the table that we needed on the table in order to negotiate with the Russians an agreement to get out of their hands weapons grade plutonium. There is no higher priority of our government than doing that. And yet that agreement was put in danger by the reckless bill which passed the House in order to pay for the agriculture problems.

That bill, because of those outrageous offsets, has been languishing in the Senate going nowhere. So when this bill came to the floor, we produced an amendment on this side which we will vote upon sometime today, which tries to recognize that we ought to deal with the emergency for the folks on the home front the same way we deal with the emergency for Kosovo. We believe it deserves equal treatment under our actions here.

Now, what is going on here today is very simple. Because our amendment includes a number of provisions to deal with the emergency in rural America, our friends on the other side of the aisle are feeling the political heat. So they are looking for a way, in my view, to obscure the lack of progress that has gone on dealing with the problems on the farm front so far.

□ 1330

This is, in effect, what many people would call a cover-your-tail amendment, to be blunt about it. It is paid for by hijacking one of the items that we used to pay for our amendment.

The worst thing about it is not what it does, because I do not really oppose the idea of providing credit for farmers. Obviously, we have been trying to get that done for months. So has the administration.

But the problem is that that is the only thing this amendment does on the farm front. It does nothing to provide the $42 million that is necessary in order to help eliminate the backlog in loan deficiency payments, for instance, out in rural America. It provides nothing for section 32 aid to hog farmers, who desperately need it.

It is consistent with past Republican actions on farm issues, however. Because we will remember in 1993 when we had the Mississippi and Missouri River floods which devastated large sections of this country, the majority held up passage of emergency help on that score for months, debating about what the offsets should be.

In 1996 when Grand Forks in the upper Midwest again was flooded and facing an emergency, again the majority party held up for months passage of getting effective relief to those folks, again because we got into the same accountant's debate.

Now today again we are told that this is an important issue, but it is not important enough to treat it as an emergency, although, in this very bill, they are treating as emergencies the construction of a number of facilities in Europe which the Pentagon did not even want to build for the next 5 years.

If anybody believes that this amendment, well-intentioned as it may be, is sufficient to bring into parallel treatment military bases in Europe versus the needs of our farmers at home, they are not reading this amendment or this bill very carefully.

I am going to oppose this amendment, not because I am opposed to the intent, but because of the double standard which is being applied which does not recognize the emergency on the farm to the same degree that we recognize other problems; and secondly, because I think it is a mistake not to include the other assistance that my amendment provides for livestock, for watershed flood improvement, for the rural housing problems.

So that is why I think we ought to recognize this amendment for what it is and treat it accordingly.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman is aware that the offsets in this are ones that he proposed. The ones he is referring to really are not germane to the amendment at hand.

I would like to have everyone know that this is fully offset, it is fully paid for. It is something that I think is quite important today that we move this and move this quickly.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of very important issues in agriculture. We will deal with a lot of those through the normal appropriations process. This is the one area where there is consensus to move ahead. Everyone agrees that this needs to be done and needs to be done today.

If we want to start more fights with the other body, if we want to stop or stand in the way of help for our farmers and the critical needs that they have today, all we need to do is load it up with a bunch of extraneous issues. But this is critical today, that we move this and move it quickly.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to, in closing, urge everyone to support this amendment. It is paid for. I want to also thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for her support on so many of these agricultural issues, and our chairman of the subcommittee, and also, certainly, the chairman of the full committee, who bent over backwards to be of assistance to agriculture.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for the Latham amendment.

Last year's unexpected and uncontrollable market forces caused farm income to decline precipitously. Farming, a notoriously risky business, saw even tougher times due to the Asian financial crisis, which caused export markets to dry up, and bountiful production world wide, which drove prices down. On top of natural disasters here at home, Congress had to act.

The $6 billion provided last fall allowed farmers to get through the year. It helped them harvest and market their crops and pay off their bills. However, as many geared up for planting this spring, poor market forecasts which projected inadequate cash flows, forced producers to seek direct and guaranteed loans from USDA.

However, due to extraordinary demand, there's a large shortfall in these loan programs. Already, more than 26,000 producers have received loans from USDA. By providing an additional $106 million, as this amendment does, 12,000 more farmers will be able to farm this year.

This amendment and USDA's credit program deserve your support. By supporting them, you not only signal to farmers that Congress recognizes their distress, but you also help farmers keep their dreams alive for a bright future in agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 submitted for printing in House Report 106–127.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 submitted for printing in House Report 106–127 offered by Mr. COBURN:

At the end (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. Within 15 days after Congress adjourns to end the first session of the 106th Congress and on the same day as a sequestration (if any) under sections 251 and 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall cause, in the same manner prescribed for section 251 of such Act, a sequestration for fiscal year 2000 of all non-exempt accounts within the discretionary spending category (excluding function 050 (national defense)) to achieve—

(1) a reduction in budget authority equal to $12,947,495,000 minus the dollar amount of reimbursements identified in the report required by section 205 (efforts to increase burden-sharing); and

(2) a reduction in outlays equal to $12,947,495,000 minus the dollar amount of reimbursements identified in the report required by such section 205.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 159, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will control the time in opposition.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this debate be expanded to 20 minutes on each side.

There was a drafting error in the rule. We were supposed to be given the same amount of time as all of the other amendments. Because of the drafting error, we were not. I would ask unanimous consent as a courtesy from the minority to give us the same amount of time on our amendment that he will have on his.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we gave a lot of reasons why Members should vote against the rule when it was before us. One of the reasons is that not enough time was provided for a number of amendments.

If we had had some time in opposing that rule we might have been able to deal with each of the problems equitably, but I do not think it is fair to make adjustment to only one amendment, and therefore, I do object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, the United States is engaged in a war. It is a war not of Congress' making, but a war, nevertheless, and one that has revealed for the whole world to see the inadequacy of the resources available to our military services.

We have a moral obligation to provide the necessary resources to the men and women whose lives are at risk fighting this war, but we have another obligation as well. That is an obligation to the American taxpayer and our senior citizens to maintain integrity in our budgeting, to pay for the additional necessary emergency military spending without using social security

funds. We have an obligation to maintain fiscal discipline and achieve truly honestly balanced budgets.

This amendment represents the honest, responsible way to pay for this military emergency. It recognizes that, first of all, the President has a responsibility to secure reimbursements from our NATO allies for our military operations in Yugoslavia.

Currently the United States is bearing the overwhelming majority of the military burden of this NATO bombing campaign. It is our pilots whose lives are at risk, it is our reservists being called up, it is our forces stretched too thin around the world.

It is unconscionable that we should also be bearing the overwhelming majority of the financial burden, so I offered a provision in this bill that forces the President to pursue reimbursements from our NATO allies and report back to Congress on its progress by September 30 of this year. I hope the President takes this responsibility as seriously as President Bush did in the similar circumstances of the Persian Gulf War.

This amendment today reasons that the President may not succeed in seeking equitable reimbursements. To the extent that the reimbursements from our NATO allies fall short of the total emergency expenditures, then this amendment will force across-the-board reductions in most nondefense spending, and it will fully offset this new emergency spending.

It is important to note that if the President does his job and secures the appropriate reimbursements from our allies, for whom we are fighting, the spending cuts necessary will be very small, indeed. In fact, under this amendment, the size of any spending reductions is really up to the President.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and offset the costs of the war we are waging in and for Europe. Mr. Chairman, if we pass this amendment we can keep our moral obligation to both our soldiers and our seniors, but a vote against this amendment forces us to choose between soldiers and seniors, and that is a choice we should not have to be making.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman because I know that he has been such a strong supporter of national defense issues, so I am reluctant to oppose his amendment.

However, I think his amendment would give us real trouble. I am not usually one that raises the issue of a presidential veto, but I am satisfied that if this amendment became part of this bill, that it would certainly invite a presidential veto.

Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution for fiscal year 2000 already cuts nondefense spending by over 9 percent. The Coburn amendment would increase this by an additional 5 percent, and would make the total reduction for fiscal year 2000 funding that this amendment would cut a 14 percent cut in nondefense spending for fiscal year 2000.

That is just not going to work. The fiscal year 2000 problem is already serious enough. The across-the-board cut would force a devastating 14 percent reduction in all nondefense programs, including education, food safety inspection, drug law enforcement, science research, the national parks, drug prevention, crime prevention, agriculture, the National Institutes of Health, elderly housing, and many other programs. It just will not work.

So as much as I support the effort that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) makes in supporting our strong national defense, I just cannot support his amendment because of what it does to the FY 2000 budget.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD)

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

My dad used to have a saying, and that was, the Lord helps those who help themselves. I think my dad would be rolling around in the grave right now if he knew that we were part of a 19-country alliance wherein we were picking up about 80 to 90 percent of the bill. Yet, that happens to be the case.

So the question with this amendment is, if we choose to foot the bill on 80 to 90 percent of the goods, will we at least account for it honestly, rather than borrowing it from social security? So I think that is the simple choice that this amendment is all about.

To put it in perspective, what we are talking about here is Thirteen billion. Experts have said we have a real problem coming with social security. If we do not do this, that problem gets worse. Thirteen billion dollars is enough money to pay for a full year's worth of social security benefits for 1.4 million retirees. Thirteen billion would pay for a full month's worth of benefits for nearly 20 million retirees. Thirteen billion is more than social security pays in an entire year for seniors' insurance, for benefits for kids under the age of 18. Thirteen billion would pay social security benefits for every African American retiree until September in a given year. Thirteen billion is over 10 percent of this illusory and quickly-diminishing social security surplus.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is just about truthful and straightforward accounting. If we want to spend, if we want to build somebody else's house, if we want to cover 80 to 90 percent of the cost of this endeavor, fine, but let us account for it honestly.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The problem we face here is that we are operating under a budget process which is, in my view, a public lie. I think the entire budget process is a fraud, and because it is, we see amendments like this offered which, in substance, would make no sense whatsoever.

We are already required by the budget to cut virtually everything that the government provides on the domestic side of the ledger by 13 percent next year. This budget or this amendment would require us to cut that even more deeply.

Over the next 5 years the budget requires us to cut virtually everything that we do on the domestic side of the ledger by 18 percent in real terms. I do not know of many Members of this House on either side of the aisle who would actually vote for that when the time comes. We are required to cut health by 18 percent over that period, we are required to cut administration of justice by 18 percent in real terms over that period, we are required to cut agriculture by 25 percent over that period, in real terms.

This amendment would add to those cuts. It would require us to make further reductions in health funding, such as the National Institutes of Health, which this Congress pretended just 3 weeks ago it wanted to double spending on.

It would require us to make further cuts in the FBI. It would require us to make cuts of 2 percent in veterans' health care, and deeper cuts in other veterans' programs.

□ 1345

I do not believe that that is what the public supports. This is portrayed as a Social Security amendment. It does not really have anything to do with that issue. I do not know of many Social Security recipients who think that we ought to be cutting veterans benefits, who think we ought to be cutting the Weather Service. Ask the senior citizens who just had their homes wiped out in Oklahoma whether they would like to see the Weather Service cut back further so they get even less warning from tornadoes than they got last week.

It just seems to me that this is an amendment which is extreme in nature. It suggests that there is only one priority in the entire country; and, in fact, I do not know of many responsible citizens over 65 or under 65 that happen to share that view. What they want us to do is to take a balanced view, recognize something that is an emergency and recognize what it is not. That is what we should be doing instead of dealing with this amendment today.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to that.

All that is is Washington double-talk. What that is saying is we cannot deliver services more efficiently. What we are hearing is hearing an appropriator say we do not want to cut spending.

The Federal Government is not efficient. Nobody knows that better than

the people here. The refusal to demand efficiency and accountability out of the agencies of the Federal Government is why we have this problem. Thirteen billion dollars will pay for Social Security benefits, bringing them back up for every one of the notch babies.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Let me just say that I did not intend to speak on this amendment, but in a former life I chaired the subcommittee that funded veterans' programs in the country. I also serve on another committee that addresses questions like the FBI.

I have a penchant for appreciating the work that is done at the subcommittee level, where people take seriously the business of listening to the pros and cons of very special programs and making judgments about spending levels that are a reflection expert testimony.

We made major adjustments downward in that first subcommittee. Half of the savings in the last few years came from those efforts. But in the meantime we listened to the people who were directly affected and, because of a lack of that in an amendment that cuts across the board, I am afraid I must rise and urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' against this amendment.

This amendment will put special limits on next year's process that do not fairly reflect the work of the subcommittees and committees. So I urge our Members to recognize that the work really gets done around this place in authorizing as well as appropriation subcommittees, and that is where it appropriately should take place.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Coburn amendment that will completely offset this supplemental. Failure to offset this spending will result in a raid on Social Security.

President Clinton has created a national security emergency by cutting our military while stretching our troops around the world. Providing for our troops, however, does not mean the abandoning of fiscal discipline and taking from Social Security.

The Coburn amendment calls for the President's Office of Management and Budget to perform an across-the-board cut of all fiscal year 2000 nondefense discretionary spending equal to the amount of this appropriation.

Make no mistake about it, voting against the Coburn amendment is a vote to raid the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for this spending. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Coburn amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, could we inquire as to how much time is remaining for each side?

The CHAIRMAN. Both sides have 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. And may I inquire as to who has the right to close the argument on this debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has the right to close.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

One of the reasons that I believe that the gentleman objected to our unanimous consent request is that it is hard to hear about spending Social Security money. It is not palatable to politicians.

This chart shows exactly the fallacy of what Washington is telling the American public about surpluses. Here, in green, is what Washington is saying is the surplus. The red shows the rise in the national debt each year.

The question that I would have for our body is, if we have a surplus, why is the debt rising? Why did the debt rise $105 billion last year? Why are our children going to be burdened with an additional $1,000 per person just on the basis of what we did last year?

Congress has a moral obligation to our troops, to restore our military readiness, and we also have a moral obligation to our farmers, who are dependent on us. But we also have a moral obligation not to spend Social Security money. Probably that is not right. We have a moral obligation to be truthful about whether or not we are going to spend Social Security money. To oppose offsetting this bill is to make the assumption that this government is running at an efficient level.

So everybody at home can actually see where we are on the numbers, these are CBO numbers, the projected Social Security surplus. Not real surplus, but an excess of Social Security payments over Social Security outflows that were projected to be $127 billion this year.

We already have consumed, on what we have done so far this year, $16 billion of that. We have already committed $16 billion of the seniors' Social Security money. When we pass this supplemental, without this amendment, we will spend another $13 billion of Social Security money. That is enough money for every notch baby in this country to get equitable treatment to the neighbors that are around them.

I understand why it is difficult to trim. I have great respect for the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the hard job that they have. But I also know what the American people feel about it. They want those services delivered, but they know they are not delivered in an efficient manner. For us to say we cannot do so is not an appropriate response to the people that we represent.

I would take my colleagues back to World War II. We did not allow spending to go up in every other branch of government. We actually cut spending in every other branch of government because we had a war.

I have heard that today from both sides of the aisle: ''We have a war.'' There is not a moral imperative for us to pay for the war out of other agencies instead of taking it from our seniors?

The last point that I would like to make is, if we take this money from our seniors, what we are really doing is lowering the standard of living of our children and we are decreasing the opportunity that our children will have to have a standard of living comparable to what we have.

As we take opportunity, and we are the land of opportunity, we should never be so guilty as to steal the future from our children, because they will pay back this money. Our seniors are not going to pay this back, the Members of this body are not going to pay back this money, but our children and grandchildren will be the ones to pay back this money.

So the question we have to ask ourselves as we leave here today, as we leave after voting, and I am very hopeful that we pass this bill, is, can I live with myself saying it is morally right to support our troops and to fund them at a level that makes their readiness and gives them the equipment and the ability to carry out their missions and it is not morally right to pay for it; but it is morally right to take money from every notch baby, to take money from the Social Security System, to take money out of the very future that we say is our highest priority?

This conference passed a budget that said we are going to protect 100 percent of Social Security, and there are Members on this floor and in this body that voted for that. By failing to vote for this amendment, what the Member is saying is, ''King's X. I did not mean it. I am not going to vote to protect Social Security. I am not for protecting the Social Security surplus. I am not for fixing Social Security. My vote on the budget was meaningless. It did not matter.'' If that is the case, then we need to fix the budget process.

I would appreciate the support on this amendment, as will every other senior in this country and every child.

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

Again, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am reluctant in my opposition to this amendment to offset the spending, because my history in this House has been to vote for as many spending cuts as I possibly could. However, to make spending offsets from the fiscal year 2000 funds that have not even been appropriated yet to pay for a fiscal year 1999 expenditure is just not right and it is not workable.

The gentleman is correct. There are a lot of ways and a lot of places where we can save money. One of the areas that

has been rather sacrosanct for a long time is mandatory spending. The 4 years my party has been in the majority, the Committee on Appropriations, has put forth to this body major reductions in many, many programs, some of them very difficult to vote for, but we did.

We started to get our fiscal house in order, but we did not touch the mandatory programs, and those are programs where the money has to be spent without some change in the basic law. That might be a place that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and I could look for future offset funding; but for a fiscal year 1999 supplemental, we should not be reaching out to fiscal year 2000 where the money has not even been appropriated.

Now, on the Social Security issue, and I agree with the gentleman, we have an obligation. We have made a commitment on Social Security, and I represent a district that has more Social Security recipients than most anybody in this House, and I certainly would be extremely careful of anything that we do relative to Social Security. But, understand, again we are talking about fiscal year 1999 money. The budget resolution, the setting aside of the Social Security Trust Fund and all those monies are in fiscal year 2000, not fiscal year 1999. So the issue does not really apply to the bill that we are dealing with today.

Now, the last point. Based on the omnibus appropriations bill that was approved by this Congress last year, and I certainly hope that that never happens again, because that is not something any of us are really proud of, but based on that bill, the baseline or a freeze at fiscal year 1999 levels takes us $17 billion over the budget caps of 1997 for fiscal year 2000. And if we continue the things that we really are obligated to do, where we have commitments, where we have contracts already in the procedure, we are then up to over $30 billion over the 1997 budget caps. If we take 14 percent cut in nondefense spending for fiscal year 2000, we cannot get there from here.

So as much as I appreciate the gentleman's efforts and the work we have done together over the years for national defense, I cannot support his amendment, and I would hope that the House would reject that amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Coburn amendment. I rise against this amendment because any cut in domestic programs is wrong—including the proposed 2 percent cut for Community Health Centers, Migrant Health Centers, Indian Health Facilities, Indian Health Services, and Veterans' Medical Care.

The priorities of this amendment are misplaced. This amendment that seeks to take an across-the-board swipe against the challenges that working families and/or the struggling poor face in consequential areas such as job training, education, health care and affordable housing is morally wrong.

Our nation is a nation divided when it comes to healthcare. There are those with access and those without. And as you know, the poor are less likely to have access to care. African Americans, Latinos and other minority groups are less likely to have access to care. That is why I believe that community and migrant health centers are so vital. Until we can have a national health care plan, health centers provide the gap for those that do not have access to coverage.

Mr. Chairman, non-defense discretionary spending for FY2000 is approximately $40 billion less than provided for in 1999. Given the human needs in my district where the median income is $25,250, I cannot support another cut.

I cannot support this amendment and I urge my colleagues not to support it because it does nothing to lend a helping hand to those people in America who are hungry, who are out of a job, who are ill or who need a roof over their head. The solution to our problems cannot be solved by taking from someone in need in order to help someone else.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Coburn-Toomey-Sanford amendment—an amendment which would offset the entire cost of this emergency appropriations bill in two ways.

First, the amendment calls for our allies to share the burden of funding this NATO operation with the United States taxpayer. It would hold the nations participating in Operation Allied Force responsible for sharing the cost of what is swiftly becoming a protracted and costly air campaign. Member nations are already participating materially with us. We need for them to participate monetarily.

Second, should the Administration be unable to obtain reimbursement from our NATO allies, this amendment would allow funds to be utilized from FY2000 non-defense discretionary spending; thus ensuring that this appropriation will be paid for without dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund.

Offsetting this spending is vital to maintaining our budget priorities, which this Congress labored so hard to preserve earlier this year. The United States has domestic priorities that must be protected.

We must be disciplined, Mr. Speaker. Members have talked about saving Social Security and Medicare during our recent budget debate. We have talked about creating a lock box for our nation's retirement security. I voted for a budget that set aside surplus money for our nation's elderly, and I am not going to waver from that commitment.

This amendment will help protect our elderly and maintain our fiscal discipline.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''Yes'' on the amendment.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the importance of supporting our troops during the current conflict in Kosovo. It is essential that these men and women who are putting their lives on the line for the safety and freedom of the ethnic Albanians be provided with the tools necessary to perform their work.

Nonetheless, I strongly object to the Coburn/Toomey/Sanford amendment which pits the current needs of our military services against the health care needs of our veterans. The VA budget for Fiscal Year 2000 is already almost $2 billion dollars less than is needed to provide health care to our current veterans.

This tells not only our nation's veterans, but those currently serving in Kosovo, that our government will provide them with the ammunition they need to fight a war, but should they be harmed as a result, we may not be able to take proper care of them when they return. This is the wrong message to send to our fighting men and women in Kosovo and around the world.

A vote for this amendment is a vote against our nation's veterans. I urge my colleagues to defeat this measure.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my support for this emergency supplemental bill.

Our national security is at stake here today, and I believe that a vote against this emergency bill is equivalent to turning our backs on the young men and women in our armed forces.

The President has offered a version of this emergency defense bill that represents a first step, but one that is inadequate in meeting the true emergency before us.

The Clinton Administration has asked that we only provide enough funds to cover the costs of the war in Yugoslavia. But we were running out of cruise missiles before we ever launched one over Kosovo. And our airplanes faced a spare parts shortage before we sent a single one to take on Milosevic. In other words, the President wants to only invest enough to maintain our military's current weakened status.

That's not good enough. We owe it to America and our troops to do more than just return the military to its previous unacceptable level of readiness. We have a moral obligation to give our soldiers, pilots and sailors the tools to carry out their missions. Just as they are doing their duty to protect us, we must do our duty to support them.

Mr. Chairman, if we want a true assessment of our current situation, then we should heed the concerns of our nation's top soldier—Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Henry Shelton.

A recent article in Jane's Defense Weekly said the following:

> With the number of US combat aircraft involved in NATO's Operation ''Allied Force'' in Yugoslavia set to reach 800 in the coming weeks, senior Department of Defense (DoD) officials are downgrading the armed forces' ability to meet its national military strategy of being able to concurrently fight and win two major regional conflicts.

The article continues,

> As a result Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Henry Shelton now believes the armed forces' ability to prevail in a second MTW [Major Theater War] in a reasonable amount of time and with minimum casualties has been dulled by the continuing commitment in the Balkans.

Mr. Chairman, we simply cannot afford to play games with our national security, and I believe that it is essential to support this emergency defense bill.

And, while I believe that this bill represents a critical investment in preserving our national security, I do not take its price tag lightly.

Mr. Chairman, we have made great strides in recent years under the leadership of this Congress to balance the federal budget for the benefit or our future generations. I am disappointed today that the President chose to send us this emergency funding without a corresponding offset in the budget. The bottom line, however, is that the money has to come from somewhere and the only alternative to cutting spending is to add this bill to our nation's federal debt.

Mr. Chairman, I made a pledge to my constituents in the 8th District in North Carolina that I would lock away Social Security funds and not allow them to be used for other government spending. While I truly believe that our Nation faces a critical situation with our national security, I believe that it is better to pay for this measure by other means rather than adding to the deficit as the President has proposed in his request.

That is why I will support the Coburn, Toomey, and Sanford amendment to offset this emergency appropriations bill with reimbursements from other NATO countries and a minor reduction in other areas of government spending. I am supporting this amendment with the understanding that our government will aggressively pursue reimbursements from other NATO countries, because I believe that we have shouldered a disproportionate share of the costs of this operation.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote in favor of this amendment. However, if it is not successful, I will still support final passage of this emergency spending bill because I truly believe that our nation faces threat in its national security.

Mr. Chairman, this operation has stretched our armed forces too thin, and we all know that a rubber band will break when it's stretched too far. This Congress cannot run that risk with the U.S. military. We need this emergency legislation to help restore our military readiness. We must restore our military resource because this strain is compromising our security here at home.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, 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 CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 159, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 106–127.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3, submitted for printing in House Report 106–127, offered by Mr. OBEY:

Before the chapter 1 heading, insert the following new heading: ''TITLE I—KOSOVO AND SOUTHWEST ASIA EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS''.

In section 207—

(1) after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $850,400,000)'';

(2) after the second dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $341,000,000)'';

(3) after the third dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $509,400,000)''; and

(4) after the last dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $850,400,000)''.

In section 208—

(1) after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $635,000,000)'';

(2) after the second dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $87,000,000)'';

(3) after the third dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $262,700,000)'';

(4) after the fourth dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $58,000,000)'';

(5) after the fifth dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $224,300,000)'';

(6) after the sixth dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''; and

(7) after the last dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $635,000,000)''.

In section 210—

(1) after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $122,100,000)'';

(2) after the third dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,200,000)'';

(3) after the fourth dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $16,300,000)'';

(4) after the fifth dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $77,000,000)'';

(5) after the sixth dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $600,000)'';

(6) after the eighth dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $23,000,000)''; and

(7) after the last dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $122,100,000)''.

In section 211—

(1) after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $254,000,000)'';

(2) after the second dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $116,200,000)'';

(3) after the third dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $45,900,000)'';

(4) after the fourth dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $8,000,000)'';

(5) after the fifth dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $69,800,000)'';

(6) after the seventh dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $13,800,000)'';

(7) after the eighth dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $300,000)''; and

(8) after the last dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $254,000,000)''.

Strike section 212 and insert the following:

SEC. 212. (a) FISCAL YEAR 2000 INCREASE IN MILITARY BASIC PAY.—(1) The adjustment to become effective during fiscal year 2000 required by section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, in the rates of monthly basic pay authorized members of the uniformed services shall not be made.

(2) Effective on January 1, 2000, the rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services shall be increased by 4.4 percent.

(b) REFORM OF RATES OF BASIC PAY.—Effective on July 1, 2000, the rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are as follows:

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS [1]

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
0–10 [2]	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
0–9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0–8	6,569.10	6,784.50	6,926.40	6,966.60	7,148.40
0–7	5,458.50	5,829.60	5,829.60	5,871.90	6,091.20
0–6	4,045.50	4,444.50	4,736.10	4,736.10	4,754.40
0–5	3,236.10	3,799.50	4,062.30	4,112.10	4,276.20
0–4	2,727.30	3,321.30	3,542.70	3,592.20	3,798.60
0–3 [3]	2,534.40	2,873.40	3,100.80	3,351.90	3,512.40
0–2 [3]	2,210.40	2,517.90	2,899.80	2,997.60	3,059.40
0–1 [3]	1,919.10	1,997.40	2,413.80	2,413.80	2,413.80
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
0–10 [2]	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
0–9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0–8	7,443.00	7,512.30	7,794.60	7,876.20	8,119.20
0–7	6,258.30	6,451.20	6,643.80	6,837.00	7,443.00
0–6	4,958.40	4,985.70	4,985.70	5,152.50	5,769.00
0–5	4,276.20	4,404.90	4,642.50	4,953.60	5,268.30
0–4	3,966.00	4,236.90	4,447.20	4,593.60	4,740.90
0–3 [3]	3,688.50	3,835.50	4,024.80	4,123.20	4,123.20
0–2 [3]	3,059.40	3,059.40	3,059.40	3,059.40	3,059.40
0–1 [3]	2,413.80	2,413.80	2,413.80	2,413.80	2,413.80
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26
0–10 [2]	$0.00	$10,614.30	$10,666.80	$10,888.80	$11,275.20
0–9	0.00	9,283.80	9,417.60	9,611.10	9,948.30
0–8	8,471.40	8,796.60	9,013.50	9,013.50	9,013.50
0–7	7,955.10	7,955.10	7,955.10	7,955.10	7,995.10
0–6	6,063.00	6,357.00	6,524.10	6,695.70	7,024.20

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS [1]—Continued

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
O–5	5,415.30	5,562.30	5,731.80	5,731.80	5,731.80
O–4	4,791.60	4,791.60	4,791.60	4,791.60	4,791.60
O–3 [3]	4,123.20	4,123.20	4,123.20	4,123.20	4,123.20
O–2 [3]	3,059.40	3,059.40	3,059.40	3,059.40	3,059.40
O–1 [3]	2,413.80	2,413.80	2,413.80	2,413.80	2,413.80

[1] Notwithstanding the pay rates specified in this table, basic pay for commissioned officers may not exceed the rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule.

[2] While serving as Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commandant of the Marine Corps, or Commandant of the Coast Guard, basic pay for this grade is calculated to be $12,441.00, regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code. However, actual basic pay for these officers may not exceed the rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule.

[3] This table does not apply to commissioned officers in the grade O–1, O–2, or O–3 who have been credited with over 4 years of active duty service as an enlisted member or warrant officer.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS WITH OVER 4 YEARS OF ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE AS AN ENLISTED MEMBER OR WARRANT OFFICER

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
O–3E	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,351.90	$3,512.40
O–2E	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,997.60	3,059.40
O–1E	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,413.80	2,578.50
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
O–3E	$3,688.50	$3,835.50	$4,024.80	$4,184.40	$4,275.60
O–2E	3,156.30	3,321.30	3,448.20	3,542.70	3,542.70
O–1E	2,673.60	2,770.50	2,866.80	2,997.60	2,997.60
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26
O–3E	$4,402.50	$4,402.50	$4,402.50	$4,402.50	$4,402.50
O–2E	3,542.70	3,542.70	3,542.70	3,542.70	3,542.70
O–1E	2,997.60	2,997.60	2,997.60	2,997.60	2,997.60

WARRANT OFFICERS

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
W–5	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
W–4	2,582.10	2,777.70	2,857.80	2,937.60	3,071.70
W–3	2,346.90	2,545.80	2,545.80	2,578.50	2,684.10
W–2	2,055.60	2,223.90	2,223.90	2,297.10	2,413.80
W–1	1,712.70	1,963.50	1,963.50	2,127.60	2,223.90
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
W–5	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
W–4	3,204.90	3,337.50	3,471.90	3,608.40	3,739.20
W–3	2,804.40	2,962.80	3,059.40	3,164.70	3,285.60
W–2	2,545.80	2,642.40	2,739.30	2,833.50	2,937.90
W–1	2,323.80	2,424.00	2,523.60	2,624.10	2,724.30
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26
W–5	$0.00	$4,458.00	$4,611.00	$4,764.90	$4,918.50
W–4	3,873.30	4,006.20	4,139.70	4,273.50	4,410.30
W–3	3,405.60	3,525.60	3,645.60	3,765.90	3,886.20
W–2	3,044.70	3,151.80	3,258.60	3,365.70	3,365.70
W–1	2,824.20	2,899.80	2,899.80	2,899.80	2,899.80

ENLISTED MEMBERS

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
E–9 [1]	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
E–8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
E–7	1,758.90	1,920.60	1,993.20	2,066.10	2,139.60
E–6	1,513.20	1,671.90	1,746.00	1,817.40	1,892.70
E–5	1,327.80	1,488.30	1,560.90	1,634.70	1,708.50
E–4	1,238.10	1,368.00	1,441.80	1,514.40	1,587.90
E–3	1,167.00	1,255.80	1,329.00	1,330.80	1,330.80
E–2	1,123.20	1,123.20	1,123.20	1,123.20	1,123.20
E–1	[2] 1,001.70	1,001.70	1,001.70	1,001.70	1,001.70
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
E–9 [1]	$0.00	$3,003.90	$3,071.70	$3,157.80	$3,259.20
E–8	2,518.80	2,591.70	2,659.50	2,741.10	2,829.30
E–7	2,212.50	2,285.40	2,359.50	2,430.90	2,504.40

ENLISTED MEMBERS—Continued

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
E–6	1,966.50	2,040.30	2,111.40	2,184.00	2,235.90
E–5	1,783.50	1,855.20	1,928.70	1,929.00	1,929.00
E–4	1,587.90	1,587.90	1,587.90	1,587.90	1,587.90
E–3	1,330.80	1,330.80	1,330.80	1,330.80	1,330.80
E–2	1,123.20	1,123.20	1,123.20	1,123.20	1,123.20
E–1	1,001.70	1,001.70	1,001.70	1,001.70	1,001.70
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26
E–9 [1]	$3,360.30	$3,460.20	$3,595.50	$3,729.60	$3,900.90
E–8	2,921.40	3,014.40	3,149.10	3,282.90	3,471.90
E–7	2,577.30	2,650.50	2,776.80	2,915.10	3,122.40
E–6	2,274.60	2,274.60	2,274.60	2,274.60	2,274.60
E–5	1,929.00	1,929.00	1,929.00	1,929.00	1,929.00
E–4	1,587.90	1,587.90	1,587.90	1,587.90	1,587.90
E–3	1,330.80	1,330.80	1,330.80	1,330.80	1,330.80
E–2	1,123.20	1,123.20	1,123.20	1,123.20	1,123.20
E–1	1,001.70	1,001.70	1,001.70	1,001.70	1,001.70

[1] While serving as Sergeant Major of the Army, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy, Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, or Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard, basic pay for this grade is $4,701.00, regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code.

[2] In the case of members in the grade E–1 who have served less than 4 months on active duty, basic pay is $926.70.

(c) RETIRED PAY COMPUTATION FORMULA FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ENTERED MILITARY SERVICE ON OR AFTER AUGUST 1, 1986.—(1) Section 1409(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(C) in paragraph (1), by striking ''paragraphs (2) and (3)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2)''.

(2) Paragraph (3) of section 1401a(b) of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(3) POST-AUGUST 1, 1986 MEMBERS.—

''(A) If the percent determined under paragraph (2) is equal to or greater than 3 percent, the Secretary shall increase the retired pay of each member and former member who first became a member on or after August 1, 1986, by the difference between—

''(i) the percent determined under paragraph (2); and

''(ii) 1 percent.

''(B) If the percent determined under paragraph (2) is less than 3 percent, the Secretary shall increase the retired pay of each member and former member who first became a member on or after August 1, 1986, by the lesser of—

''(i) the percent determined under paragraph (2); and

''(ii) 2 percent.''.

(3)(A) Section 1410 of such title is amended—

(i) by striking ''on that date'' and all that follows through ''increases in the retired pay'' and inserting ''on that date if increases in the retired pay'';

(ii) by striking ''section); and'' and inserting ''section).'';

(iii) by striking paragraph (2); and

(iv) by amending the section heading to read as follows:

''§ 1410. Restoral of cost-of-living adjustment amount at age 62 for members entering on or after August 1, 1986''.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''1410. Restoral of cost-of-living adjustment amount at age 62 for members entering on or after August 1, 1986.''.

(C) Chapter 73 of such title is amended as follows:

(i) Section 1447(6)(A) is amended by striking ''(determined without regard to any reduction under section 1409(b)(2) of this title)''.

(ii) Section 1451(h) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(iii) Section 1452(c) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on October 1, 1999.

(d) FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, for military personnel functions administered by the Department of Defense, to be available only for increases in basic pay attributable to subsections (a) and (b) and for increased payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund attributable to the amendments made by subsection (c), amounts as follows:

For ''Military Personnel, Army'', $559,533,000.

For ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $436,773,000.

For ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $177,980,000.

For ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $471,892,000.

For ''Reserve Personnel, Army'', $40,574,000.

For ''Reserve Personnel, Navy'', $29,833,000.

For ''Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps'', $7,820,000.

For ''Reserve Personnel, Air Force'', $13,143,000.

For ''National Guard Personnel, Army'', $70,416,000.

For ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $30,462,000.

(e) APPLICABILITY CONTINGENT ON EMERGENCY FUNDING DESIGNATION.—(1) Each of the amounts provided in subsection (d) is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

(2) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) (including the amendments made by those subsections) shall take effect only if, and the amounts provided in subsection (d) shall be available only if, the President transmits to the Congress before October 1, 1999, an official budget request that includes, for each of the amounts provided by subsection (d), designation of the entire amount as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

In chapter 4, strike the item relating to ''NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM''.

In section 401—

(1) after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $810,920,000)'';

(2) after the second dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $285,000,000)'';

(3) after the third dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $159,890,000)'';

(4) after the fourth dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $329,730,000)'';

(5) after the fifth dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $35,500,000)''; and

(6) after the last dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $810,920,000)''.

At the end of the bill, strike the short title and insert the following:

TITLE II—OTHER EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $42,753,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For additional gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928–1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, $1,095,000,000, as follows: $350,000,000 for guaranteed farm ownership loans; $200,000,000 for direct farm ownership loans; $185,000,000 for direct farm operating loans; $185,000,000 for subsidized guaranteed farm operating loans; and $175,000,000 for emergency farm loans.

For the additional cost of direct and guaranteed farm loans, including the cost of modifying such loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to remain available until September 30, 2000: farm operating loans, $28,804,000, of which $12,635,000 shall be for direct loans and $16,169,000 shall be for guaranteed subsidized loans; farm ownership loans, $35,505,000, of which $29,940,000 shall be for direct loans and $5,565,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; emergency loans, $41,300,000; and administrative expenses to carry out the loan programs,

$4,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

EMERGENCY GRANTS TO ASSIST LOW-INCOME MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS

For emergency grants to assist low-income migrant and seasonal farmworkers under section 2281 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 5177a), $25,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for $25,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY

(SECTION 32)

For an additional amount for the fund maintained for funds made available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), $120,000,000, to be used for assistance to small- and medium-sized hog farmers: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for $120,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

EMERGENCY CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the ''Emergency Conservation Program'' for expenses resulting from natural disasters, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $25,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

LIVESTOCK ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the Livestock Assistance Program under Public Law 105–277, $60,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for $60,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

LIVESTOCK INDEMNITY PROGRAM

An amount of $3,000,000 is provided to implement a livestock indemnity program as established in Public Law 105–18: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for $3,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for ''Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations'' to repair damages to the waterways and watersheds, including debris removal that would not be authorized under the Emergency Watershed Program, resulting from natural disasters, $80,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $80,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

RURAL COMMUNITY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the costs of direct loans and grants of the rural utilities programs described in section 381E(d)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009f), as provided in 7 U.S.C. 1926(a) and 7 U.S.C. 1926C for distribution through the national reserve, $30,000,000, of which $25,000,000 shall be for grants under such program: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for $30,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For additional gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, to be available from funds in the rural housing insurance fund to meet needs resulting from natural disasters, as follows: $10,000,000 for loans to section 502 borrowers, as determined by the Secretary; and $1,000,000 for section 504 housing repair loans.

For the additional cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to remain available until expended, $1,534,000, as follows: section 502 loans, $1,182,000; and section 504 housing repair loans, $352,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $1,534,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For an additional amount for grants for very low-income housing repair, as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 1474, to meet needs resulting from natural disasters, $1,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $1,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM AND GRANT ACCOUNTS

For an additional amount for ''Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts'' for humanitarian food assistance under title II of Public Law 480, $175,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the Congress hereby designates the entire such amount as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further,* That such amount shall be available only to the extent of a specific dollar amount for such purpose that is included in an official budget request transmitted by the President to the Congress and that is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to such section 251(b)(2)(A).

GENERAL PROVISIONS, THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 1101. The Secretary of Agriculture may waive the limitation established under the second sentence of the second paragraph of section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), on the amount of funds that may be devoted during fiscal year 1999 to any 1 agricultural commodity or product thereof.

SEC. 1102. Notwithstanding section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714i), an additional $28,000,000 shall be provided through the Commodity Credit Corporation in fiscal year 1999 for technical assistance activities performed by any agency of the Department of Agriculture in carrying out any conservation or environmental program funded by the Commodity Credit Corporation: *Provided,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for $28,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

ENFORCEMENT AND BORDER AFFAIRS

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses, Enforcement and Border Affairs'' to support increased detention requirements for Central American criminal aliens and to address the expected influx of illegal immigrants from Central America as a result of Hurricane Mitch, $80,000,000, which shall remain available until expended and which shall be administered by the Attorney General: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Army'', $8,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That of such amount, $5,100,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Army'', $7,300,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That of such amount, $1,300,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $1,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $69,500,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $16,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $300,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $8,800,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $46,500,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For an additional amount for ''Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid'', $37,500,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CHAPTER 4

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, for an additional amount for ''International Disaster Assistance'' for necessary expenses for international disaster relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction assistance, pursuant to section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, for an additional amount for ''Economic Support Fund'', in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, to provide assistance to Jordan, $50,000,000 to become available upon enactment of this Act and to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN EMERGENCY

DISASTER RECOVERY FUND

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, for necessary expenses to address the effects of hurricanes in Central America and the Caribbean and the earthquake in Colombia, $621,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and, except for section 558, the provisions of title V of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(d) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)): *Provided further*, That up to $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this paragraph may be transferred to ''Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development'', to remain available until September 30, 2000, to be used for administrative costs of USAID in addressing the effects of those hurricanes, of which up to $1,000,000 may be used to contract directly for the personal services of individuals in the United States: *Provided further*, That up to $2,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this paragraph may be transferred to ''Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General'', to remain available until expended, to be used for costs of audits, inspections, and other activities associated with the expenditure of the funds appropriated by this paragraph: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated and expended subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the funding ceiling contained in section 580 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in Division A, section 101(d) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)), notwithstanding section 545 of that Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for nonproject assistance: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEBT RESTRUCTURING

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, for an additional amount for ''Debt Restructuring'', $41,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That up to $25,000,000 may be used for a contribution to the Central America Emergency Trust Fund, administered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, for an additional amount for ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', for grants to enable the President to carry out section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, for grants only for Jordan, $50,000,000 to become available upon enactment of this Act and to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be nonrepayable, notwithstanding section 23(b) and section 23(c) of the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 2401. The value of articles, services, and military education and training authorized as of November 15, 1998, to be drawn down by the President under the authority of section 506(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, shall not be counted against the ceiling limitation of that section.

CHAPTER 5

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

RECONSTRUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for ''Reconstruction and Construction'', $5,611,000, to remain available until expended, to address damages from Hurricane Georges and other natural disasters in Puerto Rico: *Provided*, That the

entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the amount provided shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That funds in this account may be transferred to and merged with the ''Forest and Rangeland Research'' account and the ''National Forest System'' account as needed to address emergency requirements in Puerto Rico.

CHAPTER 6

OFFSETS

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–277 and in prior acts making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, $17,000,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 104–208 for the cost of direct loans authorized by section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, $18,000,000 are rescinded.

MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–277, $23,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Of the budgetary resources provided for ''Small Community Air Service'' by Public Law 101–508 for fiscal years prior to fiscal year 1998, $815,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BANKS

(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, $6,500,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

TRUST FUND SHARE OF TRANSIT PROGRAMS

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Of the budgetary resources provided for the trust fund share of transit programs in Public Law 102–240 under 49 U.S.C. 5338(a)(1), $665,000 are rescinded.

INTERSTATE TRANSFER GRANTS—TRANSIT

Of the available balances under this heading, $600,000 are rescinded.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS TITLE

SEC. 2601. Division B, title I, chapter 1 of Public Law 105–277 is amended as follows: under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', strike ''$1,496,600,000'' and insert ''$1,456,600,000''.

TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS

CHAPTER 1

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses,'' $921,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES

RELATED AGENCY

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

BUYING POWER MAINTENANCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $20,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER 2

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

For necessary expenses for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, as authorized by title II of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–292), $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 105–83, $6,800,000 are rescinded.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for ''Federal Trust Programs'', $21,800,000, to remain available until expended, of which $6,800,000 is for activities pursuant to the Trust Management Improvement Project High Level Implementation Plan and $15,000,000 is to support litigation involving individual Indian trust accounts: *Provided*, That litigation support funds may, as needed, be transferred to and merged with the ''Operation of Indian Programs'' account in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the ''Salaries and Expenses'' account in the Office of the Solicitor, the ''Salaries and Expenses'' account in Departmental Management, the ''Royalty and Offshore Minerals Management'' account in the Minerals Management Service and the ''Management of Lands and Resources'' account in the Bureau of Land Management.

CHAPTER 4

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

Under this heading in section 101(f) of Public Law 105–277, strike ''$3,132,076,000'' and insert ''$3,111,076,000'' and strike ''$180,933,000'' and insert ''$164,933,000''.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL CAPITAL LOAN PROGRAM FOR NURSING

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under the Federal Capital Loan Program for Nursing appropriation account, $2,800,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in section 101(f) of Public Law 105–277, $6,800,000 are rescinded.

RELATED AGENCY

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

For an additional amount for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, to remain available until expended, $11,000,000 to be available for fiscal year 1999, and $37,000,000 to be available for fiscal year 2000: *Provided*, That such funds be made available to National Public Radio, as the designated manager of the Public Radio Satellite System, for acquisition of satellite capacity.

CHAPTER 5

CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

HOUSE PAGE DORMITORY

For necessary expenses for renovations to the facility located at 501 First Street, S.E., in the District of Columbia, $3,760,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol shall transfer to the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives such portion of the funds made available under this paragraph as may be required for expenses incurred by the Chief Administrative Officer in the renovation of the facility, subject to the approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5) shall not apply to the funds made available under this paragraph.

O'NEILL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

For necessary expenses for life safety renovations to the O'Neill House Office Building, $1,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5) shall not apply to the funds made available under this paragraph.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 3501. (a) The aggregate amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year for the lump-sum allowance for the Office of the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the aggregate amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year for the lump-sum allowance for the Office of the Majority Whip of the House of Representatives shall each be increased by $333,000.

(b) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2000 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 3502. (a) Each office described under the heading ''HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES'' in the Act making appropriations for the legislative branch for a fiscal year may transfer any amounts appropriated for the office under such heading among the various categories of allowances and expenses for the office under such heading.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any amounts appropriated for official expenses.

(c) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 1999 and each succeeding fiscal year.

CHAPTER 6

POSTAL SERVICE

PAYMENTS TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND

For an additional amount for ''Payments to the Postal Service Fund'' for revenue forgone reimbursement pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 2401(d), $29,000,000.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101–130, the Fiscal Year 1990 Dire Emergency Supplemental to Meet the Needs of Natural Disasters of National Significance, $10,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER 7

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

Notwithstanding the 6th undesignated paragraph under the heading ''COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS'' in title II of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–276; 112 Stat. 2477) and the related provisions of the joint explanatory statement in the conference report to accompany such Act (Report 105–769, 105th Congress, 2d Session) referred to in such paragraph, of the amounts provided under such heading and made available for the Economic Development Initiative (EDI) for grants for targeted economic investments, $250,000 shall be for a grant to Project Restore of Los Angeles, California, for the Los Angeles City Civic Center Trust, to revitalize and redevelop the Civic Center neighborhood, and $100,000 shall be for a grant to the Southeast Rio Vista Family YMCA, for development of a child care center in the City of Huntington Park, California.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Under this heading in Public Law 105–276, add the words, ''to remain available until September 30, 2000,'' after $81,910,000,''.

TITLE IV—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

SEC. 4001. The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(a) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is amended—

(a) in title III, under the heading ''Rural Community Advancement Program, (Including Transfer of Funds)'', by inserting ''1926d,'' after ''1926c,''; by inserting '', 306C, and 306D'' after ''381E(d)(2)'' the first time it appears in the paragraph; and by striking '', as provided in 7 U.S.C. 1926(a) and 7 U.S.C. 1926C'';

(b) in title VII, in section 718 by striking ''this Act'' and inserting ''annual appropriations Acts'';

(c) in title VII, in section 747 by striking ''302'' and inserting ''203''; and

(d) in title VII, in section 763(b)(3) by striking ''Public Law 94–265'' and inserting ''Public Law 104–297''.

SEC. 4002. Division B, title V, chapter 1 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277) is amended under the heading ''Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Research Service'' by inserting after ''$23,000,000,'' the following: ''to remain available until expended,''.

SEC. 4003. The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(d) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is amended—

(a) in title II under the heading ''Burma'' by striking ''headings 'Economic Support Fund' and'' and inserting ''headings 'Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund', 'Economic Support Fund' and'';

(b) in title V in section 587 by striking ''199–339'' and inserting ''99–399'';

(c) in title V in subsection 594(a) by striking ''subparagraph (C)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)'';

(d) in title V in subsection 594(b) by striking ''subparagraph (a)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)''; and

(e) in title V in subsection 594(c) by striking ''521 of the annual appropriations Act for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs'' and inserting ''520 of this Act''.

SEC. 4004. Subsection 1706(b) of title XVII of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r–5(b)), as added by section 614 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999, is amended by striking ''June 30'' and inserting ''September 30''.

SEC. 4005. The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(e) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is amended—

(a) in the last proviso under the heading ''United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Administrative Provisions'' by striking ''section 104(c)(50)(B) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1361–1407)'' and inserting ''section 104(c)(5)(B) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361–1407)''.

(b) in section 354(a) by striking ''16 U.S.C. 544(a)(2))'' and inserting ''16 U.S.C. 544b(a)(2))''.

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall take effect as if included in Public Law 105–277 on the date of its enactment.

