United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1999 No. 72

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 18, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD A. PEASE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) for 5 minutes.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, we will later today vote on the conference report to H.R. 1141, the bill to further fund NATO's aggression in Yugoslavia. The President has requested $7.9 billion but Congress has felt compelled to give him $15 billion.

Congress does not endorse the war. We voted overwhelmingly against declaring war and yet we are giving the President twice the amount he requested to wage the war. It does not make any sense.

We are asking the President to seek reimbursement from NATO members since we have assumed the financial burden for fighting this war. This has tremendous appeal but cannot compensate for the shortsightedness of spending so much in the first place. The money may well never be recouped from our allies, and even if some of it is it only encourages a failed policy of military adventurism. If this policy works, the United States, at Congress' urging, becomes a hired gun for the international order, a modern day government mercenary. This is not constitutional and it is a bad precedent to set.

Reimbursement for the Persian Gulf War has helped to perpetuate that conflict now going on for nearly a decade. It is time to think about a more sensible foreign policy.

We should not encourage the senseless and immoral NATO aggression against Serbia. The funding of this war should not be approved, no matter what special interest appropriations have been attached to the initial request to gain support for this special spending measure.

Our bombing continues to complicate the mess we helped create in Yugoslavia. Just about everyone concedes that the war cannot be won without massive use of ground troops, which fortunately no one is willing to commit. So the senseless bombing continues while civilian casualties mount. And whom are we killing? It looks like we are killing as many innocent Albanians for whom we have gone to war as innocent Serbs.

Why are we killing anybody? There has been no aggression against the United States and no war has been declared. It is time to stop this senseless bombing.

The U.S. has become the world's bully. In recent months we have bombed Serbia, Bulgaria, Kosovo, Afghanistan, Sudan, Iraq and China; and in recent years, many others.

The fetish we have with bombing anybody who looks cross-eyed at us has preoccupied our leaders for several decades regardless of which party has been in power.

We may not be willing to admit it, but it is hardly the way to win friends and influence people. It is lousy diplomacy. It must stop. The only reason we get away with it is because we are the military and economic superpower, but that only leads to smoldering resentment and an unsustainable financial commitment that will in due time come to an end. Our superiority is not guaranteed to last.

NATO, through their daily briefings, has been anxious to reassure us that its cause is just. Yet NATO cannot refute the charge that the refugee problem was made much worse with the commencement of the bombing.

Yesterday it was reported in the Los Angeles Times by Paul Watson, in stark contrast to NATO's propaganda, that in Svetlje, Yugoslavia, 15,000 Albanians displaced by the bombing remain near their homes in north Kosovo, including hundreds of young military age men, quote, strolling along the dirt roads or lying on the grass on a sunny day. There were no concentration camps, no forced labor and no one serving as human shields according to an Albanian interviewed by the Los Angeles Times. Many admitted they left their homes because they were scared after the bombing started. Some of the Albanians said the only time they saw the Serb police was when they came to sell cigarettes to the Albanians.

We should not be in Yugoslavia for obvious constitutional and moral reasons, but the American people should

Printed on recycled paper.

not believe the incessant propaganda that is put out by NATO on a daily basis. NATO's motives are surely suspect. I meet no one who can with a straight face claim that it was NATO's concern for the suffering of the refugees that prompted the bombing and demands by some to escalate the war with the introduction of ground troops.

Even with NATO's effort to justify its aggression, they rarely demonstrate a hit on a military target. All this fine star wars technology and we see reruns of strikes with perfect accuracy hitting infrastructures like bridges and buildings. I have yet to see one picture of a Serbian tank being hit, and I am sure if they had some classy film like that we would have seen it many times on the nightly television.

NATO must admit its mistake in entering this civil war. It violates the NATO treaty and the U.N. Charter, as well as the U.S. Constitution. The mission has failed. The policy is flawed. Innocent people are dying. It is costing a lot of money. It is undermining our national security and there are too many accidents.

I am sick and tired of hearing NATO's daily apologies.