SEC. 4006. The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(f) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is amended—

(a) in title I, under the heading ''Federal Unemployment Benefits and Allowances'', by striking ''during the current fiscal year'' and inserting ''from October 1, 1998, through September 30, 1999'';

(b) in title II under the heading ''Office of the Secretary, General Departmental Management'' by striking ''$180,051,000'' and inserting ''$188,051,000'';

(c) in title II under the heading ''Children and Families Services Programs, (Including Rescissions)'' by striking ''notwithstanding section 640 (a)(6), of the funds made available for the Head Start Act, $337,500,000 shall be set aside for the Head Start Program for Families with Infants and Toddlers (Early Head Start): *Provided further*, That'';

(d) in title II under the heading ''Office of the Secretary, General Departmental Management'' by inserting after the first proviso the following: ''*Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading for carrying out title XX of the Public Health Service Act, $10,831,000 shall be for activities specified under section 2003(b)(2), of which $9,131,000 shall be for prevention service demonstration grants under section 510(b)(2) of title V of the Social Security Act, as amended, without application of the limitation of section 2010(c) of said title XX:'';

(e) in title III under the heading ''Special Education'' by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph the following: '': *Provided further*, That $1,500,000 shall be for the recipient of funds provided by Public Law 105–78 under section 687(b)(2)(G) of the Act to provide information on diagnosis, intervention, and teaching strategies for children with disabilities'';

(f) in title II under the heading ''Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' by striking ''$322,000'' and inserting ''$180,000'';

(g) in title III under the heading ''Education Reform'' by striking ''$491,000,000'' and inserting ''$459,500,000'';

(h) in title III under the heading ''Vocational and Adult Education'' by striking ''$6,000,000'' the first time that it appears and inserting ''$14,000,000'', and by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph the following: '': *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available for the Perkins Act, $4,100,000 shall be for tribally controlled postsecondary vocational institutions under section 117'';

(i) in title III under the heading ''Higher Education'' by inserting after the first proviso the following: ''*Provided further*, That funds available for part A, subpart 2 of title VII of the Higher Education Act shall be available to fund awards for academic year 1999–2000 for fellowships under part A, subpart 1 of title VII of said Act, under the terms and conditions of part A, subpart 1:'';

(j) in title III under the heading ''Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement'' by inserting after the third proviso the following: ''*Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under section 10601 of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, $1,000,000 shall be used to conduct a violence prevention demonstration program: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under section 10601 of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Center for Educational Technologies to conduct a feasibility study and initial planning and design of an effective CD ROM product that would complement the book, We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution:'';

(k) in title III under the heading ''Reading Excellence'' by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph the following: '': *Provided*, That up to one percent of the amount appropriated shall be available October 1, 1998 for peer review of applications'';

(l) in title V in section 510(3) by inserting after ''Act'' the following: ''or subsequent Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Acts''; and

(m)(1) in title VIII in section 405 by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) OTHER REFERENCES TO TITLE VII OF THE STEWART B. MCKINNEY HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT.—The table of contents of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.) is amended—

''(1) by striking the items relating to title VII of such Act, except the item relating to the title heading and the items relating to subtitles B and C of such title; and

''(2) by striking the item relating to the title heading for title VII and inserting the following:

''''TITLE VII—EDUCATION AND TRAINING'.''.

(2) The amendments made by subsection (m)(1) of this section shall take effect as if included in Public Law 105–277 on the date of its enactment.

SEC. 4007. The last sentence of section 5595(b) of title 5, United States Code (as added by section 309(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1999, Public Law 105–275) is amended by striking ''(a)(1)(G)'' and inserting ''(a)(1)(C)''.

SEC. 4008. The Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section

101(g) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is amended: (a) in title I under the heading ''National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Operations and Research, (Highway Trust Fund)'' by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph '': *Provided further*, That notwithstanding other funds available in this Act for the National Advanced Driving Simulator Program, funds under this heading are available for obligation, as necessary, to continue this program through September 30, 1999''.

SEC. 4009. Division B, title II, chapter 5 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277) is amended under the heading ''Capitol Police Board, Security Enhancements'' by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph '': *Provided further*, That for purposes of carrying out the plan or plans described under this heading and consistent with the approval of such plan or plans pursuant to this heading, the Capitol Police Board shall transfer the portion of the funds made available under this heading which are to be used for personnel and overtime increases for the United States Capitol Police to the heading ''Capitol Police Board, Capitol Police, Salaries'' under the Act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year involved, and shall allocate such portion between the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate in such amounts as may be approved by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate''.

SEC. 4010. Section 3027(d)(3) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (49 U.S.C. 5307 note; 112 Stat. 366) as added by section 360 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(g) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is re-designated as section 3027(c)(3).

SEC. 4011. The Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(b) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is amended—

(a) in title I, under the heading ''Legal Activities, Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities'', by inserting ''and shall remain available until September 30, 2000'' after ''Holocaust Assets in the United States''; and

(b) in title IV, under the heading ''Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Salaries and Expenses'', by inserting ''and shall remain available until September 30, 2000'' after ''Holocaust Assets in the United States''.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 5001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

This Act may be cited as the ''1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 159, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and a member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) seek to control the time in opposition?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will control 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

□ 1400

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this country is engaged in a war which is the consequence of the inability of the West to act going as far back as 1982. Mr. Milosevic has been consistently and perniciously grinding people into the dust in Bosnia, in Croatia, in Kosovo for over a decade. And because action was not taken to stop him more than a decade ago, the cost of stopping him now is going to be much higher than it otherwise would have been.

We can all argue about how we got here, but the fact is we are here, and we owe the troops in the field and we owe the President an obligation to deal with this issue on the merits—right down the middle. I do not think this House has done a very good job of doing that.

We have seen an incredible array of political comments the last few weeks. Last week, for instance, we have seen one Member of this body indicate that this needed to be clearly understood as Clinton's war rather than the national problem that it really is. We saw a good many efforts being made to simultaneously oppose what the President is doing and what NATO is doing and at the same time double the spending for conducting that war.

We saw 80 percent of the Members of the majority party vote last week against conducting the very operation which today they are suggesting we should spend twice as much money on as the President is asking. I think that that is spectacularly inconsistent, and I think it is confusing and destructive of our ability to find common ground on this issue.

The President asked for $6 billion, a little over $6 billion, to finance a war which is literally an 800-plane, 24-hour-a-day constant bombarding of all of Yugoslavia, not just Kosovo. He has asked for funds fully sufficient to conduct at least that level of activity between now and the end of the fiscal year.

In addition to that, he has asked for funds fully sufficient to pay for an Apache operation over there twice as large as the one which is now operating. And it seems to me that we ought to support him in that effort.

The majority party has responded, after falling off one side of the horse last week by refusing to support this operation, they are now responding by falling off the other side of the horse and saying, in essence, that we ought to increase the size of this bill by 125 percent.

They increased $460 million for additional munitions. The amendment now before us says, all right, in the interest of compromise, we will buy that. They increased procurement by $400 million. We say, okay, in the interest of compromise, we will buy that too. They provided a billion dollars to avoid reprogramming for operation and maintenance items because they want to make sure we have enough money to fully fund all of the Pentagon's needs, not just in Kosovo but elsewhere. We say, okay, we agree with that. We will give them that billion dollars.

What we do not want to give them is the $3 billion that has nothing whatsoever to do with Kosovo but has everything to do with another game that is going on. We have 2 simultaneous problems. We have the Kosovo problem. We also have a budget problem. And under the budget which the majority passed two weeks ago, caps were established on what we can spend for every category of Government, including defense.

What they are now trying to do with this bill is to take $3 billion of items that are not related to Kosovo, stick them in this bill, which will, therefore, enable them to spend $3 billion more on what largely are pork items. And we do not agree with doing that.

So we removed that $3 billion. That still leaves us $5 billion above the President's request, a huge amount of funding. And we make the pay raise, which the majority party claims it is providing real, by making it deliverable immediately rather than deliverable upon passage of another piece of legislation. That is what we do.

We also, responding to some of the advice of Members, such as the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) who suggested that we need more money by way of food aid. We have also provided that.

What we do not want to do is misuse the precious privilege we have to declare certain items emergencies when we think they are emergencies. And it just seems to me, therefore, that if they want to avoid polarizing this issue, they would take the amendment that we are offering today and support it in the interest of moving both sides to the center.

Now, some persons will say, well, we have to add all of these items to this bill despite the fact that they are not emergency items because we have a readiness problem, and they claim that the President is responsible for that. The fact is that for the last 4½ years the majority party has been in control, they have added $27 billion to the President's military budgets and all but $3½ billion of that has gone to nonreadiness items.

I did not make those choices. They did. They had the votes to push them through and they did. I would simply ask, if we do have a readiness problem today, I would say let us take care of it. The defense bill is going to be coming out here in a few weeks' time. Deal with it on that bill.

What I would say, also, is that if they think that we have a readiness problem, why did they put 80 percent of the money they added to the defense budget in non-readiness items? That seems to me again spectacularly inconsistent. We are also told, ''Oh, we have to put more money in because the Pentagon says that they are stretched too thin.''

I want to read from a document prepared by the Pentagon. It makes five points. It says: ''In the event of a major theater war, assets would be required to swing between theaters to support major theater war operations and the ongoing operation in Kosovo, just as envisioned by the Quadrennial Defense Review.''

The second thing it says is: ''The total number of Air Force aircraft deployed or planned for Kosovo represent only about 25 percent of the total number of the services' primary aircraft. Clearly, the Air Force possesses sufficient forces to meet an additional regional war with some aircraft still in reserve.''

It also makes the point that the Navy has already taken the steps needed to ameliorate the situation in the Western Pacific by making the U.S.S. Constellation ready to sail within 96 hours if it is needed to support operations in Korea.

It also makes a number of other points which refute the idea that there is such a crisis in military spending that we must wholesale abuse the emergency designation in this legislation.

I want every dollar that is needed for any contingency in Kosovo to be provided, but I do not want this Congress to misuse the emergency designation in order to simply facilitate moving $3 billion from the regular appropriation bill into this bill by pretending it is an emergency, thereby making room for the same kind of pork items that have been added in the past that, in my view, should not have been added. So that is, essentially, the issue that we face.

And I would also say one other thing. We have heard people say there must be a more fair division of burdens between us and our NATO allies. I could not agree more. And so I would ask, if people believe that, why are they supporting the original bill which forward funds—in other words pays one year early—the $240 million military construction obligation that we will have for our share of NATO costs next year?

There is no other country in the world that is providing that money a year ahead of time. If we provide that money ahead of time, it takes away from our leverage to ask that other NATO allies meet their fair share of the cost in dealing with this war.

So I do not want to hear any rhetoric about how we must oppose the Obey amendment in order to support our troops in the field. This amendment fully supports every possible requirement of troops in the field. What it does not do is engage in the fiction that we ought to use this war in order to pretend that billions of additional dollars are emergencies when in fact they are not.

There is no emergency that requires us to build 37 of those military construction projects in Europe, which the Pentagon did not even want on its list for the next 5 years. This reminds me of the debate just a couple years ago where the Congress insisted on providing a billion-dollar aircraft to the Pentagon that it did not want.

And one last comment again, because I heard it three times, on JDAMs. Yes, we need more JDAMs. This is a new weapon. The administration asked that their request be fully funded last year. It was not Bill Clinton that cut the funds for that program. It was not the gentleman from Wisconsin. It was the committee, under the control of the majority party, which cut that request by 18 percent.

So I remind my colleagues, if they want to know why some of these so-called readiness problems afflict the military, I would advise them to simply look in the mirror; and keep in mind that today we are supposed to be funding emergencies on an emergency basis, we are not supposed to be using it to play ''let us pretend'' games on next year's budget.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, one of the big arguments here today seems to be the fact that the Congress is recommending more funding for our national defense capabilities than the President asked for.

Well, the President's record on estimating the length of time of a military deployment and how much the cost is going to be is not all that great. For example, in Bosnia, for those of us who attended those first meetings about Bosnia, we were told that we would be in Bosnia for about a year, and it would cost about $1.2 billion. But, Mr. Chairman, 5 years later and $10 billion later, we are still in Bosnia.

This administration's record on estimating how long the deployment is going to take or how much it is going to cost is not very good.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) likes to make the point that we have included items that the Pentagon did not want, and he makes this argument every time there is a defense bill on the floor. But let me explain how this works.

When the administration request comes to this Congress, it does not come from the Defense Department. It goes from the Defense Department to the Office of Management and Budget, and they decide what the Defense request will be to the Congress. So just because OMB does not want something does not mean that the warfighters have not already identified it and told us that, in fact, it was a requirement.

And then the point about the Congress doing things that the Pentagon does not want, let me give my colleagues an example. One of the examples of this was the C–17. There were attempts by the administration to kill the C–17. Congress insisted that we needed the capability that the C–17 would provide.

I would say to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that without the C–17 in the inventory today there is no way that we could be doing in the Kosovo region what we are doing. We just could not get enough of C–5's there into the Tirana Airport in Albania. But the C–17's can carry significant amounts of cargo into that area.

□ 1415

The gentleman from Wisconsin likes to continue his conversation about the JDAMs. JDAMs is a good system. But a year ago, there were serious technical problems with JDAMs. Our committee is very, very careful when there are problems not to throw money at it. It does not say we did not support the program. We did make a minor reduction in the JDAMs program because there were technical problems, and we needed to convince the administration that those problems had to be fixed.

Let me give Members another example of how that works. The THAAD program, the Theater High Altitude Air Defense system, everybody that understands what that system is knows we have got to have it. We have to have what THAAD would provide. But THAAD has been, unfortunately, a serious failure, so far, in its development. And so the committee took substantial amounts of money from that program to get the attention of the contractor and the administration, to say, ''Fix it. Don't just throw money at something that doesn't work. Fix it.''

That is what we did on JDAMs. We said, ''Fix it.'' So they fixed it. And JDAMs is a good system, and it is well under way now.

THAAD will become a good system. We need what THAAD would produce and provide for our troops in the field. But we have got to have a THAAD system that works.

So this committee is very careful about what it provides funding for or what it does not provide funding for. That is why when we bring a bill to this floor it is well thought out and can be easily defended. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a good bill.

One of the gentleman from Wisconsin's other complaints is the fact that we put a pay raise in this bill for our men and women in uniform. He does not object to the pay raise, but he objects to the fact that we did not spell out the details of the plan. We had an understanding with our authorizing committees, both parties, that we would provide the money but we would allow them to function as their jurisdiction provides so that they would spell out the details.

I have confidence in the Committee on Armed Services, and it will address

this. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) that we heard earlier on the floor is chairman of the subcommittee that will deal with this. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) is chairman of the full committee. The Senate has already passed their plan. We will go to conference on that one shortly, and the pay raise will become effective.

The gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned earlier that I had dragged a red herring across the debate. If I could use that same phrase, I think that argument about the pay raise is a typical red herring.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Obey amendment.

It provides a fiscally responsible way to address real emergencies, of supporting our troops in Kosovo, aids thousands of fleeing refugees, helps farmers who are being left high and dry here at home and the Central American communities trying to rebuild after the destruction of hurricane Mitch. It is a responsible alternative, rather than the Republican bill which is loading up with nonemergency defense items and from a group of people who just last week decided that it was not in the best interest of our troops who are in the field, men and women in the field, to support their efforts, that they come back and try to pile on in this supplemental appropriation.

The Obey amendment represents the values of American families. We affirm Congress' commitment to our men and women in the Armed Forces who are carrying out a brave and vital mission. It sends an important message to Milosevic that his savage campaign of ethnic cleansing against the Kosovar Albanians will not be tolerated. Mr. Milosevic continues to wage war on ethnic Albanians through his acts of violence, mass murder of innocent families and driving thousands of people and whole communities from their homes to refugee camps.

Make no mistake, Mr. Chairman. This is Milosevic's war. If you do not want to listen to me, listen to Margaret Thatcher, Jacques Chirac, President Schroeder, Prime Minister of England Tony Blair.

Mrs. Thatcher has said Milosevic's regime and the genocidal ideology that sustains it represents something altogether different, a truly monstrous evil. If you want to be serious about supporting our troops in this effort, support the Obey amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to seriously question what was just said, and I want to quote: ''The Obey amendment affirms the value of American families.'' Sending $100 million of Social Security money to Jordan is affirming the value of American families? The money comes from our seniors and our children. What we are going to do is we are going to affirm the value of anybody that is not going to pay for the Social Security money that we are going to spend. Who is that? It is not anybody. Because we are all going to pay for it. There are no family values in that. $100 million to Jordan needs to go, and we passed a bill that paid for it by decreasing spending somewhere else. The Obey amendment does not address that issue.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

As usual, the gentleman has his facts wrong. Jordan is fully offset in the Obey amendment. There is not one dime that adds to the deficit under that.

I wish that if the gentleman is going to attack my amendment, he would at least first understand it correctly.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but respond to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) when she talks about the vote last week, in which a broad cross-section of the membership did address that policy by saying that they disagreed fundamentally with the way this whole effort has been structured by the administration and out of their frustration wanted to express that concern.

Today is an entirely different debate, however. Today we are talking about sending a message to Milosevic by way of the House in a bipartisan, almost nonpartisan way, supporting funding of considerable amount to the troops who are in harm's way.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has pointed to the fact that, by way of his amendment, he is attempting to touch on the reality that we have a Kosovo problem and we have a budget problem, but fails to discuss very clearly the fact that we also have a military crisis on our hands, where we are spread too thin across the world, attempting to preserve the foundations for freedom. And in the meantime, it is because of a lack of long-term policy that we find ourselves in a situation where we are critically low on munitions.

In the area of readiness, for example, that the gentleman from Wisconsin did not really want us to discuss very much today, this amendment cuts by two-thirds the funding we added in the bill for critical, high-priority readiness items, a $1.9 billion cut. It cuts money for spare parts and maintenance, for military training and for base operations. For example, it cuts nearly $1.5 billion from spare parts and depot maintenance accounts, essential funding needed to keep our equipment available in top condition.

Let me tell my colleagues what the problem is here. For the past 8 years, the mission-capable rate of our front-line Air Force and Navy aircraft has been steadily dropping. It has gotten so bad that on any given day one out of every four U.S. Air Force aircraft is rated not mission capable. The Navy's numbers are even worse. Thirty percent of its aircraft are nonmission capable.

This problem, which is growing worse, affects many aspects of our readiness. Pilots cannot train adequately, and parts are cannibalized on the front lines. It is clear that we have problems across the board as it relates to readiness.

Earlier today, I touched briefly on an item that my chairman mentioned as well. The gentleman from Wisconsin does speak to the pay question. Should we provide funding in this mechanism for assistance, additional pay to our men and women who are in harm's way? The answer is, absolutely yes. But it is intriguing to me that the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, who in the past has talked long and hard about the need to cooperate with our authorizing committees, continues himself in this case to say, we ought to be doing the authorizing here.

Mr. Chairman, it is important for our colleagues to know that the authorizing committees have worked hand in hand with us and have done a fabulous job of making sure that their important work is held intact, while at the same time we deliver the pay to our troops that is so important to their effectiveness.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly support the Obey substitute which supports our troops in Kosovo as Democrats unlike Republicans did in their votes last week, which gives a real pay raise to our men and women in uniform and which supports emergency assistance for Albanian refugees. But we have other real emergencies in this process, like the near-Depression conditions faced by farmers in the Midwest, like our fellow Americans in Oklahoma and Kansas and like the national interest the United States has spawned by the hurricane damage in Central America. These are real emergencies which we need to deal with responsibly.

It is scandalous that 6 months after Hurricanes Georges and Mitch devastated the Caribbean and Central America the Republican leadership has failed to act. The emergency in Central America pressures are a national interest in preventing illegal immigration, preventing the spread of disease due to unhealthy conditions, preventing the

spread of the narcotics trade and cementing the democracies we spent billions to promote.

We have failed to address this emergent national interest. For a party seeking to stymie illegal immigration and halt the growth of the narcotics trade in the Americas, their inaction has given rise to an increase in both. It seems to me they have shown the true depth or rather the utter shallowness in upholding their responsibility as well as the contempt for the Latino community of the United States. Their actions truly reflect their priority: Politics over emergencies, rhetoric over reconstruction.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), a member of the Subcommittee on Defense.

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

Mr. BONILLA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we are on the verge of being forced to hang ''Sorry We're Closed'' signs like this on the gates of our military installations around the world. It is unfortunate that we are on the brink of having a hollow force again. Our troops often reach on the shelves, and there are no spare parts. The ammunition supplies are low. The pay is low. The health care provided is not what it should be anymore. Recruiting is down in the Army. In the Air Force we are losing pilots, a thousand pilots short last year alone.

It is mind-boggling to me that there are Members in this body who do not care about our military and the future safety and security of this country. We must never forget how we got to this point in history. We have the greatest economy in the history of the world. We have the greatest workforce. We have the greatest technology. We have the greatest health care ever seen on the face of this planet. It did not happen just by chance. It happened because our military has preserved our freedom and liberty for generations through very difficult times.

I, for one, will stand here any day and support an even higher number of funds for our military because they need it. Their families are falling apart because they have been overdeployed. They are doing social work in causes around the world for our Commander in Chief and it is wrong. I say to my colleagues, if we support this cut that is being proposed now by some Members, we will be forced to hang this sign at the gates of our military installations. If we start doing that, we may as well hang one on our country.

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

If the gentleman is going to make the statement that there are Members of this House who do not care about our servicemen or the national security interests of this country, I think he ought to have courage enough to identify which Members he is talking about or else not say something so ridiculous on this House floor. That is the kind of meaningless, nasty rhetoric that discredits this entire institution; and the gentleman ought to take back those remarks.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a very important member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to strongly support the base package and strongly oppose the Obey amendment for this reason. We did an analysis and asked the Department of Defense under the Clinton administration how short we were in basic ammunition compared not to some Republican standard, not to some think tank standard, but compared to the President's own two-war requirement, how short we were in everything from cruise missiles, right on down to M–16 ammo. The answer is, $13.8 billion short. Even passing this supplemental, even passing the fiscal year 2000 budget, we are going to be short.

We asked the services how short they were in terms of near-term war-fighting capability. We did not ask contractors. We did not ask Members of Congress.

□ 1430

They gave us a list of $28.7 billion. That includes ammunition and equipment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) says, ''Well, why didn't you spend more money on readiness?'' Well, the reason, Mr. Chairman, is because we lost 55 aircraft last year crashing because we have got old systems. We have got 40-year-old CH–46 helicopters instead of the new V–22. So, we have been forced to choose with this limited amount of money between bullets and having safe platforms for our people to fly.

Now the gentleman said, ''Well, what have you Republicans done with this $27 billion that you added?'' Mr. Chairman, I think the Commandant of the Marine Corps gave the best answer when our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), asked him, ''Where would you be right now if we hadn't added the 27 billion over the last several years?'' The Commandant of the Marine Corps said, ''You wouldn't have had a 911 force, the U.S. Marine Corps. You would have had a 91 force.''

So we have done good things with the money we added. This thing should have been a lot bigger. I would have liked to have seen a supplemental with $20–$25 billion in it. Every dollar of that could have been justified by matching the two MRC requirements against what we actually have.

I commend the committee. Let us pass this thing.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman so that I could speak on behalf of the bill and for the Coburn and against the Obey amendment.

As my colleagues know, 2 years ago, Mr. Chairman, we debated the balanced budget agreement on this floor. In fact, it was supported 333 to 99. I happen to have been one of the 99 that voted against it, and what does that have to do with today's debate?

Mr. Chairman, I voted ''no'' on May 20, 1997, for the same reason I am going to support the Coburn amendment today, an idea called fiscal discipline. In 1997 the House voted to increase the deficit by $24 billion, pushing the burden to balance the budget off into the future. It simply pushed the spending cuts and the discipline into it the future. All the surpluses that we read about assume that Congress will find a way to support those cuts and Congress will demonstrate that fiscal discipline. Sometime, somewhere Congress is going to have to show this discipline and actually make some tough choices. I think now is a good time.

Two years ago I voted to make those choices then, not later, and today I am calling on my colleagues to do the same today, make that choice today.

Last fall President Clinton said he wanted to save Social Security first, and I agreed with him. I voted to put off tax relief. Last fall he said let us use 100 percent of Social Security for Social Security, and then in January in the State of the Union he said, well, no, let us just use 62 percent for Social Security. Then he submitted a budget that said, well, no, 57 percent was enough. Now the President is coming here asking for billions of dollars for Kosovo, all of it coming from Social Security.

We need to exercise fiscal discipline, and we need to support our men and women, too, who are risking their lives in the Balkans. I do not support the President's decision to go to war. I think it is a terrible mistake. But I do support the men and women who are over there fighting.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) does not understand that it is not just the men and women who fighting in the Balkans that are at risk. Our whole national security is at risk. The President has overcommitted our military. We have 265,000 troops in 135 countries. Since the Gulf War we have shrunk our military by 40 percent. Since 1990 we have had 33 troop deployments; there were 10 in the 49 years that preceded that. Under the War Powers Act, President Clinton has submitted 46 reports, more than twice as many as Ford, Carter, Reagan and Bush submitted combined, and 90 percent of the President's line item vetoes were for military needs.

To conduct this war the President has diverted planes from Iraq. He has

called up 25,000 reservists. We are short pilots, we are short seamen and women, we are short ammunition, we are short parts, we are short training, and all the while we are asking our men and women to do more and take more risk.

We have got to make a tough vote today. We got to choose, we got to pick priorities. Spending billions of dollars in the Balkans going to war is not my priority, but the President made that decision for us. I would rather use that money for Social Security, and Medicare, and education, and national parks and health care, and to suggest to the American people that we can do both is wrong. But to hide from the tough choice is wrong, too.

To all my colleagues on the left who came to this floor last fall saying save Social Security first, they need to stand up and support the Coburn amendment, and all those on our side who said that they wanted to balance the budget and establish fiscal discipline for our kids and our grandkids, they need to support the Coburn amendment. Do the right thing and support the Coburn amendment, but in any event oppose the Obey amendment and support our men and women in Kosovo.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES) a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for yielding this time to me, and I rise in reluctant opposition to the Obey amendment and remind my colleagues that this House has dealt with the supplemental dealing with natural disasters, and Congress in a bipartisan way has never ever neglected its responsibilities to meet those needs, and we will again.

However, today is about repairing damage that has been done to our national security, and I talk specifically about the lack of funding, the reduction in funding over the last several years, and we are now, as has been alluded to already, involved in more places in the globe than ever before, and the men and women in uniform need to know that the United States Congress is behind them.

This package is a good package as reported out by the House Committee on Appropriations, and I would urge my colleagues to stand behind it. This measure would replenish depleted stocks of munitions and spare parts, begin needed military construction projects, boost military pay and retirement benefits for a military that is stretched beyond reason, and provide humanitarian aid.

It is a good bill, Mr. Chairman, and we should pass this bill and send it to the President.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the Committee on Appropriations' Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is a very close friend of mine, and I know he has the right heart, but I want to answer the gentleman when he said:

''Identify those Members that have not supported defense.''

Mr. Chairman, I want, and let me finish, I want him to read, Mr. Chairman. Look on the web page, look at www.dsausa.org. That stands for: Democrat Socialists of America. They want government health control, they want government control of private property, government control of education, the highest progressive tax ever, and they want to cut defense by 50 percent.

There is 58 of them on that side, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to close, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds.

With all due respect to the previous speaker, what I did was ask the gentleman who spoke earlier to identify which Members of the House, in his words, ''did not care about our troops and did not care about the national security interests of this country.'' That is what I, and, no, I will not yield to the gentleman. He has not shown courtesy to me, and I will not show it to him.

Mr. Chairman, I am simply not going to tolerate that kind of ad hominem attack on Members. It is a disservice to this House to attack Members with innuendo as the gentleman just did.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), our distinguished Minority Leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, this debate today should not be about politics; it should be about people. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) I believe is a better way to go about dealing with the problems that we face. We need to support the troops in the field.

However my colleagues feel about the action that is taking place, I think by now we have all come to the conclusion that we got our young people out there. We need to support them. The President asked us for $6 million to support our young men and women in the field. The pay, which the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) puts into his alternative is obviously needed and sends a strong message to our young people that we intend to try to retain people in the service and get people that we are trying to recruit.

Mr. Chairman, I think that makes sense, and that is why he put it in the bill.

There are a lot of other needs in the military. I do not think the place to address those needs is in this bill. I do not deny that those needs ought to be looked at. Many of them ought to be fulfilled. I simply believe that in an emergency bill that we are trying to get through here in a expeditious manner, it does not do well to raise a lot of issues that are properly raised in the appropriation process. So I think the Obey amendment deals with the military needs that we have got right now in Kosovo in the best way.

But further than that, what is also important about the Obey amendment is that it deals with emergencies that we have already spoken to on this floor that we need to include in this legislation. We have thousands of people in Central America who are out of their homes, who are migrating northward, trying to come to Mexico, trying to come to the United States, because we have been here 79 days and we have not dealt with the emergency in Central America. And we have been here 79 days, and we have not dealt with the emergency in middle America with our farmers in agriculture. The Obey amendment, the Obey substitute, deals not only in the most sensible way with Kosovo, he also deals with middle America and agriculture and deals with Central America and Hurricane Mitch and the crisis that is on there.

If my colleagues are thinking about people both here in the United States and in other places in the world that need our support, and if my colleagues are thinking about our young people out prosecuting this air war in Kosovo, vote for the Obey amendment. It is more sensible, it is more intelligent, and it better meets the problems that we, as a people, face today.

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

I was interested in listening to the minority leader's statement about agriculture, and I want to remind the Members that when we were developing the first supplemental that we dealt with, when we received that initial supplemental request from the White House there was nothing in it about agriculture. It was an afterthought. The President afterwards requested that. So we finally got it in our first bill, and it will come to conference basically at the same time that this bill goes to conference, and we will all have a chance to vote on it again.

I would also remind the minority leader that the pay that he is talking about that he supports, and I am happy to have his support, the pay is in the committee bill to pay for the men and women who wear the uniform of our country. It is in the committee bill, increased pay as well as the retirement package.

But in closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say this:

We are in Kosovo deeper than most of us thought we were, and unless Milosevic has a change of heart, we are

going to get in deeper, and it is going to be longer and more expensive.

We are stretching ourselves too thin. We were planning for two major regional conflicts, one in the Korean theater, one in Southwest Asia. We have taken assets from the Korean theater, an aircraft carrier, U–2 spy planes, F–15 fighter airplanes, a Marine Corps prepositioned ship, all moving out of that area of responsibility to service the Kosovo activity. We have taken EA6Bs out of the no-fly zones over northern Iraq and southern Iraq. We are stretched too thin.

General Hawley made that case very strongly, and I commend him for his courage because he is still an active duty general, that the Air Force is stretched too thin. So is the Army. So is the Navy. So is the Marine Corps. We have got to do something about it, and there should be no politics in this debate when we talk about accomplishing the mission and giving our soldiers some way to protect themselves while they do it.

Let us defeat the Obey amendment, let us defeat the Coburn amendment, and let us move on to get this bill to conference so that we can get it back to our colleagues here within the next week or 10 days.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, today, I voted in support of our uniformed men and women in Yugoslavia by voting in support of the President's emergency request for Kosovo.

I voted in support of increasing by 4.4% the pay of our military personnel and readjusting pension benefits.

I voted in support of increased humanitarian aid for the refugees from Kosovo in the Balkans region.

I also voted in support of funding for the replenishment of military equipment and supplies, as well as military construction, required for the NATO operations in the Balkan region.

In addition, I voted again to move forward the emergency disaster relief for American farm families, and the victims of Hurricane Mitch and Hurricane Georges in Central America and the Caribbean—a package of emergency disaster relief that the President requested 80 days ago.

This is what I support and what is contained in the amendment to H.R. 1664 offered by Representative DAVID OBEY (D-WI) for which I voted earlier today.

I cannot, however, in good conscience, vote for final passage of H.R. 1664, the Kosovo and Southwest Asia Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, because it is a public and political lie.

The majority's defense cookie jar includes hundreds of millions of dollars for defense items that were going to be considered part of the FY2000 Department of Defense authorizations and appropriations bill—and quite frankly, they would have been approved at that time as is proper. They are not emergency items in any sense of the word, and funds from the Social Security surplus should not be spent in FY 1999 to purchase them.

In addition, the bill contains $346 million for items not even in the Pentagon's five-year plan, despite the Republican claim that the money is for pressing defense needs.

The bill also includes $215 million for military construction items that neither the President nor the Pentagon requested.

This legislation is a fiscal farce. One of the main reasons why military readiness, equipment and supplies need to be replenished is that the Republican Congress has added $23 billion to the Pentagon's budget requests between 1995 and 1998, but only 10% of those funds went to Operations and Maintenance. The remaining 90% went to pork-barrel procurement projects that the Pentagon neither requested nor wanted.

By moving items that would normally have been funded in the Pentagon's FY2000 appropriations bill, the Republican majority has opened up over $2 billion in the FY2000 defense budget.

Will the Republicans shift these funds to allow for greater education spending FY2000? I think not.

Will the Republicans shift these funds to allow for prescription drug coverage under Medicare in FY2000? I think not.

The Republican majority will fill up the FY2000 defense budget with more pork barrel projects with the $2 billion they have just given themselves by shoving non-emergency items into the FY99 emergency spending bill.

I simply cannot support such a lack of fiscal accountability, nor can I support such a dishonest and insulting budget process.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey substitute because it is the responsible thing to do. The substitute keeps our promise towards peace in Kosovo, $175 million for emergency food assistance, America's military personnel by providing the $1.9 billion pay raise, U.S. farmers that have been hurt by falling crop prices, the new King of Jordan, King Abdullah, the people that were affected by Hurricanes Mitch and Georges in the Caribbean and Central America last fall and eliminates much of the unrequested funding.

Mr. Chairman, this substitute keeps the promise of where our priorities ought to be in the Supplemental and is fiscally responsible.

The Appropriations Committee-reported bill provides a total of $12.9 billion—more than double the Administration's request. These increases beyond the request contain spending for items that are neither connected to the Kosovo operations nor emergencies as defined by the Budget Act. Moreover, much of the $1 billion for military construction above the request are for proposals that the Administration says may not begin construction for several years and many of which are not even included in the long range plan of the Defense Department. Maybe someone could tell me why my colleagues across the aisle who repeatedly criticize members of my party for so-called spending, spending, spending . . . the same members who voted against the air war in Yugoslavia . . . why they would vote for this massive increase in the defense budget.

Thus, I strongly support the Obey substitute and I urge my colleagues to do the right thing, the responsible thing—vote for the Obey amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Obey amendment. The alternative presented here today provides for the full request of the President for Kosovo, provides for a real pay raise for our troops, provides high priority operation and maintenance funding for DOD, increases amounts for emergency food assistance for Kosovo, and most significantly, provides the funds for the Central American disaster and for American farmers without offsets.

It is now over six months since Hurricane Mitch struck Central America, and this Congress has yet to provide any of the reconstruction assistance that is vitally needed to help our neighbors to the South. While the House and Senate have passed bills providing this assistance and everyone involved espouses their good intentions, no funding has been made available. This amendment adds the full $956 million for the Central American disaster as an emergency. The Kosovo bill contains about $600 million to address the humanitarian needs of the Kosovar refugees, and it does so without offsets. This same standard should be applied to emergency funds for Central American. Both of these events are true emergencies and should be funded as such.

I want to remind members that the planting season has begun in Central America and many of the 100,000 small farmers wiped out by the Hurricane are without credit, seeds or the other inputs necessary to plant their crops. Without a significant and immediate input of agricultural assistance we will undoubtedly face food shortages again soon in Central America.

No funding is in place to begin the reconstruction of the 3,000 miles of rural roads or the 300 bridges destroyed by the Hurricane. Over 200,000 school children continue to attend classes in temporary open-air facilities. It is time to put aside our differences and get this badly needed assistance moving.

The amendment also provides $100 million in assistance to Jordan as requested. The Obey amendment does offset this non-emergency spending. Finally the Obey amendment provides $175 million in food assistance for Kosovo. Unfortunately the Administration did not request any additional funding to meet needs in Kosovo. With over 600,000 refugees now in camps and another 800,000 to 900,000 people displaced within Kosovo, it is now clear that the need for food assistance has grown, and that the existing resources of the Emergency feeding programs will not meet the needs. In addition it appears that ongoing food programs for Indonesia, Yemen, Ethiopia, and Rwanda have been cut back to meet needs in Kosovo. The $175 million for additional PL 480 in the amendment will enable feeding programs to continue all over the world and emerging needs to be met in Kosovo.

The assumptions used by the Administration did not take into account refugee needs beyond September 30th of this year. There are no funds in this bill to move refugees back into Kosovo. There are no funds in this bill to winterize refugee camps, if that becomes necessary. In short there is very little wiggle room with these humanitarian accounts to respond to changing circumstances on the ground. This $175 million in additional food assistance will ensure that all refugees will be fed wherever they end up, and it will ensure that cuts are not made to other vital feeding programs.

Support the Obey amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the supplemental bill before you and in support of the Obey substitute.

As you all know, my father, along with our colleague ROD BLAGOJEVICH and a group of ministers and religious leaders, met with President Milosevic and other Serbian leaders in Yugoslavia last week.

As a result of that trip and other factors, I have come to firmly believe that the United States and other NATO leaders should pause for peace and make another attempt at a diplomatic solution to the conflict in Kosovo.

The release of the American POWs provides an opening that the U.S. and our allies should take advantage of.

I do not support continuing the bombing at this time, but the Obey substitute presents an opportunity to support our humanitarian efforts in Albania and Macedonia, our continued military presence in the Balkans, and disaster relief to Latin America.

Another point I want to make today is that it is pure hypocrisy to classify military construction projects unrelated to the event in Kosovo as emergency funding, while maintaining the position that funding to assist in relieving the devastation in South and Central America be offset.

This effort to sneak extra funding into the defense budget, outside of the self-imposed budget caps, by including it in the Supplemental is underhanded and should not be allowed to continue.

I would love the opportunity to provide similar amounts of ''emergency funding'' for education, health care, housing and other vital domestic programs.

At the very least, the humanitarian refugee crisis in Albania and Macedonia as well as the crisis in Latin America resulting from Hurricane Mitch should be classified as an emergency, and they are in the Obey substitute.

The Obey substitute amendment correctly defines an emergency as an emergency and I urge its support.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment in the nature of a substitute and to applaud my colleague DAVID OBEY for bringing it.

This is an emergency appropriation, and it must be treated as such. We should not be engaging in a misguided effort by adding on other non-emergency measures that should more properly be considered within the context of the annual appropriations process.

In this substitute, we would provide the President's request and support our family members who are in harms way in Kosovo, provide humanitarian assistance to the refugees from terrible atrocities in their homeland, and provide the important and deserved pay raises to our armed forces that we tried but couldn't get included last year.

Mr. Speaker, three months ago we passed a badly needed supplemental bill to provide emergency funding to our friends in Central America who suffered a terrible natural disaster, and for our own farmers. We need to get this done also, and this amendment would include these long overdue funds—again relieving suffering in this hemisphere.

As Chair of the Health Braintrust of the Congressional Black Caucus, I have another interest in the previously passed supplemental bill, because it addresses human suffering here at home by including a technical amendment that would allow the release of funds that were authorized but never appropriated for the Office of Minority Health to address HIV/IDS in communities of color.

I ask my colleagues to support the Obey amendment.

□ 1445

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 159, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 159, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN); amendment No. 3 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 101, noes 322, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

AYES—101

Aderholt
Bachus
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Biggert
Bilbray
Boehner
Burr
Burton
Campbell
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Crane
Cubin
Deal
DeMint
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hutchinson
Isakson
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kingston
LaHood
Largent
Linder
Manzullo
McIntosh
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mica
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Norwood
Paul
Pease
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Portman
Radanovich
Ramstad
Riley
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherwood
Smith (MI)
Souder
Stenholm
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Toomey
Walden
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)

NOES—322

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Granger
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns

Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Baker
Berman
Brown (CA)
Cox
Green (TX)
Kuykendall
McNulty
Slaughter
Tiahrt
Wynn

□ 1506

Messrs. MCKEON, POMEROY, and DAVIS of Virginia changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. COBLE, EHLERS, FOLEY, COOKSEY, WATTS of Oklahoma, HUTCHINSON, and BACHUS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I was unable to cast a vote on the Coburn amendment to H.R. 1664 due to a family emergency. However, had I been present I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 159, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 260, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

AYES—164

Ackerman
Allen
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sherman
Shows
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—260

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Berman
Brown (CA)
Cox
Green (TX)
Kuykendall
McNulty
Slaughter
Tiahrt
Wynn

□ 1517

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 118, except for my daughter's wedding I would have been present. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I was unable to cast a vote on the Obey amendment to H.R. 1664 due to a family emergency. However, had I been present I would have voted "aye."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

Notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, an additional amount for ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'', $17,071,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

SECURITY AND MAINTENANCE OF UNITED STATES MISSIONS

Notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, an additional amount for ''Security and Maintenance of United States Missions'', $50,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which $45,500,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes the designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in

the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

Notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, an additional amount for ''Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service'', $2,929,000, to remain available until expended, of which $500,000 shall be transferred to the Peace Corps and $450,000 shall be transferred to the U.S. Information Agency, for evacuation and related costs: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army'', $2,920,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $7,660,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $1,586,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $4,303,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund'', $5,219,100,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That of such amount, $1,311,800,000 shall be available only to the extent that the President transmits to the Congress an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that (1) specifies items which meet a critical readiness or sustainability need, to include replacement of expended munitions to maintain adequate inventories for future operations, and (2) includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military personnel accounts; operation and maintenance accounts, including Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid; procurement accounts; research, development, test and evaluation accounts; military construction; the Defense Health Program appropriation; the National Defense Sealift Fund; and working capital fund accounts: *Provided further,* That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further,* That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further,* That such funds may be used to execute projects or programs that were deferred in order to carry out military operations in and around Kosovo and in Southwest Asia, including efforts associated with the displaced Kosovar population: *Provided further,* That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have a series of four amendments, three I understand are in order, but this one has been ruled not to be in order, and I will not challenge that ruling.

The intention of this amendment was to take in this section where it says $5,219,100,000 for Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund and take $3,300,000,000 of that and move it to the four readiness accounts that come up under procurement, to put $825 million under weapons procurement for the Navy, $825 million under aircraft procurement for the Air Force, $825 million under missile procurement for the Air Force, and $825 million for ammunition procurement for the Air Force.

The problem apparently with this is that, once we strike in one section, according to our relatively recently adopted rule in the budget agreement, when we strike it from one section, we cannot put it in another section. But I wanted to illustrate several points with this amendment, not that it likely would have passed anyway.

The way the bill is written, it is hard to tell that, in fact, this bill forward funds the war in Kosovo because it is not specified particularly in the bill. It says, Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund. However, in the CRS breakout, the $3.3 billion that the President requested for military operations is still in the bill; the $335 million for the military portion of the Kosovo refugee operations is still in the bill; the $257.8 million for Southwest Asia is still in the bill. The only difference from the President's request in this section is the readiness and munitions contingency reserve.

If anybody has a doubt that the $3.3 billion is in this $5.29 billion, the question that comes is, why on line 5 on page 5 does it say $1,311,800,000? That happens to be the difference of the amount directly going to Kosovo in Southwest Asia operations from the Readiness and Munitions Contingency Fund.

My goal was to give those Members who favor strengthening our military and supporting the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) in their efforts to try to recoup some of what we have lost in our military effort, in our readiness, in our preparedness, in our munitions, in our defense system, rather than blowing it up in Kosovo.

We, in fact, have $3.3 billion here that could be used for our readiness. In fact, we have heard from the Air Force that they are $18 billion short, not the $40 million in aircraft procurement, $178 million in missile procurement, and $35 million in ammunition. We have heard that the Navy is $3.8 billion short, rather than $431 million.

I wish in this bill I would have been able to redirect the misguided efforts in the Balkans and put that into military procurement. Because many of us who have grave reservations about this bill and many of us who will oppose this bill do not oppose the much-worthy efforts of the chairman to address these terrible declines in our military capacity.

I also want to address this point, and I will refer to this several times this afternoon. I was very concerned about some language in the earlier amendments that were debated. I heard those of us who oppose this war and oppose this funding for forward funding the war and possibly escalating this war as monies are transferred, as several of my future amendments will address, are putting our children in harm's way. We have heard we cannot abandon our own troops. We have heard that nothing could be worse than to walk away. We have heard that it is sending the wrong signal and that we somehow, at least an implication, that we are not patriotic.

I think an apology, although it was not that direct, an apology is in order not only to the Members of Congress who have concerns and believe we should stand down but also to our national American Legion which yesterday, as their leader said, ''The Legion's National Executive Committee unanimously adopted a resolution calling for all U.S. soldiers, pilots and support staff to be removed from the region of the Balkans.''

The resolution says, ''The U.S.-led NATO attacks against Serbia'', and this is the American Legion, veterans all over in America are, in effect, saying stand down, ''could only lead to troops being killed, wounded and captured without advancing any clear purpose, mission or objective.''

More particular, here are the whereas clauses: ''The President has committed the Armed Forces of the United States in a joint operation with NATO to engage in hostilities in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia without clearly defining America's vital national interests. Whereas, neither the President

nor the Congress have defined America's objectives in what has become an open-ended conflict characterized by an ill-defined progressive escalation.''

Mr. Chairman, I will cover the rest of this later, but, clearly, there are more than just a few Members of Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. It is amendment No. 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. Souder:

Page 5, line 5, strike ''of such amount $1,311,800,000'' and insert ''such amount''.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in order because it does not move the money but addresses the same point.

If I can explain the technical part of this amendment again so people understand exactly what we are doing here. In the operation and maintenance account it says, Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund of $5,219,100,000 is available to be expended. In that, according to the CRS breakout, and I would say evidence illustrates this later in the bill, there is nothing in this bill that says we are giving the President his $3.3 billion to forward fund this war. But, in fact, if we break out the $5.219, we will find that we are forward funding the military operations, we are funding the refugee operations, we are funding the Southwest Asia.

On page 5 of the bill, where it says $1,311,800,000, that is the House appropriations figure on readiness and munitions contingency reserve in munitions. Now, in an effort to keep the $3.3 billion from bracket creep, they have included in that, as a ''provided further'' on page 5 of the bill, that puts two restrictions on the $1.3 billion. It specifies items which meet a critical readiness or sustainability need, to include replacement of expended munitions to maintain adequate inventories for future operations; and, two, includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act. That is very commendable.

My amendment is very simple. It takes the entire $5.2 billion and says, put those two conditions on it. Make sure that they meet a critical readiness or sustainability need and includes a designation of the entire amount.

□ 1530

I do not think that this amendment is particularly controversial unless, in fact, we are trying to avoid the obvious, which is, in fact, we are forward funding this war, and that we do not want something coming to Congress that makes us specify or vote on the critical readiness needs.

This would not cut off any funds. This is merely an amendment that does what the bill already does but says that the money for Kosovo should be subjected to the same rules as the money for readiness and munition, and that is, the President should have to defend it, that he is not hurting our readiness and sustainability and in fact that it is critical and it is an emergency.

Now, if I can finish in the remaining time I have, the American Legion statement of why they believe we should currently withdraw all soldiers, pilots, and support staff from the Balkans, they said:

''Whereas, the President nor the Congress have defined America's objectives in what has become an open-ended conflict characterized by an ill-defined progressive escalation; and,

''Whereas, it is obvious that an ill-planned and massive commitment of U.S. resources could only lead to troops being killed, wounded or captured without advancing any clear purpose, mission or objective; and,

''Whereas, the American people rightfully support the ending of crimes and abuses by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and the extending of humanitarian relief to the suffering people of the region; and,

''Whereas, America should not commit resources to the prosecution of hostilities,'' which, in fact, this bill does, ''in the absence of clearly defined objectives agreed upon by the U.S. Congress in accordance with Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.''

So for those of us who have a concern about this forward funding of the war, please do not refer to us as disarming our military, or they would have the same statement about the veterans of the American Legion who said that they do not believe that we should also forward fund and continue to fund this war, and in fact are calling for the withdrawal of the troops, the pilots and support staff in the Balkans.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise with great hesitation in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, it is with great hesitation that I oppose my colleague's amendment for I know that his interest and concern are sincere. My concern is that I believe as we go forward with this measure we want to be very careful about the messages that we are sending from this well, that might be misinterpreted by Mr. Milosevic and his supporters.

This amendment does not do what the sponsor alleges, in my view. Indeed, this amendment literally does nothing except perhaps create more bureaucracy.

Let me explain. The President has submitted a budget regarding this war. As he has outlined his projections, I have a number of reservations that we have attempted to deal with as we have gone forward with this legislation. But, indeed, we have tried to be careful, to make sure that there is not misinterpretation of our intent.

This amendment supposedly would take some $5.2 billion in the bill that we provided to pay for the cost of the Kosovo operation and apply it to other unspecified military readiness and munitions needs. But a close reading of the amendment reveals that all it does is require that before the $5.2 billion can be spent, the President must submit a budget request specifying a critical readiness or sustainability need, to include replacement of expended munitions.

Frankly, during the time that we are carrying forward a war, we do not need to have a day-in and day-out exchange with the administration, but rather continue the oversight that the committee feels is its responsibility.

The amendment does not say money cannot be spent on readiness needs or munitions related to Kosovo. It simply requires the President to submit a budget request for readiness needs for munitions, period. And as this is construed under the Budget Act, all he has to do is submit the request and the money is released.

And what would the President do? He would ask that these funds be applied to Kosovo because the drain on dollars and munitions from this operation represents the most immediate readiness need that the Pentagon has.

So what does the amendment do? Really it does nothing but perhaps send a message that we do not need to send. In a fundamental way, it does nothing except force the President to send up a budget request again, one that he has already asked for. If it does not restrict him in any fashion whatsoever, then what are we doing it for?

Indeed, if anything, this amendment is harmful, as it simply creates a requirement for more paperwork which would potentially delay the release of monies that DOD needs, at the very time we want to be sending a message that we support our men and women who are in harm's way overseas.

Regrettably, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, the main purpose of this amendment was to highlight the fact that, in fact, there was a differential in the first section that had $3.3 billion. We are going to have a number of recorded votes later that will enable us who are concerned to restrict that funding.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is withdrawn.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the House, and I will not use the full 5 minutes. There is a group of us that wanted to speak earlier, but because of the way the rule was constructed we were unable to obtain time. So we have

chosen to use this procedure to make our statements.

There is also a group of us in this House who want to be productive and not engage in partisan and political fights on this floor even on ordinary issues, but especially not on emergency supplemental appropriations issues where so many millions of lives are at stake. Unfortunately, a partisan political battle is what this process has turned into today.

This group of Members who feel this way is also reminded that the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), is the Speaker of the whole House, not just the minority Members. We are also reminded that the Commander in Chief is the Commander in Chief of the whole Nation, not just of the members of his party.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my dear friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), is a person I have a great deal of admiration and respect for. I know he is operating under some very, very difficult circumstances beyond his control, created within his own conference and by his own leadership.

But this has turned into a very partisan politicized battle over three emergency disasters. Number one, our farm economy; number two, Hurricane Mitch relief; and thirdly, our involvement in NATO's efforts in Kosovo.

This is evidenced by the fact that last week the majority voted not to support the air strikes in Kosovo and against allowing the President to use any ground elements. Then today we hear the same Members who will vote to double the President's request for funds to execute the NATO actions in Kosovo.

How can my colleagues in good conscience say they do not support the action but they want to double the funds available to take those actions? The only answer is that partisan politics and political considerations are driving this vote.

These three emergencies, in the meantime, are tightening the noose for millions of people. Our farmers are languishing under a national agricultural policy adopted by Republican Congress in 1996 that has been a complete failure. My farmers call it the ''Freedom to Fail'' policy. Planting dates have come and gone for most parts of our farm country, and still this Congress, under the majority's leadership, cannot come to grips with a simple emergency package which provides credit for our farmers to put their crops in the field for 1999.

Hurricane Mitch happened over 6 months ago. And this Congress, under the present leadership, cannot deliver a package to the President for his signature in spite of the fact that most everybody agrees we should.

And lastly, on the defense issue, many Members of this body today have blamed President Clinton for cutting back the military. I have in my possession a CRS report which shows that the fiscal year 1999 request for defense from the President was $270.9 billion, and this House passed and sent to the President for his signature a bill which contained $270.4 billion, $500 million short of what President Clinton requested.

I would like to remind all Americans that it is the responsibility of this House, this Congress, to pass the appropriations bill. And I am sure that most Members who will vote for the supplemental package today voted for the lower than requested defense appropriations bill last year.

Do not be hypocritical. Do not play partisan political games with the millions of lives affected by the passage of these supplemental appropriations bills.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISTOOK

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ISTOOK:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

''In addition to the funds made available in this bill, the sum of $11,300,000 shall be available for tornado related damage at Tinker Air Force base.''

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) reserves a point of order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I also reserve a point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I have been working with the chairman. I do not believe it is going to be necessary to offer this amendment for a vote, but I do think it is important that it be presented.

Everyone in the Nation, of course, is aware of what has happened in Oklahoma City this week with the tornado that has left thousands of people homeless and a number of people dead and a great amount of devastation. We are appreciative of the assistance and the care and the prayers and the concerns of people all over the country.

This particular amendment is only dealing with one small portion of this particular disaster. I offer this amendment not only on my own behalf but also on behalf of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. J.C. WATTS) in whose district most of the devastating damage has occurred.

Mr. Chairman, part of the damage done by the tornado was to Tinker Air Force Base, one of our premier Air Force installations. In fact, for those who have seen on television the images of hundreds of homes devastated, leveled to the ground, what they may not be aware is that happened immediately across the street, across Sooner Road from the western edge of Tinker Air Force Base.

In fact, as terrible as it was, it could have been worse had that tornado gone through Tinker as it was headed to do. At the last moment, when it came to Sooner Road that tornado veered to the north rather than heading across the air force base.

We have some $11 million in damage to different housing facilities, dormitories and barracks on the base that is addressed by this amendment. We were very fortunate, however, that the tornado did not proceed to go across Tinker. Because there were still on the apron at Tinker, where they could not get them out of the path of the tornado, half a dozen of our AWACS aircraft, 10 of our tankers, two of our B–52's, two of our B–1's, about $3 billion of premier aircraft that were in the path of the tornado until it took that twist. Nevertheless, a number of people on base lost their housing.

This amendment is to specify that $11 million from this emergency supplemental appropriations should be used to restore that damaged housing at Tinker. We have several of those units that were damaged, a couple of hundred people on the base that were dislocated by the damage that are currently being housed elsewhere.

Some of the buildings have already been condemned by the civil engineer on base, the base's civil engineering. Some may be repairable. Some may have to be replaced.

The preliminary estimates which we have received from Tinker are that the repairs will be some $11,280,000. That figure, of course, may change. But I think it is necessary, when we want to make sure that we have the emergency response to the military needs, that we had an unforeseen disaster that affected Tinker on top of the, frankly, even worse disaster that afflicted so many people in Oklahoma.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do offer this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) and on behalf of myself. And at the proper time, I would certainly wish to yield to the chairman of the full committee for a colloquy.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISTOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the comments of the gentleman from Oklahoma are well-taken. Certainly the committee has always responded rapidly to damage done by natural disasters to any of our military facilities.

However, a point of order does lie against his amendment at this point. And I would just say to the gentleman that there are other opportunities to address this. We can address it in the conference. There is the regular appropriations bill. I understand the urgency involved here, but I must make the

point of order against the amendment. The gentleman may withdraw it if he would like. But he has my assurances that we will deal with this issue very, very expeditiously.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I think the concerns, as the chairman well knows, are that the people of Oklahoma and Tinker want to make sure that we address this on an emergency basis; and I know he has provided assurances that we are going to address this in an expedited and timely fashion, most likely within the conference report of this bill.

□ 1545

I do understand, of course, because of the timing of this, it presents several parliamentary problems to try to bring it up at this stage. I appreciate that. With those assurances from the gentleman that this will be addressed in conference and otherwise, I would, Mr. Chairman, withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', $431,100,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $40,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $178,200,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force'', $35,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATIONAL RAPID RESPONSE TRANSFER FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act and the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–262), $400,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000, is hereby made available only for the accelerated acquisition and deployment of military technologies and systems needed for the conduct of Operation Allied Force, or to provide accelerated acquisition and deployment of military technologies and systems as substitute or replacement systems for other U.S. regional commands which have had assets diverted as a result of Operation Allied Force: *Provided,* That funds under this heading may only be obligated in response to a specific request from a U.S. regional command and upon approval of the Secretary of Defense, or his designate: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Defense shall provide written notification to the congressional defense committees prior to the transfer of any amount in excess of $10,000,000 to a specific program or project: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds made available under this heading only to operation and maintenance accounts, procurement accounts, and research, development, test and evaluation accounts: *Provided further,* That the transfer authority provided under this section shall be in addition to the transfer authority provided to the Department of Defense in this Act or any other Act: *Provided further,* That the entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $400,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. Section 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–262), is amended by striking out ''$1,650,000,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$2,450,000,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by Mr. SOUDER:

In chapter 2, strike section 201 (relating to additional transfer authority).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, this will be one of the most critical votes on this bill. We are faced with a difficult decision because we have been given a difficult decision in Congress.

Those of us who favor strengthening our military, making sure that they get some of the funds replaced that we have been trying to replace for a number of years and rebuild it as we have seen it weakened, as we hear stories of our soldiers in harm's way, who have not fired live ammunition, who are being asked often to take weapons into combat in ways that they were not intended to come into combat. We are running out of missiles. We are very concerned about that.

But at the same time we see this as well as a pay raise for our Armed Forces being combined with an effort not only to fund the war of what has been already spent but to forward fund the war. As we established earlier in the first section of the bill, $3.3 billion of that forward funds the war.

We have in this section, 201, a very interesting little section. It says, ''Section 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999, Public Law 105–262, is amended by striking out $1,650,000,000 and inserting in lieu thereof $2,450,000,000.'' What exactly does that mean?

Last week, this Congress sent a very clear message. We believed that the ground war should not occur and that the air war on a tie vote should not go ahead. Is our message this week, ''Never mind''?

Under current law, the Defense Department has authority to transfer up to $1.65 billion from the specific purposes for which Congress appropriated the money to other uses, including the conduct of the war in Yugoslavia which Congress has otherwise refused to approve. To me, it is an outrage that the President should be able to take money specifically appropriated for other purposes and use it for a war that is not supported by a majority of Congress.

It is my understanding that the Defense Department is preparing to submit a large reprogramming request to cover its expenses so far to conduct the war. Including that request, the Pentagon will have already used $1.4 billion of its $1.65 billion in reprogramming authority. This would leave them with only about $250 million in transfer authority. With war costs as much as $40 million a day, this theoretically at least means that there is only enough money left to conduct the war for another week without specific congressional action. In other words, this clause, in addition to the $3.3 billion, allows other funds to be reprogrammed to escalate and to continue this war.

Many of us have a concern that while we say we are doing long-term buildup and while we say we are preparing readiness, in fact in this bill we potentially could even fund a ground war. It is clauses like this that give us grave concern. I understand that they have to apply for reprogramming requests, but in fact evidence shows that about $1.4 billion has already been spent in reprogramming requests without the approval of this Congress.

Now, for those who say that those of us who, in effect, say stand down and negotiate, in fact last week's vote, we were told, boy, that could lead to these terrible catastrophes. In fact, what it appears to have led to, in addition to Reverend Jackson going over and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) in a delegation working with

the Russians, it appears to have led to the negotiations that should have been occurring before that.

But when we look at this, for those who say it is wrong for us to say stand down before more lives are lost and the situation over there is actually getting worse, not better, more refugees are at danger with continuation of the war than not continuation of the war, let us get the settlement over, it will likely, like Vietnam, be the same settlement as earlier.

For those who would question me and others for voting for this stand-down, remember, you are also criticizing the American Legion. As I pointed out twice, their head yesterday said that the troops, the pilots and support staff should be immediately withdrawn. They also in a unanimous vote said the resources should not be approved to continue this war.

I believe the number is 6.9 million Americans are in the American Legion who have this background. They know what a risk we are putting our veterans at. They know the risk of the continuing air war and, for that matter, the logical escalating strategy without a clear plan.

If there is a clear exit plan, if there is an ability to show that, in fact, we have an achievable goal that will lead to even a better negotiated settlement, perhaps we could vote these resources. But we in fact here are not only giving $3.3 billion in forward funding, we are giving this waiver in this clause, the potential shifting of funds in this clause to fund the ground war. I believe that is inconsistent to say we oppose the war but fund it more.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following material for the RECORD:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, May 5, 1999.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The American Legion, a wartime veterans organization of nearly three-million members, urges the immediate withdrawal of Armenian troops participating in ''Operation Allied Force.''

The National Executive Committee of The American Legion, meeting in Indianapolis today, adopted Resolution 44, titled ''The American Legion's Statement on Yugoslavia.'' This resolution was debated and adopted unanimously.

Mr. President, the United States Armed Forces should never be committed to wartime operations unless the following conditions are fulfilled:

That there be a clear statement by the President of why it is in our vital national interests to be engaged in hostilities;

Guidelines be established for the mission, including a clear exit strategy;

That there be support of the mission by the U.S. Congress and the American people; and

That it be made clear that U.S. Forces will be commanded only by U.S. officers whom we acknowledge are superior military leaders.

It is the opinion of The American Legion, which I am sure is shared by the majority of Americans, that three of the above listed conditions have not been met in the current joint operation with NATO (''Operation Allied Force'').

In no case should America commit its Armed Forces in the absence of clearly defined objectives agreed upon by the U.S. Congress in accordance with Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States.

Sincerely,

HAROLD L. ''BUTCH'' MILLER,
National Commander.

Enclosure.

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE AMERICAN LEGION, MAY 5, 1999

RESOLUTION NO. 44: THE AMERICAN LEGION STATEMENT ON YUGOSLAVIA

Whereas, The President has committed the Armed Forces of the United States, in a joint operation with NATO (''Operation Allied Force''), to engage in hostilities in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia without clearly defining America's vital national interests; and

Whereas, Neither the President nor the Congress have defined America's objectives in what has become an open-ended conflict characterized by an ill-defined progressive escalation; and

Whereas, It is obvious that an ill-planned and massive commitment of U.S. resources could only lead to troops being killed, wounded or captured without advancing any clear purpose, mission or objective; and

Whereas, The American people rightfully support the ending of crimes and abuses by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and the extending of humanitarian relief to the suffering people of the region; and

Whereas, America should not commit resources to the prosecution of hostilities in the absence of clearly defined objectives agreed upon by the U.S. Congress in accordance with Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the National Executive Committee of The American Legion in regular meeting assembled in Indianapolis, Indiana, May 5–6, 1999. That The American Legion, which is composed of nearly three million veterans of war-time service, voices its grave concerns about the commitment of U.S. Armed Forces to Operation Allied Force, unless the following conditions are fulfilled.

That there be a clear statement by the President of why it is in our vital national interests to be engaged in Operation Allied Force;

Guidelines be established for the mission, including a clear exit strategy;

That there be support of the mission by the U.S. Congress and the American people; and

That it be made clear U.S. Forces will be commanded only by U.S. officers whom we acknowledge are superior military leaders; and, be it further

Resolved, That, if the aforementioned conditions are not met, The American Legion calls upon the President and the Congress to withdraw American forces immediately from Operation Allied Force; and, be it further

Resolved, That The American Legion calls upon the Congress and the international community to ease the suffering of the Kosovar refugees by providing necessary aid and assistance; and, be it finally

Resolved, That The American Legion reaffirm its unwavering admiration of, and support for, our American men and women serving in uniform throughout the world, and we reaffirm our efforts to provide sufficient national assets to ensure their well being.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

I would suggest to the gentleman that we may be comparing apples with oranges here. We have made some effort to talk with the gentleman's staff relative to the way reprogramming goes, but there seems to be a bit of a disconnect relative to what that process is really all about, and so I would like to take a few moments to discuss it here for the record.

The amendment would delete from the bill a general provision, a section 201 which was requested by the Pentagon involving transfer authority. Section 201 of the bill provides for an increase in the funding transfer authority available to the Secretary of Defense as regards funds in fiscal year 1999 defense appropriations. It increases the existing transfer authority ceiling to $2.45 billion.

This is really a technical provision. We customarily every year provide the Department with a $2 billion transfer authority. What this then does is provide the Secretary of Defense and the military services with the ability to propose the routine reprogramming of funds subject to prior congressional approval. Section 201 of the bill raises the existing transfer authority to $2.45 billion.

The DOD needs this additional authority principally to accommodate the burden of several unanticipated reprogramming needs which we had to deal with earlier this year, relating to the war on drugs and the DOD response to Hurricane Mitch. But the important fact here is that this additional authority is not a blank check for the DOD to move around money.

When the DOD wants to reprogram funds, any significant amount over $5 million for reprogramming, the Secretary must come back to the congressional committees. There are four committees that are involved, the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and the House and Senate Armed Services Committees. These committees must approve the proposed reprogramming, the people who deal with it day in and day out in a professional way. We do not want to bind the Department of Defense and make them totally paralyzed in an emergency circumstance, but we still want the Congress to have a chance to have oversight.

I know some may believe this provision is somehow intended to give the administration additional authorities with respect to Kosovo. That is not the administration's intent, nor is it the committees' intent. This is really a technical fix. I cannot tell Members that the administration will not seek to use this additional authority for Kosovo. Indeed, they may have to. But, in the meantime, when we are in the middle of having troops in harm's way, we do not want to tie the hands of the people who are carrying out the war.

The Congress is not going to be here every day of the week, and the reality is there is a requirement for the congressional committees in an appropriate way to review such transfers. I frankly would hope the gentleman would have faith in the committees' work and recognize that we are trying to deal with this in as professional a way as we can.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman's comment about the American Legion, I have a letter here from the American Legion supporting strongly this supplemental appropriations bill. There is also one here from The Military Coalition signed by about 25 members of The Military Coalition, also one from The Retired Enlisted Association. While they may have some concern about whether they support the mission or not or the decision to get into the mission, they do support our troops.

That is what this bill does. This bill supports our troops, provides them training, provides them equipment, provides them technology to do their job.

The text of the letters is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1999.

Hon. TOM DELAY, MAJORITY WHIP
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DELAY: The American Legion supports the FY 1999 Defense supplemental appropriations bill. Once again servicemen and women, both active-duty and reserve components, are engaged in yet another international crisis. If America is willing to place the newest generation of patriots in harm's way, America must also make sure that these defenders of democracy are well equipped, properly trained, and adequately compensated.

Based upon the ongoing conflicts in the Persian Gulf and Kosovo, coupled with a continuing erosion of America's overall defense capabilities, The American Legion supports this $13 billion request for additional DoD funding. The Bosnia peacekeeping operations, as well as servicemembers stationed worldwide, are stretching already fragile DoD resources to the limit.

The obvious replacement costs for the air campaign in Kosovo and related expenses must be dealt with immediately. Moreover, the $1.8 billion for military basic pay and other critical quality of life funding should be enacted rapidly to hopefully quell the ongoing exodus of experienced personnel and declining morale, as well as keeping faith with our servicemen and women.

As the nation's largest group of wartime veterans, The American Legion appreciates your attention to its views and legislative mandates for maintaining a strong national defense and caring for he who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and for his orphan.

For God and Country,

STEVEN ROBERTSON,
Director, National Legislative Commission.

THE MILITARY COALITION,
Alexandria, VA, May 4, 1999.

Hon. C.W. BILL YOUNG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG: The Military Coalition (TMC), a consortium of nationally-prominent military and veterans organizations, representing more than 5 million current and former members of the uniformed services, plus their families and survivors urges you to vote for final passage of the FY 1999 Emergency Defense Supplemental Appropriations Bill.

There is no doubt that the armed forces are facing a readiness crisis, driven in large measure by the massive force drawdown. In the last 10 years, the armed forces have been reduced by more than one-third, while worldwide operational commitments have increased by 300 percent. The rapidly increasing commitment in Kosovo is imposing additional strains on family life and the retention of highly skilled and expensively trained servicemembers.

The significant readiness initiatives in the bill, including the downpayment on more adequate pay raises and the repeal of REDUX (the 1986 law which degraded the value of the military retirement system by more than 20 percent), will send a powerful signal that this Nation appreciates the dedicated service and sacrifices of the servicemembers we daily place in harm's way. Please do all in your power to ensure that the Emergency Defense Supplemental Appropriations Bill passes the House by a wide margin.

Sincerely,

THE MILITARY COALITION.

THE RETIRED ENLISTED ASSOCIATION,
Silver Springs, FL, May 5, 1999.

Hon. C.W. ''BILL'' YOUNG,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YOUNG: The Florida members of The Retired Enlisted Association (TREA) respectfully request that you vote for the Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Emergency Supplemental Appropriation spending package.

For years, the Armed Forces of the United States have witnessed a decline in recruitment, retention and benefits. Now, as our Armed Forces are engaged in operations in Europe and the Middle East, as well as continuing to maintain their presence in Asia, they are faced with shortages of equipment and personnel.

The Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Emergency Supplemental Appropriation spending package provides an opportunity to correct some of these problems. By providing funding for desperately needed equipment, pay raises and an improved retirement system. Congress can display its commitment to our men and women in uniform by working to make their lives better.

We appreciate your continued efforts in behalf of the retired members of the Armed Forces.

Respectfully,

JOHN W. HARRELL.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

I would add to that that there is adequate oversight provided for in the process by the committees that deal with this professionally day in and day out.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, today we are here talking about $12.9 billion of supposed emergency funding. That is $12.9 billion from the Social Security Trust Funds. Let us make that clear. That is where this money is coming from, the so-called surplus. The surplus is intended and the tax is raised for the purposes of Social Security.

Now, if this were a dire and absolute emergency and there were no alternatives and it was essential to the American people, it might make some sense. This amendment would make things, in fact, worse, because at the core of this amendment is the way to resolve this problem. The Pentagon should reprogram other funds to pay for this crisis.

In a conversation with a senior White House official yesterday, I said, what is the crisis the end of this month that you are telling us about that you need, the President is asking for $7 billion, for this war?

The crisis is the Pentagon might have to reprogram funds. They might have to take money from the seven C–130Js that was stuffed into an authorization and appropriation last year for the Speaker of the House that the Pentagon did not want and does not need. They might have to take money from their $30 billion of appropriated unobligated funds. They might have to fix their computer program which has ordered $41 billion of unneeded parts, many of which are obsolete and still being ordered by Hal the computer down there at the Pentagon.

Yet we are saying we are here in a crisis and they need more money so they can keep doing things the way they have been doing them in the past, which is to waste money.

Certainly I support a pay raise for the troops, but it should not be on an emergency basis. It should come in the regular order of things, and it should not come out of the Social Security Trust Fund. We should not set the young people in our military against the senior citizens and the future senior citizens of this country by spending those funds on a pay raise for people in the military today. It should come out of the general fund of the Treasury. It should come out of the Pentagon budget in the next year.

So we should not further restrict the Pentagon from reprogramming. In fact, we should require that the Pentagon reprogram all of the funds for this activity from that $30 billion of unspent funds from programs that they themselves have said they do not want. Let us stick it to a few Members of Congress who have gotten their pork in past bills and getting their pork in this bill and take that money back and spend it on something the Pentagon really needs that supports the troops in the field.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1664, making emergency supplementary appropriations for military operations in Kosovo. The Department of Defense (DOD) has over $30 billion in unobligated and unspent funds that it could reprogram for the Kosovo military operations. It does not need an additional $6 billion. I further oppose this bill because it includes $7 billion in unneeded additional funding for the DOD that has nothing to do with the Kosovo operation.

Last year Congress provided an additional $8 billion in the Omnibus Appropriations bill for the DOD under the guise of military readiness. Most of that funding didn't do anything for military readiness. It was more about campaign readiness. For example, is a study about military uses for caffeinated gum crucial to the readiness of our military? If the DOD needs funding for Kosovo, it should reprogram some of the unneeded funding from that bill. Or perhaps the DOD should look a little harder for the $17 billion that it has lost over the past decade. The Pentagon simply cannot account

for $17 billion. It has nothing to show for it, not even an overpriced screwdriver. or perhaps the Pentagon should reprogram the funding for the 7 unrequested C–130Js that Congress provided last year.

This bill contains $7 billion that the President did not request for the Kosovo operations. For example, it contains $1.34 billion for spare parts that was not requested by the President. This is outrageous since the General Accounting Office found that the DOD maintains over $41 billion in obsolete parts. How did that happen? The computer that orders spare parts can't communicate with the computer that knows what spare parts are currently on the shelf. The DOD doesn't need more money for spare parts. It needs to fix the system that orders the parts. If Congress keeps giving the DOD more money to cover up a broken system, the DOD will never fix it and billions more will be wasted.

The DOD does not suffer from a lack of aggregate funding. It suffers from a lack of discipline necessary to function effectively in the post Cold War era. The DOD has over $30 billion in unobligated funding that it could reprogram. But the DOD refuses to make changes and cut unneeded programs. Congress could force the Pentagon to critically examine its spending and cut the waste by refusing to blindly throw good money after bad. Congress could take the first step towards fiscal discipline at the Pentagon by denying additional funding for the Kosovo mission. It is simply outrageous that the Pentagon cannot function effectively with a $280 billion year budget. The Pentagon claims it is prepared to fight two major theaters at once. Yet every time we actually use the military, taxpayers are forced to give the Pentagon more money. It's time to stop wasting billions of tax dollars and force the Pentagon to be more responsible with our money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

□ 1600

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 202. Notwithstanding the limitations set forth in section 1006 of Public Law 105–261, not to exceed $10,000,000 of funds appropriated by this Act may be available for contributions to the common funded budgets of NATO (as defined in section 1006(c)(1) of Public Law 105–261) for costs related to NATO operations in and around Kosovo.

SEC. 203. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414).

SEC. 204. Notwithstanding section 5064(d) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355), the special authorities provided under section 5064(c) of such Act shall continue to apply with respect to contracts awarded or modified for the Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) program until June 30, 2000: *Provided*, That a contract or modification to a contract for the JDAM program may be awarded or executed notwithstanding any advance notification requirements that would otherwise apply.

SEC. 205. (a) EFFORTS TO INCREASE BURDENSHARING.—The President shall seek equitable reimbursement from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), member nations of NATO, and other appropriate organizations and nations for the costs incurred by the United States government in connection with Operation Allied Force.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 1999, the President shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report on—

(1) All measures taken by the President pursuant to subsection (a);

(2) The amount of reimbursement received to date from each organization and nation pursuant to subsection (a), including a description of any commitments made by such organization or nation to provide reimbursement; and

(3) In the case of an organization or nation that has refused to provide, or to commit to provide, reimbursement pursuant to subsection (a), an explanation of the reasons therefor.

(c) OPERATION ALLIED FORCE.—In this section, the term ''Operation Allied Force'' means operations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) conducted against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) during the period beginning on March 24, 1999, and ending on such date as NATO may designate, to resolve the conflict with respect to Kosovo.

SEC. 206. (a) Not more than thirty days after the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to Congress a report, in both classified and unclassified form, on current United States participation in Operation Allied Force. The report should include information on the following matters:

(1) A statement of the national security objectives involved in U.S. participation in Operation Allied Force;

(2) An accounting of all current active duty personnel assigned to support Operation Allied Force and related humanitarian operations around Kosovo to include total number, service component and area of deployment (such accounting should also include total number of personnel from other NATO countries participating in the action);

(3) Additional planned deployment of active duty units in the European Command area of operations to support Operation Allied Force, between the date of enactment of this Act and the end of fiscal year 1999;

(4) Additional planned Reserve component mobilization, including specific units to be called up between the date of enactment of this Act and the end of fiscal year 1999, to support Operation Allied Force;

(5) An accounting by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the transfer of personnel and materiel from other regional commands to the United States European Command to support Operation Allied Force and related humanitarian operations around Kosovo, and an assessment by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the impact any such loss of assets has had on the war-fighting capabilities and deterrence value of these other commands;

(6) Levels of humanitarian aid provided to the displaced Kosovar community from the United States, NATO member nations, and other nations (figures should be provided by country and type of assistance provided whether financial or in-kind); and

(7) Any significant revisions to the total cost estimate for the deployment of United States forces involved in Operation Allied Force through the end of fiscal year 1999.

(b) OPERATION ALLIED FORCE.—In this section, the term ''Operation Allied Force'' means operations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) conducted against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) during the period beginning on March 24, 1999, and ending on such date as NATO may designate, to resolve the conflict with respect to Kosovo.

SEC. 207. In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act for the Department of Defense or in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999, $1,339,200,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000, is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense only for spare and repair parts and associated logistical support necessary for the maintenance of weapons systems and equipment, as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $457,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $676,800,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $24,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $26,000,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $118,000,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $31,300,000; and

''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $6,100,000:

Provided, That the entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $1,339,200,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

SEC. 208. In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act for the Department of Defense or in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999, $927,300,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000, is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense only for depot level maintenance and repair, as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $87,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $428,700,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $58,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $314,300,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $3,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $6,800,000; and

''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $29,500,000:

Provided, That the entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $927,300,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

SEC. 209. In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act for the Department of Defense or in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999, $156,400,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000, is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense only for military recruiting and advertising initiatives, as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $48,600,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $20,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $37,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $29,800,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $1,000,000; and

''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $20,000,000:

Provided, That the entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $156,400,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

SEC. 210. In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act for the Department of Defense or in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999, $307,300,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000, is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense only for military training, equipment maintenance and associated support costs required to meet assigned readiness levels of United States military forces, as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $113,200,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $15,200,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $28,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $88,400,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $600,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $11,900,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $23,000,000; and

''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $27,000,000:

Provided, That the entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $307,300,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

SEC. 211. In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act for the Department of Defense or in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999, $351,500,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000, is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense only for base operations support costs at Department of Defense facilities, as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $116,200,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $45,900,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $53,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $91,900,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $18,700,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $13,800,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $300,000; and

''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $11,700,000:

Provided, That the entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $351,500,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

SEC. 212. (a) In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense in other provisions of this Act, there is appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000, and to be used only for increases during fiscal year 2000 in rates of military basic pay and for increased payments during fiscal year 2000 to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,838,426,000, to be available as follows:

''Military Personnel, Army'', $559,533,000;

''Military Personnel, Navy'', $436,773,000;

''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $177,980,000;

''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $471,892,000;

''Reserve Personnel, Army'', $40,574,000;

''Reserve Personnel, Navy'', $29,833,000;

''Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps'', $7,820,000;

''Reserve Personnel, Air Force'', $13,143,000;

''National Guard Personnel, Army'', $70,416,000; and

''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $30,462,000.

(b) The entire amount made available in this section—

(1) is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)); and

(2) shall be available only if the President transmits to the Congress an official budget request for $1,838,426,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

(c) The amounts provided in this section may be obligated only to the extent required for increases in rates of military basic pay, and for increased payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, that become effective during fiscal year 2000 pursuant to provisions of law subsequently enacted in authorizing legislation.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. FOWLER

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mrs. FOWLER:

At the end of chapter 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 213. (a) ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINUATION OF ES–3. AIRCRAFT.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act for the Department of Defense or in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999, $94,400,000 is appropriated as follows:

(1) For ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $29,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000, to be used for ES–3 aircraft squadron staffing.

(2) For ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000, to be used for ES–3 aircraft operations and maintenance.

(3) For ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $31,500,000, to be used for procurement of critical avionics and structures for ES–3 aircraft.

(4) For ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $3,900,000, to be used for procurement of critical avionics spares of ES–3 aircraft.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Such amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in such section 251(b)(2)(A), is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

(c) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study to examine alternative approaches to upgrading the ES–3 aircraft sensor systems for the life cycle of the aircraft. The study shall include comparative costs and capabilities, and shall be submitted to the Congress by October 1, 1999.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I am putting forth this amendment for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense, after which time it is my intention to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I introduced this amendment because I am gravely concerned about the status of our airborne signal intelligence capabilities and, in particular, about the Navy's decision to terminate the ES–3 program by the end of fiscal year 1999.

The 16 ES–3s in the Navy's inventory cost us some $500 million to acquire and only made their first deployment in fiscal year 1994. The aircraft represents the only carrier-capable signal intelligence aircraft in the Department of Defense inventory, and it also constitutes some 20 percent of our carrier air wings' in-flight refueling capabilities. Moreover, I would note that a comprehensive DOD analysis of our signal intelligence needs only 2 years ago called for retaining and upgrading the ES–3.

Despite these important considerations, the Navy has opted to disestablish its two ES–3 squadrons for budgetary reasons.

Now I am greatly disturbed by this decision. Only last Friday the Washington Post ran a front-page article featuring comments by General Richard Hawley, the commander of Air Combat Command, who lamented that the air campaign over Kosovo had made clear the desperate shortage of intelligence gathering, radar suppression, and search-and-rescue aircraft in the DOD inventory.

In fact, with the requirement to provide 7-day-a-week, 24-hour-a-day coverage in the Balkans, which I remind

my colleagues is not one of the two major regional contingencies in our military that we had planned for, our Nation is currently facing a serious shortfall of signal intelligence capability. There are gaps today in our coverage in other key locations around the world.

Under these circumstances the Navy's decision to terminate the program seems extremely questionable to me.

I believe that our signal intelligence shortfall represents a critical readiness deficiency that merits consideration in the context of this supplemental. However I appreciate the gentleman's desire to move a clean bill through the House in order to get the conference with the other body as soon as possible and to meet our urgent readiness requirements.

So I would just ask the gentleman if he would be willing to get a complete brief from the Department of Defense and our intelligence community regarding our current SIGINT deficiencies and look into the issue of proceeding with ES–3 program termination under the current circumstances. If he finds himself in a situation in conference where a compelling argument to accommodate these concerns in the context of conference arises, I would greatly appreciate it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Let me respond first by expressing my deep appreciation to the gentlewoman for the professional way she is not just handling this matter, but the effective service she always provides in the authorization committee connected with our work. I would be pleased to look into this matter, and I appreciate the gentlewoman bringing it to my attention.

As the gentlewoman may know, I was previously the chair of the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, and I continue to serve on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, so I am very much aware of and concerned about our signal intelligence shortfalls. In light of the current conflict in the Balkans and the requirements it has imposed, I do agree that a further review of this matter is appropriate at this time, and I would look forward to working with the gentlewoman between now and conference.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentlewoman from Florida is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 3

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for ''International Disaster Assistance'', $96,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. PELOSI:

On page 22, line 16, after ''$96,000,000'' insert: ''(increased by $67,000,000)''

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in order to increase the amount of humanitarian assistance that is available for the refugees in the Balkans. We have disagreements in many areas here, but one thing we all agree on and the American people are interested in is to provide humanitarian assistance to the refugees.

With the passage of the Latham amendment we have some breathing room, some headroom in the foreign operations programs, and my amendment takes $67 million from the Latham amendment activity and adds it to the AID disaster assistance account in order to meet the emerging needs in Kosovo including the provision, and emphasizing the provision, of food. As my colleagues know, both the Obey amendments had a provision for $175,000 for additional humanitarian assistance, and Mr. Hall's amendment had $150 million for additional food. Neither of these prevailed; the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) did not pass, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) was not made in order. However, I want us to just stipulate to the fact that there is general agreement that more food is needed.

Many of us, including the distinguished chairman of the full committee, were in the Balkans and we saw people waiting in line for hours for food. We saw little babies who had crossed the mountains and through the forests have only cold tea for 2 weeks of their very young lives. The refugee problem is a greater one than was anticipated.

If we do not increase the humanitarian assistance, Mr. Chairman, I believe we will have a second humanitarian disaster. Therefore in this amendment I will submit more information for the RECORD, but in the interests of time I urge my colleagues to support this amendment which increases the humanitarian assistance in the bill by $67 million and with a special focus on food programs.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentlewoman on the amendment and I say that I agree to accept the amendment, and I might remind her that during this entire process in our conversations with the President and our conversations with the Department of State, the Secretary of State, that I have repeatedly told them in the beginning they are not asking for a sufficient amount of money to handle the true needs of the refugees that we are going to need for the next several months.

The response was, as I understood it, Mr. Chairman, that they felt like this would at least get them through June or July, and maybe they could come back for another supplemental during that period of time. But we are going to be very busy during that period of time with the other appropriations bills, and I think it was not wise for the administration not to accept a sufficient amount of money.

So I compliment the gentlewoman from California for bringing the level of funding back up, with her amendment, to the $566 million that the President initially requested, and I would accept the amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for accepting the amendment and for his comments, and I want to commend him because indeed he has at every opportunity, impressed upon the administration that more funding would be necessary. That is why this is a great opportunity for us. It takes some of the pressure off of our foreign operations bill where we may be asked to provide even more humanitarian assistance. But at least today we can get the $67 million especially to focus on the food needs within the disaster assistance account.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say on this side we agree with the amendment and accept it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to the gentleman. The administration had intended to use the existing P.L. 480 title 2 resources and surplus commodities from the section 416(b) program to meet the needs in Kosovo. As we know, the needs have exceeded in terms of numbers of refugees and the duration in the camps, and I just respond to the issue that the gentleman had brought up.

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman [Mr. CALLAHAM] for his leadership, the distinguished ranking member [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished chairman of the full committee [Mr. YOUNG] for his cooperation, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to thank the gentlewoman from California for offering this amendment. I had an amendment that would have also used the $67 million, but obviously, being the ranking member of the committee, hers in the prioritization came first. But it is unfortunate that we would be looking to use the money for one thing and cannot get to the other. The money that I was hoping to use it for would be for the construction of refugee camps.

I was part of the Armey delegation that just got back from Macedonia and Albania along with the presiding Speaker, and 19 of us were there and heard it was unanimity. Everybody we talked to, from the two star General to the AID people, that they desperately needed to build two more refugee camps in Albania to accommodate 20,000 people each.

As my colleagues know, we got to remember there are, according to General Wesley Clark, 820,000 internally displaced people and more than 700,000 people who have exited the borders and are now officially called refugees, an enormous number of people, and unfortunately, because of budget caps and things of that kind, we are unable.

Last night I went to the Committee on Rules and respectfully asked that I be able to offer $100 million additional moneys for the construction of those two refugee camps. They are $50 million a pop, and, like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and his food aid amendment, I was turned down, and that is most unfortunate.

□ 1615

Let me just say, when this gets into conference, it is my desperate hope, because we are looking at the possibility of cholera and other contagious and infectious diseases, we need to stabilize this situation and the military, no one does it better when it comes to constructing these camps.

I would like to ask our very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), if he will help us, because I know his heart.

He added $70 million to the refugee camp account over and above what the President requested and did make that appeal to the President to be more generous, not less.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I will be more than happy to convey your message to the conference committee as we convene to try to find some resolve to the concern of the gentleman.

I would like to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), as well as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and others who take the time and the effort to visit the refugee camps in situations such as this and come back and inform us of the true needs.

Refugee camps, however, have generally, historically, been constructed by the Department of Defense. I think that the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) certainly would be interested in seeing that they have a sufficient amount of resources to provide the camps that are necessary to house these people that are suffering.

Yes, certainly during this process I will encourage the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) to recognize the needs of the Department of Defense to have the necessary monies to build the needed and required refugee camps.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to join my distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs in commending the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his leadership on this issue. As I said last night, I support his amendment.

We can all agree to the need for those camps from the standpoint of sanitation and hygiene and meeting the needs of these refugees who have been dislocated or are grieving or malnourished and the rest.

I would hope that the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense, I understand there is about $100 million unprogramed there that can be used for this purpose, and I would support the gentleman's appeal to the conference committee with that.

I want to again acknowledge the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). To be in his company and that of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), two leaders on child survival issues throughout the world, is indeed an honor; and I once again commend them.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman. The feelings are mutual.

This is a bipartisan effort and I do believe that the money is there if we have the priority to get it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to discuss this with my colleague, for there are a number of Members on both sides of the aisle who have expressed a great interest in this area. Indeed, it is my view that the American public are themselves focusing at this moment on refugees by way of television cameras that are depicting this picture, which is the worst of the fallout from the Milosevic effort here of ethnic cleansing.

Indeed, already the Air Force has spent $25 million for one refugee camp. There is little doubt that there is much more to be done. As we go forward I am sure the committee, as well as the body, will do everything they can to be responsive to the gentleman's interests; and I appreciate him bringing the matter to our attention.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, in mentioning all of the people that have done so much, I forgot to mention my colleague, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), because she, too, has been one of the stalwarts and one of the people who have worked so very hard in this respect.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to applaud the Pelosi amendment and to applaud the dialogue and debate that I have heard on the very issue dealing with humanitarian need.

Last Thursday a week ago, I voted on the floor of the House to support the effort to eliminate the terrible devastation that Slobodan Milosevic has created in the Balkans; in particular, to support the air strikes and to recognize that this war, this conflict, is defined. The definition is to end the ethnic cleansing that is going on in that region.

By traveling this past weekend with my colleagues, such as the chairman, as well as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), I can say that this is a defined conflict.

It is a conflict to save the amount of human tragedy that is occurring in that area, and it is an issue that we should be very clear about.

I am unsure when someone says that it is undefined, but it is to eliminate the brutality and to ensure that our troops are safe but as well to ensure that the refugees have a place to return home.

As I did in Bosnia, I was able to visit with the people; and we traveled in the camps. We talked to the refugees, who indicated they had seen atrocities. They had seen women raped. They had seen intellectuals killed. They had seen their homes being burned. In these refugee camps, although they were very grateful to be safe, there is no running water, there is no electricity, there is no sewer, and there are long lines for food.

In talking about the military preparedness, let me say in my conversations with General Clark, he was very assuring that he had the skills, the tools and the resources to carry on. He was very sure of the definition of this

conflict and that is, of course, to make sure that the refugees have a right to return home.

I would like to support the Pelosi amendment to increase the amount of food emergency assistance but, as well, I join in with the words of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) to indicate that there is a need to assist in the building of refugee camps. Because in the one that we visited in Macedonia in particular it was built for 20,000 people and yet it has 32,000 people.

I supported the Obey amendment because it included concerns that I had about making sure we supported the military operation. It had monies to increase military pay and, as well, it dealt with the issue of emergency food assistance.

If we can make this legislation better, I am sorry to say that the Obey amendment did not pass, we should really emphasize the fact that we need more aid for the humanitarian crisis. We need more aid to build these refugee camps that are in need, even though we see more and more of the refugees leaving to go to other countries. It is extremely important that we focus on that.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), who I know as well attempted to get his amendment in on emergency food assistance. I would only take comfort in the representations by the chairman and ranking member that they will work in conference to get us the dollars that we need to build humanitarian camps and, as well, they will give us the dollars to ensure that we have the monies for more food assistance.

I only hope, as I have written to the President and in light of the great success that Reverend Jackson had over the last weekend in releasing our POWs, I hope that we will have a pause in the bombing so that we can sit down to the table and get a negotiated settlement and that Milosevic will agree to all of the points that NATO has raised. I think this can be done in light of last weekend, as well as proceed with the idea of funding for humanitarian aid.

I would only hope that we reconsider the form of the Obey amendment and ensure that we have that kind of fair representation in that effort.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes, but I do want to stand up with great approval and excitement and encouragement for this amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). It is a good amendment. The $67 million will help.

As I read the amendment, it goes to the section relative to disaster assistance, but especially in this particular emphasis it will be for the Balkans. It does two things. It not only will add to the fiscal year 1999 appropriation for the Balkans and that pot of $200 million, but, because we are adding more money, it will help in some of the trouble spots that we have around the world. We are now facing catastrophes and crises and great needs in Sierra Leon, Sudan, Cambodia, North Korea, Indonesia, East Timor, a lot of different places. So this amendment goes a long way.

I hope that this is not the end of our help relative to humanitarian aid. I hope the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and all the Members of the Committee on Appropriations look at certainly a lot more money for food. We really need it because we came up very short relative to the humanitarian aspect of this bill.

Again, I want to say to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) this is a great amendment, and I applaud her and really appreciate the work that she does. I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) for sponsoring our amendment together; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for accepting it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and certainly congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

I also rise to speak about this supplemental in general. Obviously, it is very important; and I do applaud the increase and support the humanitarian needs and the needs of those refugees; and I am glad to see that we are doing that.

I am also very concerned because the supplemental should not be a partisan issue, as this humanitarian effort should not be a partisan issue, because it is about the well-being of our troops. It is about the security of our Nation. It is about looking at risks that we have across this world, including the conflict that we are currently in.

As I looked at the papers this morning and saw a crash, an Apache helicopter crash, I thought of the two young soldiers that were killed there, their families. I was reminded of an era not too long ago when we tried to attempt to get some hostages out of Iran, when it was a similar time, when military funding was low, when spare parts were hard to come by, when cannibalization of other aircraft was taking place, when maintenance was a problem, morale was very low, and retention was a problem, and we had problems with readiness.

We had problems implementing that rescue, and I believe it was because of the very conditions that we have that exist today.

I do not know if the decreased funding that we have had for our military in the last few years resulted in that crash yesterday, but, believe me, do not underestimate how much military morale, maintenance and the experience of those that work directly on the aircraft, how much influence that has on our military readiness and the ability of our pilots and our troops over there to fly safe missions and accomplish what they are setting about to do.

I also read in the paper, there was a Pentagon officer that said, I believe he said, that about 10 years ago this battalion of Apaches could have arrived to the station on Monday, flown reconnaissance missions on Tuesday and Wednesday, simulated attack runs on Thursday, live practice runs on Friday and been deployed on Saturday.

They have been there for 20 days and still not ready, and they are asking for more train-up time.

I have every bit of confidence in our troops, but I think as we reduce spending, as has been done over the last few years, or hold it straight, not provide the kind of funding, we reduce our troops' ability to act and to act rapidly as it is needed in this world and in this conflict.

I think it is very important that we look at this again, that we do not underestimate the effect this supplement will have, the message it will give.

As I remember my time in the service, I remembered when military spending was cut, when we were not getting the kind of maintenance, when retention was poor, of what effect it had on morale and our ability to get aircraft off the ground.

So this is an emergency supplement, not just the direct that has been asked for by the President but also those to increase the pay, to give a message to our troops there that we are fully behind them.

Believe me, I have had a lot of conflict personally over this in Kosova because I do not believe that it was prepared properly. I do not believe we had an entry strategy that we needed, an exit strategy, but now that we are there and we have seen the problems we need to make sure that we give the kind of support to make sure that we accomplish our goals in this conflict.

We have troops all over the world. There have been 33 U.S. deployments across the world, and yet we have not adequately funded our troops. In the period of 40 years before that, there were only 10 deployments. We have 265,000 American troops in 135 countries. This administration's defense policy simply does not make sense: decreased funding and increased deployments.

I believe it is easy to see the problems created by this lack of funding. The U.S. Air Force will be 700 pilots short for fiscal year 1999, 1,300 short by 2000. The Navy will be 18,000 soldiers and 1,400 recruits short in 1999. The Army will be 140 Apache pilots short for 1999. In the last 14 months there have been 55 Air Force crashes during noncombat situations. The USS Enterprise went to sea short 400 personnel. The Army's budget for new weapons is the lowest since 1959. Since the Gulf War, our military has shrunk by about 40 percent.

Now recently and yesterday, we on the policy committee heard from former Secretary Caspar Weinberger. He spoke beyond politics about our threats, other threats, our military readiness; and he expressed concerns about what would happen if we do not immediately start rebuilding our forces.

So I ask for support, and I thank the chairman for the supplement. In addition to the supplement for humanitarian needs, we need to support this amendment and this supplement in order to begin the necessary rebuilding.

□ 1630

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I want to commend the gentlewoman from California for offering it. I think it is clear that the American people expect us to do everything possible in our power to alleviate the suffering that the Kosovar refugees are enduring right now, and I might add that our NATO allies are contributing their fair share to a bulk of the refugee assistance as well, so it is not as if we are doing this alone.

I also want to rise in support of the emergency supplemental bill before us today to support our young men and women in American uniform who are being asked yet again in this century to restore the peace and stability and to bring back some humanity to Europe.

But I have to be honest, I am conflicted in supporting final passage of this emergency spending bill. I am just in my second term representing western Wisconsin in this great institution, Mr. Chairman. I do not serve on the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Armed Services or Committee on International Relations, so I am not intimately familiar with the details of the specified purposes of the listed items in this spending bill.

I am not sure whether all the listed items in this spending bill are truly for an emergency purpose. I do know, however, that our military advisers have made a request to the American people through the Administration for $6 billion to carry out the campaign in Kosovo. But once Congress got its hands on this, it suddenly became a $13 billion emergency spending bill rather than the $6 billion that our military advisers were requesting.

I am not sure whether a $35 million operation and control center on Bahrain Island in the Gulf is necessary for this operation, or $4 million for barracks renewal in Bamberg, Germany, or $3 million for an indoor shooting range in Stuttgart, or $12 million for three additional fire stations in Ramstein Air Force Base in Germany, if these are all emergency items; or if $3 billion for military construction projects that will take years to complete because they are not even on the Pentagon's 5-year development plan are true emergency items.

But I do know that I am the representative of one of the two pilots who gave their lives two days ago in their training mission with the Apache helicopter in Albania, Chief Warrant Officer Kevin Reichert. Officer Reichert was a loving husband and father of three little kids. He and his co-pilot, Officer David Gibbs from Ohio, served their country with honor and pride, and made the ultimate sacrifice. My thoughts and prayers are with them and their family at this time.

I also know that it would not be right to our troops if voting against final passage of this bill would delay for even a little bit the utilization and distribution of the resources and supplies that our men and women who are carrying out this dangerous operation need in order to perform their duties in as safe a manner as possible.

I would just hope that this Congress would have the decency when it comes to issues of war and peace, life and death, to play this straight, without taking political advantage of the situation to bypass the normal authorization and appropriation process, where these items can be debated openly and thoroughly and fairly and within the context of fiscal discipline. It is a sad day in this Congress if there are some who would take advantage of this emergency situation for their own political agenda.

Lieutenant General John Hendrix, commander of the Apache Task Force Hawk, stated, when asked about the loss of these two brave young men, that ''We cannot eliminate the risk from this mission.'' That is true. In cases of war, the training and the deployment of troops are inherently going to be risky, but this Congress can do our part in reducing that risk as much as possible.

That starts today. That is what this bill should be all about, the troops, and ultimately the welfare of the troops. That is why I am going to give my support for final passage of this bill, so the rest of our troops who are deployed in the Balkans can carry out their mission as safely as possible, and be returned to their families as soon as possible.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in accepting this amendment, I thought seriously that we would be able to accept it and move on with business, since we fully fund the request of the President, and we respond also to the concerns of the gentlewoman from California.