There's nothing America can be proud of in this effort and if we don't quickly get out of it, it could very well escalate and the getting out made impossible. The surest and quickest way to do this is for Congress today to reject the funding for this war.

The only answer to senseless foreign intervention is a pro-American constitutional policy of non-intervention in the affairs of other nations; a policy of friendship and trade with those who are willing and neutrality with others who are involved in conflict. This is the only policy that makes sense and can give us the peace and prosperity all Americans desire.

KUDOS FOR BETTE MIDLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, my goal in Congress is to help the Federal Government be a better partner with State and local governments, with business and private citizens, to do everything it can in promoting livable communities, because what our families really care about is that their children are safe when they go out the door to school in the morning, that families are economically secure and healthy.

There is a vital component to this livability movement that goes well beyond the crafting of Federal legislation. The most powerful livability champions out there make the message real. They are the folks who take the rhetoric one step farther and actually walk the talk. For the last 3 months I have been especially intrigued by one such person, Bette Midler, who first got my attention when she took to national syndicated television a few months back and confessed that if she had not gone into entertainment she probably would have pursued a career as an urban planner, and she certainly has moved to the forefront in promoting livability with her personal advocacy and investment.

This was most apparent last week when she spearheaded the rescue of 112 pocket parks and community gardens in New York City from being sold for redevelopment. Had Miss Midler not stepped in, along with the Trust for Public Land and a group that she founded in 1994, the New York Restoration Project, a great number of New Yorkers would have lost the joy they have received from these gardens.

Over a third of a century ago, author Jane Jacobs captured in her book, The Life and Death of Great American Cities, the importance of places for people to congregate over sterile formal parks, planned with even the best of intentions, in ways that do not speak to people's needs for diversity and connection.

In threatening to auction these small gardens to the highest bidder, Mayor Giuliani not only added to the evidence that he does not get the revitalization taking place in New York City, that it needs to be about more than simply adding police officers on the corner, talking tough and bribing the New York Yankees to stay in New York City.

Revitalization is most effective when it brings people together. When people invest in their communities, they feel that they have ownership in the neighborhood, and this feeling of ownership is undoubtedly the most effective deterrent to crime and deterioration.

Community gardens take little enclaves that otherwise might be garbage dumps or staging areas for crime and turns them not just into green oasis but a place where people want to go. They define community pride, engagement and involvement.

Under the guise of providing money and housing opportunities, Giuliani proposed selling off for a couple million dollars these little neighborhood gems. Put aside for a moment that the amount of money is minuscule compared to the hundreds of millions of dollars Giuliani has talked about subsidizing for a few selected businesses. Also ignore for a moment that there are thousands of run-down, dilapidated buildings and vacant lots that would be prime candidates for redevelopment in New York City.

This case illustrates the strengths of partnership and why I for one do not trust any one single level of government on its own because there is clearly enough insensitivity and ineptitude to go around.

The public which has fought so hard to establish these toeholds fortunately pushed back, and luckily the partners existed in New York City that make livable communities strong and vital. They provided not just money and interest but the spark that brought those pieces together.

Today the community gardens are safe, New York City is richer and hopefully politicians like Giuliani have learned a lesson. Sometimes that just means listening to the people about what makes communities and neighborhoods work.

Congress can certainly do its part by enacting legislation to make contributions to the public easier for things like scenic and conservation easement, agriculture and timberlands and wetland conservation. The public has learned, with the help of Miss Midler and others, that it can challenge city hall and win, which may be the most important lesson of all for livable communities.

ADDRESSING THE CONCERNS OF FOLKS BACK HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to represent a very diverse district in Illinois. I represent the south side of Chicago and the south suburbs in Cook and Will Counties, a lot of bedroom communities and farm towns, too. When one represents such a diverse district, they learn to listen to the concerns back home and try and respond to those concerns.

I have had one very common message that I hear in the city and in the suburbs and in the country in the diverse district that I represent, and that message is pretty simple. People back home want us to work together and find solutions to the challenges that we are facing.