While we do not want to deny anyone the opportunity to speak on this very important issue, I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is time that we move on with the vote on the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

For an additional amount for ''Economic Support Fund'', $105,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000, for assistance for Albania, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Romania, and for investigations and related activities in Kosovo and in adjacent entities and countries regarding war crimes; *Provided*, That these funds shall be available notwithstanding any other provision of law except section 533 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(d) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)): *Provided further*, That the requirement for a notification through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations contained in subsection (b)(3) of section 533 shall be deemed to be satisfied if the Committees on Appropriations are notified at least 5 days prior to the obligation of such funds: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES

For an additional amount for ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'', $75,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000, of which up to $1,000,000 may be used for administrative costs of the U.S. Agency for International Development: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated and expended subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for ''Migration and Refugee Assistance'', $195,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000, of which not more than $500,000 is for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

UNITED STATES EMERGENCY REFUGEE AND MIGRATION ASSISTANCE FUND

For an additional amount for the ''United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund'', and subject to the terms and conditions under that head, $95,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 301. The value of commodities and services authorized by the President through

March 31, 1999, to be drawn down under the authority of section 552(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to support international relief efforts relating to the Kosovo conflict shall not be counted against the ceiling limitation of that section: *Provided,* That such assistance relating to the Kosovo conflict provided pursuant to section 552(a)(2) may be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. ROUKEMA

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ROUKEMA:

After chapter 3, insert the following new chapter:

CHAPTER 3A

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM AND GRANT ACCOUNTS

For an additional amount for ''Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts'' for humanitarian food assistance under title II of Public Law 480, $150,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the Congress hereby designates the entire such amount as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further,* That such amount shall be available only to the extent of a specific dollar amount for such purpose that is included in an official budget request transmitted by the President to the Congress and that is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to such section 251(b)(2)(A).

Mrs. ROUKEMA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) object to suspending the reading of the amendment?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman, because we do not have a copy of it, and I have no idea whether it is permissible under the Rules or not. We have no idea what the content is. I would like the amendment read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist that the amendment be read?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued reading the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I also reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) on her amendment.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment clearly compliments the so-called Pelosi amendment we just passed, but it clearly is a recognition that more needs to be done. As well received as the Pelosi amendment was and should have been, more needs to be done.

Yesterday the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and myself offered an amendment in the Committee on Rules, this amendment in the Committee on Rules, and unfortunately, the Committee on Rules did not make it in order. But the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), our chairman here, spoke strongly in the Committee on Rules to work and add this vital funding in the conference.

I certainly look forward to working with the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the Committee on Appropriations to ensure that the food aid is included in the conference.

As we all know, there is a great human tragedy unfolding in the Balkans. There is no question but that the United States and NATO have taken on the challenge of stopping a ruthless aggression. Members of Congress may disagree on the merits of this policy, but there must be no disagreement, and I stress this, no disagreement on the necessity of caring for the basic needs of the thousands of refugees who have been forced from their homeland. They are innocent victims of a terrible, terrible plight.

Mr. Chairman, I have been, as has been recognized here with a number of my colleagues, a long advocate of fighting hunger across the world. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) attended the recent trip, accompanying majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), and he and I have conferred on the problems that they saw among the refugees and the needs that they have firsthand. He and I have worked for a long time on hunger issues, whether in Ethiopia, the Sudan, or visiting the Kurds, the refugee camps for the Kurds in the mountains.

I will tell the Members, if they have ever seen starvation up close and the hollowed eyes of a starving child, they will never forget it. That is exactly what we are dealing with here today.

Mr. Chairman, I might make reference to the fact that we even brought the problem back to President Reagan at the time, and he helped us provide safe passage for food to refugees. This is not a partisan issue. Republicans and Democrats, all of us should be pulling together.

We recognize that it is mainly the children who suffer. Many families have been torn apart by this violence, and they have lost their homes and many times they are separated from the children, the children from the families. It is our responsibility to accept this, because if we do not in this Congress, who will accept the full responsibility?

I must repeat to my colleagues here the Biblical admonition of our Lord Jesus in Matthew 25:40, ''Whatever you do for the least of one of these of our brethren, you do it for me.''

We must provide these funds, and if Members have any doubt about it, they should know the people, the groups, the religious and community groups that are supporting this amendment and this effort, whether it be Catholic Relief Services, Save the Children, Red Cross, Doctors Without Borders, Mercy Corps, et cetera, numerous groups are supporting this effort.

The food package, as has been stated, would give $150 million for this effort, and that is only the equivalent of barely 1 percent of this committee's funding bill. I will tell the Members, it will last a long time, for years, in helping these refugees.

Mr. Chairman, I must urge, and again quoting our president, President Ronald Reagan, a hungry child knows no politics. I think that should be our guiding light here today. I thank the chairman of the committee for this opportunity to discuss this issue, and would hope that we could have the gentleman's cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, the Kosovo supplemental provides some additional humanitarian aid, but does not cover the most basic of humanitarian needs . . . food aid for the 1.4 million Kosovar refugees. This complements the Pelosi amendment just passed, but more needs to be done.

Yesterday Representative HALL and myself offered an amendment in Rules that would have added $150 million in humanitarian food aid through title II of the PL–480 ''Food for Peace'' program. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee did not make the amendment in order.

Representative LEWIS spoke strongly at the Rules Committee to work and add this vital funding in the Conference. I look forward to working with you Mr. YOUNG and the Appropriations Committee to ensure that food aid is included in the Conference.

As you all know, there is a great human tragedy unfolding in the Balkans. The United States and NATO have taken on the challenge of stopping the ruthless aggression.

Members of the Congress may disagree on the merits of this policy but there must be no disagreement on the necessity of caring for the basic needs of the hundreds of thousands of refugees who have been forced from their homeland. They are the innocent victims of this terrible situation.

I have long been an advocate of fighting hunger across the world. Mr. HALL attended the recent trip of Members to the Balkans led by the Majority Leader ARMEY. Those Members saw the refugees and the need first hand. Shortly, I hope to also visit the Balkans. I have visited Ethiopia, the Sudan, the Kurds isolated in mountain refugee camps and have seen starvation up close. I have seen the devastation of hunger in the hallow eyes of a starving child. That is something none of us want to see in the refugee camps surrounding Kosovo.

In the eighties, I sat down with President Ronald Reagan to convince of the need to fight hunger around the world: And with his kind reasoning, he made the strong decision to do all we can to fight hunger and provide safe-passage for food supplies to refugees.

It is, after all, mainly the children who are going to suffer. So many families have been torn apart by this violence, so many have lost their homes and means to survive. These poor people have no one to turn to. We must accept the responsibility because if it is not us . . . the who? It is our moral obligation to care for those who need the most. As the Lord Jesus says in Matthew 25:40, ''I tell you the truth, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers of mine, you did for me.'' This is the Biblical admonition.

We must provide these funds in Conference to take care of their most basic food needs. The coalition of humanitarian organizations that are working with Kosovar refugees—Catholic Relief Services, Save the Children, World Vision, CARE, Mercy Corps, the Red Cross, Doctors Without Borders—all support this adding the funding.

This food-aid package that would get 1.4 million refugees through the end of 2000 would cost what we're spending in just one week fighting this war ($150 million versus $718–$990 million per month). The amount we are asking for represents just barely 1 percent of this bill's total funding.

If there is any emergency in Kosovo it is ensuring that the refugees do not starve. The situation in these camps is already tragic with the refugees fending off depression, poor sanitation, and questionable living conditions. Hunger will amplify this situation into a catastrophe.

I urge the Appropriations Committee to work in the spirit of President Ronald Reagan's famous quote. ''A hungry child knows no politics.'' The issue of a hungry child is never debatable. I look forward to working with you to add the needed $150 million in food aid and I greatly thank the Chairman, and the entire Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for bringing this to our attention. She has done a tremendous amount of work on this issue for the many, many years she has been here in the Congress. I want to assure the gentlewoman that we will give her proposal every consideration as we proceed to conference with the Senate.

However, Mr. Chairman, I must insist on my point of order.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, do I understand of the gentleman that there would be an intention to raise the subject in the conference?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, yes, we would be more than happy to raise the subject in the conference, and we will be pleased to work with her and Mr. HALL in the coming days. As the gentlewoman knows, we can never predict what a conference might or might not do. We will certainly make sure the issue is considered.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I was hopeful for a commitment of conference, but I do understand that the gentleman does not have control of the conference. There is no doubt but that the need is obvious and there. I thank the chairman.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 4

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program'', $240,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may make additional contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $240,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 401. In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1999, $831,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available until September 30, 2003, as follows:

''Military Construction, Army'', $295,800,000;

''Military Construction, Navy'', $166,270,000;

''Military Construction, Air Force'', $333,430,000; and

''Military Construction, Defense-wide'', $35,500,000:

Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated or expended to carry out military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $831,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTSCH

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by Mr. DEUTSCH:

After chapter 4 of the bill, add the following new chapter:

CHAPTER 4A

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

ENFORCEMENT AND BORDER AFFAIRS

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses, Enforcement and Border Affairs'' to support increased detention requirements for Central American criminal aliens and to address the expected influx of illegal immigrants from Central America as a result of Hurricane Mitch, $80,000,000, which shall remain available until expended and which shall be administered by the Attorney General: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Army'', $8,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That of such amount, $5,100,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Army'', $7,300,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That of such amount, $1,300,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $1,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $69,500,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $16,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $300,000:

Provided, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $8,800,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $46,500,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For an additional amount for ''Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid'', $37,500,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, for an additional amount for ''International Disaster Assistance'' for necessary expenses for international disaster relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction assistance, pursuant to section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN EMERGENCY

DISASTER RECOVERY FUND

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, for necessary expenses to address the effects of hurricanes in Central America and the Caribbean and the earthquake in Colombia, $621,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and, except for section 558, the provisions of title V of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(d) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)): *Provided further*, That up to $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this paragraph may be transferred to ''Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development'', to remain available until September 30, 2000, to be used for administrative costs of USAID in addressing the effects of those hurricanes, of which up to $1,000,000 may be used to contract directly for the personal services of individuals in the United States: *Provided further*, That up to $2,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this paragraph may be transferred to ''Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General'', to remain available until expended, to be used for costs of audits, inspections, and other activities associated with the expenditure of the funds appropriated by this paragraph: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated and expended subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the funding ceiling contained in section 580 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in Division A, section 101(d) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)), notwithstanding section 545 of that Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for nonproject assistance: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEBT RESTRUCTURING

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, for an additional amount for ''Debt Restructuring'', $41,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That up to $25,000,000 may be used for a contribution to the Central America Emergency Trust Fund, administered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

RECONSTRUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for ''Reconstruction and Construction'', $5,611,000, to remain available until expended, to address damages from Hurricane Georges and other natural disasters in Puerto Rico: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the amount provided shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That funds in this account may be transferred to and merged with the ''Forest and Rangeland Research'' account and the ''National Forest System'' account as needed to address emergency requirements in Puerto Rico.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) reserves a point of order on the amendment.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would put in the emergency supplemental that we passed earlier this year, House bill 1141, as an amendment onto this emergency supplemental bill, and specifically, the reason for that is there is a very true emergency going on right now that appropriately this House and the Senate both passed legislation to deal with.

It is interesting, following the comments of my colleague, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) about hungry children, there are not only hungry children today in the Balkans, but there are literally tens of thousands of hungry children in Central America, much closer to our shores, much more directly impacting the United States.

□ 1645

And, in fact, the hurricane that occurred in October was of incredible proportions. I had the opportunity to travel to Central America, to Nicaragua, with the President and had a chance actually to view firsthand some of the destruction, where literally entire villages were wiped out.

I remind my colleagues, and, again, this House passed 1141, but I remind my colleagues of what is happening in Central America. Up until the hurricane, a lot of very good things were happening: Economies were growing, had been growing, through the dynamic progress of a capitalistic, democratic, emergent democratic society; there were vigorously contested elections and vigorous opportunities in terms of an economic future. Right now that is on hold, and it has been on hold effectively since October.

We have no choice, and not just because of the humanitarian reasons, but I think, really, for America's national security reasons. Many in this Chamber remember a different Central America, where the United States was spending far in excess of $1 billion for issues other than humanitarian aid, and I would hope and I would pray that that does not happen again.

Without this aid package that we have approved, to do things like build infrastructure, to do things like deal with potential immigration problems to the United States of America, I am not sure what the future holds for Central America.

And if the chairman of the committee would enter into a colloquy with me, I would appreciate knowing if my understanding is correct that the Senate's desire is to merge the two bills, the two emergency supplementals.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEUTSCH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, let me explain where we are here. The House expedited the consideration of that first supplemental, and I will concede there has been some undue delay in going to conference on that bill. I want the Members to know it is not the fault of the leadership of the

House, and it is not the fault of the Committee on Appropriations, but I will not go any further than that.

The answer is, yes, we do expect that the leadership will sign off on a plan that would allow this bill that we will vote on today and the original supplemental to be considered in conference at the same time.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Florida was very supportive, obviously, of the early supplemental, but is it fair to say the gentleman's current position is to be supportive and to include the Central American aid package, House bill 1141, as part of the final product that will come with this?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman will continue to yield, that is correct, yes.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be withdrawn; and I thank the gentleman for that assurance.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have now had a number of amendments brought to the House floor which the authors understand are not in accordance with the House rules and which the committee understands are not in accordance with the House rules. I had been under the impression that we were going to recognize that a lot of Members have other time obligations and we would not be debating issues which we do not have the right under the rules to debate.

So what I would simply ask of the gentleman from Florida is this: I wonder if we could have an understanding that if there are any further amendments that are offered that are clearly subject to points of order that we will immediately make those points of order unless the sponsor of the amendment agrees to limit the time they want to discuss them to 1 minute. Otherwise, we are going to inconvenience many Members.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for raising the issue, and we do have a time problem. I had set the goal of being completed by 4:30 today. Obviously, we did not make that.

I wanted to assure all the Members that they would have an opportunity to have full and open debate, as we had promised an open rule, which we did. But I think the gentleman makes a very good point, and I would hope that those where a point of order does lie would be willing to limit the time they would use in describing that amendment to the 2 minutes the gentleman has suggested. Otherwise, we could go straight to the point of order and eliminate any conversation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to have an understanding that unless the sponsor of an amendment which we know is out of order agrees to a 1-minute discussion of it, we will immediately move to make the point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I am happy to join him in that announcement and also to say we have about 10 more amendments that we need to consider here this evening, about half of which a point of order will lie against.

So I agree with the gentleman, and I think it is proper we put the Members on notice.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in the Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 602. It is the sense of the Congress that there should continue to be parity between the adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the adjustments in the compensation of civilian employees of the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISTOOK

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ISTOOK:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 503. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the implementation of any plan to invade the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia with ground forces of the United States, except in time of war.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I might mention that this amendment is identical to one that has previously, under the precedence of the House, been held in order, and that was an amendment that was filed in 1967 during the time of the Vietnam War. The language is identical in this case, only changing the words North Vietnam to Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to compliment our chairman on this bill that meets some very vital and important needs of the United States Armed Forces. I support this bill. I intend to support the bill whether this amendment is approved by the House or not.

Our military has been depleted; it has been overused. This bill is intended to replenish our military. This bill is intended to restore strength and vitality that has been taken from our military. This bill, as I believe most proponents say, is not, however, intended to expand the war that currently is being waged in Yugoslavia, which has not been declared as a war by the Congress of the United States. This bill is to replenish our military but not to expand past the air campaign that currently is under way.

We cannot take up a more serious issue in this House than committing the men and women of our Armed Forces into combat and the potential of having them sent in a hostile environment into Yugoslavia. The President of the United States has said he does not intend to do so, but, nevertheless, he is having plans drafted for the contingency of doing that.

Mr. Chairman, that cannot occur; that must not occur under our system of government, under our Constitution, unless the Congress of the United States so specifies. That is what this amendment says, that no ground forces of the United States can invade Yugoslavia absent a declaration by this Congress to do so.

I should mention, Mr. Chairman, the significance of this issue. The great import of this issue is such that in 1991, when the Persian Gulf War, Desert Shield and then Desert Storm, was being put together, the President of the United States, George Bush, thought it crucial to make sure that he sought not only consultation but approval of the Congress at that time.

Then Senator William Cohen of Maine, now the Secretary of Defense, at the time that the Persian Gulf campaign was being contemplated took to the floor of the United States Senate, the other body, and made it clear that our Constitution would not permit that campaign to go forward unless Congress approved.

In fact, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, 1991, Mr. Cohen stated, and I quote him, ''The President has said that he has the authority to go forward without congressional consent. I disagree with that particular position. He has also said that even in the face of opposition from Congress, he will go forward. I think that not only is a constitutional error but a tactical one as well.''

What does the administration say and do? They said, well, we will talk to Congress, but we will not agree that we will not send our troops into the ground in Yugoslavia in a hostile environment unless Congress approved it.

This amendment seeks to honor what the House voted last week by 249 to 180, that, absent congressional action, no ground forces were to be sent in. Without this amendment, Mr. Chairman, the press and the public will claim that we have voted this money, this $12 billion, to widen this poorly conceived military effort.

I do not think that is the intent. I do not think that is the intent of the chairman in bringing this bill forward. I do not think that is our intention, to enlarge this war. But we want to make sure it does not deplete the resources of our military.

Does this amendment pull us out of what is going on now? No. Does it endorse the air war? No. Does it stop the air campaign? No. Does it prevent peacekeepers from going in should peace break out? No, it does not. Does it prevent rescue of our forces? Of

course not. But it does make it clear that we are not going to send any ground troops in in an invasion unless it becomes a time of war, which under our Constitution can only be declared by the Congress of the United States.

It does not undercut our strategy. The President has said ground troops are not our strategy. It does not undercut our Armed Forces. It clearly is following the Constitution on who makes decisions of this tremendous import.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment; and I urge its adoption.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order, and under my reservation I ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) does not have time under his reservation of a point of order. The gentleman may make his point of order or withdraw his point of order or continue to reserve his point of order at this point.

Mr. OBEY. I am continuing to reserve my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman move to strike the last word while continuing to reserve his point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Well, I continue to reserve my point of order; and I would ask if the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) would yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin continues to reserve his point of order.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida rise?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if he could explain to us what the words in his amendment ''in time of war'' mean? Is that a declaration of war or is it something else?

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin, this means, of course, the same as has been established in the precedence of the House with this particular language. I mean it, of course, to mean a declaration of war or any act by the Congress that would be any equivalent approval of a declaration of war.

Congress, of course, has not given any authorization for such a commitment of our forces.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that means it would not apply to Kosovo?

Mr. ISTOOK. When the gentleman says it does not apply to Kosovo, Kosovo is part of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, so certainly it applies to Kosovo.

Mr. OBEY. But the gentleman is saying there must be a declaration of war for a time of war to exist, or is he saying there are other conditions which might pertain?

Mr. ISTOOK. There is no condition under our constitution which constitutes an official war absent an official action by the Congress of the United States. That is Article I, Section 8, of our Constitution.

Mr. OBEY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding under his time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I continue my opposition to the amendment.

The House has already voted on this issue. Every Member has had a chance to be recorded, and I think all of us agree that we would hope American ground troops would not be deployed anywhere unless the very direct security interests of the United States is threatened.

□ 1700

But here is why I oppose this amendment today. This is real. This is an appropriations bill. It is real. I just do not think Congress should micromanage any kind of military activity, number one.

Number two, it is a mistake to tell an enemy what we will do and what we will not do in a military situation. If we tell Milosevic that we are not going to send any ground troops to the area, Milosevic then only has to focus on the air war. He can put all of his attention on the air war. If we do not give him any direct answer one way or the other on ground troops or anything else, then he has got to plan for all kinds of contingencies, he has got to make his preparations very diverse, and it is not easy for him to do that. It is easy for him to focus just on the air war.

So I think we would make a big mistake by adopting this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the one thing the administration has asked us to do is expedite this supplemental, to get it done so they can get the money so we can do the rearmament on things like JDAMs that are critically important.

This will ensure a veto of this bill and that, therefore, we are going to slow this process down. It is going to mean it is going to have to come back to this body. I would hope that the House would agree with our chairman and defeat this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes a very good point. I think it is ill-timed at this point, and I would hope that the House would reject the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate the chairman being flexible here in terms of yielding.

I think he made a very important point at the beginning that needs to be repeated. That is, we already had a vote on this amendment. There is an authorizing committee that is alive and going forward, but it does not interfere with the appropriations process. This bill needs to move forward quickly. We do not need to be threatened with a veto. It is unnecessary at this time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as Franklin Roosevelt said once, I hate war. And I am sure everybody in this room does. But I have to tell my colleagues that I think this amendment, while it may be well-intentioned, I think would have very pernicious results.

Back in 1982 when my son was a student in Germany, I went to the University of Friedberg and I gave a speech to the student body right after Germany had recognized Croatia. What I said was essentially this: I said,

> Look, your country has just recognized Croatia, against the wishes of the United States Government. I said, the United States in 1948 recognized Israel; and when we did that, we incurred a permanent obligation to defend their security.

And what I said to them was that,

> You may not like it, but the fact is that when you recognize Croatia the way you did, you triggered certain events; and Mr. Milosevic is not going to stand by and watch Yugoslavia slowly fall apart. He will be taking serious military action. And in fact, in the end, we will have to be involved militarily and so will you.

Now, when I said that to that German audience, they booed. They did not like what I said. But the fact is that I believe I was correct, and I think events have borne that out.

I am convinced that if we had bombed Milosevic immediately after he began his first ethnic cleansing campaigns, that within a week he would have been out of power because there was a strong political opposition to Mr. Milosevic at that time. But the West temporized for 10 years; and so literally we have had the number of people die because of Mr. Milosevic's actions which are equivalent to more than half of the population of my congressional district.

Now, they were not Americans, so maybe we are not all that concerned, but I think we should be. I think we need to have meant it when we said about Europe after Hitler in World War II ''Never Again!'' And I think when the President walked into this problem and we saw what was happening in Yugoslavia, that we had an obligation to try to stop it.

Now, if this Congress had an objection to that action, then it should have

stated so when we were at the beginning of the war. The Senate did take action in supporting what the administration was doing. This House did not act.

Now that we are in this situation, I think we have an obligation not to make it worse. I think we make it worse for the refugees. I think we make it worse for our troops whose lives are now on the line, including those Apache helicopter pilots. I think we owe it to them to support policies that can get us out of this war as quickly as possible.

I do not know whether we should use ground forces or not militarily. That is a military judgment which ought to be made by our military commanders with the agreement of the Commander in Chief. That is the way the Constitution is set up. The Congress has the power to say whether we should or should not be in a war. But if we are in it, we do not have the power to micromanage it, in my view. And we certainly do not have the talent to or the information to.

And so it seems to me that the best way that we can try to assure that the air war succeeds, and I have grave doubts about that, I come much closer to JOHN MCCAIN on that than I do anybody else in this Congress, but the best chance we have to make that air war to succeed is to let Mr. Milosevic think that he may be facing a ground attack if it does not.

If we want the Russians to play with this issue for real rather than just around the edges for domestic consumption, we also need to let them know that if their efforts at negotiation do not succeed, they may very well see a ground situation. That is, in my view, the best way to try to assure that the air war will achieve its desired ends.

I respect the opinion of every single person in this institution, but I would urge them not to take this action and support this amendment because I think it will be immensely counterproductive and could in fact lead to the loss of more lives.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Istook amendment. I think that this would send a strong message that we do not endorse this war. It was said that this is the same vote that we had last week, but last week's vote is sitting on the table and it is going to sit there.

This one may well go someplace and have an effect. So this is a much more important vote that we had last week. It is very important that we vote the same way as we did last week.

I think it is interesting, I think we have an interesting constitutional question here, because I agree with the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that it is not the prerogative of the Congress to micromanage a war. That is correct. It is the job of the Congress to declare the war. But here we have a Congress involved in diplomacy and micromanaging a war that has not been declared. That is the issue. The issue is not the micromanaging.

I can support this amendment because the war has not been declared. The issue is how do we permit the President to wage a war without us declaring the war. Once we declare the war, it is true, we should not be talking about whether or not we use airplanes or foot soldiers or whatever. We do not micromanage. We do not get involved in diplomacy maneuvers.

But today we have things turned upside down. We have the President declaring where and we say nothing and the Congress micromanaging the war that should not exist. We need to consider that. And we can straighten this mess out by rejecting these funds.

It is suggested that this amendment would go a long way to doing it. I am not all that optimistic. For us to say to the President ''thou shalt not use these funds for the ground war,'' well, he has not had the authority to wage his air war. Why would he listen to us now?

Can we trust him and say that he is going to listen to what we tell him? Of course not. He is already fighting his air war and he will continue to. And he has set the standard, and not he alone, all our Presidents from World War II have set the standard that they will do what they darn well please.

This is why I have been encouraged in the last couple weeks that this debate has been going on, because it is an important debate. I have finally seen this Congress at least addressing the subject on whether or not they should take back the prerogatives of war and not allow it to remain in the hands of the President.

This is very, very good. I have come to the House floor on numerous occasions since February, taking this position that we should not be involved. As a matter of fact, we had a couple dozen, maybe three dozen Members in this Congress who signed on a bill in February, a month or so before we even saw the bombs dropping in Yugoslavia, that would have prevented this whole mess if we would have stood up and assumed our responsibilities.

It is said that we must move in now to help the refugees. Have we looked at the statistics? How many refugees did we have before the bombing started? Others say, well, we must move in because Milosevic is so strong. Prior to the bombing, Milosevic was weak.

Talk about unintended consequences. They are so numerous. What about the unintended consequence of supporting the KLA who are supported by Osama Bin Laden? How absurd can it get? Osama Bin Laden was our good friend because he was a freedom fighter in Afghanistan and we gave him our weapons and supported him. But then we found out he was not quite so friendly, so we captured a few of his men and he retaliated by bombing our embassies. Of course, we retaliated by bombing innocent chemical plants as well as people in Afghanistan that had nothing to do with it.

So where are we now? We are back to supporting and working hard and just deliberating over whether we should give weapons to the KLA. I mean, the whole thing is absurd.

There is only one thing that we should do, and that is stop this funding and stop the war. My colleagues say, oh, no, we are already too far in that we cannot. It is not supporting the troops. Well, who wants to get down here and challenge me and say that I do not support our troops? I support our troops. I served in the military for 5 years. That is not a worthwhile challenge. We all support our troops.

They say, well, no, they are in a quagmire and we have to help them and this is the only way we can do it. So the President comes and asks us for $6 billion and then, in Congress's infinite wisdom, we give him $13 billion. And yet, we do not declare war.

This appropriation should be defeated.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, last week I called our friend Tom Foglietta, who is the Ambassador to Italy, and I said, ''Mr. Ambassador, tell me what the reaction in Italy is to the debate going on in the United States Congress.'' And the Ambassador called me back 2 days ago and he said,

> The Italian papers in their editorial section said we do not have to worry about the communists. We do not have to worry about the Greens. We have to worry about the United States Congress destroying the NATO allies, the alliance.

Now, that was in reaction to the fiasco we had last week. We have two ways that we can limit the President. One is, by a two-thirds vote we can override his veto. The other way is to limit the funds that the President has to use for readiness.

For 5 years we have limited the funds of the President for readiness because for 2 years this Congress, this House, insisted we offset the money that the President asked for in his emergency money for Bosnia because there were a number of people that asked for those funds or a number of people who opposed that position of us being in Bosnia.

□ 1715

We were not successful in getting out of Bosnia, but we did limit the readiness money. Our troops are now at a precipice of readiness.

I went aboard the *Abraham Lincoln*. The *Abraham Lincoln* has 5,000 troops normally. It was 800 people short. If Members think they are hurting anybody but the troops, they are wrong. They are hurting our American servicepeople when they limit the money. If we do not have a two-thirds

vote on the floor of the Congress of the United States, in both Houses, we cannot override a veto, and we know the other body has already voted to go along with what is happening.

So what we are doing is sending a message to Milosevic, and we are saying to him, ''We're divided.'' We are playing into his hand. We are making him think we are divided as a country, and we will never solve the problem. As the refugees stream out of Kosovo, as they stream into the refugee center with mud and no facilities, we are helping them with that.

Unless we see a two-thirds vote, the only recourse we have is to limit the funds that are available to the President. We have done that, and we have reduced readiness substantially. Everybody here knows that. Everybody knows that the carriers are short, the destroyers are short, the Army is short 12,000 people, the Navy is short 7,000 people. The infantry fighting vehicles do not have any infantry in them. They only have the driver and the commander.

I would ask my colleagues to think very hard. This amendment will cause a veto of the bill. It will slow down money we need to have by Memorial Day for the troops that are overseas. If Members support the troops, I ask them to vote against this amendment and then vote for passage of the bill, of the $12.8 billion for the troops that are serving in harm's way in the Balkans.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Let me just say to my esteemed colleague, when the President sent our troops into Bosnia, he said they would be out in 6 months. It has now been over 3 years, and we have spent billions of dollars. That is why many of us were very concerned and are still concerned.

Now, we all want to support our troops. We all want to put additional funding into the hollowed-out military that has been hollowed out to such a degree that we cannot deal with the crises around the world. But let me just give my colleagues a fact. The fact is, from 1950 to 1990, military operations, we had 10 of them. In 40 years, we had 10 of them. In the last 7 years, we have had 25 deployments without the Congress being involved, unilateral actions taking place by the administration, by the President.

Now, let us take a look at what happened when George Bush was President. The Democrat Congress, in 1991, insisted that we have a vote on whether or not we go to war in the Persian Gulf. There was proper planning. We had 550,000 troops. General Schwarzkopf was in charge. We planned it fully before we did anything. But still the Congress insisted that George Bush come before this body before we started any military operations. I remember Lee Hamilton standing right there debating against that operation. But it passed both the House and the Senate.

Mr. MURTHA. How did I vote?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I do not know how the gentleman voted.

Mr. MURTHA. I led the fight.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is great. I am glad he did.

But the point is we have got a similar situation today, and they do not want a vote of the Congress of the United States. Why? Why is it that it was important back then and it is not important now? We are going to be taking young Americans' lives and putting them at risk in Kosovo in a ground war, in a mountainous area that is not like what we faced in the Persian Gulf.

The fact of the matter is that the Congress of the United States and the American people need to be on board if we are going to send our troops into harm's way in a ground war. They have said that they would need as many as 300,000 troops if we had to go in there. Do Members want to commit them without the people's voice being heard through their elected representatives? I think not. We need proper planning.

Let me just say one more thing to my colleague. When Mr. Tudjman in Croatia killed 10,000 people and ran 750,000 out of that country with an ethnic cleansing, what did this body do? What did we say? Not a darned thing. But now we are talking about possibly giving this man unilateral authority to send in ground troops in Kosovo. It is an insane policy.

The American people ought to be heard through the people they elect in this House and in the other body. It is no different, Mr. Chairman, than it was in 1991 when we went into the Persian Gulf. They insisted on a vote then, and I insist on a vote now.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words; and I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is missing my point. We have two ways to stop it, reducing readiness by reducing money available or having a two-thirds vote, or allowing Milosevic to see we are divided. That is the point I am making.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I would just like to make this case to the gentleman from Indiana. There is nothing in this bill that would authorize any money to be used to deploy ground troops into Kosovo, to invade Kosovo or anything else. There is nothing in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I was one of those Democrats in 1991 that voted to support President Bush. President Bush was right in the Persian Gulf War and President Clinton is right today. In fact, when President Bush did come before us, he had all his ducks lined up. That is true. But it was basically a fait accompli. The troops were there, and we voted to support the President. We should not pull the rug out from under the President now.

A lot of my colleagues say, ''We shouldn't fight this war with one hand behind our back. Vietnam was fought with one hand behind our back. We shouldn't let the politicians control the war. We should let the military people fight the war.''

Then let us let the military people fight the war. All options should be on the table. We do not announce to a tyrant like Milosevic what we will do and what we will not do ahead of time. The only thing he understands is force, and the only thing he understands is unity. This man is an absolute tyrant. And so we need to have all options on the table, in my estimation, including the use of troops on the ground.

I hope the bombing campaign will work. I have my doubts, but I hope it will work. But isolationism is not the way to go. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, there is a sense of isolationism in this Chamber in some quarters, and that is why this amendment should be absolutely defeated. The votes in my estimation last week were irresponsible not to support the bombing war, irresponsible to want to micromanage every aspect of the war. We should not be doing that. It is absolutely wrong.

Now, ethnic cleansing. This is not a civil war. People say it is a civil war. This is ethnic cleansing. This is genocide. This is a tyrant like Milosevic killing people because of their ethnicity, driving them out because of their ethnicity. This should not be allowed.

I hear my colleagues talk about the KLA and Bin Laden. There is no evidence, believe me, from the highest sources, there is no evidence that Bin Laden or any of those Islamic fundamentalists have infiltrated the KLA. That is a smear, just because the Albanians happen to be Muslims; and, frankly, I resent the smear because it is not what we should be doing. This is about ethnic cleansing. This is what we really ought to be concerned about.

I had an amendment which I am not offering which would give more money to the Economic Support Fund because I believe that the countries in the area like Albania, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Romania and Montenegro need our help and we are going to need to come there and help. Because this is, again, a crisis of paramount proportion.

In my estimation, we should be aiding the KLA. They are the only counter to the Serbs on the ground. When we bombed in Bosnia, we were successful, in my estimation, because the Croatian army was on the ground as a counter force to the Serbs. We ought to be helping. If we do not want NATO troops on the ground or U.S. troops on the ground, then we ought to be helping the people that are on the ground and that is the KLA. I think we should be dropping antitank weaponry to them. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) and I have a

bill that would arm and train the KLA as MITCH MCCONNELL and JOE LIEBERMAN have in the Senate.

We cannot have our cake and eat it, too. Ultimately, the situation for Kosovo I believe is independence. I think that the Serbs have ceded any moral authority to ever govern the ethnic Albanians again. There is no future for the ethnic Albanians under Serbian rule.

Kosovo ought to be independent. There ought to be no partition of Kosovo. We should not reward Milosevic for his campaign of ethnic cleansing.

Saying that somehow the bombing brought on ethnic cleansing, Mr. Chairman, this ethnic cleansing against the Albanians has been going on directed by Milosevic for years and years. I called it slow ethnic cleansing and quiet ethnic cleansing, and 3 years ago I took to the floor and I said what Milosevic is doing to the Bosnians, he will do to the Kosovars and make Bosnia seem like a tea party. He will drive a million over the border and try to kill another half million.

I was right about the million over the border. I hope I am wrong about the half million. But when we finally get into Kosovo and we see the mass graves, we are going to see tens of thousands if not hundreds of thousands of people being butchered by this butcher, Milosevic.

I commend President Clinton for having the courage to stand up and say no. It would have been politically easier for him to sit back and do nothing.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment ought not to be supported. All options ought to be on the table. I am going to vote for the finished product of this bill even though it is laden with pork, but we need to be firm, and we need to be united.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. My reasons are different from some of those that have been expressed on the floor this afternoon, because, as many of my colleagues know, I was opposed to this air war that the President and his advisers started without coming to the Congress for consultation, and I have definitely been opposed to any expansion of it on the ground.

As a result of my concerns, I introduced H.R. 1569 the last week, on April 28, which passed by an overwhelming majority of the Members of the United States House of Representatives. 249 Members of this body voted in favor of that bill. That bill sent a very clear message to the President. It was not micromanaging, because the wording in that bill was very different from the wording in the amendment before Members today.

I want to make clear that the people who voted for my bill last week understand that there is a difference. Because in order to make this amendment germane, the gentleman from Oklahoma had to change the wording of his amendment. So Members need to look carefully at the wording of this amendment and the wording that they voted on a week ago, because there is a difference.

Last week, the bill that passed by this House, bipartisan vote, 45 Democrats voted for it, said that none of the funds appropriated, I am going to skip over, could be used for the deployment of ground elements of the United States Armed Forces in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia unless such deployment is specifically authorized by law enacted after the enactment of this act. So it talked about deployment of forces and it could not be until after the enactment of a law.

This amendment before Members today refers to none of the funds being appropriated in this act shall be available for the implementation of any plan to invade the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia with ground forces of the United States except in the time of war.

There are major differences in the wording and the meaning of each of these. We need to understand that. Those of us who believe in Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution and believe that the President should come before this body, as I do, before ever starting a war, should have done that before starting the air war, much less commit them on the ground, this amendment today is not the way to express that. We expressed it last week when we passed H.R. 1569.

I am urging the Senate now to take it up. We need to each urge our Senators, because the Senate needs to act on that bill, because the President I think would have to sign that bill. Because that bill, as a result of that bill, the afternoon of the vote, the President sent a letter to the Speaker, I want to submit this letter for the RECORD, in which the President committed to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, he said, ''Indeed, I would ask for congressional support before introducing U.S. ground forces into Kosovo into a non-permissive environment.''

That was a result of that bill being on the floor and a result of that vote being taken.

I am hoping the President meant it. We are going to put this in the record, on the official record, that he did. Because I do not think the President would dare now, after a majority of the Congress vote, to send our forces on the ground without coming to this Congress.

But this is not the place. This bill today is about the readiness of our Armed Forces. We are at a critical time. We have got to get this emergency funding, because the President is going to continue to spend it. It is coming out of the hide of our troops right now.

When I have got 16 P–3s on the tarmac at my Jacksonville Naval Air Station that will not fly because they cannot get the parts, they cannot get the engines because the money is being taken and sent to the Balkans, we have got to get the money in now. We cannot let this bill get hung up.

I would hope the gentleman from Oklahoma would withdraw his amendment; but if he will not withdraw it, I want to urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment and then to vote for this bill. We need to send a message to our troops that we do support them, but we are certainly not going to let them be sent on the ground without the President coming back to us.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following letter for the RECORD:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, April 28, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the opportunity to continue to consult closely with the Congress regarding events in Kosovo.

The unprecedented unity of the NATO Members is reflected in our agreement at the recent summit to continue and intensify the air campaign. Milosevic must not doubt the resolve of the NATO alliance to prevail. I am confident we will do so through use of air power.

However, were I to change my policy with regard to the introduction of ground forces, I can assure you that I would fully consult with the Congress. Indeed, without regard to our differing constitutional views on the use of force, I would ask for Congressional support before introducing U.S. ground forces into Kosovo into a non-permissive environment. Milosevic can have no doubt about the resolve of the United States to address the security threat to the Balkans and the humanitarian crisis in Kosovo. The refugees must be allowed to go home to a safe and secure environment.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in support of the Istook amendment. As one of the people that helped construct the amendment last week, I believe sincerely that this amendment is absolutely consistent with what we did last week. I think if Members voted last week to send a message to the administration that they did not want to escalate this war, I believe they should come to the floor and support the Istook amendment.

□ 1730

I have heard some discussion out here about the role of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. Well, let us make it very clear. Our Founders did not believe that one individual and an click that surrounds the President of the United States ought to be the one to carry out war-making in America. In fact, our Founders believed that it was essential for the House and the Senate to have their say. Why? Because the Founders really believed that it was absolutely essential that the people have their say, and the people can have their say best by expressing their opinions through their

representatives in the Congress of the United States.

In fact, in a poll just this week in one of the national newspapers the indication was the people were far more comfortable having the Congress of the United States direct this war and where we head than they were with the President. Why? Because frankly I believe they are very dissatisfied with where we are.

Why is it that we would come to the floor and support an amendment that says that we should put no one on the ground? Well, for fundamentally three reasons. One is, and these are not confusing, they are simple, and we ought to follow them all the way through: Does America have a direct national interest in Kosovo? Well, the answer is no, we do not have a direct national interest in Kosovo.

But as my colleagues know, is it possible that America ought to intervene in conflicts where we do not have a direct national interest, and the answer to that is certainly yes. However, we should not intervene in conflicts where we have no direct national interest if we do not have an achievable goal that is accompanied by an exit strategy.

Now, for those that have studied this region, the region in Kosovo, there has been ethnic and civil war and religious civil war going on in Kosovo bordering on six solid centuries. There was a time, in fact, when the Turks had invaded Kosovo and were brutalizing the Serbs, and their administrators were the Albanians. The fact is in that part of the world there has been ethnic and religious fighting for centuries, and the idea that the United States and its friends can fly into this region, and drop bombs and think that that is how we are going to solve this, it borders on arrogance and represents a misunderstanding of this region. In addition to that, the notion that now that we are dropping bombs, that the solution lies in escalating a bad policy, is really wrongheaded.

So what I would suggest to all of my colleagues in light of the fact that there is no national interest, in light of the fact that dropping bombs is not going to solve the problems that have been raging here for six centuries, and in light of the fact that escalating the war does not make any sense because starting this war did not make any sense to begin with; frankly, we should have used the economic incentives that we had to strangle Milosevic. He is not a popular man at home. He should have been isolated and toppled, and the United States should have been involved in that.

Well, what do we do today? Well, we have started this policy of bombing. Last week I voted against pulling troops out precipitously because I believe we must keep the pressure on Milosevic. But I urged several weeks ago that we enter into mediation, that we call on the G–8, the President, to convene a special G–8 conference to get our allies together, particularly involving the Russians. As my colleagues know, we have alienated the Russians. We worked hard to bring them into our orbit, and we have now alienated them, we have gone backwards.

I believe what we need to do now is keep the pressure on and keep our eyes on the goals. What are the goals? Return the refugees, withdraw the military forces of Milosevic, have an international force that can provide protection to the refugees that return and build liberal democratic institutions in the region. The fact is we ought to be looking for opportunities to mediate a solution, and stabilize the region, and rebuild our alliances, not looking for opportunities to escalate this war, and I am happy to say today that there appears to be some progress through the G–8.

There appears to be some movement to involve the Russians and I hope ultimately the Greeks in being able to stabilize this region and accept our goals, accomplish our goals, but preconditions and dictating our way through this will not reach our goals. We will not have a successful conclusion like we can in my judgment if we search for peace, search for mediation, keep the pressure on. At the end of the day I think we will be successful.

Let us support Istook. It does not allow us to escalate this any more.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Istook amendment. Last week Congress, all of us, took some stands publicly. Basically Congress was posturing last week. We postured for the public. We let the public know apparently what we believe.

This is where we make it real. This is the real vote. This is when we determine what we were sent here to determine, what the future of the United States of America will be, not just posturing, not just saying what we would like it to be. We are here to determine what the actual policy of our country is.

This legislation, the base legislation that we are describing, is designed to do what? We are here trying to upgrade the readiness of America's military forces, of our Armed Forces. That is the purpose of this amendment or this legislation. Frankly, if this amendment does not pass, we are striking yet another blow to undermine the readiness of the American military. Throughout the world we will make our country vulnerable. In all these other regions we are depleting those forces in order to fight a battle in the Balkans that has nothing to do with our national security. It is up to us to determine right now whether or not we agree with that policy, that money should be spent in the Balkans when there are threats elsewhere in the world to our national security.

The President's threat to veto our efforts if we do not continue to pour money down this rat hole in the Balkans, is an insult to this Congress. For 6 years this President has starved our military, and he has abused those people in our Armed Forces by sending them on all kinds of military missions that were not important to our national security, and in doing so he has brought us to a state of unreadiness. Now if we continue this operation, we will be in jeopardy in Asia, in jeopardy in the Persian Gulf; tens of thousands of American troops in jeopardy because of the President's strategy for these 6 years, and now we are not up to facing this challenge.

Mr. Chairman, that is our challenge right now, that is what we are determining. Are we going to upgrade the readiness of our troops, or are we going to give the President a blank check, a blank check to spend what he wants to spend, further deteriorating our readiness in this Balkan campaign that has nothing do with our national security.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), I have respected him for many years, and we worked together on many human rights issues. Mr. ENGEL offered an alternative that was a good alternative. We need not send American troops all over the world, we need not be the policemen of the world, we need not carry the burden of the Europeans and everyone else in the world. We can arm people like the Kosovars, let them defend themselves.

That is what we did in Afghanistan. How would we have voted had President Reagan sent troops into Afghanistan and then said, ''Well, we're already in. We have got to spend even more billions of dollars.'' That would have been an insane policy, and do my colleagues know why? It would have made us vulnerable throughout the world and the Cold War would still be on.

Today we have another option, and it is the same option that we should have taken in the beginning. Let us work with those people who want to defend themselves, but let us not be the policemen of the world. Let us not send a signal to the Europeans that after we have defended them for 40 years, and bore the burden of the Cold War. Now we will signal them through this vote, through this vote, that America, that Members of Congress, are going to continue to spend our hard-earned tax dollars, put our people in harm's way for their security. Europe is rich enough, Europe is strong enough to defend themselves.

Please do not buy this argument that it is all or nothing, that we have to send our troops in, we have to conduct this air war, we have to spend our tens of billions of dollars or do nothing. That is a false dichotomy. It is false, and it is even worse because not only do we then get ourselves involved in a conflict that we do not need to be involved in, but we deplete those scarce resources that we are trying to replenish today.

What is this legislation all about? Why are we here? We are here because

we care about the well-being of our military personnel. The Istook amendment is going to make sure that that is what we care about, that is our number one priority, the national security of our country and the well-being and security of our own military personnel. Because if we do not pass the Istook-Burton amendment, or if we do not pass the Rohrabacher-Kucinich amendment which comes on after this, what we are saying is those forces will continue to be depleted because we are giving the President a blank check. I, for one, will not vote for a blank check for this President.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I know Members are anxious for the debate to quit, but in the 8 years I have been here I do not think there is very many things as important as what we are discussing here today regardless of what side colleagues come down on the issue, and I think there is a strange dichotomy for people that basically do not support the military, understand it or even, in some cases, loathe the military. They find themselves in a strange dichotomy. They try to use the vehicle of the military, which they have not supported, for a humanitarian issue, and I understand that. But I think in many cases those decisions have been faulty and inept.

I agree that it is an absolute mistake to tell an enemy that we are not going to use ground troops if we are trying to change his heart and mind, that we are only going to conduct an air war. I mean it is absolutely ludicrous. I spent 20 years planning the invasions of Southeast Asia in European countries. One would never do that. I am against putting in ground troops for other reasons, but to tell one's enemy that they are not going to do that is foolhardy. It limits actions and allows him to prepare for other things and put that aside.

And I have heard that we ought to leave it up to the military. The military, the Pentagon, recommended that we not conduct air strikes in the first place. They said unless we are willing to commit ground troops that we will not stop any of the problems on the ground, that we will actually exacerbate the problems, we will not achieve our goals and we will cause the forced evacuation which people call ethnic cleansing of millions of Albanians.

I would like to tell my friends, first of all, if I was an Albanian and I lived in Kosovo, I would be a member of the KLA. But I also want my colleagues to know if I was of Yugoslavian decent I would be part of that force, and that is the whole problem is understanding both sides of the issue. People to their guts, to the blood of their families, feel that they are right, and unless we understand that, we are never going to arrive at a peaceful settlement in this issue. And to go against the military when they said that we are going to cause ethnic cleansing? And that is exactly what happens. I do not care what kind of spin we try to do it to try and justify a position, the bombings accelerated any ethnic cleansing that was in Kosovo.

There are millions of people. Look at the interviews. Ninety-nine percent of them when they are interviewed say, ''What happened to you?''

I was told to leave my home.

I had 10 minutes or I had 5 minutes.

Or I was told now.

They were not refugees, they were in their homes. The bombing accelerated it, and there are millions of people today suffering.

Look into the eyes of those children. They do not know what is going on. They are not KLA, they are not mujaheddin or Hamas. All they know is that they are being brutalized.

But we are responsible in part for forcing many of those refugees to be refugees; I mean it goes beyond logic to disagree with that because it is a fact.

The gentleman said that Osama bin Laden from the highest source. There are mujaheddin and there are Hamas working with the KLA. Now that same source said, ''Is it a major force?'' We asked, ''Is it a major force?'' He said no, but there are mujaheddin and Hamas working with KLA, and the drug traffic that goes through there, they said it is logical that the drug traffickers are using that to supply arms and weapons because they are sympathetic like they have been in Bosnia and other parts.

□ 1745

The whole point is, unless we draw a termination of this, and I disagree with Jessie Jackson most of the time but I want to publicly thank Jessie Jackson. I think he has had more vision, more insight, not for just bringing the POWs back but for looking for directions for peace instead of everything I hear directions for war.

It is easy to kill. It is very difficult to work to live. That is what I would ask my colleagues, instead of saying, let us bomb, let us put in troops, damning the Serbs or damning the Albanians or whatever it is, there are peaceful solutions to this.

Let the Russians be a part of the solution and the Greeks and the Scandinavians by putting them in instead of the United States and Italian and German troops that neither side trusts, and having withdrawal.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get an idea of how many more speakers there are on this subject.

Mr. HOYER. Can I reclaim my time and perhaps the gentleman, on unanimous consent, can do that, spend the time finding that out? I am interested in the question myself. I will not object.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Would the gentleman ask the question then, because we have to get an idea of how much longer this is going to take. We had planned to have this conferenced by Tuesday. We may not have this bill finished by Tuesday.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, my problem is I want to have 5 minutes. If the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) can do that on unanimous consent, I will not object.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read a couple of portions of speeches that have been given recently about this issue, and I would hope my colleagues on the Republican side would listen.

I came into the Chamber to make my remarks as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) was speaking. Shortly thereafter, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) spoke. Both of those gentlemen in 1991 voted on the DURBIN amendment that the President did not have to come to Congress for approval of taking military action. Both the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and, I might add, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) in 1991 took a different position with respect to the President's authority.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is wrong about my vote.

Mr. HOYER. Here is the roll call.

Mr. Chairman, this is not, as JOHN MCCAIN said, about Bill Clinton's credibility. This is not about the credibility of this Congress. It is about America's credibility. It is about NATO's credibility.

My colleagues heard me say on this House floor, after that 213 to 213 vote, that it was the lowest point in my congressional career. This Congress, in my opinion, did not stand for the principles for which this country stands at that hour. It did not stand for the kind of bipartisanship that we ought to have when we confront despots abroad.

Let me read from a speech by Margaret Thatcher just given a few days ago. She said this, I understand the unease that many feel about the way in which the operation began but those who agonize over whether what is happening in Kosovo today is really of sufficient importance to justify our military intervention gravely underestimate the consequences of doing nothing.

There is always a method in Milosevic's madness. He is a master at using human tides of refugees to destabilize his neighbors and weaken his opponents.

She went on to say, there are, in the end, no humanitarian wars. War is a serious and deadly business. The goal of this war, she said, is victory.

Let me read another two sentences. Mr. President, in a letter to the President, nothing could be worse than surrendering our principles, values and credibilities because we lack the will to do what it takes to win.

That letter went on to conclude, history, history, my friends, he said, will record that at the end of the 20th century the United States and its NATO allies had the means to defeat a brutal, belligerent but second rate dictator in Europe. The only question, he said, not yet answered is whether history will record that there was the will to do so.

That was a letter written by Bob Dole to the President of the United States just a few days ago.

The rhetoric of confronting a dictatorship, the rhetoric of standing up for human rights, the rhetoric committed to political self-determination is useless, without effect, hypocrisy, if we are not prepared in the final analysis to stand and fight for those beliefs.

This is, as JOHN MCCAIN has said, not about the credibility of Bill Clinton, not about the trust for this President. This is about the credibility of America.

I urge the defeat of this amendment and the support of this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Istook amendment. Let me say, I was reserving the right to object, but I am not the Member who objected. I have tried to cooperate throughout this day in not calling for votes. Even though I was denied an earlier right to vote, though, I could have called for a quorum or an adjournment to get Members over. I have tried to cooperate, but I believe Members have a right to be heard on a question of whether we are going to war, whether we are going to escalate that war and whether we are going to have ground troops in that war.

What we have established so far in the process of the debate in the Committee on Rules yesterday and today's debate is waivers were not granted. When we tried to offer amendments about whether to reach back to previous appropriations bills in order to try to restrict the expansion and escalation of this war, amendments that were proposed to transfer funds that I had to move the war funds, the $3.3 billion to refugee assistance, were ruled out of order.

A point of order was made on an amendment that I originally thought was in order to try to move the war money. A point of order was made, and I withdrew the amendment. I tried to move the $3.3 billion war money over to readiness, because many of us who strongly favor the efforts of both the full committee chairman and the Subcommittee on Defense chairman to increase readiness would like to see more dollars in readiness. We do not favor dollars to war.

The leadership opposed an attempt to try to specify that the President would have to come and designate the funds as an emergency. That was an earlier amendment that I withdrew to try to say that there had to be a specific designation, and that was opposed.

There was an attempt to block a vote on reprogramming, when, in fact, there are billions of dollars pending to come in to reprogramming, at least $700 million pending and an additional $1.2 billion coming for reprogramming funds beyond the nature of this.

So when it came down to real money questions, as opposed to a resolution last week on the ground war and a resolution on the air war, when it came down to real money questions, the fact is that there is $3.3 billion in this bill, that there is reprogramming money in this bill, that there is a $400 million rapid response team that many of us strongly favor, but without a Balkans limitation becomes another $400 million to expand and escalate this war.

There is no protection, substantive protection, on the $6.9 billion even for pay to keep it from being moved because of the way there is the fungibility of funds. That is why it is so essential that at least we make a statement.

My friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), pointed out earlier that the language was changed. That is not because the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) wanted to change it. It is because in the Committee on Rules the leadership opposed a waiver for him and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Burton) where they could have had the same language on ground war.

So now it is slightly different, but it is the best we can do in this bill.

For those of us who do not want any more blood on our hands, who do not want any more Apache helicopter pilots going down, who realize that, yes, as my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, one of the greatest crusaders for human rights in the world, said earlier, it has been a terrible tragedy. It is not clear why this is not like Vietnam, why we are not hearing the Lyndon Johnsons and the General Westmorelands now telling us just a couple more weeks, just a few thousand more soldiers, it will all change. When we know apparently only the American people are deceived about whether or not we are going to have loss of lives and a ground war, how much the loss of lives will be.

Milosevic knows all of this. He knows the history of Serbia. These underground things that he has in his army were set up by Tito. They have been fighting in this turf for 700 years.

The only people who are not being leveled with are the American people, and it is time they understood that this bill not only funds the current war, it forward funds the war, it potentially escalates the war. And for all the good things in the bill that I will always vote for and for all the refugee money that is so desperately needed that I will vote for and the help for Macedonia and other countries that have been decimated in this process I will always vote for, but I will not vote to spend more money to increase this war.

I will support the efforts of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) to at least try to limit those funds.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if the walls could talk, at least twice in this century these walls have heard those familiar strains of isolationism, of America should not get involved with serious problems elsewhere that do not have a direct interest on our country; and they do in this instance. The stability of Europe, the stability of the Balkans, economically, culturally, morally, is important to the United States of America. Oh, if these walls could talk, they would say, we have heard this before.

It is also kind of like the song we used to sing at Boy Scout camp lo those many years ago, and let the rest of the world go by.

We cannot, Mr. Chairman, let the rest of the world go by. This is a very, very important piece of legislation. The purpose of this legislation is to take care of the troops. This is the year of the troops. We must in this Congress reflect what is good and best about us in looking after those young men and young women in uniform. That is what this bill is all about.

The battle on this issue was fought the other day. It has no business here. I certainly hope that we can put this to rest, defeat it soundly and move on and take care of the young men and young women, the troops of whom we are so fond.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Istook amendment; and I rise in strong support of the supplemental amendment.

I listened to the debate in my office, and I just wanted to be sure that the record was clear when historians went back and looked at what we are doing today.

This activity in the Balkans began in a little village called Vukovar in 1991 where Milosevic sent in his people, and after we later got in we found actually mass graves all over Vukovar.

□ 1800

They went into the hospitals, took the people out, and they shot them. Two hundred fifty thousand people died in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the war. They died at the hands of Milosevic. This is not a recent action. This has been going on for years.

Do Members remember that cold Saturday afternoon when the shell hit in

the Sarajevo marketplace, and only then finally did the United States and the West do something there.

Read Peter Moss's book, the Washington Post reporter, Love Thy Neighbor, where he talks about the rape houses; that the Serb forces would come in and rape young girls 14, 15, and 16.

Read the portion where he says that the Serb forces put the gun up against a father's head, and tells the father, rape your daughter. And the father says, no, I can't do that. And then he turns the gun and he puts the gun up to the daughter's head, and then he says to the father. And the father says, oh, no, and he knows what is happening.

This just did not begin 30 days ago or 42 days ago. What we do in this body today, we are setting a precedent for future presidents, hopefully future Republican presidents, but for future presidents. We are also sending a message to the Chinese as to whether or not they will deal with Taiwan and North Korea, whether or not they will deal with South Korea, and many other nations.

I wanted to make sure that everyone knows that Milosevic was not just bad for what he has done for the last 42 days, but he is bad for what he has done for the last years. I, too, for my party do not think that our party should be an isolationist party. We are the party of Ronald Reagan, who down in Orlando called the Soviet Union the Evil Empire. And many people who were liberal criticized Reagan, but Reagan had a vision for the future, to make sure that we did what we could to make the world safe for people.

I rise in strong support of this bill. Let us pass it to help the troops. I rise in strong opposition to the Istook amendment.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I move to strike the requisite number of words, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise because I want the leadership of the full Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittee to know that there are a number of people, Members, who have consistently and strongly supported this bill, but that if this amendment is attached, will vote against this appropriations bill. I think they know this, and I think they know how much we respect the leadership on the Committee on Appropriations. But I think they also understand what is at stake here.

There are, as I see it, three reasons why this amendment should not be passed and why in fact our action in the Balkans today is justified.

The first is our interest in having a strong and resolute NATO. The second is our past experience with Mr. Milosevic. The third is the strategic location of Kosovo and the Balkans.

Mr. Chairman, it is in our vital national interests, Mr. Chairman, that we have a strong and resolute NATO. This is not a unilateral action, this is a multilateral action. This is a result of 19 democratic, free European nations deciding that they will now take a stand, take a stand for human rights, for democracy, for all the things that Mr. Milosevic and the Communist empire have been opposed to.

We lost 292,131 American soldiers in World War II, and we would not have lost those men and women if we had had a strong and resolute NATO. That is why we invested in NATO. That is why we have put everything we stand for behind NATO, because it is in our vital national security interests.

If NATO yields, if NATO does not prevail in this conflict, NATO will not be worth the paper that its charter is printed on. We cannot let NATO fail in this mission.

Secondly, our experience with Mr. Milosevic. This is the man that is responsible, as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) said, for over 200,000 deaths of innocent civilians; 40,000 women, these were not soldiers who were raped; 2½ million people displaced in the Bosnia war. This is the same man. And because we did not and NATO did not stand up to him, he knows how far he can go.

What is his greatest ally? It is a lack of resolve on the part of politicians. He watches very closely exactly what we do on the floor of this House. Too often we give him comfort instead of reason to fear us.

Thirdly, it must be understood, the strategic location of Kosovo, on the fault line between the Muslim and orthodox worlds. We know what Mr. Milosevic's plan was. It is not any classified intelligence. He amassed his troops to do the same thing he did in Bosnia, to drive out the Kosovar Albanians.

If he went ahead and was able to do that without NATO standing up to him, do Members believe for a moment that the rest of the world would have stood by, the Muslim world? Do Members think that the extremists in the Muslim world would not have gotten engaged? Do Members think the Slavic world would not have gotten engaged? It would have spread throughout the region. It is the same kind of thing that created World War II.

NATO stepped in because they realized what the alternative was. They realized that they were stepping in for the kind of principle that they and we believe in, and it was worth what resources it took. It is worth whatever resources it will take to prevail, not to yield.

Milosevic is an old line Communist. He is head of the Serbian Communist league. He uses people for his own political purposes. He does not believe in human rights and individual freedom and liberty. He controls the media. He has fed the Serbian population toxic lies for over a decade. This guy is bad news. He is representing evil forces. And there are evil forces in the world, and we should be darned proud that we are standing up for principle.

Let us continue to do the right thing. Support this action. Vote against this amendment and pass this bill.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not have to come down here to yell and scream, I come down here to speak in a more practical sense.

Mr. Chairman, I support the emergency supplemental bill, and I reluctantly oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

Let me just say to all those members on this side of the aisle who are thinking about supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK). This is a crucial question we have to think about. We have already had the vote with the Goodling-Fowler amendment. It was very clear how Members felt when they supported it: No deployment of ground forces, of the United States Armed Forces in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, et cetera, et cetera. It is very clear. Members have had their vote on this side of the aisle, so Members do not have to go out and make their strong stand on this, because there is a much larger issue we are talking about.

When we read the Istook language, the Goodling-Fowler has the word ''deployment'' and Istook had implementation. They are very, very similar. Do Members think they have to make another stand on an emergency supplemental appropriations that is going to affect our military?

Mr. Chairman, let me just say, our forces have been engaged in 26 different engagements over the past 8 years, while the U.S. forces had only been engaged in just 10, just 10 from 1961 to 1991.

There has been obviously a dramatic escalation of the number of missions, and it has stretched our military dangerously thin, to the point where our military's ability to conduct a two-war strategy is now in question and our entire military readiness is in question.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle, if they are going to support the Istook amendment, they must realize that those colleagues like the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and others who are going to vote against the emergency supplemental are going to effectively stop the military from having its resources. In other words kill this funding for the military.

So I do not think the day in court on the deployment or the implementation of forces in Yugoslavia is at this point, at 6:10 tonight, that is not the question. The question is, do we want to support our military.

Mr. Chairman, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shelton, said, ''without relief, we will see a continuation of our

downward trend in readiness next year, and extension of the problems that have become apparent in the second half of this fiscal year.'' The Army Chief of Staff talked about the degradation, complete degradation, of our military.

Mr. Chairman, the fight on the budget for our military between us and President Clinton and the administration is not on the Istook amendment tonight. No tonight, it is a vote to support our military.

For those who go back to Ronald Reagan and other great conservatives, they are standing tall this day and for this evening for our military: to provide a clear message that we are going to help increase our readiness, and we are not going to get caught in the technicalities on a vote that we have already voted on by saying we are going to draw the straws and defeat this emergency supplemental because the Istook amendment passed.

I urge my colleagues to look at this matter in a practical sense, in a broad view here. We stand for increased military readiness, and this is a vote on military readiness. It is not a vote on deployment of the troops. We have already had that vote.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague yielding, and appreciate his calmly-made point that is fundamental: The House has had this vote. That is why the Committee on Appropriations rejected another vote out of hand in committee.

This is a money bill that deals with delivering funds needed for the troops. Let us not put those in jeopardy, for we have already had the other vote. I appreciate my colleague making that very important point.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying that our nation's security cannot be ignored, no longer. If Members, my Republican colleagues, decide to support the Istook amendment at the expense of perhaps bringing down the whole entire emergency supplemental appropriations bill, that is not going to be good. If Ronald Reagan was here tonight, I think he would urge my Republicans colleagues by saying, let us defeat the Istook amendment. Think of our military and their readiness.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, about 2,000 years ago, this time of year, an angry mob hauled a Jewish carpenter before a Roman governor, a man that he knew to be innocent. The Roman governor, though, let the mob have their way, and to wash away his dereliction of duty he symbolically washed his hands, thinking it would kind of absolve him from what happened. History has proven that it did not.

''On Wednesday, April 28, Congress proved itself unwilling to fulfill or incapable of discharging its own constitutional responsibilities. In two successive votes, the House of Representatives rejected resolutions that would have either declared war or have pulled U.S. troops out of the quagmire in Kosovo. The best the House could manage was a 249 to 180 vote on a nonbinding requirement that Mr. Clinton get their permission before committing U.S. ground troops to combat. Then late in the evening the House demonstrated its ultimate ambivalence in a 213–213 vote whether air strikes should continue.

''But the votes on April 28 made it clear, Congress has now joined the Clinton administration in its failure to devise a clear strategy for ending what is undeniably an undeclared war in the Balkans.''

The latter part of my remarks were written by an unsuccessful Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate. His name is Oliver North, and it appeared in today's Washington Times.

If Members think this vote on the Istook amendment somehow absolves Members of their constitutional duty to declare war and to look out for the benefit of the Army and the Navy, it does not. Members had that vote last week. They had the opportunity to get the troops out of Kosovo last week. The majority of this body did not vote to do that.

They had an opportunity to declare war and do it right. They did not do that, either. They in effect did nothing. They did what Pontius Pilate did. He was not absolved then, and Members are not absolved now.

This is a funding bill for the United States military. It does not need this nonsensical language attached to it. We are at war. Who is kidding who? Ask the kid climbing into an F–16 tonight, ask the kid climbing into an F–15 tonight, ask the kids getting into the A–6s tonight, ask the families of two airmen who died 2 days ago.

We cannot walk away from our job. Members were not anointed to it, they were not appointed to it, they begged people for it. They were elected to this job. I ask the Members to do their job, admit we are at war, fund the war, and let us do this right. And above all, let us be worthy of those kids over there who have sworn to defend our Nation.

□ 1815

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I would just wish to state my support for this emergency supplemental bill and for all the hard work that the chairman and the minority members have done to put this together.

I hear the passion here today, and I appreciate all the effort. I have friends on both sides, and I always support my friends, but I do appreciate the passion here today.

The President has offered a version of this emergency defense bill. That represents a first step. It is just not enough. It is inadequate in meeting the emergency before us.

We owe it to America and our troops to do more than just return the military to its previous unacceptable level of readiness. We have a moral obligation to give our pilots and soldiers and sailors the tools to do their mission. Just as they are doing their duty to protect us, we must do our duty to support them.

Mr. Chairman, we need this emergency legislation. I would hope we would put this amendment aside, bring the bill forward, support it, and vote for it. Let us do it for our troops.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the Fowler bill. I do not support ground troops in Kosovo, but I do support our leaders in this Congress who have imparted some wisdom here today. Many of them are appropriators and authorizers, and many times I take question with appropriators, but today they have given us fine counsel.

My colleagues, we would trigger a veto by passing this amendment. The money would not get to the troops. As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) have stated, we will send unusual signals to Milosevic. That is not the way to proceed.

I am going to vote ''no'' on this amendment for that reason and for the following reason, for anybody else who joined with JIM TRAFICANT in supporting the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. TILLIE FOWLER) last week. Clearly, the President must come before us for authorization, but why should we tie the hands of our military and why should we not make available every option that we have?

Today we are funding. Although funding is policy, let there be no mistake we have yet to address the total policy. In 1986, we were advised that a free and independent Kosovo should be recognized. We failed to do that. Now we reap the harvest of that mistake.

We, today, must provide the money for our military; and we, today, must support the leaders who themselves do not want to see ground troops.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments; and I want to just add a paragraph that the President sent us on April 28.

However, were I to change my policy with regard to the introduction of ground forces, I can assure you that I would fully consult with the Congress. Indeed, without regard to

our differing constitutional views on the use of force, I would ask for congressional support before introducing U.S. ground forces into Kosovo into a nonpermissive environment.

I think that says it all, and I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I want to support the statement of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) as well. I think today we have to stand up to provide the money for our troops that are in harm's way, and I want to congratulate the Members who have made such a tough decision in light of the popularity, the low popularity of ground troops going possibly into Kosovo.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The author of the amendment is a good friend of mine. I might even express some genuine appreciation for the sentiments that has prompted him to bring this amendment here. But it seems to me we have to keep a focus on what it is we are trying to do today.

I asked myself this question on so many occasions: What is this about? This bill is about funding our military.

Our colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services, people like the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. NORM SISISKY), people like the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. IKE SKELTON), people like the gentleman from California (Mr. DUNCAN HUNTER), and the distinguished chairman of the committee have been telling us for some time how seriously hollowed out is our defense readiness, what a strain it puts on the nerves and the lives of our brave young men and women in uniform, what a hazard it is seen by their families.

Many of us have heard testimony from wives of service people who have said, my husband is not safe. He is not properly trained. He does not have the equipment, the time to train properly for a mission.

I suppose we have all had a sense of the accuracy and the need for that, perhaps in the abstract, but this deployment, this deployment, I think, has made us all come to a sharp understanding of this.

We have moved aircraft carriers from other appointed positions where we thought they were needed to support this mission, and we have seen them move 400 sailors short. We see deployments of people who are exhausted from being away from their family. We see the sense of urgency and the fear for shortages of materials. We see the sense of deprivation by people stationed in other theaters where the concern and the danger and the threat is great and they feel themselves somewhat less prepared to meet with the threat that might emerge.

We have had our debates, and, quite frankly, good decent, honorable debates of different points of view regarding the question of should we be involved here, should we have this deployment, should we be engaged. We have discussed that. How did the decision get made and were we properly consulted. We have discussed that. We laid down a marker saying please do not escalate this involvement or change its definition or direction without coming back and consulting us. We have made that point.

Throughout all of those debates, we have always understood one very critical reason: If we are going to ask these people to serve, if we are going to have them out there, indeed as we see here in the Balkans, in harm's way, then we have a moral obligation to get them funded and get them funded now.

When the President sent up his request, we said it may be enough for this operation at this time but it is not enough to fulfill the overreaching need of a hollowed-out military where servicemen and women are beginning to worry and even, in fact, despair for shortages they face. So we said we must do more.

We were right. We were good to see that need and respond.

And now we have brought a bill, a bill the purpose of which is to fund the needs of our military for readiness now in this theater and in every other theater where this great Nation is committed to defending liberty and freedom.

What will happen to the urgency of that? Do we really believe that we must do this and do it now as a moral obligation of this body to the brave young men and women that serve? We should ask ourselves, what will be the consequence of passing this amendment here tonight? The consequence can be spoken of in one word and one word only: delay. It will not change whether or not the mission goes forward. It will not answer the question of some future redefinition of the mission. It will only delay the process.

We will say to these young men and women, yes, we know the urgency of your need; yes, we know the breadth of the need; yes, we know the depth of the need; yes, we know we must act now, but only within the context of this statement which says we know it must be done now, but later is okay, too.

No, I am afraid that we must understand our duty is broader than this statement made by this amendment. Our duty is more urgent. We must vote this amendment down. We must vote this money. We must get the men, materiels, preparation and readiness in the hands of these brave men and women.

I was there last weekend. I talked to a lot of these servicemen at all rank, and I will tell my colleagues something, they did not complain. They take their duty to this great land and they vow and commit to do their duty.

Let us tonight honor that. Let us say to each and every young man and woman in uniform on behalf of this Nation's commitment to freedom and dignity in the world that they have a right to understand that they will be equipped by this Congress now to perform whatever mission they accept with the highest possible degree of effectiveness and speed and at the highest possible degree of personal safety.

Any action that we take less than that tonight will be, in fact, an action that we will regret for a lifetime.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I have heard this debate. I have sat here for a few hours, and I can say that I understand the passion that has been expressed because I have a passion about this as well.

The Constitution of the United States says that only Congress has the war power. I think all of us have read the Founders. We have read Washington, who talks about that; we have read Madison, who talks about the power to declare war being vested in the legislature; we are familiar with Thomas Jefferson, who has spoke often about that in messages to Congress and in various letters.

This Congress has actually voted against the declaration of war. That has been stated today. Yet today Congress will pay for the continuation of an undeclared war. Congress voted against bombing, yet this vote will pay for future bombs. Congress has voted against sending ground troops. We have had the assurance of the White House that ground troops would not be sent without the President asking for it. Yet this vote would, in effect, pay for ground troops.

Now, I believe that we can best support our young men and women in uniform by not sending them off to advance a speculative ground war which cannot be imposed without massive loss of life. Perhaps this vote would support troops we have not sent, perhaps this vote would support bombs we have not dropped, perhaps this vote will support a war we have not declared, but I cannot support any of this because this Balkan war has become a rough beast of a catastrophe slouching towards Washington to be born.

We are being drawn along in the name of NATO, which is not accountable to this Congress and which has its own momentum.

Mr. Chairman, I offer for the RECORD this quote:

> By the ''self-momentum'' of a power or a system I mean the blind, unconscious, irresponsible, uncontrollable, and unchecked momentum that is no longer the work of people, but which drags people along with it and therefore manipulates them.

I want to thank Vaclav Havel for that quote in his book ''Disturbing the Peace''.

We cannot settle the conflict by military means, so why provide funds for

further war? It is time to turn to diplomatic means of ending the war. We need to remember the message which comes from the meeting in Vienna with Members of Congress and leaders of the Russian Duma, that peace is at hand if we are willing to pursue it with the same vigor which we would pursue war.

We have a plan to extricate ourselves, the Kosovar Albanians, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, all of Europe and the world. That plan involves the stopping of bombing, the withdrawal of the Serbian armed forces from Kosovo, the return of refugees to their homes under the protection of international peacekeeping troops, and the rebuilding of the homes of the people. All this can be accomplished and all of it must be accomplished without further escalation.

Let us keep thinking peace and talking peace and working for peace instead of spending our resources for the escalation of an undeclared war.

□ 1830

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Istook amendment and in support of this very important supplemental defense bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Emergency Defense Appropriations bill. Approving this measure sends a strong message to our men and women in uniform and to our adversaries around the globe that we are united in providing the resources necessary to ensure national readiness.

The bill also includes much-needed funding for a military force with serious readiness shortfalls. Our Armed Forces are being dispatched to more places around the world today than at any time in history. They are being asked to perform more missions with fewer personnel. This operations pace has produced a critical shortage of the spare parts, weapons, and support services necessary to be successful.

As a member of the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee, I have seen first-hand the poor condition of many of our military facilities in Europe. This bill contains money to make much-needed upgrades including combat communications, radar approach sites, crash and rescue stations, and other facilities where U.S. troops are stationed in support of this mission in Yugoslavia. These improvements will boost morale, as will funding for pay raises and benefits.

I was disappointed to hear members of the Democratic leadership last week accusing Republicans of partisanship in voting against a resolution supporting the air campaign in Yugoslavia. The fact is that 26 Democrats also opposed that resolution. We are told that somehow it was a matter of conscience for Democrats to vote ''no'' and a matter of politics for Republicans to do the same thing.

But last week's vote was on a sense of the Congress resolution with no force of law. The key vote on supporting the troops is on this Appropriations bill. This goes beyond the rhetoric to actually provide for the safety of our troops, and give them the equipment and material necessary to carry out their mission.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest it is some of my colleagues on the other side who are sending the wrong signals by opposing this measure. They seem to be willing to commit American troops to missions around the world, but they are reluctant to provide the resources to equip, train, and house them adequately.

Last week's votes in the House indicate Members of Congress in both parties have concerns about our policy in the Balkans. There should be no disagreement, however, on the strong level of support we show our Armed Forces while they are engaged in this operation. We want them to succeed. This funding is critical to their efforts.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to set aside the Yugoslavia policy debate and join in a bipartisan effort to ensure our military personnel have the resources necessary to perform the duties assigned to them.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had a conversation with one of my 700,000 constituents to whom I am accountable under the Constitution of the United States, and she said, ''Congressman, my three brothers and my husband fought in World War II. My two sons fought in Vietnam. What are you going to do to keep my grandsons from fighting in the war in Kosovo?''

And I told her, I said, ''Under the Constitution, Congress has two powers and the President has one. And the power that Congress has under the Constitution is to declare war and to provide the funds for war. And the power that the President has is to be the Commander in Chief.''

Now, we have had votes this past week, the so-called limitation votes, but I would submit to my colleagues that those votes do not mean anything. First of all, the Fowler amendment and the other votes that we took here at the end of April are not finding their way to the other body to be voted upon, so they will die.

So the only way to limit any type of use of the funds would be to occur through curtailing of our constitutional power of the purse. This is our obligation. We are called to this under the Constitution, and I have to follow the Constitution.

Now, if there were separate votes on increasing the pay for the military and for beefing up our military forces, I would vote for that. But I cannot vote in favor of $6 billion to bomb Kosovo, having just voted against the air strikes.

This is the only authority that we have. This is the only authority that the people that we represent have. And is it not interesting that the Founders of the Constitution gave to us, to us, the Members of this body, accountable to them every 2 years, the sole power to declare war. Because if they do not like what we do with regard to the declarations of war, they have the authority to vote us out at the very next election, the genius of the Constitution to protect the people against going into war.

And what are we doing? There are 900 planes involved in the air strikes. 600 are American planes. 300 more are on their way. And guess how many planes come from Tony Blair's United Kingdom? Just 20. Twenty aircraft.

And is NATO united? I dare say not. At a time when NATO planes were bombing the oil refineries, members of NATO themselves were still involved in the shipping of petroleum to Serbia. That does not make sense. It simply does not.

The Istook amendment simply says what the President has promised, that these funds cannot be used for ground war, period.

Now, we have heard talks from many Members here. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) talked about this war, this war, this war, this war. And he appropriately used that word. The problem is that this body has voted not to go to war, and yet today it is ready to spend the funds to go to war. Supporting the troops means something besides giving them the weapons of war, it is giving them the constitutional protection not to be put into the war if we follow our obligations under that great document.

Those of us who are opposed to this supplemental are simply saying, what obligation do we have as Members of Congress? What obligations do I owe this grandmother back home? What obligations do I owe the 115,000 children in the district that I represent? What obligations do I owe to the sons and daughters who may have to go into combat in that very rough terrain?

The obligation that I owe them is that if they go, I will be accountable to them on whether or not I should vote for war or not, and that is precisely what the Istook amendment says. It says if we are willing to commit this money, then it should be with the approval of Congress in a situation of war.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this supplemental, but I want to make some remarks relative to the amendment which is now before us. The truth is that because of long procurement cycles, essentially none of the money in the supplemental will ever have anything to do with support of this war. It just takes too long to build the equipment and get it there.

I am very strongly in support of this supplemental bill because it does two things that I want to do. I want to put back all of the resources that have been expended in this war which I do not think should ever have occurred and I do not think it should continue. I want to put back all of those resources that we have been denied through several years of underfunding our military.

I will tell my colleagues, I wish that this supplemental were a great deal larger than it was because our military needs far more money than this. I am

as much in support of our troops as anybody in this Congress, but please do not confuse support of the troops with support of use of the troops. Do not impugn to us who are going to support this amendment motives that we do not have.

I support the supplemental. I support the troops. I will not support this war. And I can support the troops without supporting the use of the troops. And I know that America understands. I hope that more Members of this body understand this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take a great deal of time. Let me just state, it was mentioned earlier about a vote that I took earlier and I just thought I would clear that issue up. Let me make it very clear.

During the Gulf War, when I was here, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) and myself spent considerable time at the White House trying to convince the White House to come here for a vote and to make sure that they sought Congressional approval.

Let me just say that, on that vote that was brought up by my good friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), it is 10 years later and I think I am 10 years wiser. I think I would have voted differently at that time.

Even then I knew it was important for the White House to come here and seek approval. Now, after thinking about it and seeing it and having experienced this body, I do believe that in a free society it is important for our power, the legislative branch, to express itself on such issues as this. I do not believe that is hypocrisy. I think that is learning. But even then I knew it was important for the President to come here.

I thought I would make that clear.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), and I support the passage of the final legislation before us.

But first I want to just say, I want to thank the distinguished majority leader for his very eloquent words here not so very long ago in opposition to the amendment. And then I want to make some comments about the earlier comments that have been made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) asked the question, ''Is it in our national interest to be in Kosovo?'' And I think, to use his words, that it certainly is in the national interest to be there because we are there as part of the NATO alliance, all 19 countries.

It is difficult to keep them together. That is part of the problem, why it is so difficult to keep a process and a strategy that many of us might disagree with. But all 19 are together and they are together at stopping a pathological killer from continuing what is this most odious kind of operation of ethnic cleansing that he has been involved with over an historical period, at least the last 10 years.

We heard the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who could have stood at the microphone and regaled us for 2 hours, 2 hours without stopping, with the incidents, one after the other. He gave some of the most graphic ones, but there are others, each as graphic, each as odious or more odious than the last, of the history of what Slobodan Milosevic had done in Croatia and then in Bosnia.

But we are talking about Kosovo and it is right there in Kosovo. He has now driven out three-quarters of a million of the citizens of Kosovo. His own Yugoslavian citizens he has driven out. He has been the cause of the burning of hundreds of Albanian ethnic villages where people in the middle of the night were told they must be out within 5 minutes or 10 minutes and then their villages were burned.

We could go through a whole series as long as the series in regard to Bosnia or in regard to Croatia, of the whole communities where every man, woman, and child was killed, everybody. We can find a considerable number of others where all the men were separated from the women and the children, and the men and boys from 15 and older, 16 and older, the men have not been seen again. The number that we will find when we get into Kosovo will surprise us all.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget then gave what I think almost everybody here would agree unanimously are the principles that we are there for, which are, as he put it, that there must be an international force that could provide security so that refugees could return to their homes, homes that they have lived in for in some cases several generations or hundreds of years, and to build democratic institutions in Kosovo.

I think we would almost all agree that those are principles that we ought to be for, and almost all of us could agree that those are important principles.

I would submit to my colleagues that the adoption of the Istook amendment tonight would make it considerably harder to achieve any one of those principles or all of them in their totality. It would make it much more difficult for NATO, the 19-member alliance in which we have a very strong interest, to achieve what we went there to do, which was to stop the ethnic cleansing, to stop that most odious action, which is rape and expulsion and intimidation and the killing of men, separation of families, the men from the women and children, the separation and the killing of the men. That is why we are there.

The adoption of the Istook amendment would make it much more difficult for us to achieve those ends, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 117, noes 301, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No 119]

AYES—117

Archer	Goodlatte	Peterson (MN)
Bachus	Goodling	Petri
Baker	Graham	Pitts
Baldwin	Gutknecht	Pombo
Barr	Hall (TX)	Ramstad
Bartlett	Hayworth	Rivers
Barton	Hefley	Rogan
Bass	Herger	Rohrabacher
Bilbray	Hill (MT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Hilleary	Royce
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Ryan (WI)
Brady (TX)	Hostettler	Salmon
Bryant	Hulshof	Sanders
Burton	Istook	Sanford
Campbell	Jackson (IL)	Scarborough
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Schaffer
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kasich	Serrano
Chenoweth	Kleczka	Sessions
Coble	Kucinich	Shadegg
Coburn	Largent	Shuster
Combest	Lee	Smith (MI)
Conyers	Linder	Smith (TX)
Cook	LoBiondo	Souder
Crane	Lucas (OK)	Stark
Cubin	Manzullo	Stump
Danner	McDermott	Sununu
DeFazio	McIntosh	Talent
DeLay	McKinney	Tancredo
DeMint	Metcalf	Tauzin
Doolittle	Miller, George	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	Mink	Thune
Ehlers	Moran (KS)	Towns
English	Myrick	Upton
Franks (NJ)	Ney	Wamp
Ganske	Norwood	Watkins
Gekas	Ose	Weldon (FL)
Gibbons	Paul	Weldon (PA)
Goode	Pease	Young (AK)

NOES—301

Abercrombie	Camp	Edwards
Ackerman	Capps	Ehrlich
Aderholt	Capuano	Emerson
Allen	Cardin	Engel
Andrews	Carson	Eshoo
Armey	Castle	Etheridge
Baird	Chambliss	Evans
Baldacci	Clay	Everett
Ballenger	Clayton	Ewing
Barcia	Clement	Farr
Barrett (NE)	Clyburn	Fattah
Barrett (WI)	Collins	Filner
Bateman	Condit	Fletcher
Becerra	Costello	Foley
Bentsen	Coyne	Forbes
Berkley	Cramer	Ford
Berry	Crowley	Fossella
Biggert	Cummings	Fowler
Bishop	Cunningham	Frank (MA)
Blagojevich	Davis (FL)	Frelinghuysen
Blumenauer	Davis (IL)	Frost
Blunt	Davis (VA)	Gallegly
Boehlert	Deal	Gejdenson
Boehner	DeGette	Gephardt
Bonior	Delahunt	Gilchrest
Bono	DeLauro	Gillmor
Borski	Deutsch	Gilman
Boswell	Diaz-Balart	Gonzalez
Boucher	Dickey	Gordon
Boyd	Dicks	Goss
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Granger
Brown (FL)	Dixon	Green (WI)
Brown (OH)	Doggett	Gutierrez
Burr	Dooley	Hall (OH)
Buyer	Doyle	Hansen
Callahan	Dreier	Hastert
Calvert	Dunn	Hastings (FL)

Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thurman
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Bereuter
Berman
Bliley
Brown (CA)
Cooksey
Cox
Green (TX)
Greenwood
King (NY)
Kuykendall
Lewis (GA)
McNulty
Packard
Slaughter
Tiahrt
Wynn

□ 1903

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I was unable to cast a vote on the Istook amendment to H.R. 1664 due to a family emergency. However, had I been present I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) assumed the Chair.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

KOSOVO AND SOUTHWEST ASIA EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARR OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Farr of California:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. . (a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE PAYMENTS.—Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements to make payments for the settlement of the claims arising from the deaths caused by the accident involving a United States Air Force CT–43 aircraft on April 3, 1996, near Dubrovnik, Croatia.

(b) DEADLINE FOR EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall make the decision to exercise the authority under subsection (a) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SOURCE OF PAYMENTS.—Amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of the Air Force for operation and maintenance for fiscal year 1999 or other unexpended balances for prior years shall be available for payments under subsection (a).

(d) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The amount of the payment under this section in settlement of the claims arising from the death of any person associated with the accident described in subsection (a) may not exceed $2,000,000.

(e) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—Any amount paid to a person under this section is intended to supplement any amount subsequently determined to be payable to the person under section 127 or chapter 163 of title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law for administrative settlement of claims against the United States with respect to damages arising from the accident described in subsection (a).

(f) CONSTRUCTION.—The payment of an amount under this section may not be considered to constitute a statement of legal liability on the part of the United States or otherwise as evidence of any material fact in any judicial proceeding or investigation arising from the accident described in subsection (a).

Mr. FARR of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD..

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman's right, the right to object, but this bill that we are dealing with, the underlying bill, is a spending bill, an emergency spending bill, and we have a legal emergency that has to be taken care of. They are the families of our constituents who were killed on a United States mission on a United States aircraft while approaching Dubrovnik Airport.

The families of the Ron Brown Trade Mission have no place to turn. They cannot use tort law as a remedy, they cannot use the Foreign Claims Act as a remedy, they cannot have any other redress because they were flying on a military aircraft. The Senate has used this supplemental bill on their side to pay for the families affected by the gondola accident at Cavalese, Italy. If the Senate can help the families who lost their loved ones in an accident caused by an U.S. Marine Corps aircraft, then the families of the Ron Brown crash should also have remedy.

Mr. Chairman, the only way they can have remedy is for this Congress to authorize the Department of Defense to help those families, and that is what this amendment does.

Mr. Chairman, I introduced this amendment for a very simple reason: justice.

The bill in an "emergency appropriation." We have legal problem that can only be solved by Congress. I think that qualifies as an "emergency."

The problem is that all the families of the civilians who lost their lives on a U.S. Air Force plane on the mountain side while approaching the Dubrovnik airport in foul weather, have no legal place to turn.

They can't use tort law nor the foreign claims act nor other redress—nor does the military have the authority to help the families.

The crash occurred on a "military aircraft" that was not properly equipped with standard navigational and safety equipment.

Flight protocols had been violated!

The Dubrovnik airport map was incorrectly drawn!

If any of these factors had changed, the 35 people aboard flight CT–43 would not have died.

The Air Force's own Accident Investigation Board Report plainly states: (quote) "the CT–43 accident was caused by a failure of command, aircrew error, and an improperly designed instrument approach procedure." (Unquote)

Since the crash, the families have been dismissed by the U.S. Government because the government generally lacks the authority to give restitution for the families' loss.

This amendment fixes that. It gives the DOD the authority to enter into settlements with the families who had victims on CT–43 if the DOD finds their claims worthwhile.

This House should also note that the in Senate version of the supplemental bill is language very similar to mine. In the Senate bill money is set aside to pay the families affected by the Calavesee gondola accident. It seems to me that if we can consider giving Europeans families who lost loved ones in the gondola accident—caused by a U.S. Marine Corps flyer—restitution for their pain, then we can give equal consideration to American families similar treatment.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following for the RECORD:

FAMILIES OF THE CT–43

We the undersigned are family members of the citizens of the United States who were killed on USAF CT–43 on April 3, 1996, near Dubrovnik, Croatia. They died while engaged in a journey for peace and restoration of the war ravaged countries of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia. No citizen of the United States should lose his or her Constitutional rights to seek justice simply by virtue of being a public servant, traveling abroad on US government business, or traveling aboard US government vehicles or on US government property. The United States government employer should not be exempt from its own principles of justice as law maker.

No one on that plane would have been so cavalier or reckless with their lives or family responsibilities to have knowingly boarded a plane that USAFE (United States Air Force European) had given direct orders not to fly, into an airport USAFE had ordered Air Force personnel not to land in by instrumentation, flown by a flight crew USAFE had ordered not to fly without theater specific training, using erroneous missed approach plans USAFE had declared were not approved. Nor would any government employees have stepped on a government plane knowing that in the event of injury or death resulting from acknowledged gross negligence by Air Force personnel they or their families would have no standing before any court of law in the United States, criminal, civil, or military, and therefore no means of redress or compensation. Nor would they have flown knowing that in the event of a crash by a military plane or foreign soil their insurance might be canceled (some were), or that individuals in the private as well as public sector would have no guaranteed basis for claim under any United States statute.

(Signatories to the Families of the CT–43 letter)

Sheila Christian, Darrell Darling, Karen Darling, Kelvin Farrington, Douglas Farrington, Ina Ray Farrington, James Warbasse, Kenneth Dobert, Maureen Dobert, Patricia Conrad, Nora Poling, Edward Kaminski, Michael Kellogg, Char Kellogg, Mary Schelle, Alicia Branley, Paul Cushman, Jr., Paulette Cushman, Donna Shafer, Phil Shafer, Marilyn Pieroni, Deborah Davis, Nettie Jackson, Jane Hoffman Davenport, Emma Williams, Dona Hamilton, Charles Hamilton, Jean Whittaker, Susan Elia, Deirdre English, Leonard Pieroni III.

May 5, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESS MEMBER SAM FARR:

Thank you for your tireless efforts to seek corrections and compensation for the causes of the unnecessary loss of 35 brilliant lives on April 3, 1996, including our own bright son, Adam.

We are the families of those men and women who died on April 3, three years ago in Croatia on a mission of peace through trade. The President in his memorial remarks said, ''They are all patriots.'' Their mission was that of beginning to help rebuild the infrastructure and the economic underpinnings of a land decimated by war. They were entirely willing to take eyes-open personal risks which are concomitant with any travel and work in areas of hostility and violent conflict.

They were not prepared for nor informed of the risks, of flying aboard United States governmental aircraft. Quoting USAF Brig. Gen. Charles H. Coolidge, Jr., President of the CT–43 Accident Investigation Board: ''The CT–43 accident was caused by a failure of command, aircrew error, and an improperly designed instrument approach procedure'' (p. 65, ¶3, Causes, April 3, 1996 Accident Report).

The risks unknown to anyone aboard the CT–43 were:

Flying illegally with a flawed missed-approach map which showed St. John's Mountain to be 200 feet lower than it actually was. They struck the mountain 70 feet below the summit.

Flying into an airport (considered by many commercial pilots to be one of the three most notoriously dangerous airports in the world) which had not been previously inspected and approved by US Air Force inspection personnel. An inspection would have disclosed that the missed-approach beacon was inadequate, the map was inaccurate, the flight control system had been sabotaged, the winds are violently capricious.

Flying into one of the 30–40 airports previously behind the Iron Curtain into which USAF European command had ordered no USAF crew may fly without first taking training flights into those specific airports, April 3, 1996, the CT–43 was the very first flight of any US military aircraft into Dubrovnik.

Flying into bad weather with extremely low visibility requiring instrument approach, in direct violation of specific USAF orders to fly into the Dubrovnik (Cilipi) airport only under visual landing conditions, without the assistance of instrumentation. The flight crew could not see the mountain in front of them through the clouds until the instant they struck it.

Flying an aircraft into an airport equipped with no guidance instrumentation except two non-directional beacons for which two radio receivers are required on board the aircraft. It is illegal and a violation of USAF regulations to switch from one radio frequency to another. The plane was equipped with only one radio with which to remain on course. In fact, the operable navigation system of the CT–43 was inferior to that of the Enola Gay, 50 years ago. The Air Force would not have been able to rent its own CT–43 as a charter because it did not meet minimum navigation and safety standards.

Flying a Boeing 737 which was old, known to veer off course erratically, without a black box, carrying a crash locator with a depleted battery and innumerable other flaws. When questioned why the CT–43 flew a straight line nine degrees to the left off course, the head of the investigating team simply said, ''We cannot figure out why these two capable, experienced pilots would do that.'' The report provides no further in-depth analysis of possible equipment failure approaching the thorough reconstruction of the TWA 800 and other similar crashes. The pilot who flew the CT–43 to Europe before the Department of Commerce trade mission reported that the plane was drifting to the left. According to the 7,000-page investigation report that pilot was never called to testify.

General William E. Stevens appealed for a waiver of all the above flight restrictions November, 1995. In January 1996 USAF European Command denied General Stevens' appeal. General Stevens continued to order flights in direct violation to direct commands. In March he ordered the flight of First Lady Hillary Clinton on the same CT–43 over the same terrain. He got lucky. On April 3, General Stevens' luck ran out and 35 people died as a direct result of his disobedience and disregard for the most basic safety. On April 4, early in the morning General Stevens ordered all such disobedient missions cease. Today General Stevens is at the Pentagon without a single day's loss of pay, demotion, or loss of benefits. Our family members are dead.

For the last year and a half the families of CT–43 victims have consistently worked together to:

Provide for legislation which would begin to close the gap between death benefits from commercial aircraft crashes, and the private sector compensation ranging from $3 million to $16 million to CT–43 private sector families, and the paltry $10,000 value the US government places on the lives of its own single employees, even in instances of gross negligence.

Advocate for regulations in the Administrative Departments which ensure all passenger-carrying government aircraft without exception meet FAA safety equipment and procedure standards and in event of a crash are investigated under NTSB or comparable independent jurisdiction.

Provide every civilian and employee traveling aboard government aircraft with a clear and unambiguous statement of disclosure that until corrections 1 and 2 above are fully implemented, government aircraft may not meet FAA standards of safety, life insurance may be made null and void, any death benefits which families receive in the event of death will be limited to a maximum of $10,000 for government employees without dependents, their families, will have no standing in any US court of law, and no legal redress.

If the US Government does not conform to the standards and ensure the rights and benefits which that same government requires every commercial airline to provide, and if the government makes itself immune from a citizen's rights of redress regardless of how egregiously or grossly negligent its agencies may be, at least the government of the people has the moral obligation to warn its citizens of potential harm.

A patriot is one who values the well-being of the nation and fellow citizens above his or her own life or well-being. It is a very small thing to ask of these patriots' representatives that they protect their own lives, the lives of their employees, and the lives of others who serve the country. Enough lives have been lost without their foreknowledge. Now that we know the potential loss, it is unconscionable that we would not act to eliminate future deaths and that restitution for prior gross negligence would not be made.

Sincerely,

DARRELL AND KAREN DARLING,
Parents of Adam Noel Darling For the Families of the CT–43.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the committee

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the amendment. It proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill. Therefore it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the amendment, but I urge all the people in this room who have the responsibility for finding a remedy when there is no other remedy to seek redress wherever we may be able to possibly to do it. I appreciate the time allowed.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROHRABACHER:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 503. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be available for the use of United States Armed Forces in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, this debate has been spirited, it has been heartfelt, and let me say that I appreciate the sincerity as well as the hard work that has gone into this, but the sincerity on both sides of this issue, and one note of which I am just a little bit upset about, and I will just state it for the record:

I think it is disconcerting to me that today this body is being forced to vote on two separate issues, and I am not just condemning the President, but I am also going to put this on the House leadership, which is Republican. When we are talking about issues of life and death, of peace and war, we should not be linking together two separate issues. This is not right.

Mr. Chairman, the American people deserve an accountability, deserve us to vote up and down on whether or not we should improve the readiness of our troops without having to know that we are being forced to vote on it because, if we do not, that we will not have some other issue come through, and this is whether we vote for war in the Balkans or whether we vote for readiness. These are two different issues.

So I am a little upset about that, and I think the American people deserve better.

Finally let me just say about this debate, because this is the last time I am going to have a chance to talk on this, and I will make it very brief: We are debating something that goes far beyond micromanaging. Mr. Chairman, we should recognize what this debate is really about, and it is not micromanaging our troops. What we are debating is far from that. It is just the opposite.

In fact, what we are debating is the biggest issue of all. It is what the strategy should be for the United States of America in the post-Cold War world. Are we going to have the same kind of involvement?

Now we postured, there was a lot of posturing going on last week in those votes. But it is these votes today that really determine where we are at, where Congress is at. If we continue to carry the burden of Europe, if we continue to be the policemen of the world as we were during the Cold War, if we permit the President to continue having and exercising these expanded powers that we gave him during the Cold War, our country will not be a safer place, and we will put our troops in jeopardy because we cannot afford to carry that burden anymore.

So while I would like to present my amendment, I recognize that those people who voted against the Istook amendment would not be voting for my amendment because it actually goes a step further, but I ask the people in voting on the final vote today to consider that we are not just voting for the Balkan war and to upgrade our readiness in other parts of the world, but we are also voting on what our policies are going to be, whether or not we are going to have this expanded role in the world anymore, which I do not believe the United States can afford to do.

So, with that said, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is withdrawn.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this to try to avoid having to take a lot of time on a recommittal motion, and let me say this about final passage of this bill:

I have frankly gotten whiplash from watching the majority party reverse its position on military action in Yugoslavia during the past week.

□ 1915

First we had a vote to withdraw troops, and they voted 127 to 92 in favor. Then on the Gejdenson amendment, the one originally offered in the Senate by Senators MCCAIN and WARNER to support current policy in Yugoslavia, namely the air war, they voted 31 to 187 against. Of the 97 Republicans who voted against the withdrawal, 62 voted against the air war.

They then voted for a resolution restricting the use of ground troops 203 to 16, but that was last week. Now, we have had the Istook amendment on this bill, which tried to make real last week's restriction on ground troops, and the same leadership which lobbied their Members to restrict the use of ground troops last week lobbied them against a restriction on ground troops this week. This time they voted against the restriction 116 to 97. A total of 101 reversed their vote from a week earlier.

Now, finally, undoubtedly they will vote overwhelmingly for final passage of an appropriation that more than doubles the amount of money requested by the President for the war which they voted against last week.

I respect every individual decision made in this House. I simply want to express the hope that the conference will produce a more consistent product, a more disciplined product, and a product that more effectively and accurately does reflect the true costs of the operation that we are now engaged in.

I would ask each and every Member of this House on final passage to disregard the desires of either party leadership and simply vote their consciences.

I will intend to vote no. I vote no not because I do not believe we ought to be involved in Yugoslavia. I do, and I passionately support the efforts there and the efforts of our troops. I simply believe that this bill is one that has engaged in excess. I do not want to prolong the debate by offering a motion to recommit, which could take more time, but I wanted to say that now so that we can put in some perspective what the final vote will represent in the context of what has happened in this House the last 2 weeks.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

At the end (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 502. Such funds borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund Surplus to finance this Act shall be repaid.

Whenever there is an on-budget surplus for a fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to use such funds to retire public debt until $12,947,495,000 of such debt is retired.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I also reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I know my colleagues are restless. I will try to make this brief. I have been waiting 9 hours to talk about a point that I think is very important.

The motion, the amendment, says that since we are borrowing this money, since we are taking the surplus from the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for this bill, that this amendment says that when there is an on-budget surplus, we should use that money and put it in the same kind of lockbox that we passed in the budget resolution that would go to pay down the debt.

I just plead with my colleagues that something as important as this kind of funding for our military, does it not justify increasing taxes to pay for it, or cutting other government spending to pay for it, instead of just increasing borrowing that our kids and our grandkids are going to have to pay back?

Listen to this: For almost every year out of the last 40 years, we have used the Social Security Trust Fund surplus for government spending. This year, in a historic vote, this Chamber voted a budget resolution that says starting next year we are not going to do that

anymore. We are going to, starting next year, not use any of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus for government spending, and it is going to be put in this so-called lockbox. In effect, it is going to go to pay down the public debt, until it can be used for a solid Social Security.

It just seems so reasonable not to continue to increase the debt subject to the debt limit that somebody else is going to have to pay back sometime.

Let us make a decision of priorities. Let us make a decision if spending of the government is important enough to increase taxes, let us take that question to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, this supplemental appropriations bill will result in additional government spending out of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus. That's not right and it shortchanges current and future retirees.

This amendment creates a ''lockbox-type'' mechanism to repay the money that this supplemental appropriation will require us to borrow from Social Security.

The amendment captures the first $12.9 billion in non-Social Security surpluses that come into the Treasury. The amendment then directs the Secretary of the Treasury to use that money to retire public debt.

This is the same thing done by the ''Social Security lockbox'' legislation.

This amendment allows us to support our military while being fiscally responsible and protecting Social Security for future generations.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is withdrawn.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read the last two lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Kosovo and Southwest Asia Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999''.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, 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. 1664) making emergency supplemental appropriations for military operations, refugee relief, and humanitarian assistance relating to the conflict in Kosovo, and for military operations in Southwest Asia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 159, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 passage of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 311, nays 105, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—311

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Scott
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—105

Archer
Baird
Baldwin
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capuano
Carson
Chabot
Clayton
Coble
Conyers
Cook
Coyne
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Doggett
Duncan
Ehlers
Eshoo
Ewing
Frank (MA)
Ganske
Goode
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hill (IN)
Hooley
Hulshof
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaHood
Largent
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Lofgren
Luther
Manzullo
Markey
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Myrick
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Owens
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Portman
Rahall
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shuster
Souder
Stark
Stupak
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—18

Bereuter
Berman
Bliley
Brown (CA)
Clay
Cooksey
Cox
Green (TX)
Greenwood
King (NY)
Kuykendall
Lewis (GA)
McNulty
Northup
Packard
Slaughter
Tiahrt
Wynn

□ 1940

Ms. CARSON changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on final passage of H.R. 1664 due to a family emergency. However, had I been present I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, because of the prior commitment of my daughter's wedding in Houston, I was not present for

the final vote on H.R. 1664, the Kosovo Supplemental bill. If I had been present, I would have voted yes on final passage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on H. Res. 159 because I was attending my son's college graduation. However, had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on the Coburn-Toomey-Sanford amendment because I was attending my son's college graduation. However, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on the Obey substitute amendment because I was attending my con's college graduation. However, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on the Istook amendment because I was attending my son's college graduation. However, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on final passage of H.R. 1664, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill, because I was attending my son's college graduation. However, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 116, 117, 118, 119, and 120.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' or ''aye'' on rollcall votes 118 and 120 and ''no'' or ''nay'' on rollcall votes 116, 117, and 119.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 984

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 984.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING LIMITATIONS ON AND PROCEDURES FOR FILING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 775, YEAR 2000 READINESS AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at 3 o'clock this afternoon a Dear Colleague letter was sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of May 10 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 775, the Year 2000 Readiness and Responsibility Act.

The Committee on the Judiciary ordered H.R. 775 reported on Tuesday, May 4, and is expected to file its committee report on Friday, May 7. Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules up in H–312 of the Capitol by 3 p.m. on Monday, May 10; and let me repeat that, by Monday, 3 p.m.

Amendments should be drafted to the amendment in the nature of a substitute ordered reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. Copies of this amendment may be obtained from the Committee on the Judiciary. It is also expected to be posted on their web site.

Members should also use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted, and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 979

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as cosponsor of H.R. 979. My name was inadvertently added to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, MAY 7, 1999 TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1555, THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence have until midnight, May 7, 1999, to file its report on the bill, H.R. 1555.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING FILING OF H.R. 1555, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000, AND AVAILABILITY TO MEMBERS OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE AUTHORIZATIONS IN CLASSIFIED ANNEX

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to all Members of the House that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence ordered the bill, H.R. 1555, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, reported favorably to the House. That report will be filed tomorrow, Friday, May 7, under the unanimous consent just agreed to.

I would also like to announce that the classified schedule authorizations in the classified annex that accompanies H.R. 1555 will be available for review by Members at the offices of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, which is room H–405 of the Capitol, beginning any time after the bill is filed.

The committee office will be open during regular business hours for the convenience of any Member who wishes to review this material prior to its consideration by the House.

I anticipate that H.R. 1555 will be considered on the floor probably next week, but no sooner than Thursday, I am advised, and possibly later than that.

□ 1945

I would recommend that Members wishing to review the Classified Annex contact the committee's Director of Security and Registry to arrange a time and date for that viewing. The number is on everybody's telephone chart. This will assure the availability of committee staff to assist Members who desire that assistance during their review of these classified materials. I urge Members to take some time to review these classified documents before the bill is brought to the floor, if they have an interest, in order to better understand the recommendations of the committee.

The Classified Annex to the committee's report contains the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's recommendations on the intelligence budget for fiscal year 2000 and related classified information that cannot be disclosed publicly. There are procedures.

It is important that Members keep in mind the requirements of Rule 24 of the House, clause 13. That rule only permits access to classified information by those Members of the House who have signed the oath set out in Rule 24.

I would advise Members wishing to review the Classified Annex and its Classified Schedule of Authorizations that they must bring with them a copy of the Rule 24 oath signed by them when they come to the committee office to review that material. If they do not have a copy of the oath or cannot get one and wish to review the Classified Annex, the committee staff can administer the oath and see to it that it is executed in proper form and sent to the Clerk's office. We are happy to provide that service.

Additionally, the committee will require that Members execute an acknowledgment form indicating that they have been granted access to the Classified Annex and Classified Schedule of Authorizations and that they are familiar with both the Rules of the House and the committee with respect to the classified nature of information contained in the Classified Annex and the limitations on disclosure of that information.

That is a standard operating procedure for our committee. Nothing unusual. And we urge all who are interested to come to the committee and take a look at the material.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman from New York about next week's schedule.

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

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded legislative business for the week. There will be no votes tomorrow, Friday, May 7.

The House will next meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, May 10, for a pro forma session. Of course, there will be no legislative business and no votes on that day.

On Tuesday, May 11, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

We will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to all Members' offices. Members should note that we expect votes after 6 p.m. on Tuesday, May 11.

On Wednesday, May 12, and the balance of the week, the House will take up H.R. 775, the Year 2000 Readiness and Responsibility Act; and H.R. 1555, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000; and we expect the conference report for the supplemental appropriations bill.

On Wednesday, May 12, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. and recess immediately for the annual meeting of the Association of Former Members of Congress. The House will reconvene for legislative business at approximately 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 13.

And on Friday, May 14, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

Mr. Speaker, we hope to conclude legislative business by 2 p.m. on Friday, May 14, and I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I have several questions for the gentleman.

First, will we definitely be here voting next Friday, in view of the rather light work schedule that the gentleman has just announced?

Mr. LAZIO. If the gentleman from Texas will further yield, I would say it appears as though, if we can move quickly through the week, if we have the conference report on the supplemental available to us by Thursday, it would be more likely than not that we would not have to be in on Friday. But that will depend on the work of the conference and whether we have that supplemental conference report available to the House by that time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman one other question. During the last several weeks we have been here fairly late at night on a regular basis. I would ask the gentleman whether he expects any late-night sessions next week.

Mr. LAZIO. Again, we do not expect any extraordinarily late nights for next week. Again, assuming that we can move through our legislative business as expected, we are not expecting to have any very late nights.

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

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield for a question, I do not believe that I heard that we would have the campaign finance reform legislation next week, or did I miss that? And if not, I would ask, it seems it is a very light week, it will be the second or third 3-day week that we have had in 2 or 3 weeks, and I was wondering when we might expect to have the campaign finance reform bill slipped into this rather busy agenda?

Mr. LAZIO. If the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) will further yield, the gentleman may recall and be cognizant of the fact that the Speaker of the House has announced and has committed himself to the fact that we will have campaign finance reform on the floor sometime by the end of September.

The gentleman from Illinois, the Speaker, is a man of his word. I have every confidence that that will happen, that this House will consider campaign finance reform in a prompt and expeditious way before the end of September.

Mr. STENHOLM. I would concur with everything that the gentleman said about the Speaker. There are about 191 Democrats and about 60 on the Republican side that I think would like to see it considered a little earlier, and I would respectfully ask that we take a look at the scheduling and see if we cannot find a way to bring it up a little bit before September.

Mr. LAZIO. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas. I know that the Speaker is trying to be sensitive to all the concerns of the Members but is very anxious to complete the business of the House, particularly the appropriations work that will see us through the summer. I think if it is at all possible for there to be a reconsideration of that date, that he will probably seize the opportunity.

He is committed to having campaign finance reform considered in this House by the end of September, and there is no doubt in my mind that this body will be acting far earlier than the body down the hall.

Mr. STENHOLM. The gentleman said one other thing that prompts me to again just observe that it is precisely because we are going to have a rather ambitious appropriations schedule, and as we have seen today with the debate and all of the rhetoric that has gone on, I think it is a fairly good prophecy that we are not going to have a very smooth appropriations schedule and cycling this year, that therefore it would seem to me it would be prudent for us to move the campaign finance reform before we get into what obviously we are going to be getting into.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LAZIO. Let me note as well that we are confident and the Speaker is confident that we will have several appropriations bills available to the House for a vote before Memorial Day break. That is well in front of schedule, and it is something I think the Speaker is committed to doing, to ensuring that we consider our appropriations bills earlier and get our work done earlier.

Hopefully, that will allow us the time both to consider campaign finance reform and to have a less contentious situation over the next few months. But the gentleman can rest assured the Speaker's word is good, that he is committed to a full hearing of campaign finance reform. It will be on the House floor, and it will be voted on.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 10, 1999

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 11, 1999

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, May 10, 1999, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 11, 1999, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1999

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, May 12, 1999, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, May 13, 1999, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 12, 1999, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday May 13, 1999, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain one-minute speeches.

SUPPORT A DIPLOMATIC END TO CONFLICT IN KOSOVO

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, there are those who would say that involvement by Congress or private citizens in U.S. foreign diplomacy in the Balkans is not necessary and we can only complicate matters.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, we do not have to look very far to see these naysayers could not be farther from the truth. They could not be farther out of touch with America's wishes for peace and the quick and safe return of our military men and women.

We need only to look at the Reverend Jesse Jackson and his very successful campaign to free our U.S. POWs, and we need only to look no farther than this House, where numerous delegations, bipartisan delegations, have traveled great distances to observe firsthand U.S. military involvement in the dire refugee situation in the Kosovo region.

I commend and salute my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, and the leadership of both parties for supporting our effort to build a better understanding and working relationship with our counterparts in the Russian Duma. This information gathered by these bipartisan delegations provides all of us with a clear picture on how we can better do our job representing the American people on global issues.

CLINTON LEGACY WILL BE BALKANS WAR

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton says he is going to continue the bombing in Yugoslavia, and some people are beginning to ask what the Clinton legacy will be. Some say scandal and impeachment. I do not think so. I think it will be the war in the Balkans.

Mr. Speaker, when NATO began bombing Yugoslavia it led the way to billions and billions of dollars that will be spent on this war. Will we be expected to rebuild all that we destroy in Yugoslavia, as some have suggested?

To rebuild all that we have destroyed could cost hundreds of billions of dollars, power plants, airports, factories, bridges, oil refineries, infrastructure. The cost would be staggering. And where would the money come from if we have to pay it? That is right, Social Security, Medicare, our schools, and our roads. Our budget needs.

This administration is digging a deep hole with the war in the Balkans that is going to last for many years after President Clinton has left office. That may be the Clinton legacy.

CLINTON ACTIONS HAVE TURNED RUSSIA AGAINST AMERICA

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, earlier today we had a member of the Russian Duma who held a press conference in this building; and he said something that is very insightful. He said that for years and years and decades and decades the Soviet Communist party has spent billions of dollars to convince the Russian people that America should be the enemy, and it did not work in spite of all the effort of the Communist party. He went on to say that in 45 days President Clinton has done what the Soviet Communist party could not do, he has turned the Russian people against America.

Our embassy now tells Americans to not speak in English when they walk the streets. The Russians have cut off all contact with America. In 45 days this President has done what the Soviet Communist party could not do with billions of dollars in 70 years. Is this the kind of activity, is the continuation of this insane and reckless policy worth driving Russia into the hands of the ultranationalists and the Communists? I say no.

REPORT ON TELECOMMUNICATIONS PAYMENTS MADE TO CUBA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 106–59)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6), as amended by section 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, Public Law 104–114, 110 Stat. 785, I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on telecommunications payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury specific licenses.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 6, 1999.*

ANNUAL REPORT ON STATE OF SMALL BUSINESS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Small Business:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to present my fifth annual report on the state of small business. In 1996, the year covered by this report, more than 23.2 million small business tax returns were filed. A record 842,000 new small employers opened their doors and new incorporations hit a record high for the third straight year. Corporate profits, employment compensation, and proprietorship earnings all increased significantly. Industries dominated by small firms created an estimated 64 percent of the 2.5 million new jobs.

Small businesses represent the individual economic efforts of our Nation's citizens. They are the foundation of the Nation's economic growth: virtually all of the new jobs, 53 percent of employment, 51 percent of private sector output, and a disproportionate share of innovations come from small firms. Small businesses are avenues of opportunity for women and minorities, first employers and trainers of the young, important employers of elderly workers, and those formerly on public assistance. The freedom of America's small businesses to experiment, create, and expand makes them powerhouses in our economic system.

An Unprecedented Record of Success

Looking back to the 1986 White House Conference on Small Business, one of the top priorities on the small business agenda was deficit reduction. Small business capital formation efforts had been undermined by interest rates driven sky-high by the demand for funds to service the growing national debt. Today I'm proud to say we've done what was thought nearly impossible then. This year we have converted the deficit to a surplus—and the budget deficit is no longer the issue it once was.

And my Administration is committed to continuing the dramatic growth of the small business sector. We continue to pay close attention to the perspectives and recommendations of America's small business owners. The 1995 White House Conference on Small Business sent a list of 60 recommendations to my Administration and the Congress—the result of a year-long series of conferences and a national meeting on the concerns of small firms. In their 1995 recommendations, the small business delegates told us they need less onerous regulation, estate tax relief for family-owned businesses, and still more access to capital to start and expand their businesses.

On each of these fronts, and on many others, impressive steps have been taken. I have signed 11 new laws that address many of the delegates' concerns. In fact, meaningful action has been taken on fully 86 percent of the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business recommendations.

Easing the Tax Burden

The Taxpayer Relief Act, which I signed in 1997, includes wins for small businesses and the American economy in the form of landmark tax reform legislation. The law will provide an estimated $20 billion in tax relief to small business over the next 10 years. It extends for three years the exclusion from taxable income of money spent by an employer on education for an employee. The unified gift and estate tax credit will increase the amount excluded from taxation on a transferred estate to $1.3 million for small family-owned businesses.

The new law expands the definition of a home office for the purpose of deducting expenses to include any home office that is the business' sole office and used regularly for essential administrative or management activities.

And capital gains taxes are reduced from 28 percent to 20 percent. This will help small businesses by encouraging investments in businesses that reinvest for growth rather than investments in companies that pay heavy dividends. The law also improves the targeted capital gains provisions relating specifically to small business stocks. Moreover, small corporations are exempted under the new law from alternative minimum tax calculations. This provision saves about 2 million businesses from complex and unnecessary paperwork.

Capital for Small Business Growth

One of the Small Business Administration's (SBA) highest priorities is to increase small business access to capital and transform the SBA into a 21st century leading-edge financial institution. The SBA's credit programs—including the 7(a) business loan guarantee program, the Section 504 economic development loan program, the microloan program, the small business investment company program, the disaster loan and surety bond programs—provide valuable and varied financial assistance to small businesses of all types. The Small Business Lending Enhancement Act of 1995 increased the availability of funds for SBA's lending programs. In the 7(a) program in fiscal year 1997 alone, with approximately 8,000 bank and nonbank lenders approved to participate, 45,288 loan guarantees valued at $9.5 billion were approved as of September 1997.

My Administration developed community reinvestment initiatives that revised bank regulatory policies to encourage lending to smaller firms. When combined with lower interest rates, this led to a sizable increase in commercial and industrial lending, particularly to small businesses. And in the first year of implementation under the Community Reinvestment Credit Act, new data were collected on small business loans by commercial banks. The SBA's Office of Advocacy has been studying and publishing its results on the small business lending activities of the Nation's banks.

And the Office of Advocacy launched a nationwide Internet-based listing service—the Angel Capital Electronic Network (ACE-Net) to encourage equity investment in small firms. ACE-Net provides information to angel investors on small dynamic businesses seeking $250,000 to $3 million in equity financing.

Reforming the Regulatory Process

The Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA), fully implemented in 1997, gives small businesses a stronger voice where it's needed—early in the Federal regulatory development process. The law provides for regulatory compliance assistance from every Federal agency and legal remedies where agencies have failed to address small business concerns in the rulemaking process.

The new process is working. Agencies and businesses are working in partnership to ensure that small business input is a part of the rulemaking process. In the summer of 1997, for example, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, in conjunction with the SBA's Office of Advocacy, convened four regional meetings with small firms to discuss a safety and health program under development.

Small firms are also witnessing more agency compliance assistance once regulations are in effect. Agencies are routinely providing compliance guides and lists of telephone numbers and e-mail addresses for small business assistance.

And the law provides for a national ombudsman and 10 regional regulatory fairness boards to make it simple for small businesses to share their ideas, experiences, and concerns about the regulatory enforcement environment. The ombudsman and boards are addressing many concerns expressed by small firms in dealing with regulating agencies.

Expanding Technology and Innovation

Initiatives like the Small Business Innovation Research Program, the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology's Manufacturing Extension Partnership and Advanced Technology Program were put in place in the 1980s to channel more Federal funding to small business research and to help small businesses move ideas from the drawing board to the marketplace. Clearly, progress has been made; much remains to be done. New Internet-based initiatives like the Access to Capital Electronic Network and the U.S. Business Advisor are designed to help many more small businesses make the connections they need to commercialize their innovative technologies.

Enhancing International Trade and Federal Procurement Opportunities

During my Administration, our Nation has led the way in opening new markets, with 240 trade agreements that remove foreign barriers to U.S.-made products. Measures aimed at helping small firms expand into the global market have included an overhaul of the Government's export controls and reinvention of export assistance. These changes have cleared a path for small businesses to enter the international economy.

To make certain that small companies can do business with the Government, my Administration and the Congress have streamlined the Federal procurement process through administrative changes and the Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1996. The changes instituted in these reforms are cost-effective for the Government and are intended to enable businesses to compete more effectively for Government contracts worth billions of dollars.

I am pleased that the SBA has instituted a new electronic gateway to procurement information, the Procurement Marketing and Access Network, or Pro-Net. This database on small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses will serve as a search engine for contracting officers, a marketing tool for small firms, and a link to procurement opportunities.

The Human Factor

My Administration is moving to anticipate 21st century demands on our most important resource—our people. As a recent report by the SBA's Office of Advocacy points out, small businesses employed more people on public assistance in 1996 than did large businesses. Our Welfare to Work Partnership has already had positive results—we've moved two million Americans off welfare two full years ahead of schedule. And we are enlisting the help of more and more small business people to expand that record of success.

We want to educate and train a work force that will meet all our future global competition. For those in the work force or moving into it, I recently signed legislation that consolidated the tangle of training programs into a single grant program so that people can move quickly on their own to better jobs and more secure futures. The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 encourages employers to provide training for their

employees by excluding income spent on such training from taxation. The SBA has also increased training opportunities for businesses by funding new export assistance centers and women's business centers across the country.

Women have been starting their own businesses at a dramatic rate in recent years. More than 6 million women-owned proprietorships were in operation in 1994, a phenomenal 139 percent increase over the 2.5 million that existed in 1980. But it is also women who are most affected by the lack of adequate child care. The SBA's Office of Advocacy has found that while small firms value the benefits of child care as much as large businesses, small businesses have been less likely to offer this benefit than large firms for a variety of reasons related to cost. The bottom line is that we've got to raise the quality of child care and make it more affordable for families. I have proposed tax credits for businesses that provide child care and a larger child care tax credit for working families.

I am pleased that so many Americans of all races and nationalities are asserting their economic power by starting small businesses. This report documents the growth: the number of businesses owned by minorities increased from 1.2 million to almost 2 million in the 5-year period from 1987 to 1992. The Federal Government has a role in widening the circle of economic opportunity. Programs are in place to ensure that socially and economically disadvantaged businesses have a fair chance in the Federal procurement marketplace. The share of Federal contract dollars won by minority-owned firms has remained at 5.5 percent for two years running—up from less than 2 percent in 1980. And recently the SBA and the Vice President announced new small business lending initiatives directed to the Hispanic and African American small business communities to give these Americans better access to the capital they need.

We have been working for the past 5 years to bring the spark of enterprise to inner city and poor rural areas through community development banks, commercial loans in poor neighborhoods, and the cleanup of polluted sites for development. The empowerment zone and enterprise community program offers significant tax incentives for firms within the zones, including a 20-percent wage credit and another $20,000 in expensing and tax-exempt facility bonds. Under the leadership of the Vice President, we want to increase the number of empowerment zones to give more businesses incentives to move into these areas.

Future Challenges

America's small business community is both the symbol and the embodiment of our economic freedom. That is why my administration has made concerted efforts to expand small business access to capital, reform the system of Government regulations to make it more equitable for small companies, and expand small business access to new and growing markets.

This is an important report because it annually reflects our current knowledge about the dynamic small business economy. Clearly, much is yet to be learned: existing statistics are not yet current enough to answer all the questions about how small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses are faring in obtaining capital, providing benefits, and responding to regional growth or downsizing. I continue to encourage cooperative Government efforts to gather and analyze data that is useful for Federal policymaking.

I am proud that my Administration is on the leading edge in working as a partner with the small business community. Our economic future deserves no less. The job of my Administration, and its pledge to small business owners, is to listen, to find out what works and to ensure a healthy environment for small business growth.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 6, 1999.*

□ 2000

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). 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 Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS 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 Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN STUDIES PROGRAM AT HEBREW UNIVERSITY IN JERUSALEM

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 4, at the Embassy of the Republic of Armenia here in Washington, D.C., an important milestone was celebrated, the 30th anniversary of the Armenian Studies Program at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

I believe this event is important not only because of the celebration of three decades of one of the world's finest programs for the study of Armenian language, literature, art and history, although this is of course extremely important in its own right. What distinguishes this week's celebration and the entire mission of the Armenian Studies Program at Hebrew University is the cooperation it represents between the Armenian and the Jewish peoples. This cooperation was in evidence as distinguished representatives from both the Armenian-American and Jewish-American communities were present at the Embassy.

Mr. Speaker, the Armenian and Jewish peoples have much in common. They are two of the most ancient and enduring nations, with histories and traditions that are measured not in centuries but in millennia. Sadly, these two peoples of great cultural achievement have also been singled out for unthinkable suffering, particularly in this century.

Last month, Members of this House paid tribute to the victims and survivors of the Armenian genocide in which 1.5 million Armenians died at the hands of the Ottoman Turkish Empire during the years 1915 to 1923. At that time there did not exist a word to properly convey the enormous horror of an entire people being singled out for mass murder, for racial or ethnic elimination.

It was not until the Nazi Holocaust, in which six million Jews were killed for no other reason than for who they were, that a term was devised to describe this mass atrocity: Genocide. In fact, when Hitler was planning his so-called ''final solution'' against the Jewish people, he said to his associates, ''Who today remembers the extermination of the Armenians?''

Yet today, Mr. Speaker, the Armenian and Jewish people have overcome the horrors of the past, not forgotten, of course, but overcome. The Republic of Armenia is an emerging democracy that has worked to establish the institutions of a civil society at home while maintaining its national security despite being surrounded by hostile neighbors. The State of Israel has succeeded at these same daunting tasks, fostering a thriving democracy while remaining secure against hostile neighbors for half a century.

In Israel's capital of Jerusalem, in the southwestern part of the Old City, surrounding the Citadel of King David, is the Armenian Quarter. The staunchly Christian Armenian people, the first to embrace Christianity as their national religion, have maintained their presence in that area since early times. The Armenian St. James Cathedral is one of the most impressive churches in the Old City. The Armenian Museum is a graceful cloister housing a fascinating collection of manuscripts and artifacts.

Armenian Orthodox Patriarchate Road and Ararat Street, named for the mountain in full view from Armenia's capital of Yerevan, where Noah's Ark is believed to have come to rest, are two of the area's main thoroughfares. Jerusalem's approximately 2,000 Armenians live in a tightly-knit community

known for their sophistication, dedication to their faith and their nation, and hospitality to visitors.

During the Armenian genocide, hundreds of thousands of Armenians were forced by the Ottoman Turks into the deserts of the Middle East. In the midst of their suffering, some Armenians were taken in and given protection by many people in the Middle East, and Armenian communities still exist in that part of the world.

Israel and Armenia continue to work on expanding and improving their bilateral relations. While there have admittedly been some differences, Armenian Foreign Minister Vartan Oskanian visited Israel late last year, at which time the governments of both countries emphasized their commitment to increased cooperation.

But, Mr. Speaker, while government-to-government initiatives continue, some of the most important advances come from the person-to-person relationships. Tuesday night's event at the Armenian Embassy is a testimony to that effort.

I want to pay particular tribute to two individuals who have done so much to further these important contacts, Annie Totah and Aris Mardirossian, the co-chairs of the 30th Anniversary Celebration. I also salute all of the Armenian and American Friends of the Hebrew University and all of the leaders in the Armenian and Jewish communities who have worked so hard for this very worthy cause.

Tuesday's reception will be followed by several noteworthy events in Jerusalem, including the International Conference on the Armenians in Jerusalem on May 24 through 26, a symposium for the Israeli public on June 6, and a symposium on the Armenian Pilgrimage to the Holy Land with guest of honor His Beatitude Mesrop II, Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople, and an alumnus of the Armenian Studies Program.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to one of the leading figures in the media, ABC news anchor Peter Jennings. On last Friday's broadcast, Mr. Jennings presented as part of his series on the century a poignant and powerful report on the Armenian genocide. In a century in which genocide has been a recurring horror, from the Nazis to Cambodia to Rwanda to the Balkans, it is important that all of us, in politics, in the media, in the field of education, and in other walks of life, be aware of what happened to the Armenian people 84 years ago.

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

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

THE FAA, DOT IG, NTSB AND AVIATION SAFETY

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1999, the House Appropriations subcommittee on Transportation held a hearing on the topic of aviation safety. At that hearing, Jane Garvey, administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) testified, as did Ken Mead, Department of Transportation inspector general (IG), and Jim Hall, chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB).

Last year, domestic air carriers had an excellent safety record: no passengers died on U.S. commercial flights. Many worked diligently to make safety a priority, and in the transportation appropriations subcommittee we have focused our efforts on aviation safety as well as all transportation modes.

In listening to the testimony prepared by each agency, it appeared that there was a difference of opinion in some areas with regard to the progress being made in aviation safety. Therefore, I requested that the IG and NTSB review the FAA's testimony and the FAA review the testimony of the IG and NTSB. In addition, I asked each to respond to the comments made by the others. I have provided this information for the FEDERAL REGISTER.

In general, the oversight agencies (NTSB and IG) believe that the FAA could be moving more aggressively in the referenced areas of aviation safety. For example, the NTSB noted that the FAA should be moving more quickly to ensure that aircraft registered in the United States have new flight data recorders. Similarly, the IG points out that draft regulations seeking to reduce the number of runway incursions have not yet been published while the number of runway incursions continues to rise.

Both oversight agencies suggest that the FAA should use more realistic measures of aviation safety. For example, the IG notes that a good measure of airport security is not the number of new explosive detection machines purchased and distributed, but the number of bags screened by the machines. After all, it's one thing to purchase and place explosive detection machines and it is quite another to put them into service and screen bags.

For its part, the FAA agrees that more should be done in the areas of runway incursions, airport security and project oversight.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the FAA will continue to work with the IG, NTSB and the aviation industry to fund and implement additional safety initiatives. The safety record of the industry last year was good, but we must remain vigilant in our efforts to improve the safety of the traveling public. As chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee, I am committed, as I know all members of the subcommittee are, to do what we can to make sure that transportation safety remains a priority.

OIG COMMENTS ON FAA'S STATEMENT

We have the following comments on FAA's statement before the Subcommittee on Transportation, Committee on Appropriations.

I. AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL MODERNIZATION

FAA's statement gives the impression that final deployment of the HOST and Oceanic Computer System Replacement for Phase 1 hardware has been completed. However, final deployment has not yet occurred and is currently planned to be complete by October 1999.

II. SECURITY

FAA's testimony on deploying explosives detection systems state that FAA has been very effective in getting advance explosives detection systems up and running. FAA's statement cites the fact that security equipment for checked baggage has been installed at over 30 airports, and that trace explosive detection devices for carry-on bags are being used at more than 50 airports.

The issue is not whether security equipment has been installed at more than 30 airports or whether the equipment has been ''procured'', ''installed'' or is ''operational.'' In our opinion, the true measure of effectiveness is the number of fully operational, FAA-certified bulk explosives detection machines in use at Category X and I airports that are screening at or near the demonstrated mean capacity of 125 bags per hour per machine. In our opinion, this usage rate is reasonable as it includes time to resolve alarms and is just more than half of the certified rate of 225 bags per hour.

Accordingly, our message to Congress in the past 2 years has focused on the underutilization of explosives detection equipment at this country's largest airports. In our opinion, it is ultimately the number of bags screened that makes the difference in aviation security, not the number of explosives detection machines installed.

FAA also stated that it continues to expand the use of realistic operational testing of the aviation security system. While FAA may be expanding the use of realistic operational testing, much of the testing to date has not been ''realistic.''

In our recneltly completed audit of Secretary of Checked Baggage, we found that checked baggage security testing by over 300 FAA security field agents assigned to FAA regions was limited to air carrier compliance with manual profiling and positive passenger bag marching requirements. Also, at the time of our audit, only a few ''red team''[1] security agents assigned to FAA Headquarters were testing the new automated passenger profiling systems, explosives detection equipment, and equipment operators. Therefore, red team testing of the new checked baggage security requirements has been infrequent, limited to specific testing criteria, and applied to only a few air carriers.

In prior audits, we found similar conditions. For example, in 1993 and 1996, we reported that FAA testing of airport access control was ineffective (not realistic or aggressive) and, in 1998, we reported that FAA testing of air carrier compliance with cargo security requirements was not comprehensive. We ntoed certain compliance requirements were omitted from the test plans.

Current OIG efforts indicate little improvement. For example, in our current audit of airport Access Control, we found FAAs airport access control assessments were limited in scope, included little testing of controls, and were conducted without using a standard testing protocol.

Our test results confirm the importance of a standard test protocol that includes realistic and aggressive testing procedures. In a majority of our tests involving airport access control, we successfully penetrated secure areas and boarded a large number of passenger and cargo aircraft. The majority of individiuals we encountered failed to challenge us for unauthorized access. FAA recognizes that improvements are needed and, on

[1] Red team refers to a group of security agents assigned to FAA's Civil Aviation Security Special Activities Office.

March 3, 1999, issued a letter to Airport Security Consortiums to take immediate action to fix the problems.

III. SAFETY

FAA's testimony states that Runway Incursion Action Teams have helped Cleveland-Hopkins International Airport reduce its incursion rate to an all-time low. However, data provided by FAA staff in the Runway Safety Office indicate that the incursion rate at the airport is not at its all time low. In 1995, the runway incursion rate at the Cleveland airport was 0.375 per 100,000 operations. The rate climbed in 1996 and has remained steady over the last three years at just over 1.9 per 100,000 operations. The number of runway incursions (six occurrences) has also remained steady in the past 3 years.

IV FINANCING

FAA's statement suggests that the proposed performance-based organization (PBO) for air traffic control will be funded in FY 2000, in part, by $1.5 billion in new, cost-based user fees. This estimate is highly optimistic because the proposed user fee system will require FAA's cost accounting system to be in place and operating. Although FAA plans to being implementing its cost accounting system this summer in the oceanic and enroute environment to support overflight fees, other types of air traffic under fees will require further deployment of the cost accounting system and concurrence of both Congress and users.

FAA's statement also suggests that the proposed PBO will make air traffic control more accountable for good performance. Accountability for performance was also a main tenet of personnel reform and part of the impetus behind exempting the agency from most Federal personnel rules in 1996. In our September 30, 1998, report on the status of FAA's personnel reform, we found that even with the new flexibilities provided by reform, accountability for performance had not been uniformly instilled throughout the agency. Accordingly, in our opinion, there is no guarantee that reorganizing air traffic control into a PBO will provide the necessary catalyst to ensure greater accountability for performance within that organization.

FAA'S RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL'S COMMENTS ON FAA'S TESTIMONY

NAS MODERNIZATION

HOST and Oceanic System Replacement (HOCSR):

The FAA did not mean to imply that final deployment of the HOCSR hardware is complete. We are on schedule and anticipate final deployment to be complete by October, 1999.

AVIATION SECURITY

Explosive Detection Equipment:

We agree with the IG that the utilization rates should be significantly higher and we are working with air carriers to do that. Recent data indicates an upward trend.

Airport Access Control:

We agree that airport access control needs improvement in many areas. We have initiated an aggressive plan with our industry partners at 78 of the Nation's largest airports. Over the next 6 weeks, we will conduct inspections and tests to identify vulnerabilities systematically. We will use the information to direct appropriate corrective action. The FAA issued a letter, on March 3, 1999, to Airport Security Consortiums to take immediate action to fix the problems.

AVIATION SAFETY

Runway Incursions:

Specific reference by FAA that Cleveland runway incursions ''dropped to an all-time low'' is, regrettably, incorrect information.

FINANCING

We agree with the IG that the estimated $1.5 billion in new, cost based user fees for FY 2000 is optimistic. However, we believe that ultimately moving to a cost based system is essential to the development of a more independent, more businesslike and more efficient air traffic service.

FAA'S RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL'S TESTIMONY

At the FY 2000 House Appropriation hearing on March 10, Chairman Wolf asked the FAA to respond to testimony from the Department of Transportation's Inspector General (IG) and the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB). This is the FAA's response to the IG testimony on NAS Modernization, Security, Safety and Financing.

NAS MODERNIZATION

Standard Terminal Automation Replacement System (STARS):

The Inspector General recommends that FAA defer decisions on the full range of software development needed for human factors on full STARS until testing on the DOD system is completed.

Although we understand the IG's concern about software development, we disagree with their recommendation. We have worked very closely with NATCA to identify and find mutually agreeable solutions to the human factors issues for the Early Display Configuration. These changes will be incorporated into the Initial System Capability (ISC), or full STARS. We believe that NATCA is fully committed to STARS as the system for the future and wants to work with FAA to successfully field a STARS product with minimally agreed to human factors additions as soon as possible.

Wide Area Augmentation System (WAAS):

The Inspector General indicates that the program continues to experience schedule slippage.

The FAA was under pressure several years ago to accelerate the WAAS schedule. Considering the many uncertainties and unknowns with this type of cutting edge technology, we knew there was a great deal of risk with such a compressed, aggressive schedule. We would like to point out that even with the 14-month schedule slip that we now project, the WAAS program is well within the initial (pre-accelerated) schedule. What caused the 14-month delay was a greater than expected challenge in developing a critical software package that monitors the performance and safety of the WAAS. All the other major software modules have been completed, the ground-based master and reference stations are in place, and the two leased geostationary satellites are in orbit providing service.

With regard to the Hopkins risk assessment study, the Inspector General discusses several issues that are unresolved and that considerable work remains to be done.

The Inspector General may have left the impression that nothing is being done by way of follow-up to the Hopkins study. In fact, the FAA is addressing the various items in the Hopkins study and will have a plan completed by this summer. The FAA is working on a ''Satellite Navigation Investment Analysis Plan,'' also due out this summer. This will include an analysis of the alternatives of backups to WAAS. The FAA discussed these alternatives in a public Satellite Navigation User Forum here in Washington, the first of three such forums to get user input in the investment/alternatives analysis process.

HOST and Oceanic System Replacement (HOCSR):

The Inspector General's comments suggest that meeting the HOCSR deadline was a relatively modest accomplishment.

The Inspector General testimony from a year ago before the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, said with regard to HOCSR, ''the FAA faces significant challenges and risks.'' The testimony also said ''Rehosting in less than 2 years at all centers is extremely optimistic. It is unlikely that FAA can completely replace the HOST hardware at all 20 enroute centers in less than 2 years.''

HOCSR phase 1, while being a hardware replacement only, is not simple. Host is connected to almost everything else in the NAS and the transition strategy [akin to changing a tire on a moving car] is fairly involved. Complex networks of cables and switches were installed, tested and connected to the existing NAS with no disruption of service. Centers were able to switch back and forth between old and new systems seamlessly. This was a major accomplishment, and we are within cost and on schedule.

Display System Replacement (DSR):

The Inspector General's testimony minimizes the DSR accomplishment because it did not involve large-scale development of software.

DSR should fit the definition of a software-intensive system. DSR required development, integration and test of almost 800,000 lines of operational software and also required integration of over 70 commercial, off-the-shelf software packages as part of the support system.

Data Link:

The Inspector General raised concerns about a prolonged transition and the associated impact on cost, schedule, and human factors.

We believe that our current plans adequately address the Inspector General's concerns. Rather than a transition to data link, the FAA will be conducting an insertion of data link technology into the NAS. Benefits will be realized immediately, both by data link and non-data link users, because of a reduction of frequency congestion on conventional voice frequencies. Data link will never completely replace voice communications especially in conditions of aircraft or system emergencies, rapidly changing severe weather, and similar high communications workload environments. From the standpoint of cost, only those users who derive a supportive cost/benefit analysis will equip; those that don't will derive the operational benefit of greater access to conventional communications frequencies. FAA costs are offset as data link provides a solution for current and future bandwidth problems. Those users that will equip will do so as the business case dictates. Human factors suggests that data link be used for routine messages; voice messages will still be available for time critical communications, and, because of the use of data link in routine traffic, a higher level of safety and efficiency will be maintained through reduced frequency congestion.

AVIATION SECURITY

Explosive Detection Equipment:

The Inspector General raises concerns about the underutilization of explosive detection equipment and recommends that the machines be used more aggressively. The Inspector General indicates that FAA's goal is to have air carriers ultimately screen all checked baggage.

We want to emphasize that the long-term goal to screen all checked baggage is very long term. With the technology that exists

today, we have more confidence in the process of screening CAPS selectee bags rather than trying to screen as many bags as possible.

AVIATION SAFETY

Runway Incursions:

The Inspector General stated that the FAA has made limited progress in implementing the Runway Incursion Plan.

The FAA has made significant progress but we realize there is much more to do. We are finalizing the program implementation plan, which establishes tasks, schedules and funding required to accomplish prevention strategies. We expect to publish this plan in April, 1999. We are well aware that we must provide appropriate funds for these priority initiatives.

We have on-site evaluations underway. Runway incursion action teams are focusing on airports experiencing an unusually high rate of incidents. We have completed 6 and plan to complete at least 14 additional evaluations by September 30, 1999.

The FAA is currently in the final stages of investment analysis that is addressing the validity of a wide range of technical and non-technical solutions, such as: improved controller, pilot, vehicle operator education and training; procedural changes; and improvements in airport signs, lighting, surface marking and other equipment (such as low cost ASDE, loop technology).

The FAA is focusing on immediate initiatives to reduce runway incursions and prevent surface accidents. We are in the process of implementing 18 separate actions, which are all funded. Some examples follow:

''Awareness blitz'' targeted for operators and users.

Monthly Air Traffic/Airport Operator/User meetings at top 20 runway incursion airports.

Develop and distribute videos to address controller and pilot awareness.

Develop and safety related brochures and materials to aviation organizations.

The FAA's Safer Skies also identifies runway incursions as one of the focus areas for commercial and general aviation. A commercial and general aviation analysis team that includes FAA, NASA, industry and aviation union representatives [the Joint Safety Analysis Team (JSAT)] was chartered and met on February 11–12, 1998. A schedule over the next 6-month period was established to analyze commercial and general aviation runway incursions and develop intervention strategies based on this data analysis. This effort is fully coordinated with and complements the efforts in the Runway Incursion Program plan.

The Inspector General indicates that FAA has completed only two of the eight recommendations included in the February, 1998 OIG report.

We continue to work towards completion of all of the 1998 recommendations from the IG. With regard to the IG's emphasis on completing the AA/AOPA education project, we would like to point out that the final part of the project is underway—the distribution of educational materials (videos, posters and brochures).

Clarification on Runway Incursion Data included in the Inspector General's Statement:

With regard to the chart on page 5 of the Inspector General's statement, the data is accurate. This data was obtained from FAA through the National Airspace Information Monitoring System.

Specific reference by FAA that Cleveland runway incursions ''dropped to an all-time low'' is, regrettably, incorrect information.

Flight Operations Quality Assurance:

The Inspector General raised concerns about the status of rulemaking to obtain air carrier safety data that would be used to proactively identify risks. The statement discusses the protection of safety data and the ability of FAA to move forward with FOQA.

The FAA is addressing the safety data protection concerns in a separate notice of proposed rulemaking which we hope to release for public comment in the near future.

The Inspector General suggests that an option for gaining industry and Government acceptance of FOQA would be to include a ''sunset provision'' in the final rule.

The FAA disagrees. The FAA has already gathered ample documentation of the value-added safety benefits that FOQA will provide, including improvements to air traffic procedures, pilot training, and airport equipage. The FAA wants accelerated industry-wide implementation of FOQA in the interest of public safety. Given the investment required by both the airlines and the FAA to achieve that goal, a ''sunset provision,'' which automatically terminates the program by a set date seems inappropriate.

Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS):

The Inspector General raises concerns about budget reduction and the impact on ATOS.

The FAA has made difficult choices this year in order to manage within a very constrained budget. We have deferred hiring ATOS data analysts his year. However, in order to keep the program on track with Phase I, we have reprioritized work plans to support ATOS until additional analysts can be hired.

We have fully funded the ATOS baseline training. This includes initial indoctrination training and travel for air carrier specific training needed by the certificate management team (CMT). Some of the flight training and air carrier systems training needed by team members has been deferred.

Regardless of the budget situation, we believe that a slower approach to ATOS is prudent. It is important to note that we will evaluate ATOS Phase I before a decision is made to expand the program.

The IG indicates that the FAA will complete an evaluation of ATOS implementation by June 30, 1999. FAA will begin an evaluation of ATOS Phase I implementation by June 30, 1999, and we expect to complete this activity September 30, 1999.

Air Tour Operations:

The Inspector General urges the FAA to issue rulemaking to extend more stringent safety and oversight of air tour operators.

FAA has developed a notice of proposed rule making (NPRM) that will establish a set of national safety standards for those operators. The rule will require that each operator obtain an air carrier certificate and associated operations specifications. The rule would also make operational information on air tour operators more readily available.

Both the IG and NTSB have insisted on the need for a data base on air tour operators. They have provided no rationale as to how a data base will improve safety. The FAA disagrees and believes establishment of such a data base is costly and unnecessary and would provide no safety benefit. Once all air operators are certificated, FAA will have sufficient information in its operation specifications data base to provide safety oversight.

FINANCING AND COST CONTROL

Rising Operations Costs:

The Inspector General indicates that FAA will need to contain increases in Operations costs in order to fund other critical functions.

FAA is also concerned about rising Operations costs because our ability to actually control payroll-related increases in extremely limited. Approximately 75% of the Operations account is payroll related. Payroll cost increases are based on mandatory pay raises as well as increases in government contribution rates for retirement, social security, health insurance and medicare.

The recent NATCA agreement does cost more than we budgeted for but represents less than 25% of our total mandatory increases this year.

The best way the FAA can control payroll costs is through staffing reductions. We have made significant staffing reductions since 1993. Even though the safety workforce has grown in recent years, the staffing levels in Operations are 4,500 lower than in 1993. These reductions have resulted in annual cost avoidance of $250 million and cumulative cost avoidance of over $2 billion. We have also reduced our costs by contracting out low level air traffic control facilities and realigning the Airway Facilities field organizations.

In the context of rising Operations costs, the Inspector General questions an FAA funding policy that has been in place for over six years.

We do not consider first year maintenance costs of a new system to be a ''mask'' for rising Operations costs. The use of F&E funds to pay for maintenance for up to one year following commissioning new systems can be compared to a service contract for a newly acquired product, or a warranty period. These are appropriately considered part of the cost of fielding new systems. This policy was coordinated with and approved by the House and Senate Appropriation Committees.

Cost Accounting:

The Inspector General points out schedule slippages in implementation of cost accounting.

While the IG is correct in noting there have been schedule slippages, we have made significant changes in how the agency approaches this critical initiative. The revised plan calls for an incremental approach to cost accounting that allows us to build on success as each piece is implemented.

For example, in the first phase, FAA will have the initial cost information available this summer for the Oceanic and En Route portions of Air Traffic Services. Once this is completed, other parts of Air Traffic Services and then other Lines of Business will be brought into the System.

We anticipate having the entire agency covered by the cost accounting system by the end of FY 2001.

When compared to private sector entities that have built similar cost accounting systems, FAA's new time schedule and cost estimates compare favorably with best business practices.

[Enclosure 2]

RESPONSE TO FAA'S COMMENTS ON OUR STATEMENTS

We have the following response to FAA's comments on our statements.

I. AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL MODERNIZATION

FAA disagrees with our recommendation that FAA defer decisions on the full range of software development needed for human factors on full STARS until the testing on the Department of Defense system in completed. FAA states that it has worked closely with the National Air Traffic Controllers Association to resolve the human factors issues with the Early Display Configuration. These human factors changes will be incorporated in full STARS.

We agree that the human factors issues identified for the Early Display Configuration should be incorporated in full STARS.

Our recommendation was intended to address the remaining human factors work that will be needed beyond those identified for the Early Display Configuration. Full STARS will completely replace ARTS with independent primary and back-up systems and includes functions not contained in the Early Display Configuration.

FAA argues that we minimize the accomplishments to date with the Display System Replacement (DSR), and the agency points out that DSR was a software intensive acquisition. DSR was indeed a software intensive acquisition. However, it is important to recognize that considerable software development for DSR was done as part of the Advanced Automation System, which was contracted for in 1988 and dramatically restructured in 1994. Therefore the success with DSR is directly related to software development work done during that six-year period.

FAA notes that current agency plans adequately address our concerns about Data Link. However, we issued a report on February 24, 1999, that made a number of recommendations aimed at improving planning for Data Link systems. We continue to believe that a comprehensive plan is needed to guide industry and government efforts to transition to Data Link over the next decade.

II. SECURITY

FAA said that the goal to screen all checked baggage is very long-term (not obtainable in the near future).

We agree that screening all checked bags is a long-term goal. However, FAA needs to begin to move forward in achieving that goal. Utilization can be increased for several reasons. First, the machines currently deployed at the nation's busiest airports are clearly capable of screening significantly more bags than the bags of selectees only. This is currently being demonstrated by a few machines deployed at some airports. Second, it offers a high potential for improving aviation security. The equipment's ability to detect explosive material does not depend exclusively on human skill, vigilance, or judgment. Third, it represents a significant outlay of funds. FAA estimates average costs of $1.3 million to purchase and install each CTX 5000 SP. Fourth, based on an FAA study, continued low use may affect operator proficiency and prevent FAA from effectively measuring how dependable the equipment is in actual operations.

III. SAFETY

Runway Incursions

FAA stated that it has made significant progress in implementing the Runway Incursion Plan. We acknowledge that FAA has made some progress in implementing the Runway Incursion Plan, which is a very sound foundation for effectively reducing runway incursions. However, only 18 of the 51 actions indicated in their plan have been initiated. Additionally, we found that some deadlines have slipped and may slip further unless funding is set aside to implement all actions in the plan. While FAA plans to identify all funding requirements for its Runway Incursion Plan through an investment analysis, it does not expect to complete this process before September 1999. Further, this analysis only pertains to future funding beginning in FY 2001 and does not address current funding requirements.

Runway incursions include operational errors, pilot deviations, and vehicle/pedestrian deviations. FAA states that surface operational error were down by 9 percent. However, data we received from the Air Traffic Resource Management Program Office indicates surface operational errors were up by 5 percent. The only decrease noted in the data was a 30 percent decrease in vehicle/pedestrian deviations.

Flight Operations Quality Assurance (FOQA)

FAA disagreed with our suggestion that an option for gaining industry and Government acceptance of FOQA would be to include a ''sunset provision'' in the final rule. FAA stated that it has already gathered ample documentation of the value-added safety benefits that FOQA will provide, including improvements to air traffic procedures, pilot training, and airport equipage. FAA wants accelerated industry-wide implementation acceptance of FOQA in the interest of public safety. According to FAA, given the investment required by both the airlines and FAA to achieve that goal, a ''sunset provision,'' which automatically terminates the program by a set date seems inappropriate.

We agree that access to FOQA data has been accepted as a value-added safety beneficial program. However, to gain acceptance of the program, FAA should include enticements in the final rule to satisfy the many reservations expressed by government agencies. In our opinion, one enticement would be a provision in the final rule that would sunset the program at a specific time. A sunset provision would allow FAA, air carriers, and government agencies to assess any concerns experienced before the FOQA programs were extended.

Air Tour

FAA stated that both the IG and NTSB have insisted on the need for a database on air tour operators but provided no rationale as to how a database will improve safety. FAA disagrees and believes establishment of such a database is costly and unnecessary and would provide no safety benefit. FAA stated that once all air tour operators are certificated, FAA will have sufficient information in its operation specifications database to provide safety oversight.

We agree with NTSB that FAA needs to know who air tour operators are and where they are flying to provide proper oversight. The NTSB stated in findings to its June 1995 report that:

''The lack of a national database for air tour operations precludes effective evaluation of the accident rate of air tour operators on the traditional basis of flight hours, cycles, and passengers carried. Also, the adequacy of staffing levels of FSDOs [FAA Flight Standards District Offices] to oversee air tour operators is difficult to evaluate because of the lack of national standards and a database to establish the magnitude of this portion of commercial aviation.''

Even though originally recommended by NTSB in 1993, there is no comprehensive air tour database or survey data. Currently the Department and FAA are proposing to act on this recommendation 2 years after the draft rulemaking is complete. The draft rule has not yet been published for comment. A required comment period and the possibility of changes based on the comments received, could mean a final rule is still months away. FAA should not continue to delay taking action on this recommendation.

IV. FINANCING

FAA stated that payroll cost increases are based on mandatory pay raises as well as increases in government contribution rates for retirement, social security, health insurance and medicare—all of which are outside the control of the agency. While we are mindful that some cost increases associated with FAA's Operations account are outside the control of the agency, other factors are within the agency's control. For example, the new pay system for air traffic controllers was the result of negotiations between FAA and the National Air Traffic Controllers Association and not the result of mandatory pay raises or increase in government contribution rates for employee benefits.

FAA also stated that it does not consider first year maintenance costs of a new system to be a ''mask'' for rising Operations costs and that the policy was coordinated with and approved by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. We did not question the practice used by FAA of funding certain activities using F&E budgets. As we stated in our testimony, FAA's procedures permit this method of accounting. However, our statement was to demonstrate that Operations costs may be even greater than reported because F&E funds are used, in some cases, to finance activities normally related to operations, such as maintenance, salaries, and travel costs.

FAA'S RESPONSE TO THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD TESTIMONY

At the FY 2000 House Appropriation hearing on March 10, Chairman Wolf asked the FAA to respond to testimony from the Department of Transportation's Inspector General (IG) and the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB). This is the FAA's response to the NTSB testimony on Safety.

INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

The NTSB indicates that their involvement in international accident investigations has increased because more and more U.S. airlines are entering into code-share arrangements with foreign airlines. He points out that FAA oversight responsibilities for foreign carriers is limited.

FAA has actively pursued new bilateral agreements that define specific obligations for both parties for airworthiness acceptance, repairs and maintenance. These new agreements, called Bilateral Aviation Safety Agreements, offer the FAA greater flexibility in dealing with the international oversight issues. Prior to implementing such agreements, the FAA conducts a detailed assessment of a partner country's aviation system and concludes implementation procedures that outline how each authority will interact. FAA's vision is that a network of competent aviation authorities will share responsibility for safety oversight and we are continuously working towards building this network.

The NTSB references a domestic situation similar to the international oversight issue that arose several years ago when large U.S. carriers began code-share arrangements with commuter airlines that did not have the same stringent safety requirements. Chairman Hall stated, ''Consequently, the traveling public was receiving in effect two levels of safety, until December 1995 when the FAA acted on NTSB recommendations and issued its final rule.''

The one level of safety initiative came from Secretary Pena's January 1995 Safety Summit and the considerable efforts of industry. The NTSB was involved, however, the rule was not specifically in response to a NTSB recommendation.

CONTROLLED FLIGHT INTO TERRAIN (CFIT)

The NTSB indicates a significant area of concern in foreign accidents is CFIT.

CFIT and approach and landing accidents are major safety items in the Administrator's Safety Agenda. The FAA and industry have extensive efforts underway to address these accident causal factors, yet no mention of the FAA/industry program is made by the NTSB.

FAA's short term efforts are directed toward (1) implementing the Terrain Awareness Warning System rule while encouraging voluntary compliance, (2) re-emphasizing current ATC CFIT training procedures and

enhancing them where necessary, (3) establishing standards for FMS equipped aircraft to enable precision-like approaches to all airports, (4) emphasizing training on approach and missed approach procedures, (5) installing MSAW capabilities worldwide with an emphasis of high risk airports, and (6) implementing the FOQA rule to better identify safety-related issues and corrective actions. FAA will continue to work with industry to identify the most effective mid and long range interventions to reduce CFIT accidents.

The NTSB lumped CFIT and approach and landing accidents in one group. We believe the two categories should not be mixed. However, we recognize the need to address both CFIT and approach and landing issues.

ENHANCED GROUND PROXIMITY WARNING SYSTEM

Chairman Hall states that ''during the investigation for the (1997) Korean Air accident, it was revealed that the installation of EGPWS would have provided the flightcrew significant warning of the impending ground collision. However, at that time, the system was not certified for that model aircraft.''

The Korean Air Lines Boeing 747 was equipped with a GPWS that provided appropriate and timely terrain warnings to the flightcrew. For whatever reason, the flightcrew did not heed the GPWS warnings.

At the time of the Guam accident, EGPWS was not only not certified for the B747, it was also not available from the manufacturer. Chairman Hall's statement could lead one to believe that the only reason EGPWS wasn't on the KAL B747 was a lack of effort by the FAA.

AIRPLANE RECORDERS

Chairman Hall states that ''the Safety Board and this Subcommittee have for many years prodded the FAA to require upgraded recorders on transport category aircraft, but sadly, most of the fleet is still equipped with outmoded recorders.''

On July 17, the FAA revised Digital Flight Data Recorder (DFDR) rules. The revision specified the required increase in recorded parameters and compliance times for four categories of aircraft. To date, the FAA believes that close to 30 percent of the affected U.S.-registered fleet (aircraft with 10 or more seats) is in compliance with the new requirements. In addition, the FAA has data indicating that 95 percent of the U.S. B–737 fleet is either in compliance or in the progress of complying with the rule. We believe progress has been made but we also recognize that there is much more to be done. Administrator Garvey is working with the Air Transport Association and the individual carrier's CEOs to ensure early compliance for a major portion of the air carrier fleet.

The FAA is initiating an accelerated rulemaking effort to mandate increased recording time (2 hours) and the provision of a 10-minute independent power source for Cockpit Voice Records (CVRs). Since January 1998, practically all transport category aircraft have left the production line with a 2-hour recorder installed as original equipment. This same rulemaking project will also require CVR retrofits on all in-service aircraft and mandate dual-recorder equipage for new aircraft. Finally, the rulemaking project will amend Part 25 to require that CVRs, FDRs and redundant combination flight recorders be powered from separate generators with the highest reliability.

AIRFRAME STRUCTURAL ICING

Chairman hall discusses a history of NTSB recommendations on icing and a lack of acceptable response from the FAA. The NTSB is hopeful that the FAA's response to the most recent series of icing recommendations will be more acceptable.

The NTSB comments may leave the impression that the FAA has done very little to respond to airframe icing safety.

The FAA initiatives to improve safety when operating in icing conditions are outlined in the comprehensive FAA Inflight Icing Plan issues in April 1997. The Plan describes rulemaking, advisory material, research programs, and other initiatives either underway or to be initiated to achieve safety in icing conditions.

With regard to FAA responsiveness to NTSB icing recommendations, the NTSB testimony is silent with respect to the numerous Roselawn safety recommendations. In fact, there are 11 icing recommendations from the Roselawn accident, and all have been classified by the Safety Board in an Acceptable status. Three are Closed Acceptable and 8 are Open Acceptable.

The FAA has completed numerous actions which directly respond to airframe icing safety:

May 1995: issued AD to require modification of the deicing boots on the Aerospatiale ATR–42 and –72.

April 1996 and February 1998: issued 42 AD's requiring aircraft with unpowered roll controls and pneumatic deicing boots to exit icing conditions when specific visual icing cues are observed.

May 1996: FAA sponsored International Conference on Aircraft Inflight Icing.

April 1997: FAA Inflight Icing Plan issued.

July 1997: issued guidance on newly designed or derivative aircraft.

December 1997: issued AD requiring installation of an ice detector system on the EMBRAER EMB–120.

December 1998: held a mixed-phase and glaciated icing conditions workshop.

February 1999: sponsored an International conference on inflight operations in icing conditions.

February 1999: provided an analysis of supercooled large droplet (SLD) data to Rulemaking Advisory Committee for discussion on certification issues.

Additional AD's related to the operation of ice protection systems and minimum speeds in icing conditions are planned as a result of the February 1999 Icing Conference.

The NTSB testimony states, ''The original recommendations that stemmed from our 1981 safety study . . . were eventually closed as unacceptable or superseded, but the recommendations remained in an ''Open—Unacceptable Response status for 15 years''.

The original recommendations were superseded with a new recommendation A–96–54 which is classified as ''Open Acceptable.''

RUNWAY INCURSIONS

The NTSB is critical of the FAA's response to the rising number of runway incursions. Specifically, he says ''the FAA has studied this issue for years and has developed several action plans. Just last year, the FAA announced that reducing runway incursions was one of its top priorities and issued the Airport Surface Operation Safety Action Plan. However, implementation of that plan has not been finalized.''

The FAA has made significant progress but we realize there is much more to do. We are finalizing the program implementation plan, which establishes tasks, schedules and funding required to accomplish prevention strategies. We expect to publish this plan in April, 1999. We are well aware that we must provide appropriate funds for these priority initiatives.

We have on-site evaluations underway. Runway incursion action teams are focusing on airports experiencing an unusually high rate of incidents. We have completed 6 and plan to complete at least 14 additional evaluations by September 30, 1999.

The FAA is currently in the final stages of investment analysis that is addressing the validity of a wide range of technical and non-technical solutions, such as: improved controller, pilot, vehicle operator education and training; procedural changes; and improvements in airport signs, lighting, surface marking and other equipment (such as low cost ASDE, loop technology).

The FAA is focusing on immediate initiatives to reduce runway incursions and prevent surface accidents. We are in the process of implementing 18 separate actions. Some examples follow:

''Awareness blitz'' targeted for operators and users.

Monthly Air Traffic/Airport Operator/User meetings at top 20 runway incursion airports.

Develop and distribute videos to address controller and pilot awareness.

Develop and safety related brochures and materials to aviation organizations.

The FAA's Safer Skies also identifies runway incursions as one of the focus areas for commercial and general aviation. A commercial and general aviation analysis team that includes FAA, NASA, industry and aviation union representatives [the Joint Safety Analysis Team (JSAT)] was chartered and met on February 11–12, 1998. A schedule over the next 6-month period was established to analyze commercial and general aviation runway incursions and develop intervention strategies based on this data analysis. This effort is fully coordinated with and complements the efforts in the Runway Incursion Program plan.

REVIEW OF FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION (FAA) COMMENTS OF TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD ON MARCH 10, 1999

INTERNATIONAL ISSUES: CODE-SHARING ARRANGEMENTS/ONE LEVEL OF SAFETY

The FAA stated ''The one level of safety initiative came from Secretary Pena's January 1995 Safety Summit and the considerable efforts of industry. The . . . rule was not specifically in response to a NTSB recommendation.''

Comment.—The impetus for the one level of safety initiative and the issue of code-sharing can be found in the Safety Board's 1994 safety study on commuter airline safety, in which the Board recommended that the FAA:

Revise the Federal Aviation Regulations such that:

All scheduled passenger service conducted in aircraft with 20 or more passenger seats be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 14 CFR Part 121. (Class II, Priority Action) (A–94–191)

All scheduled passenger service conducted in aircraft with 10 to 19 passenger seats be conducted in accordance with 14 CFR Part 121, or its functional equivalent, wherever possible. (Class II, Priority Act) (A–94–192)

These recommendations and the recommendations on pilot training (A–94–195 and A–94–196) were classified ''Closed—Acceptable Action'' when the FAA issued its final rule on commuter airlines on December 20, 1995. These recommendations, and subsequent Safety Board Congressional testimony regarding commuter airline safety, predate Secretary Pena's 1995 Safety Summit. To say that that rule was not in response to Safety Board recommendations is not accurate.

In that study, the Safety Board also recommended that the U.S. Department of Transportation:

Require U.S. domestic air carriers certificated under 14 CFR Part 121, when involved in a code-sharing arrangement with a commuter airline, to establish a program of

operational oversight that (a) includes periodic safety audits of flight operations, training programs, and maintenance and inspection; and (b) emphasizes the exchange of information and resources that will enhance the safety of flight operations. (Class II, Priority Action) (A–94–205)

Based on the safety recommendation database, that recommendation is still in an open—acceptable action status. While we were pleased with the initiatives outlined at the Safety Summit (and we should point out that we participated in the Summit), the full intent of the above recommendations has yet to be met.

The Board recognizes that some of the concerns it had with code-sharing arrangements between U.S. carriers can also exist in code-sharing arrangements between foreign-based carriers and U.S. carriers. The Board will thoroughly consider such issues should they arise in the Board's investigations and we will issue recommendations should they be warranted.

CONTROLLED FLIGHT INTO TERRAIN (CFIT)

The FAA stated that ''CFIT and approach and landing accidents are major safety items. . . .''

Comment.—From the time that EGPWS was first certified (Oct. 1996), it took FAA an additional 2 years to issue the NPRM. We are not aware that a final rule has been issued.

ENHANCED GROUND PROXIMITY WARNING SYSTEMS

The FAA stated ''The Korean Air Lines Boeing 747 was equipped with a GPWS that provided appropriate and timely terrain warnings to the flight-crew.''

Comment.—This statement is not correct. The KAL Boeing 747 GPWS did not provide any terrain warnings to the flightcrew because the airplane was in landing configuration. Only radio altitude call were given by the GPWS during the accident flight.

The FAA stated ''At the time of the Guam accident, the EGPWS was not only not certified for the B747, it was also not available from the manufacturer.''

Chairman Hall stated that at the time of the accident EGPWS was ''not certified for that model aircraft'' (referring to the KAL 747–300). Chairman Hall merely stated a fact and was not implying that FAA inaction was to blame for the lack of an EGPWS on the accident airplane.

AIRPLANE RECORDERS

The FAA stated ''To date, the FAA believes that close to 30 percent of the affected U.S.-registered fleet (aircraft with 10 or more seats) is in compliance with new requirements.''

Comment.—Thirty percent is considered a modest accomplishment when it is noted that most newly manufactured airplanes delivered since 1998 meet or exceed the new parameter requirements, and that 226 Boeing 737s were retrofitted by one airline, namely Southwest, accounting for most of the retrofits. Therefore, the bulk of this 30 percent figure can be attributed to newly manufactured airplanes and one airline's aggressive retrofit program.

The FAA stated ''. . . 95% of the U.S. B–737 fleet is either in compliance or in the progress of complying with the rule.''

Comment.—At this late date, the Boeing 737 operators should be in the process of complying with the new FDR requirements. It is the Board's understanding that ''being in the progress'' can mean that an aircraft is simply scheduled for a retrofit as much as two years in the future.

The FAA stated ''Administrator Garvey is working with the Air Transport Association and the individual carrier's CEOs to ensure early compliance for a major portion of the carrier fleet.''

Comment.—The Metrojet Boeing 737 that experienced a rudder incident near Baltimore—Washington International Airport was scheduled to have a C-check in March 1999, but was not scheduled to have the FDR upgrade until 2001. This does not reflect early compliance.

The FAA stated ''FAA is initiating an accelerated rulemaking effort to mandate increased recording time (2 hours). . . .''

Comment.—This statement is accurate. A Rulemaking project has been initiated and FAA staff assigned. NTSB staff has been invited to participate in the rulemaking effort, and thus far, Safety Board staff have had four meetings with FAA staff on this subject.

The FAA stated ''Since January 1998, practically all transport category aircraft have left the production line with a 2-hour recorder installed as original equipment.''

Comment.—While this statement is generally true, we are aware of at least one airline's labor agreement with its pilots required them to remove the 2-hour CVRs and replace them with the solid-state 30-minute CVRs.

AIRFRAME STRUCTURAL ICING

The FAA stated ''The NTSB comments may leave the impression that the FAA has done very little to respond to airframe icing safety.''

The Safety Board does believe that the FAA did very little to address airframe structural icing until after the ATR–72 accident at Roselawn, Indiana in 1994. Since then, the FAA has worked with industry, primarily through the ARAC process, to initiate several important efforts that will eventually reduce the risk of flight in icing conditions. Chairman Hall acknowledged these recent ARAC efforts in the Board's testimony.

''With regard to FAA responsiveness to NTSB icing recommendations, Chairman Hall in silent with respect to the numerous Roselawn safety recommendations.''

Comment.—Chairman Hall mentioned both the Comair and the Roselawn accident recommendations in his testimony, and acknowledged that the FAA's ARAC efforts and icing conferences are ''in response to those recommendations.''

The FAA stated ''The FAA has completed numerous actions which directly respond to airfame icing safety.''

Comment.—The Safety Board acknowledges the FAA actions cited in Administrator Garvey's response.

The FAA stated ''The original recommendations were superseded with a new recommendation A–96–54 which is classified as 'Open Acceptable'.''

Comment.—Chairman Hall's testimony correctly states that the original 1981 safety study recommendations remained in an open-unacceptable status for 15 years. It is also correct that the original recommendations were superseded with a new recommendation, A–96–54, which is classified as Open-Acceptable. The 1981 recommendation was superseded with a new safety recommendation because acceptable action had not been taken by FAA.

RUNWAY INCURSIONS

The Safety Board's concerns about runway incursions are heightened by adverse trends in recent years. Although there was a slight downward trend in runway incursions from 1990 to 1993, the trend has been moving upward since then. In 1997, there were 300 incursions, up from 275 the previous year. In 1998, there were 326 incursions. According to the FAA, the monthly rate in September 1998—0.73 incursions per 100,000 operations—was the highest monthly rate in 11 years.

The FAA stated, ''We are finalizing the program implementation plan . . . we expect to publish the plan in April 1999 . . . we are well aware that were must provide appropriate funds . . .

Comment.—The Safety Board has expressed its disappointment that the FAA failed to fund its program office for runway incursions for more than two years. This safety issue needs coordination and overall direction by the FAA, which had been the function of the program office. The Board is pleased that the FAA is now committing itself to the necessary coordination and funding, and will review the FAA's plans and budgets when they are provided. The Board hopes that the FAA will meet its target date of April 1999.

The FAA stated, ''We have on-site evaluations underway.''

Comment.—The Safety Board is aware that several initiatives have been started and tested by the FAA, but too few of these have been completed. The Board will continue to evaluate the FAA's runway incursion program based on completed programs and equipment that is placed in operation. For example, the Safety Board notes that several AMASS units may be ''fielded'' or ''deployed'', but the Board further notes that none are currently operational and the FAA has not projected an operational date.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, the National Cancer Institute estimates that over 8 million Americans alive today have a history of cancer. Before the millennium, it is expected that over one million new cancer cases will be diagnosed. Just in this decade, approximately 12 million patients will have cancer detected.

This year it is anticipated that over 500,000 Americans will succumb to cancer. That is over 1,500 people per day. Today, cancer is the second leading cause of death in the United States, exceeded only by heart disease. A bright spot in this tragic picture is the fact that when all cancers are combined, the 5-year survival rate is 60 percent.

So I am pleased to rise today to highlight the excellent work being done at Washington State University's Cancer Prevention and Research Center, a center that is in my own district in Pullman, Washington, to help win this fight against cancer.

This center in Pullman is the focal point for cancer research at Washington State University. The center is located within the College of Pharmacy, where cancer is the core of the

research conducted in the Pharmaceutical Sciences Department. The researchers there in several other Washington State University research departments are studying the deadly disease, including some in biochemistry, food sciences and human nutrition, microbiology and zoology, veterinary medicine, and many, many more.

Today, the Cancer Center is a catalyst to mobilize collaborative research efforts within the University and the surrounding health care community, especially Eastern Washington and Northern Idaho. The goals of the Center in its work are to attack cancer through a multidisciplinary research approach, provide central support services and shared facilities for ongoing research, facilitate translation of basic research to the clinic, and educate health professionals and the public about healthy life-styles and cancer prevention.

The new director of the center, Gary Meadows, hopes to make WSU, Washington State University, and its Cancer Prevention Research Center the major cancer organization in eastern Washington. And our State, by the way, is rich in cancer research facilities: The Hutchinson Cancer Research Center in Seattle, the University of Washington Medical School, and many other university support services provide great research for cancer.

So I applaud and encourage Dr. Meadows and his colleagues for their demanding pursuit to eradicate this deadly disease, and I urge my colleagues to consider favorably additional funding through the National Institutes of Health and research grants for not only cancer research and a possible cure but for diabetes and Alzheimer's and multiple sclerosis and all the other diseases that affect Americans throughout this country.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, REVISIONS TO AGGREGATE SPENDING LEVELS SET BY INTERIM ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the aggregate spending levels set by the interim allocations and aggregates for fiscal year 1999 printed in the RECORD on February 3, 1999, pursuant to H. Res. 5 and adjusted for H.R. 1141. The adjusted allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations, adjusted by the Kosovo & Southwest Asia Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999, reflects $11,109,000,000 in additional new budget authority and $2,907,000,000 in additional outlays for designated emergency spending. In addition, the Committee on Appropriations will receive $25,000,000 less in budget authority and $2,000,000 less in outlays for funds previously appropriated for arrearages that were rescinded in H.R. 1141. Overall, the allocation to the Appropriations Committee will increase to $584,912,000,000 in budget authority and $579,814,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999.

I also submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an adjusted fiscal year 2000 allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations to reflect $1,838,000,000 in additional new budget authority and $1,774,000,000 in additional outlays for designated emergency spending. In addition, the outlay effect of the fiscal year 1999 budget authority of H.R. 1664 will result in additional outlays of $5,243,000,000 for fiscal year 2000. This will increase the allocation to the Appropriations Committee to $538,109,000,000 in budget authority and $577,962,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000.

The House Committee on Appropriations submitted the report on H.R. 1664, the Kosovo & Southwest Asia Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999, which includes $11,109,000,000 in budget authority and $2,907,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 designated defense and non-defense emergency spending. H.R. 1664 includes $1,838,000,000 in budget authority and $7,017,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000 designated emergency spending.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment of the legislation. Questions may be directed to Art Sauer or Jim Bates at x6–7270.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

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

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today is the National Day of Prayer. After what my staff and I have observed in our beloved home State of Oklahoma in the past 2½ days, I would ask all of my colleagues and all Americans to lift our friends and neighbors in prayer.

This natural disaster has physically impacted virtually every region of our State. The super cells that shot from the far southwest quadrant of the State to the northeast boundaries caused damage and loss in the districts of each of my colleagues in the Oklahoma delegation.

But, as is always the case in the history of our State, no disaster, manmade or natural, can break the resolve or the spirit of our fine people.

Pray for the widow and her adult daughter in Del City who were searching through the rubble of a home she shared with her husband from 1973 until his death 2 years ago. They were not searching for diamond rings or stock certificates. No, all they hoped to find was a keepsake photo of their late husband and father.

Pray for their young neighbor boy who was so excited to find a single baseball card on the spot where his bedroom once sat.

And pray for Oklahomans in all parts of the storm-ravaged State, including the small town of Dover where over half of their community has been destroyed. They, too, need uplifting.

These good people and thousands of others are hauling off all of their worldly possessions in the trunk of a car or even a wheelbarrow. So many more were not that fortunate.

Nothing can contain their will, their faith, and their fight. God bless Oklahoma. Pray for Oklahoma.

CHINA'S THEFTS OF U.S. NUCLEAR SECRETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last week I came to the floor to point out some of the misleading statements coming out of the White House with respect to China's thefts of U.S. nuclear secrets. I said that the White House had misled the public when it was said by the President that no one had reported to him about Chinese spying, when in reality National Security Advisor Sandy Berger had made such a report to him in July of 1997.

The President said on March 19, when asked by a reporter, and the reporter asked this question, ''Can you assure the American people that under your watch no valuable secrets were lost?'' And the President responded, ''Can I tell you there has been no espionage at the labs since I have been President? I can tell you that no one has reported to me that they suspect such a thing has occurred.''

Well, Sandy Berger, the head of the National Security Council, in the fall of 1996 and early 1997 was told by the Department of Energy, their intelligence people, their security people, that there had been espionage taking place at the nuclear laboratories, at Los Alamos and others.

Now, he is the head of the National Security Council. He is appointed by the President to inform him about national security matters. He is the chief national security fellow. And yet the President said he had no knowledge of any espionage taking place; and he said this in March of 1999 this year, just last month or so.

And then again on NBC's ''Meet the Press,'' Sandy Berger, the head of the NSC, said his first Energy Department briefing with Chinese spying was very general and very preliminary, said he did not really know about it. He went on to say at that interview, at that stage Mr. Berger said to Mr. Tim Russert of NBC, ''We did not really know how and we did not really know what was taking place.''

□ 2015

These facts are not facts. These assertions do not square with the facts.

In April of 1996, Notra Trulock, the Energy Department's Chief of Intelligence, briefed Sandy Berger about the

full extent of Chinese spying. Berger was told that China had stolen W–88 nuclear warhead designs and the neutron bomb data. He was told that a spy might still be passing secrets to China at Los Alamos. He was even told that the theft of neutron bomb data occurred in 1995 under President Clinton's administration. So if he was told all that, why did he not go right into the Oval Office and tell the President? Well, I believe he did, and the President stated, later on, that he did know about these things.

At the end of the briefing, Trulock referred to a recent intelligence report. In the report a Chinese source said that officials inside China's intelligence service were boasting about how they had just stolen U.S. secrets and how those secrets allowed them to improve their neutron bomb. The neutron bomb is a weapon that could be launched at an American city, kill everybody in it but leave the infrastructure, the buildings and bridges and the roads intact. The source said that the Chinese agents solved the 1988 design problem by coming back to the United States in 1995 to steal more secrets.

According to one official, the intelligence about the neutron bomb was hot off the press, and it was included in the briefing to warn the White House of the possibility of continued Chinese espionage at Los Alamos and Livermore. It was a pretty specific briefing, one official said who was present.

When Paul Redmund, the CIA's chief spy hunter, was given a similar briefing from Mr. Trulock a few months earlier, he said that China's spying was far more damaging to the United States security than Aldrich Ames, who is now in prison, and would turn out to be as bad or worse than the Rosenbergs, who were executed for giving top nuclear information to the Soviets back in the 1940s.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to his claims on Meet the Press, the fact is that Sandy Berger knew who, knew how and really knew what with respect to the Chinese spying right then in his April 19, 1996, Energy Department briefing. So why does the head of the NSC, Sandy Berger, claim that this briefing was so general? Why does he claim that he did not brief the President until July of 1997 only after receiving a second and supposedly more detailed briefing from Trulock?

Now, he admits to briefing the President in 1997, but remember what the President said in March of this year: ''Can I tell you there has been no espionage at the lab since I have been President? I can tell you that no one has reported to me they suspect such a thing has occurred.'' And yet Mr. Berger does admit that he briefed the President in 1997.

So why was the President misleading the American people? I do not know, but we need to know why. There are only two explanations. Either Mr. Berger was grossly incompetent and did not want to tell the President when he should have back in 1996 and is now covering for himself, or he wants to protect the President and make it appear that the President only found out about the spying in July of 1997.

But, again, the President said he did not really know anything about it, even in March of this year. Is it really likely that Sandy Berger after hearing such a detailed and alarming picture of Chinese spying, that he would keep this information to himself instead of immediately informing the President? And if he did so, if he did not tell the President when he found out about it, he should be fired.

The New York Times reported that in 1998, in a sworn reply to the House committee chaired by Christopher Cox, the Cox report which we have read so much about, Berger first said that the White House was not told about the espionage until 1998. So Berger apparently has changed his story as more and more of the facts have come out.

When David Leavy, the National Security Council spokesman, was asked to explain the discrepancy about when Berger informed the President, he said that after the Cox committee process, we started to remember more. They started to remember more about Chinese espionage on our nuclear facilities at our nuclear laboratories? They just did not tell the truth.

Are we supposed to believe that Sandy Berger forgot about the briefing of the President on Chinese spying in July of 1997? That is just crazy. How could we believe anything that the Clinton administration says about this when the President says he was not told, did not know anything about it in 1999 in March? Berger says he told him in 1997 and said he did not tell him anything before that when he knew about it in the fall of 1996.

Worse than that is the man that they knew or believed was giving these secrets to the Communist Chinese about our nuclear weaponry that makes them on a par with us in many cases, this man was left in the job at these laboratories, this man who was supposed to be a spy, for 3 years. Why was he kept at the laboratory in his top secret position for 3 years after they knew espionage was taking place from our sources in China? Why did they not fire the guy?

And the FBI went to the Justice Department, not once, not twice, not three times, but four times the FBI went to the Justice Department with probable cause and said they wanted to put a wiretap on this guy and they wanted to have a warrant to investigate his computer to see if he was giving information to the Chinese Communists. And the Justice Department denied all four of the requests, saying there was not enough evidence. Yet that was the only wiretap in 1997 and 1998 that was turned down, and it was turned down four times.

Now, the Justice Department has said they are going to investigate this whole thing. But they are the ones who turned down the wiretaps on the man that was performing the espionage, according to the FBI, Mr. Lee, Wen Ho Lee.

This whole thing stinks to high heaven. And at the same time this espionage was taking place and the Chinese Communists were being able to target not one American city but 10 American cities with one missile with 10 warheads, with pinpoint accuracy, at the time all this technology was being transferred and we were leaving this guy in place at the nuclear laboratory, the White House and the Democrat National Committee was getting campaign contributions from sources in Communist China.

Mr. Johnny Chung will be appearing before my committee next week and will be questioned about these conduit contributions into the Democrat National Committee and into the Clinton-Gore Reelection Committee.

What I cannot understand is how the White House could have all these Chinese Communist businesspeople coming in and out of the White House with Johnny Chung. He was in there 49 times. He said, the only way you get in and out of the White House is by putting money in because it is like a turnstile at a subway station.

While all this money was changing hands and going into the coffers of the President's Reelection Committee, this espionage was taking place at our nuclear laboratories and the man was left in place even though the Justice Department was asked four times by the FBI for electronic surveillance.

These questions must be answered for the American people, because the security of every man, woman and child has been jeopardized by this espionage that has taken place.

Now, the thing that bothers me even in addition to all this is that when the President went to China last year, he stood beside President Jiang; and President Jiang said that nobody in his government was involved in giving illegal campaign contributions to the President's Reelection Committee or to the Democrat National Committee.

Johnny Chung has said that the head of the Chinese People's Liberation Army Military Intelligence Agency, the head man, the head spy for that country, met with him along with the head of their aerospace industry; and this lady, who is the head of their aerospace industry, is the daughter of the fellow who used to be the head of the People's Liberation Army and a member of the Communist Chinese hierarchy, the Politburo. They met with Johnny Chung and they gave him $300,000 to give to the President's Reelection Committee and to the Democrat National Committee. Part of that was delivered; part of it Mr. Chung kept.

How could the President stand beside President Jiang in 1998 and say this? When President Jiang said that they were not giving any money, he says, I do believe him, President Jiang, that

he had not ordered or authorized or approved any such thing and that he could find no evidence that anybody in governmental authority had done that.

The President said that at the same time that he knew espionage had taken place at Livermore and at Los Alamos, because he had been briefed by Sandy Berger. He knew that illegal campaign contributions had come into the United States from Communist China, and he said he believed President Jiang. Why was that said?

Again, in April of this year, how could the President listen to Chinese Prime Minister Zhu Rongji deny any Chinese involvement in spying and espionage? President Clinton said, ''China is a big country with a big government, and I can only say that America is a big country with a big government and occasionally things happen in this government that I don't know anything about.''

Talk about a disingenuous statement. In China, in Communist China, if you are involved in this kind of activity and the government does not know about it, they put you in prison or they kill you. Especially nuclear espionage. Yet the President said, ''Well, that's a big country and maybe they didn't know about it.'' Espionage at our laboratories, giving them nuclear technology that could kill 50 to 60 million Americans? Mr. Speaker, our leadership cannot continue to blindly accept each and every denial that comes out of China.

Newsweek recently reported that a team of U.S. nuclear experts practically fainted, these are our top scientists, they practically fainted when the CIA showed them the data that was obtained from its sources in China.

What did this data show, Mr. Speaker? It showed Chinese scientists routinely using phrases, descriptions and concepts that came straight out of our weapons laboratories.

One of the officials close to the investigation said, the Chinese penetration is total. They are deep, deep into the lab's black programs. That means the nuclear technology that we have spent decades developing, that have cost the American taxpayer billions of dollars, that ensured our national security against a first strike by a Communist country or an adversary, Saddam Hussein or whoever it might be, has been compromised and jeopardized; and the Chinese Communists are deep into every one of our top nuclear missile programs.

Now, they say that we are the only superpower in the world. I can tell you that the Chinese Communist government is advancing their nuclear technology with this espionage that has taken place to such a degree that, if they are not on a par with us yet, they are getting very, very close; and we are going to be in jeopardy if we ever have a conflict with them. They have 1.2 or 1.3 billion people. We have 225 or 230 million people. In a nuclear exchange, they could sacrifice 200 million people. But we could not sacrifice 50 million. Yet they now have the technology with this espionage to really cause our economy and our country severe problems, and I am talking about 50 to 60 million people killed with a first strike and our economy to be in a complete shambles.

We need to have the answers to this. We need to make sure that this kind of espionage never takes place again. And we need to make absolutely sure that those who were responsible, either through neglect or intentionally allowing this to happen, be brought to justice and be held accountable.

I intend to come to this floor every week until we get through this mess for 5 minutes or for an hour to bring this information to the attention of the American people.

Right now, we are all paying attention to Kosovo, halfway around the world, an area where we do not have any vital national interest. And while we are talking about Kosovo and our heart goes out to those people over there who are suffering, while we are talking about that, espionage has taken place in the United States that endangers every man, woman and child, and nobody is even paying any attention to it. It is a darn shame. It shall not continue if I have anything to do with it.

CHINESE ESPIONAGE

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleague who was just at the podium addressing the issue of Chinese espionage at our nuclear facilities and would, of course, like to engage the gentleman from Indiana, if I may.

And certainly a question that would have to be raised at this point in time is, can America feel secure today with its nuclear weapons secret intact now? Have we solved this problem yet? Or is there something we should be doing?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No, the problem has been exacerbated by the espionage that has taken place, as I alluded to a few minutes ago.

The thing that really concerns me is the head of the National Security Council, Sandy Berger, who was briefed about this in April 1996 really did not do anything about it.

□ 2030

He informed the President in 1997. The President has not owned up to that, and the thing that concerns me a great deal is that when this was known we should have called the head of the FBI, Louis Freeh; Janet Reno; the head of the CIA; and the head of the Energy Department, and together to come up with a way to catch the people who were involved in the espionage and make sure it stopped. But unfortunately they kept the people on at Los Alamos for 3 years after that, and the Justice Department would not even allow wiretaps on the fellow.

So it has been a real mess, and we need to get to the bottom of it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Is the gentleman suggesting that through inadvertence or maybe intentionally disregarding the danger here, the FBI and the Justice Department failed to take an active role in the investigation of this espionage once it was found out in 1995 and 1996?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think that Louis Freeh and the FBI were trying to do the best that they could. They went to the Justice Department four times asking for electronic surveillance on Mr. Wen Ho Lee, the man who was involved in the espionage, or allegedly involved in the espionage, and the Justice Department denied on four separate occasions the electronic surveillance, and to my knowledge that was the only denial of electronic surveillance where there was probable cause by the FBI in the year of 1997, 1998. And so why did they deny it when we are talking about national security, and why was this man left in this position for 3 years?

Those are questions that need to be answered and answered very quickly.

Mr. GIBBONS. Well, I do express the same concerns that my colleague has over this issue because once our nuclear weapons technology has spread to other countries, of course, as we know, there is a likelihood that that will even progress further in the proliferation of that technology to Third World countries or even rogue states. I know that China has an ongoing participation with countries like Iran, Pakistan and others who are in the process today of building up their nuclear arsenal.

So from the standpoint that America has lost a great deal of its internal security, we have also lost a great deal of our national security from the fact that now these weapons, the design of which was obviously transferred to the Chinese through some process like the gentleman is describing here, now can be directed toward us by the Chinese or other countries who possess this technology.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The gentleman makes a very valid point. The proliferation of nuclear weapons is growing at a rapid rate, and with this technology going to the Chinese communists, I do not know if they are going to let it out or not, but the fact is they have been selling a lot of advanced weaponry to countries like Iran, and I am not sure about Iraq, but I believe Iraq, and my colleague mentioned some other countries as well. And that technology, if it gets into the wrong hands, could precipitate a strike by some kind of a crazy like Saddam Hussein, if he had the opportunity, that could cause untold human misery.

And so we need to keep a tight lid on all of the nuclear technology that we have, and for us to keep a person who is suspected of espionage in a position of leadership at Los Alamos for 3 years

and not allow the FBI to even put electronic surveillance on him is a real dereliction of duty.

Mr. GIBBONS. Well, I thank the gentleman for, of course, his interest in looking into this issue. It is on the forefront of the minds of a great number of Americans, and I applaud him for his interest in keeping all of us apprised of this and looking into it on behalf of the committee and on behalf of the American people.

PEACEFULLY RESOLVING THE SITUATION IN KOSOVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for holding some time while I ran over from Rayburn. I was expecting that the other side would offer a special order, and I did want to make sure that we took this special out this evening, and I am happy that my good friend from Nevada is going to be joining us as we review, Mr. Speaker, the past 4 weeks and actually 5 weeks and discuss an effort by this Congress to move the process involving Kosovo to a new level and a new direction, and that is to try to find a way to solve the situation peacefully.

Mr. Speaker, it was actually a little bit over 4 weeks ago, the week of April 6, when Russian friends of mine who I have been involved with for the past 5 years in a formal Duma-Congress relationship called me at my home and asked if I would be open to some ideas about engaging with them to find a peaceful solution to the Kosovo crisis. They were calling me for several reasons.

One, they said they had, the Russians had been shut out of the process by our government in terms of working with them once the bombing campaign began, that there had been no overture on the part of our State Department or our administration to involve Russia, but rather our administration in the minds of the Russians had become convinced that they could solve the problem of the ethnic cleansing in Serbia by bombing and bombing in a massive way.

The second reason they called, Mr. Speaker, was because these pro-western leaders in Russia were concerned. They saw their country heading down the wrong path. In fact, they cited examples of evidence that Russia had become much more anti-American than at any point in time that they had seen since the days of the Soviet communist regime.

In fact, they said that Americans were now being told not to speak English on the streets of Russia, that the Duma had canceled all activities interconnecting with America, cancelling all conferences. The Harvard University Study Group that goes on every year was canceled. The initiative to involve exchanges of staffers was canceled. Every possible contact between us and Russia had been severed, not just because of the bombing but because of our administration's refusal to work with Russia in a proactive way.

In fact, as I mentioned earlier today, Mr. Speaker, a Duma member was here in this Capitol building, and he said something very interesting: that for decades and decades the Soviet Communist Party had spent billions of dollars to try to convince the Russian people that America was bad, that we were a Nation that was filled with hate and that Russia should not in the end want to be friends with, and he went on to say that the Soviet Communist Party failed. All the money they spent, all the activities they engaged in could not convince the Russian people that America was evil or that America was not a nation of the highest standards.

And he went on to say today that in just 45 days this President has done what the Soviet Communist party could not do in decades and decades of attempts, and that is because of the Kosovo crisis, because of the incessant bombing of the people of Serbia; because of the lack of involvement of Russia, the Russian people had turned against America, and that the polls were showing that Russians all over that nation now see America in their minds and in their eyes in a negative way.

What they have told us is that if we continue this policy, we are going to push Russia right into the hands of the communists and the ultra nationalists who want to revert back to the Cold War days when America was the enemy.

Russia has elections scheduled for this year, Mr. Speaker, and the Russians that are friends of ours, the pro-Western forces, are saying if you continue the policies that you are currently pursuing, you will defeat us in the election and you will end up with the Duma, a federation council and a president who are anti-American, who are anti-West and who will turn toward the Middle Eastern, in many cases the rogue states.

That is not what we want, Mr. Speaker.

So when the Russians called me 5 weeks ago at home, I said, ''Send me what you would like us to pursue.'' They sent me a simple document that contained three ideas.

The first one was that Russia should accept responsibility for helping to stop the ethnic cleansing, and they called it ethnic cleansing.

Number two, that Milosevic had to come to grips with the NATO requirements. The only problem Russia had with that was that they felt U.S. and British troops on the ground would not be appropriate, since America and Britain were the primary bombers that were persecuting the raids over Serbia.

And, number three, that there be a commission established between the Congress and the Duma to oversee any agreement that would be reached.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was a simple plan, but as I looked at it, I said, ''You know, it's something we can build on.'' So I took that document. Not wanting to work outside of our government, I wrote up a memo.

I first of all called the White House and talked to Leon Fuerth, the top security adviser to Vice President Gore, and I said, ''Mr. Fuerth, this is what the Russians have done. You know of my involvement with them. I want to send you a copy of their proposal, and I want to let you know I am going to work with them quietly.''

He and I suggested that I follow up that call with Carlos Pascual from the National Security Council who focuses on Russian issues. I called him. I faxed him the same memo.

In that first week of April I told no Republican what I was doing, but I kept our government informed.

Over the weekend we had additional calls.

The following week I decided to brief the Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet. I let him know that I had been contacted, what my response was and that I had told the Russians that I was supportive of the five points that NATO had eventually come to put into writing and the administration's approach, that I was willing to work with them to try to find a peaceful solution.

Also that week, Mr. Speaker, which was the week of August or April 13, I contacted two Democrat colleagues in this body: the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). Congressman Hoyer is my cochair on the Russian Duma-Congress Initiative, he is very well respected by the administration, and he is a good friend of mine who I trust. Congressman Murtha, also a good friend, is a key person that the administration relies on.

I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Maryland to talk to the administration, to talk to Strobe Talbott and talk to the White House and let them know what I was doing, and they both did that, and they told me they did. The gentleman from Maryland talked to Strobe Talbott, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania talked to the White House.

Also that week, Mr. Speaker, I approached three other Democrats in this body: the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH) because of his Serbian background and ethnic ties; the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) who had just returned from Kosovo; and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) who had gone with me to Moscow in December.

So during the second week of this process I contacted no Republicans but again focused on the other party and the administration, trying to find common ground.

At the end of that week, Mr. Speaker, I called the State Department and

talked at length two times to Steve Sestanovich, who is in charge of Russian affairs within the State Department. I talked to his assistant from my home, Andre Lewis, who had traveled with a delegation that I chaired to Moscow in early December of last year. I briefed them on what had happened and told them that I was trying to work out an idea that the Russians had brought to my attention because of their frustration in seeing that the administration had cut off contact with Russia in trying to solve the Kosovo conflict peacefully.

Mr. Speaker, besides talking to Sestanovich and Andre Lewis and all of the others that I mentioned earlier, I decided to challenge the Russians because they asked me to bring a bipartisan delegation to meet with them when they travel to Belgrade to meet with Milosevic. I said: Give me that in writing. Give me the request on your official letterhead. Tell me who the colleagues will be from the Russian side that we will interact with. Give me the written time and date of the meeting with Milosevic. Give me an understanding and a commitment that we will meet with our POWs, who up until this point in time had not been talked to by anyone, even the Red Cross. And commit to me that you will go to a refugee camp of our choosing to see the pain and suffering brought forward by Milosevic.

Mr. Speaker, the Russians agreed to all five points. They wrote to me. First, Deputy Speaker Ryshkov and now chairman of Chernomyrdin's political faction, Nosh Dom, Our Home is Russia, wrote to me a very personal letter, and he asked me to get formally involved. Again, Mr. Speaker, I did not go to my Republican colleagues. I went to my Democrat friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and I said, ''Can you help me get a meeting with the White House? Can you help me get a meeting with Sandy Berger so I can run this idea by him?''

I called Sandy Berger three times, Mr. Speaker. He never had the courtesy to return my phone call. So I asked again the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) if he would work with me to get a meeting with Strobe Talbott. He said, ''Call Talbott. He will return your call and you'll get a meeting.''

□ 2045

This was Thursday, Mr. Speaker, April 23. Strobe Talbott said I will meet with you today.

I said I want to bring the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) with me. I picked the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) up. We drove down to the State Department and for 90 minutes we met with Strobe Talbott and three of his top deputies.

We went over with him the offer of the Russians to come to Budapest to achieve a dialogue of understanding based on those first three principles; then the drive together on a bus to Belgrade, where at 1:00 on that following Monday we would have a face-to-face meeting with Milosevic; we would have lunch with our POWs and travel to a refugee camp so the Russians would see the horror that Milosevic has perpetrated on the Kosovar people.

After the meeting, Strobe Talbott said, I have concerns about what you want to do but I will talk to the Secretary of State and Sandy Berger. Two hours later that evening, Thursday, April 23, Strobe Talbott called back and said, you can do what you want as a citizen, we cannot stop you, but our advice is that you should not travel to Belgrade.

I said to him if my government says we should not go, I will not be a renegade. I will call the Russians and tell them that we are not coming to meet with them, and I did.

That was a very upsetting telephone call to the Russians because they had also arranged for one of Milosevic's top aides, Dragomir Karic, to meet with us and drive with us to Belgrade. Karic is a very successful businessman in Belgrade, in Russia. His companies employ 64,000. He owns a TV station in Serbia. He owns a bank. He owns extensive companies. He is not a member of the government but is a key financial supporter and a close personal friend of Milosevic and his wife. He was going to be the person who accompanied us into Belgrade for these meetings.

When we were turned down by our government, I told the Russians that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) had suggested that we have another meeting in a neutral site, and the State Department, through Strobe Talbott, agreed and thought that would be a good idea. So I told the Russians that weekend that they should plan a trip to a neutral city, and they said we will go to Vienna on April the 30; Vienna, Austria.

Then Monday of last week, Mr. Speaker, I developed a 3-page letter which I sent to all 435 Members of the House. That 3-page letter documented everything I had been doing, including the fact that I had not involved the Republicans because I did not want our friends on the minority side and the administration to say somehow we were doing something partisan or that somehow we were doing something that was less than honorable or that somehow we were doing something to embarrass the President. No one could say that. In fact, no one can say that today.

That letter went out to every Member and I invited every Member of this body to join with me and with others in trying to find a bipartisan solution to the Kosovo crisis that would end the bombing and end the hostility.

On Tuesday and Wednesday evening of last week, we had meetings with Members of Congress. We sat together and we talked. A number of us at our Republican Conference on Wednesday asked our leadership not to have the votes on Thursday, because we felt they would be too confusing to have votes about whether or not to declare war or whether or not to withdraw the troops.

We asked our leadership to postpone those votes until this week. We were not successful, because the gentleman who offered that resolution, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), wanted to have the votes on that day, which, in fact, is a requirement of the War Powers resolution.

In fact, I went to the Committee on Rules that night at 10:30 and asked the Committee on Rules to consider a motion to be made in order to allow me to table the votes until this week so we could meet with the Russians to see if there was some possibility of common ground.

We were not successful in that attempt. The votes occurred, and all day Thursday I sought to get the approval for a plane to take a delegation to Vienna.

Working with colleagues like my friend, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), we got the approval and at 6:00 last Thursday evening, 11 Members of Congress got on an airplane that holds 12 people. We flew all night and we arrived in Vienna the next morning.

That delegation, Mr. Speaker, included the most liberal Members of this body, including now a good friend of mine, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), our only socialist and independent; Democrats who support the President, like the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. Brown); Democrats who have been concerned about the President's policy, like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and 5 Republican Members who ranged from moderate to the very right in terms of the political spectrum, like the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Eleven of us traveled to Vienna overnight. We had discussions on the way over about what our approach would be. I briefed them on the backgrounds of the Russian delegates. I told them what we would hope to accomplish, and we reached agreement.

When we arrived in Vienna at 8:30 in the morning on Friday, we went right to our hotel. We had just enough time to change and we proceeded to go to the state house of Austria, where we had a meeting for an hour and a half with the chairman or the speaker of the Austrian parliament.

We wanted to get a feel for what Austria, an independent, nonaligned nation, would think about the Kosovo crisis and the bombing and the ethnic cleansing.

After we got the chance to meet with the speaker of that body, we went to the Russian hotel where the Russian delegates were staying and we began our meetings.

Mr. Speaker, in those meetings, besides the 11 Members of Congress representing Republicans and Democrats, I invited a State Department employee, who works in the Russian desk, who works for Stestanovich, Andre Lewis, to sit with us at our meetings, not to be a participant because this was a legislative session, but to listen to what we were saying so that no one could misconstrue our approach, our methodology and our process.

He sat through every meeting and every dinner and every breakfast and session that we had. Along with the Russians and along with the Americans, we had Dragomir Karic. He is, as I said earlier, one of the strongest financial supporters of Milosevic. He was there to advise the Russians. The Russian delegation included Vladimir Ryshkov who was most recently the first deputy speaker, number two, in the state Duma, their parliament. He now is the chairman of a very successful political party in Russia called Our Home is Russia. In fact, it is the party that Chernomyrdin is a member of. He is a very close associate of Chernomyrdin, who was Russia's envoy on the Balkan issue, the Kosovo issue, and he had had conversations with Chernomyrdin both before and during the time he arrived in Vienna.

The second member of the Russian side was Vladimir Luhkin, the former Soviet ambassador to the U.S., a member of the Yabloko, a moderate faction in the Duma, and also the chairman of the International Affairs Committee. Luhkin is a very well respected member of the Duma, someone that Duma deputies look to for advice on foreign affairs and international issues.

The third representative in the Duma delegation was Alexander Shapanov. Shapanov represented Seleznyov, the Communist faction, the largest faction in the state Duma. He was there to bring the broad coalition of political ideology to the table so that if we reached agreement it was not just with one faction or with one part of the government, but actually represented a consensus in Russia of what should be our approach to solving this problem peacefully.

Along with those three deputies was Segie Konovalenko. Konovalenko, who is a good friend of mine, is the chief protocol officer for the Russian Duma who works with all the players in the Duma and all the political factions in Russia. There are seven major factions in the Duma. He works with all seven.

In beginning our discussions, Mr. Speaker, I said that we had some basic premises that we needed to understand. Number one, we were not representing our government. We were not there as official representatives of President Clinton, nor were we representing our State Department. We were parliamentarians, engaging in parliamentary discussions as we have on numerous times over the past 5 years on a variety of issues.

The second point was that the five points that NATO had put forth were the basis of our discussion. We were not deviating from the policy of this administration. We were building on what President Clinton and the NATO countries said had to be the basis for a peaceful resolution of this conflict.

With that in mind, we started our discussions, and for the rest of Friday every member on both sides had a chance to give their views. During our discussions, the Russian side, and the representative of Milosevic, said to us you all have to come with us to Belgrade on this trip. It is extremely important that you meet with Milosevic. They said to us, if you come to Belgrade, you will be given one, perhaps two or possibly three, of our POWs. They will be released if you come to Belgrade for discussions.

I told our Russian friends, and I told the representative of Milosevic, that we would not be going to Belgrade; that I had given my word to Speaker HASTERT that our delegation would not go down to Belgrade because in his conversations with Madeleine Albright they had agreed that we should not do that. So I told the delegates that could not be acceptable, but we continued our deliberations.

On Saturday morning, after our staffs worked through the night to develop the framework of an agreement or a discussion paper, a report if you will, we met for breakfast. We continued our discussions through breakfast, stayed in one room in our hotel until we went over every word in every sentence in the document.

If any one member of the American side or the Russian side objected, we stopped. It was not a vote. It was where any one member could object to any one word or phrase we would go back and revisit that until we reached agreement.

We did that for every line in the document until at 1:00 p.m. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, this past Saturday, we reached agreement with our Russian friends and colleagues.

The agreement, I thought, was somewhat significant, because it was the first time that Russian leadership acknowledged that there must be a multinational peace force placed inside of Kosovo, and the Russians agreed with that. It was the first time that Russian representatives agreed that Milosevic must remove the armed Serbian military and armed personnel out of Kosovo, and Russia agreed with that.

It was the first time that Russia allowed the acknowledgment of the phrase, ethnic cleansing, in a document involving Kosovo, and the Russian side agreed with that.

It was the first time that an acknowledgment by Russia offered the opportunity for the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council to determine the makeup of the multinational force. It was a document that was plain, that was simple, but gave a framework for a peaceful settlement and negotiation of this crisis.

We did not negotiate. We did not get into how many troops should be left in Kosovo. We did not get into the makeup of the military force, because that is the job of our government, but we did agree on a framework.

We also said that three things must occur simultaneously, without regard to the order. We said, first of all, the bombing must stop. Number two, Milosevic must remove all of his armed forces from Kosovo. Number three, that KLA aggression must also stop. The Russians agreed to that as well.

When we finished the document about 1:00 in the afternoon, we were pleased because we had come together as representatives of different points of views but now deciding on a common agenda to move forward together that we could take back to our governments as parliamentarians and encourage them to work on.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Milosevic's representative, Mr. Karic, took the document that the Russians gave him and faxed it to Belgrade. Approximately one half-hour later, Milosevic himself was on the phone with Dragomir Karic for the third time in our discussions, and he told Karic that if we came to Belgrade, this delegation of 11 members, if we went to Belgrade, and they would provide the bus, that was not a question, it would have been a 7-hour journey down through Budapest into Belgrade, if we went to Belgrade that two things would happen. Number one, and this was said to all 11 members in the room at the same time, at 1:00 on Saturday, we were told all three prisoners of war would be released to the American delegation.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we were told, as a group, that Karic felt 100 percent certain that if we went to Belgrade the framework that we had agreed upon with the Russians would be publicly embraced by Milosevic. Now, that was certainly something new, Mr. Speaker, in both regards.

We had not gone to Vienna to talk about the POWs, but this was the way that Karic was wanting to get us to go to Belgrade.

I thought to myself, this is significant. Even though I have given the Speaker of the House my word, I have got to check with our State Department.

So I asked the representative of the State Department who was with us, Andre Lewis, to call back to Washington, the special ops center for the State Department, and see what the response would be of his bosses. He made a call and got on the phone with Steve Stestanovich, who is in charge of Russian affairs at the State Department. He asked me to get with him on the phone, and I did.

I read him the 2-page document. I told him about the agreement. I told him that we were not negotiating on behalf of the country but we reached an agreement on a framework, and I told him what Milosevic had said through Karic and what the Russians had agreed to, that if we went to Belgrade we would bring the POWs out

and that Milosevic would embrace the framework publicly.

□ 2100

He said to me, CURT, I have got to have someone higher up talk to you. I will have someone call you. I said, fine.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, one of the Members of the other side of the aisle who was with us, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MAURICE HINCHEY), who is a strong supporter of the President, called the White House from Vienna.

Through the White House Special Operations Center he got in touch with the Chief of Staff for President Clinton, Mr. Podesta. He told Mr. Podesta that the five Democrats on our trip were convinced that something was happening of significance, that the White House should talk to the State Department, because we had faxed them the two-page document.

Mr. Podesta said he would immediately contact the State Department to see what the significance of this event was, and through the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) we encouraged the White House to encourage the State Department to consider whether or not we should pursue the opportunity available to us.

Mr. Speaker, by that time a phone call came in from Washington that I was asked to get involved with from the Under Secretary of State, Tom Pickering. Tom Pickering is a longtime friend, and someone who I have a great deal of respect and admiration for. Five years ago when we started the Duma-Congress effort, he was the ambassador from our country to Russia in Moscow.

He said to me, CURT, what is happening? I said, Mr. Ambassador, and I read the document to him. I said, we have come to an agreement, a framework which I think might be useful to bring Russia and Milosevic in line with what you, the State Department, want in terms of a peaceful resolution of this conflict.

I said, I'm not asking you to endorse this paper, but I'm telling you what we have agreed upon as parliamentarians. Let me tell you what they want us to do. I said, Mr. Ambassador, they want us to go into Belgrade. They have committed to us, Milosevic through Karic, that all three POWs will be released. In addition, they have said that they are 100 percent certain that Milosevic will embrace the principles that the Russians and Americans agreed to.

He said, CURT, those promises have been made before. You can't trust Milosevic's word. What makes you think you are going to be successful? He went on to say, you know, a couple of missions have tried to get the POWs out. In fact, he said, Jesse Jackson's mission has been a failure. He is not bringing out the POWs.

Mr. Speaker, that phone conversation was at approximately 1:30 or 2 o'clock last Saturday afternoon. I had not been following the Jackson delegation, although I was supportive of what he was doing because he was trying to get our POWs out.

I said, all I am telling you, Mr. Pickering, is what the Russians and Karic tell us. I will not take this delegation to Belgrade if you say that you advise against that, because I understand that we are not to interfere with the policies and the negotiations of this government, and that we are not to go in and, in effect, create interference, especially when hostilities are occurring. So if you say don't go, even though we could go as independent citizens, we won't go.

At the end of that conversation I thanked Ambassador Pickering and went downstairs. I told my friends from the Congress, the Russian Duma deputies, and Karic on behalf of Milosevic, that we would not be going into Belgrade. They were disappointed, very upset. In fact, a couple of our Members who were with us from both parties wanted to go into Belgrade on their own. I said, no, we are not going to do that. We are going to stay together as a group.

We did open the possibility of Milosevic making some kind of a public statement which would perhaps change things. Pickering had told me, if that happens, call me back.

That was about 2 o'clock, Mr. Speaker. We met in the same meeting room that we had been in all day to decide further actions that we would take in both Moscow and the U.S. to create a visibility of our agreement, to spread it throughout the country and throughout Russia and Europe; that we thought there was a capability for a common framework, for a solution, a negotiated settlement on the terms of NATO and our government.

Two hours and 15 minutes after we had told Milosevic that we would not go to Belgrade, we were sitting in the room together and one of our military escorts came in the room and announced to us that CNN had just announced on television that Milosevic had agreed that he would release the POWs within 3 to 5 hours to Jesse Jackson's delegation.

We were ecstatic, Mr. Speaker, because that is not why we went to Vienna, but we were happy that they were being released. Obviously, we were disappointed because we could have been there, and perhaps if we would have been there we could have also done something that I think was equally important, and that was to get Milosevic to publicly embrace what I think will be the final process for achieving a peaceful settlement in Kosovo.

With the release of the POWs to occur in a matter of hours, we felt it was impossible to convince our State Department to give us the okay to go into Belgrade just to discuss this framework that we had agreed on.

So instead, we went to dinner with the Russians and with Milosevic's Rep, Karic, and we had a great time discussing how we had come together and how we would work together in the future to implement this process. Upon arriving back in Washington on Saturday, we agreed to meet this week, and all week we have had an aggressive agenda to move forward our agenda.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday we mailed letters to every Member of the House describing what had occurred in the delegation, along with the document. On Tuesday, every member of our delegation signed 40 letters. Those letters went to the Pope, they went to the chief cleric of the Muslim faith in Yugoslavia, they went to the head of the orthodox church in Yugoslavia.

A copy of the document went with a signed letter by all of us to Kofi Anan, and I called the U.N. and told them we were available for meetings. We faxed our document to every parliament from every NATO country, all 19 NATO countries.

I met with representatives of Ukraine and gave them a copy to give to the Rada, and the Rada is now considering passing a resolution equal to the one that my good friend and colleague that I am going to recognize in a moment prepared for consideration by this Congress, a resolution supporting the basic framework that we agreed upon.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, beside those contacts, we mailed copies of this to TRENT LOTT and TOM DASCHLE, DENNY HASTERT and DICK GEPHARDT, the White House, the State Department, so that everyone in America has been given not just last Saturday from Vienna, but this week, a copy of a framework that we felt could begin the peace process.

Imagine how we felt this morning, Mr. Speaker, when we all heard on the news and read in the papers that the G–7 countries plus Russia had met, and their meeting was historic because they announced this one-page statement.

This one-page statement, Mr. Speaker, is a statement of a process to begin the end of the Kosovo crisis. Mr. Speaker, this statement is identical to what this group did last Saturday with the Russians in Vienna. This group of 11 Members of Congress, liberal Democrats and conservative Republicans, supporters of the President and opponents of the President, put together a document that is almost identical to this document agreed to by the eight nations that govern activities in Europe and throughout the world, the G–8 group.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work that we accomplished, and that we may or may not have had an impact on this document. I know what we did. I know what we accomplished. I know that Chernomyrdin was talking to Ryshkov, we were done, and I said to him, Vladimir, how close is what we did to what your country will accept? He said, it is identical. What we have agreed upon is what Russia in the end will accept.

Today, Mr. Speaker, President Clinton was traveling around the world.

Maybe the President was not informed by his staff, maybe he does not read the papers. Let me read the quote when President Clinton was asked about the G–8 statement that was read to him.

This is what our president said. ''Clinton described the agreement as important because 'as far as I know, this is the first time that the Russians have publicly said they support international security as well as civilian force in Kosovo.' ''

Mr. Speaker, the President is wrong. The first time was last Saturday. The first time was in Vienna. The first time was when the leaders of the political parties in Russia agreed with us in Vienna to move forward in a new direction.

We think now is the time to seize the opportunity to reach out, to show some good faith by putting together a negotiated agreement that allows the stopping of the bombing at the same time the troops are removed, to stop the hostilities by the KLA, to reinstate the refugees, to give them protection, to provide the humanitarian assistance, to do all of those things that now we have an opportunity to succeed with.

The opportunity is in the hands of this administration. They are going to have to again reach out to Russia, but they are going to also have to reach out to Milosevic. I know we do not like to talk to Milosevic, Mr. Speaker, but we have an opportunity to end this conflict.

Forty-five days of incessant bombing, 45 days of driving people in Serbia who were enemies of Milosevic to become his begest supporters, 45 days of driving 1 million people, along with Milosevic, out of Kosovo into the fields and to the remote areas around that country who are starving, who are without food, who are living in unhealthy conditions; and 45 days of convincing the Russian people that we are their enemy.

It is time to change that, Mr. Speaker. This framework allows us to achieve dignity, dignity for NATO, dignity for this administration and our country, dignity for the Russians, dignity for the European community, for everyone who is concerned with a peaceful resolution.

I would implore this administration not to miss this opportunity. This is a chance to end this conflict on our terms, to let NATO be able to say that they have achieved what they want, to let this government say that it had an achieved what it wants, but it has done it because of the help and cooperation of the leadership in Russia.

I would say to our friends and colleagues and to the American people, I sure hope we do not miss this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, because it is going to be once in a lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) for whatever comments he would like to make, my good friend who is a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, a distinguished member of this body, and has a distinguished military career on top of that.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for yielding to me a little bit of time here to join with him in this very important process.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we can enter into the RECORD a copy of the agreement, the report of the meeting between the U.S. Congress and the Russian Duma that took place over the time frame of April 30 through the first of May that we have already been discussing, and I hope maybe later on if we have a little bit of time, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and I can go over some of the similarities between the G–8 declaration and the principles that were brought forward in our Congress and Duma process.

Before I do that I want to take just a moment, and not often does America realize the significance or the importance of the work the gentleman has been doing for the last 5 years, trying to bridge the gap, build better and more personal relationships with our counterparts in the Russian Duma, and of course the Russian Duma is similar to the House of Representatives that we have here in Congress.

It has been through the gentleman's hard work over the last several years that we have been able to call on them, to establish a working relationship that has resulted in what I think may be some of the most historic work to date from this study group.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GIBBONS. First, let me say that there is a real important reason for us to work together. Of course, we all know the fact that proliferation of nuclear weapons around this world is primarily something that we have a deep and abiding interest in, and being able to work together with countries that are nuclear powers oftentimes sheds light on how we can better preserve the peace, even build a little security for everyone around the world.

The relationship that I came away with from meeting with our Russian counterparts was one that struck me as something we should all take to heart. They were very concerned about the fact that NATO's attack on a small country, Serbia, was one that was envisioned as being 19 countries versus one single small country like Yugoslavia.

They were concerned that such countries, when they are threatened by a massive force such as NATO, would oftentimes reach back into an arsenal of weaponry that may include either biological, chemical, or even nuclear weapons which could end up escalating a war into something that no one, not in this body, not in the administration, in fact, I daresay no one in America would want to have happen.

□ 2115

And it is the relationship that the gentleman has with the Russians and the relationship that was developed in this meeting in Vienna that I think helps avoid conflicts like that, avoids the fact that they know that that is not what we want, that we do not want to face an escalation of military violence of that level. So the working relationships bridges gaps, builds friendships, and builds confidence.

And I think one thing also that we ought to help our American viewers who are watching tonight understand is that the level of distrust, of mistrust——

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that remarks are to be directed to the Chair.

Mr. GIBBONS. I thank the Speaker; and, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that I can remind you that the level of distrust and mistrust of our Russian brothers and sisters toward the United States has never been at a lower point except for the time of the Korean War.

We have an obligation, we have a duty, and yes, indeed, we have an opportunity to sort of melt part of that iceberg that is out there so that we can get on with having a safer and more peaceful world.

I was most impressed with the gentleman's effort, his energy and his willingness to continue this fight. As I listened to the historical recitation of what he went through to ensure that we had an opportunity and a voice to bring forth those Russian ideas, those Russian concerns, that cannot be overstated.

It is so important for everyone to understand that much of this diplomatic process that we go through has a foundation, has a start somewhere, and it can only start when we reach out, reach across the sea to our Russian friends, and the gentleman has certainly done that on more than one occasion, but this is a very important time.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I would enter into the RECORD at this time a copy of the report of the meetings between the United States Congress and the Russian Duma that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and I have talked about here this evening.

REPORT OF THE MEETINGS OF THE U.S. CONGRESS AND RUSSIAN DUMA, VIENNA, AUSTRIA, 30 APRIL–1 MAY, 1999

All sessions centered on the Balkan crisis. Agreement was found on the following points:

I. The Balkan crisis, including ethnic cleansing and terrorism, is one of the most serious challenges to international security since World War II.

II. Both sides agree that this crisis creates serious threats to global and regional security and may undermine efforts against nonproliferation.

III. This crisis increases the threat of further human and ecological catastrophes, as evidenced by the growing refugee problem, and creates obstacles to further development of constructive Russian-American relations.

IV. The humanitarian crisis will not be solved by bombing. A diplomatic solution to the problem is preferable to the alternative of military escalation.

Taking the above into account, the sides consider it necessary to implement the following emergency measures as soon as possible, preferably within the next week. Implementation of these emergency measures will create the climate necessary to settle the political questions.

1. We call on the interested parties to find practical measures for a parallel solution to three tasks, without regard to sequence: the stopping of NATO bombing of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, withdrawal of Serbian armed forces from Kosovo, and the cessation of the military activities of the KLA. This should be accomplished through a series of confidence building measures, which should include but should not be limited to:

a. The release of all prisoners of war.

b. The voluntary repatriation of all refugees in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and unhindered access to them by humanitarian aid organizations. NATO would be responsible for policing the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia's borders with Albania and Macedonia to ensure that weapons do not reenter the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia with the returning refugees or at a later time.

c. Agreement on the composition of the armed international forces which would administer Kosovo after the Serbian withdraw. The composition of the group should be decided by a consensus agreement of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council in consultation with Macedonia, Albania, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and the recognized leadership of Kosovo.

d. The above group would be supplemented by the monitoring activities of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

e. The Russian Duma and U.S. Congress will use all possiblities at their disposal in order to successfully move ahead the process of resolving the situation in Yugoslavia on the basis of stopping the violence and atrocities.

2. We recognize the basic principles of the territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which include:

a. wide autonomy for Kosovo

b. a multi-ethnic population

c. treatment of all Yugoslavia peoples in accordance with international norms

3. We support efforts to provide international assistance to rebuild destroyed homes of refugees and other humanitarian assistance, as appropriate, to victims in Kosovo.

4. We, as members of the Duma and Congress, commit to active participation as follows:

Issue a Joint U.S. Congress-Russian Duma report of our meetings in Vienna. Concrete suggestions for future action will be issued as soon as possible.

Delegations will agree on timelines for accomplishment of above tasks.

Delegations will brief their respective legislatures and governments on outcome of the Vienna meetings and agreed upon proposals.

Delegations will prepare a joint resolution, based on their report, to be considered simultaneously in the Congress and Duma.

Delegations agree to continue a working group dialogue between Congress and the Duma in agreed upon places.

Delegations agree that Duma deputies will visit refugee camps and Members of Congress will visit the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Members of Congress:

Curt Weldon, Neil Abercrombie, Jim Saxton, Bernie Sanders, Roscoe Bartlett, Corrine Brown, Jim Gibbons, Maurice Hinchey, Joseph R. Pitts, Don Sherwood, Dennis J. Kucinich.

Duma Deputies:

_____ _____, _____ _____, _____ _____ _____ _____.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I can go over a little bit of the similarity between our document dated the 1st of May here and the G–8, or the G–7 plus Russia announcement today.

As I look at the calendar, today is May 6, so it has been a full 5 days, and that is time enough, as I see it, for them to have an opportunity to review the good work and the hard work that we put forward in that meeting and the statement of the G–7 plus Russia principles here.

I would just like to take the first one.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I would just like to say, before we do that, that for those who say that parliamentarians should not be involved in meeting with other parliamentarians, and I think the gentleman did a good job earlier today when he gave a 1-minute on this issue, that this administration is constantly encouraging Members of Congress to engage their counterparts around the world. In fact, we have programs that do that.

I got involved with Russia long before I was in Congress when a U.S. funded program, called the American Council of Young Political Leaders, encouraged me as a county commissioner to travel to Russia because my party thought that one day I might serve in Congress. Now, little did I realize that a couple of decades ago those early trips to Russia would result in me traveling to Russia some 19 times where I would host literally hundreds if not thousands of Russian leaders when they come to America and where I would have the opportunity, working with our friend and colleague, who is, by the way, watching these proceedings tonight, a former Member, Greg Laughlin, and starting 8 years ago a Russian-American Energy Caucus to try to find ways to bring hard currency into Russia so they would not have to sell off their nuclear technology or their conventional weapons.

The administration back then was supportive of our efforts. They were supportive of our efforts to help solve environmental problems, the nuclear waste problem up in the Arctic Ocean, out in the Sea of Japan. So it is interesting that the media in this city and the administration that has encouraged us so much to interact so much with these other leaders all of a sudden, when we do something constructive that maybe embarrasses them, all of a sudden says, well, we do not need 435 armchair diplomats.

We are not armchair diplomats, Mr. Speaker. We are doing what this administration asked us to do, which Vice President Gore and Viktor Chernomyrdin, when we started this effort 5 years ago, right down the hallway on the Senate side, stood up at a luncheon and said, it is fantastic, but now Gore-Chernomyrdin is going to be supplemented by a Duma-Congress study group, and applauded our foresight as parliamentarians coming together to try to build trust and understanding.

So it is okay to do it when they think it is important, but when we disagree or think that things are not going the way perhaps they could be going, and we try to use that influence that we have, all of a sudden we are not doing the right thing. Is that not amazing that that could happen?

Mr. GIBBONS. That is absolutely correct.

And if the gentleman will continue to yield, I just wish to say that I could not be more pleased at the hard work the gentleman has done over the past few years in building that important relationship, because it came to fruition when the gentleman reached out and asked for them to meet with us on this very important document at this very important time in this Balkans crisis. They willingly came because of the great respect they have for the gentleman and his hard work, and that was evident throughout the meeting.

I have to say that every one of us, whether we are in Congress or just ordinary citizens, are diplomats of this country when we travel abroad. So it is impossible to separate ourselves from our American heritage. It is part of us.

And we have even a higher responsibility when we are an elected official, especially those of us in Congress, in dealing with our counterparts, for example in the Russian Duma, to reflect American policies, to reflect American ideals. And we did that without negotiating, without breaching fundamental trust with the administration.

This was something that was established and has been established, as the gentleman said, over a number of years, and it has absolutely proven to be one of the most important relationships, one of the most important things that we can do as Members of Congress, to build trust between countries so that we never have to realize conflict, never have to go back to the days of the Cold War.

I think we are teetering today on the brink of entering another cold war. If we lose the elections in Russia, if we lose that confidence, if we end up having the cynicism about U.S. relationships with Russia that are now starting to grow, we could very well end up back in that same old Cold War that we all celebrated the end of in 1989.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I agree.

The gentleman's suggestion was a valid one, that we go through the G–8 document and compare it side by side to what we did just so that the American people know that what we agreed on with the Russians has now, in fact, become the basis of a G–8 set of principles to negotiate an end to this conflict.

Mr. GIBBONS. I would like to be the G–8, if he wants to respond to what our agreement said.

Let me take the first one. Number one, immediate and verifiable end of violence and repression in Kosovo.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. And our position on that same issue, and I will read it word for word, the stopping of NATO bombing, cessation of KLA activities, withdrawal of Serb forces from Kosovo, calls for termination of violence and atrocities.

If that is not identical, I do not know what is.

Mr. GIBBONS. It is almost word for word.

Let me take number two. Let us see how similar we can get with number two.

Withdrawal from Kosovo of military police and paramilitary forces.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Ours says, withdrawal of Serb forces from Kosovo.

Mr. GIBBONS. Identical.

Number three, the deployment in Kosovo of effective international civil and (armed) security presences, endorsed and adopted by the United Nations, capable of guaranteeing the achievement of the common objectives.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. And ours says, agreement on the composition of armed international forces which would administer Kosovo after the Serb withdrawal, to be determined by the U.N. five-member Security Council.

Mr. GIBBONS. Does not get much closer.

Let us go to number four. Number four says, the establishment of an interim administration for Kosovo to be decided by the U.N. Security Council to ensure conditions for a peaceful and normal life for all inhabitants in Kosovo.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. And our document says, the composition of armed forces should be decided by a consensus agreement of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council in consultation with Macedonia, Albania, Yugoslavia and the recognized leadership of Kosovo. And the above group would be monitored by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, of which both Russia and the U.S. are member nations.

And we had dinner at the ambassador's home for the U.S. with the Russian ambassador alongside of us.

Mr. GIBBONS. That is correct. And so all we did was broaden out a little bit the applicability and who would be in there helping to decide this very important objective.

So it seems so far that, of the four we have talked about, we have almost got parallel if not word-for-word concurrence with what this agreement that we worked on over the weekend says.

Let us take number five. Number five states, the safe and free return of all refugees and displaced persons and unimpeded access to Kosovo by humanitarian aid organizations.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. This one sounds close here. The voluntary repatriation of refugees in Yugoslavia and unhindered access to them by humanitarian aid organizations.

Mr. GIBBONS. I guess they could not get more creative than to copy us word for word, could they?

Let us look at number six. Number six says, a political process towards the establishment of an interim political framework agreement providing a substantial self-government for Kosovo, taking full account of Rambouillet Accords and principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity of Yugoslavia and other countries in the region, and demilitarization of UCK, which is the KLA.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. And ours says, recognizes the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia, including wide autonomy for Kosovo, a multi-ethnic population, and treatment of all Yugoslavia peoples in accordance with international norms.

Mr. GIBBONS. Just reworded.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. We just did not use that fancy Rambouillet word, but the content of what we said is identical to what is in number six.

Mr. GIBBONS. That is correct.

Finally, number seven, comprehensive approach to economic development and stabilization of the crisis region.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. And we said, supports efforts to provide international assistance to rebuild destroyed refugee homes and other humanitarian assistance to victims in Kosovo.

Mr. GIBBONS. And if the gentleman will yield, as we have gone down these seven principles that were established in the G–7 plus Russia or commonly known as the G–8, I think it is very clear upon a reading of the document that we worked out over the weekend, a reading of the principles that they have stated here and a comparison of the two shows that there is a direct, an almost word-for-word influence of their statement, which has come about to be, as stated in the press, a new framework for the peaceful solution of the Kosovo crisis.

So I can only applaud and congratulate the gentleman here publicly for his effort in this, because I think it was directly because of our working agreement, our working relationship between the Congress of the United States and the Duma of Russia that we were able to bring about a higher public awareness of the willingness on terms that are satisfactory to the United States, and including many of the NATO countries, if not all of the NATO countries, for a peaceful solution of the Kosovo crisis.

I just could not be more proud of the gentleman, and I could not be more pleased to be part of this effort. Certainly, as the gentleman mentioned earlier in the evening, we do have a resolution which is going to come about next week and is going to pretty much give a sense of Congress and stating an outline of the important work that was done here, the reason for it, and sort of giving congressional support to the framework that the gentleman worked so very hard to achieve.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Let me thank my colleague and add to what he has said and congratulate him, because he is the one that worked with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and also worked with the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) to develop this legislation which is to be the subject of a hearing next week.

Unfortunately, the minority leadership, bowing to the White House again, would not let us hold the hearing on Wednesday, because that would require their unanimous consent, so we have to hold the hearing on Thursday. Another obstacle, another day of bombing. We could do this hearing on Wednesday and move the legislation, but, no, because we do not want to have the Congress discuss this issue, we cannot do it until Thursday because the administration has convinced the minority side, in spite of the support of their own Members, that we should not have this hearing until the full 7 days.

□ 2130

But I want to say we will have that hearing. I talked to our Russian counterparts this morning, and they are planning on bringing up the exact same resolution in the State Duma. Our hope is to have this Congress pass it, the Russian Duma pass it; and I am even hoping that members of the Ukrainian Rada will pass this.

In fact, I had a call today from a member of the German Bundestag. He received our document and he wants to pursue this with members of the European parliaments. So momentum is building.

I do want to take this time to acknowledge our other Members, as I know my colleague would. On the minority side we had an outstanding delegation. They would be here tonight, but since we ended the session, Members are on their way back to their districts. We do have a long weekend.

We are staying here because we have events in town. But our Members did do special orders earlier this week. We could not get a full hour because all the time was booked. But they would have been here tonight, and I want to acknowledge them all personally.

The ranking Democrat on our trip was the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. NEIL ABERCROMBIE), an outstanding Member, a tireless advocate for trying to find a peaceful resolution to this conflict;

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN), a Member who has become a dynamic leader on Russian issues. She has traveled to Russia with me twice. She now chairs an effort with female members of the Russian Duma to build better relations between our two bodies;

The gentleman from New York (MAURICE HINCHEY), a strong supporter of

President Clinton who supported the bombing efforts, support the President's policies, and was a very key part of our delegation. In fact, he is the one who talked to Podesta at the White House from Vienna;

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DENNIS KUCINICH), former Mayor of Cleveland, who is an active Member who has a background from the Balkans ethnically, understands the problems. Probably no one is as well versed in this Congress on issues involving the Balkans than the Democrat from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH);

And the fifth Democrat, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. BERNIE SANDERS), who is the only Independent, the only socialist in Congress, a self-admitted liberal. He was an outstanding contributor to our effort.

In fact, it was interesting, I was in a press conference with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. ROSCOE BARTLETT) today and he is as far to the right as the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is to the left. And the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) said, you know something, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and I sat together during all the discussions and there was not one issue that he and I disagreed on. We were in sync on every issue in every statement. My colleague and I were in complete agreement. That is the kind of relationship we have.

Perhaps my colleague would like to go over some of the other Republican Members that were with us on the delegation. I have covered the Democrats.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, if I can just repeat that my colleague down here from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) was the head of this delegation. It was a bipartisan delegation, as he has already stated.

On our side we had the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JIM SAXTON) who is a wonderful contributor to the process, brought a great deal of insight to the committee, both his position on his committee assignment, as well as having traveled to Yugoslavia earlier in the week in an effort on his own as an individual to learn more about the process and meet and be able to inform us of his findings, as well.

We had also the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. ROSCOE BARTLETT) as my colleague has said, one of the gentleman who has a defined point of view, as we say, but yet contributed very well to the whole process as we go.

We had the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOE PITTS) a wonderful colleague who came into the same Congress as I did in the same class in the 105th Congress, a remarkable individual, very renowned for his work in education and a great member of our bipartisan delegation, as my colleague has already stated.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. His colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. DON SHERWOOD) was there also, a good friend of my colleague's.

Mr. GIBBONS. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DON SHERWOOD) a freshman who entered this Congress this year but with a great deal of enthusiasm, a great deal of respect for the process, serves on the Committee on Armed Services and made an ideal partner in all of this as we went forward during this time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded again that they are to address their remarks to the Chair, not to the television audience.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. BEREUTER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 3:30 p.m. on account of official business.

Mr. KUYKENDALL (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending his son's college graduation.

Mr. BLILEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 3:00 p.m. on account of official travel on behalf of the standing committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assemblies special meeting on the Kosovo situation.

Mr. TIAHRT (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of inspecting tornado damage in Kansas.

Mr. PACKARD (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 3:30 p.m. on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NETHERCUTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HILL of Montana, for 5 minutes, on May 12.

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GIBBONS, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 10, 1999, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1901. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida and Imported Grapefurit; Relaxation of the Minimum Size Requirement for Red Seedless Grapefurit [Docket No. FV99–905–1 FIR] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1902. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Olives Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99–932–1 FR] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1903. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the New England and Other Marketing Areas; Decision on Proposed Amendments to Marketing Agreements and to Orders [DA–97–12] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1904. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Distance Learning and Telemedicine Loan and Grant Program (RIN: 0572–AB31) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1905. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1906. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1907. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the 1999 interim report on our evaluation of TRICARE, the Department of Defense (DoD) managed health care program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1073 nt.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1908. A letter from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the Office's final rule—Risk-Based Capital Standards: Market Risk [Docket No. 99–04] (RIN: 1557–AB14) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1909. A letter from the Administrator, Food and Consumer Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC): WIC/Food Stamp Program (FSP) Vendor Disqualification (RIN: 0584–AC50) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1910. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Acquisition Regulations;

Performance Guarantees (RIN: 1991–AB44) Recieved April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1911. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety of Accelerator Facilities—received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1912. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Rescission of the Conditional Section 182(f) Exemption to the Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) Control Requirements for the Dallas/Fort Worth Ozone Nonattainment Area; Texas [TX 109–1–7412a; FRL–6329–2] received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1913. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan Revisions; Ohio [OH 122–1a; FRL–6328–6] received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1914. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plans, Recalculation of 9 Percent Rate of Progress Plans and 1999 Transportation Conformity Budget Revisions [Region II Docket No. NJ33–2–191; FRL–6328–8] received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1915. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption; Sulphopropyl Cellulose [Docket No. 96F–0248] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1916. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, transmitting the Administration's final ''Major'' rule—Light Truck Average Fuel Economy Standard, Model Year 2001 [Docket No. NHTSA–99–5464] (RIN: 2127–AH52) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1917. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressiona Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Frequency of Reviews and Audits for Emergency Preparedness Programs, Safeguards Contingency Plans, and Security Programs for Nuclear Power Reactors (RIN: 3150–AF63) received April 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1918. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 99–13), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1919. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States [Transmittal No. 09–99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1920. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the Government of Norway [Transmittal No. DTC 63–99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1921. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1922. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning a transfer of up to $100M in defense articles and services to the Government of Bosnia-Herzegovina, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 118; to the Committee on International Relations.

1923. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12–634, ''District of Columbia Department of Health Functions Clarification Temporary Act of 1999,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1924. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–34, ''Solid Waste Facility Permit Temporary Amendment Act of 1999,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1925. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–33, ''Potomac River Bridges Towing Compact Temporary Act of 1999,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1926. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–32, ''Omnibus Regulatory Reform Temporary Amendment Act of 1999,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1927. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–40, ''Children's Defense Fund Equitable Real Property Tax Relief and Children's Health Insurance Program Authorization Emergency Act of 1998 Fiscal Impact Temporary Amendment Act of 1999,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1928. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions and Deletions—received March 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1929. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a copy the report of the Consumer Product Safety Commission in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1930. A letter from the Director, Employment Service-Workforce Restructuring Office, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Reduction In Force Service Credit; Retention Records (RIN: 3206–AI09) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1931. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Federal Employees Health Benefits Program: Contributions and Withholdings (RIN: 3206–AI33) received April 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1932. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Program Court Orders (RIN: 3206–AI49) received April 7, 1999, pursuant to Public Law 105–205; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1933. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's second annual Performance Plan, pursuant to Public Law 103–62; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1934. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 28 [Docket No. 990324080–9080–01; I.D. 031599D] (RIN: 0648–AM10) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1935. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Watertown, WI [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–2] received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1936. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Auburn, IN [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–3] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1937. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E airspace; Pontiac, IL [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–81] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1938. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of the legal description of the Class E Airspace; Sault Ste Marie, ON [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–1] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1939. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Orlando Executive Airport, FL [Airspace Docket No. 99–ASO–5] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1940. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule —Amendment of Class E Airspace; Toccoa, GA [Airspace Docket No. 99–ASO–3] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1941. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–600, –700, and –800 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–38–AD; Amendment 39–11107; AD 99–08–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1942. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Notice of Significant Reduction in the Rate of Future Benefit Accrual [TD 8795] (RIN: 1545–AT78) received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1943. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Accounting Period Guidance [Notice 99–19] received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1944. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability [Revenue Procedure 99–21] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1945. A letter from the Acting SSA Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Administrative Review Process; Prehearing Proceedings and Decisions by Attorney Advisors; Extension of Expiration Date (RIN: 0960–AF01) received March 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1946. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of our intent to obligate funds for additional program proposals for purposes of Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund (NDF) activities, pursuant to Public Law 105–277; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and International Relations.

1947. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense (Environmental Security), Department of Defense, transmitting the final report including an evaluation of the program, which concludes the program has been beneficial in providing environmental education and training opportunities to current and former Department of Defense personnel, as well as other young adults, pursuant to Public Law 102–580, section 310(b) (106 Stat. 4845); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Education and the Workforce.

1948. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Service, transmitting an annual report on participation, assignment, and extra billing in the Medicare program; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 1999 (Rept. 106–128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on Science. H.R. 209. A bill to improve the ability of Federal agencies to license federally owned inventions; with an amendment (Rept. 106–129 Pt. 1).

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on the Judiciary discharged H.R. 209; referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 209. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than May 6, 1999.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. FOSSELLA):

H.R. 1714. A bill to facilitate the use of electronic records and signatures in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself and Ms. WATERS) (both by request):

H.R. 1715. A bill to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1716. A bill to provide for a study of long-term care needs in the 21st century; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BLAGOJEVICH (for himself and Mr. ROGAN):

H.R. 1717. A bill to permanently ban the possession of firearms by dangerous juvenile offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYANT (for himself and Mr. HILLEARY):

H.R. 1718. A bill to amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to add Hickman, Lawrence, Lewis, Perry, and Wayne Counties, Tennessee, to the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1719. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out the National Guard civilian youth opportunities program for fiscal year 2000 in an amount not to exceed $110,000,000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1720. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to provide for an increase in the authorization of appropriations for community-based family resource and support grants under that Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

H.R. 1721. A bill to amend the Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Program Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 through 2005; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

H.R. 1722. A bill to amend the Head Start Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 through 2005; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

H.R. 1723. A bill to encourage States to require a holding period for any student expelled for bringing a gun to school; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

H.R. 1724. A bill to increase discretionary funding for certain grant programs established under the ''Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon):

H.R. 1725. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the Bureau of Land Management to Douglas County, Oregon, of a county park and certain adjacent land; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1726. A bill to allow States to develop or expand instant gun checking capabilities, to allow a tax credit for the purchase of safe storage devices for firearms, to promote the fitting of handguns with child safety locks, and to prevent children from injuring themselves and others with firearms; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself and Mrs. CHENOWETH):

H.R. 1727. A bill to eliminate the fees associated with Forest Service special use permits that authorize a church to use structures and improvements on National Forest System lands for religious or educational purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. METCALF):

H.R. 1728. A bill to reauthorize the Trade Adjustment Assistance program through fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H.R. 1729. A bill to designate the Federal facility located at 1301 Emmet Street in Charlottesville, Virginia, as the ''Pamela B. Gwin Hall''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 1730. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the installment method to be used to report income from the sale of certain residential real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. THOMAS):

H.R. 1731. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the credit for electricity produced from certain renewable resources shall apply to electricity produced from all biomass facilities and to extend the placed in service deadline for such credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSON, Mr. LEACH, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUTHER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr.

MEEKS of New York, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROTHman, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. VENTO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WEYGAND, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1732. A bill to designate certain Federal land in the State of Utah as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 1733. A bill to establish doctoral fellowships designed to increase the pool of scientists and engineers trained specifically to address the global energy and environmental challenges of the 21st century; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 1734. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve the quality of education and raise student achievement by strengthening accountability, raising standards for teachers, rewarding success, and providing better information to parents; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H.R. 1735. A bill to establish a grant program to enable local educational agencies to develop and implement a random drug testing program for students in grades 7 through 12; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1736. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide certain Medicare beneficiaries with an exemption to the financial limitations imposed on physical, speech-language pathology, and occupational therapy services under part B of the Medicare Program, and to provide for a system to vary those limitations using a classification of individuals based on diagnostic category and prior use of services; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 1737. A bill to prohibit United States reconstruction assistance for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) as a result of Operation Allied Force; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. WAMP:

H.R. 1738. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide slot exemptions for nonstop regional jet service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STARK, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LEE, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. KIND, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FORD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 1739. A bill to reform the financing of Federal elections; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURTHA:

H.J. Res. 52. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to school prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HORN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PORTER, Mr. KLINK, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. EVANS):

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution urging the compliance by Turkey with United Nations resolutions relating to Cyprus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. OSE, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. KUYKENDALL):

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Social Security reform measures should not force State and local government employees into Social Security coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and recognizing the humanitarian safeguards these treaties provide in times of armed conflict; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with regard to cultural education and awareness of the history of slavery in America; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of William C. Velasquez, the national Hispanic civic leader; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H. Res. 161. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the condition and humanitarian needs of refugees within Kosovo; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H. Res. 162. A resolution providing for enclosing the galleries of the House of Representatives with a transparent and substantial material; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KINGSTON (for himself and Mrs. CAPPS):

H. Res. 163. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to postpartum depression; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky:

H. Res. 164. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Federal laws relating to the provision of health care must allow women direct access to obstetrician-gynecologists and other health care professionals who specialize in obstetrics and gynecology; to the Committee on Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

48. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Joint Resolution 12 urging the Clinton Administration to support Taiwan and its 21 million people in obtaining appropriate and meaningful participation in the World Health Organization; to the Committee on International Relations.

49. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 543 urging the Congress of the United States to reemphasize to the American People that the thrid Monday in February is to be celebrated as a national holiday called George Washington's Birthday and to resist efforts to degrade George Washington's Birthday into an amorphous and ultimately meaningless ''Presidents Day'' holiday; to the Committee on Government Reform.

50. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Kansas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1617 requesting that the Congress of the United States return the statue of George W. Glick earlier presented by the state of Kansas for placement in Statuary Hall and accept in return for placement in Statuary Hall, a statue of Dwight David Eisenhower, a citizen of the free world, and worthy of national commemoration in Statuary Hall; to the Committee on House Administration.

51. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 7 memorializing support for the American Land Sovereignty Act of 1997 that reaffirms the constitutional authority of the United States Congress as the elected representatives of the people over the federally owned land of the United States; to the Committee on Resources.

52. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Joint Resolution 5 urging the United States Congress to amend the United States Constitution to prohibit federal courts from levying or increasing taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

53. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 523 urging the Congress of the United States to include the Coalfields Expressway in the Appalachian Development Highway System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

54. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3039 urging Congress to enact legislation to return adequate funds to states to fund the

employment security system and give a fair return to employers for the taxes employers pay under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 1740. A bill to reliquidate certain entries of N,N-dicyolohexyll-2-benzothazole-sulfenamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H.R. 1741. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel M/V *Sandpiper*; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. BARR of Georgia and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 8: Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 14: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 25: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 44: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 49: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 72: Mr. PAUL and Mr. HILL of Montana.

H.R. 82: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 107: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 111: Mr. CLAY, Mr. PITTS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 125: Ms. LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 127: Mrs. MALONEY of New York and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 147: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 148: Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 165: Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 175: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. GEKAS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HOEFFEL, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GOSS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. JOHN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. PORTER, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 183: Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 202: Mr. HILL of Montana.

H.R. 219: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 234: ADERHOLT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 254: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. HORN, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 303: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 315: Mr. WEYGAND, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 316: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BACHUS, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 351: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 352: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. GRANGER.

H.R. 353: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 357: Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 363: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 374: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 383: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 405: Mr. FORBES and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 413: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SPENCE, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 434: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 443: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 515: Mr. OWENS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 516: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 518: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 531: Mr. MCINTOSH, Ms. DUNN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HILL of Montana, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 576: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 583: Ms. STABENOW and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 592: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 599: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 614: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 623: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 632: Mr. BARR of Georiga, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 648: Mr. STUMP, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 664: Ms. LEE and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 710: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 716: Mr. BAKER and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 721: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 732: Mr. WYNN and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 738: Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 743: Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 773: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 775: Mr. REYNOLDS and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 777: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 783: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 784: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 789: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. GARY Miller of California.

H.R. 796: Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 797: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 798: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 804: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 827: Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 835: Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 852: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 860: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 864: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. NEY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 870: Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 883: Mr. COX, Mr. TERRY, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 901: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 902: Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 903: Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 904: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 937: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 957: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BOYD.

H.R. 961: Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 979: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. WU, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 984: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 997: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. HORN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. QUINN, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. OSE, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. BASS, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAHOOD, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1001: Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1006: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1008: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1021: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1039: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1055: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HILL of Montana.

H.R. 1070: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. BONO, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KLINK, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. VENTO, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr, WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MURTHA, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MCCARTHY OF MISSOURI, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. EHRLICH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FORD, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1071: Ms. CARSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1083: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 1086: Mrs. JONES, of Ohio.

H.R. 1092: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 1093: Ms. CARSON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HOEFFEL, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1095: Mr. BROWN of Ohio Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1097: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1102: Mr. WALSH, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. LAZIO.

H.R. 1123: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1130: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1144: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 1145: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 1145: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 1180: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. WISE, Ms. CARSON, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. MOORE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OSE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr.

MASCARA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FORD, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. JOHN, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 1187: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 1190: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1192: Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 1193: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 1195: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. SCHAFFER, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 1196: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1214: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1219: Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.R. 1221: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1244: Mr. BONILLA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 1245: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1246: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 1256: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 1261: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 1263: Mr. EWING, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 1264: Mr. EWING, Mr. UPTON, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 1275: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STARK, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KOLBE, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1276: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 1291: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 1293: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1301: Mr. BOYD, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 1304: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1315: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1317: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 1322: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1325: Mr. FROST, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1334: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 1336: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. QUINN, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. HILL of Montana.

H.R. 1337: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1342: Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 1349: Mr. PITTS and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1351: Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 1354: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1355: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1358: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1388: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1394: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1398: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1399: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1407: Mr. WOLF, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1414: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1421: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 1423: Mr. FROST, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1424: Mr. STUMP, Mr. FROST, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1432: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1456: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1463: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1464: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYES, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1476: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1484: Mr. SHOWS and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1485: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 1491: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 1495: Mr. NADLER and Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 1497: Mr. ALLEN and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1511: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FROST, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 1530: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. MICA, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 1535: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 1545: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1549: Mr. BAIRD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1556: Mr. FROST, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1579: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1598: Mr. CLEMENT and Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 1600: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1606: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1607: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1614: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1622: Mr. GOSS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1630: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1633: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 1657: Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 1670: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1706: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1710: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mrs. KELLY.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. HULSHOF.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. THUNE, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. LAFALCE.

H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 79: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. TALENT, Mr. COOK, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. DEMINT.

H. Res. 41: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. SPENCE

H. Res. 82: Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 979: Mr. BOYD.

H.R. 984: Mr. BOEHNER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1664

OFFERED BY: MR. FARR OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. (a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE PAYMENTS.—Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements to make payments for the settlement of the claims arising from the deaths caused by the accident involving a United States Air Force CT–43 aircraft on April 3, 1996, near Dubrovnik, Croatia.

(b) DEADLINE FOR EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall make the decision to exercise the authority under subsection (a) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SOURCE OF PAYMENTS.—Amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of the Air Force for operation and maintenance for fiscal year 1999 or other unexpended balances for prior years shall be available for payments under subsection (a).

(d) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The amount of the payment under this section in settlement of the claims arising from the death of any person associated with the accident described in subsection (a) may not exceed $2,000,000.

(e) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—Any amount paid to a person under this section is intended to supplement any amount subsequently determined to be payable to the person under section 127 or chapter 163 of title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law for administrative settlement of claims against the United States with respect to damages arising from the accident described in subsection (a).

(f) CONSTRUCTION.—The payment of an amount under this section may not be considered to constitute a statement of legal liability on the part of the United States or otherwise as evidence of any material fact in any judicial proceeding or investigation arising from the accident described in subsection (a).