I am proud to say that over the last 4½ years, we have listened and we have responded to those concerns to work to change how Washington works, to make Washington more responsive to the folks back home. I am proud to say that we accomplished some things we were told we could not do. We were told we could not balance the budget. We were told we could not balance the budget and lower taxes. We were told we could never reform our welfare system, but we did.

I am proud to say in the last 4½ years that we balanced the budget for the first time in 28 years, producing a projected $2.8 trillion surplus of extra tax revenues. We lowered taxes for the middle class for the first time in 16 years and 3 million Illinois children now qualify for the $500 per child tax credit back home in my State of Illinois. That is $1.5 billion that will stay in Illinois rather than coming here to Washington.

We also reformed our welfare system, which was failing beyond imagination. We reformed our welfare system for the first time in a generation. As a result of our welfare reform, we have seen the welfare rolls in Illinois cut in half. We have balanced the budget. We lowered taxes for the middle class. We reformed

our welfare system. That is pretty good.

Folks often say those are real accomplishments, but what is next on Congress' agenda? We are working to continue responding to the issues and concerns of the folks back home and we have a simple agenda in this Congress. The Republican agenda is simple: Good schools, low taxes and a secure retirement for all America, and our budget that were working on today reflects that.

I am often asked some questions in town meetings back home. One of the most important ones we addressed this year. I am often asked by folks, whether at a senior citizen's center, a union hall or a VFW, when are the politicians in Washington going to stop raiding the Social Security trust fund? That is a pretty important, basic question. Of course, Washington has raided the Social Security trust fund for over 30 years. Back when LBJ was president, Washington began that process, and bad habits are hard to break. I am proud to say this Republican Congress is going to lock away 100 percent of Social Security revenues for social security only.

□ 1245

Let me point out here what this means, and I will compare the Republican budget with the Clinton-Gore budget on Social Security. The Republican budget, of course, locks away 100 percent of Social Security for Social Security. I would point out that $137 billion of the Social Security surplus under our lockbox will stay in Social Security.

Now, the President talks about 62 percent of the surplus for Social Security, and what the President and Vice President Gore are talking about doing is spending 38 percent of Social Security on other things. That is what the folks back home call raiding the Social Security Trust Fund.

Republicans say 100 percent of Social Security for Social Security. Clinton-Gore, they say 62 percent and spend the rest on other things. We want to put a stop to that, and that is why the lockbox proposal Republicans are moving through the Congress is so important, because it is the first step we should take as we work to save Social Security. Let us lock away Social Security first before we consider any other reforms.

Another question I am often asked is no one ever talks about the national debt. Let me point out that in this budget this year, we are in a position where we are going to be able to pay down $1.8 trillion of the national debt. Last year we paid off $50 billion; this year we are projected to pay off $100 billion of the national debt, and under our budget we propose the potential of paying down $1.8 trillion of the national debt. Saving Social Security, paying down the debt.

I am also asked at the union halls and the VFWs and the other community centers and the grain elevators in the district that I represent, when are we going to do something about the tax burden on families? Today the average family in Illinois sends 40 percent of their income to Washington and Springfield and the local courthouse in taxes.

The tax burden today for the middle class is at its highest level ever in peacetime history. Twenty-one percent of our gross domestic product goes to Washington. That is the highest level ever in peacetime history, and it is putting a tremendous squeeze on middle class families.

I believe as we work to lower the tax burden on middle class families we should simplify the Tax Code; we should work to bring fairness to the Tax Code, beginning with the elimination of the marriage tax penalty. It is simply wrong that under our Tax Code 21 million married working couples on average pay $1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married. Let us lower taxes by simplifying the Tax Code by eliminating the marriage tax penalty, let us pay down the national debt and let us save Social Security.

ISRAEL'S COMMITMENT TO DEMOCRATIC VALUES CONTINUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, yesterday the people of Israel demonstrated their commitment to democratic values by electing a new Prime Minister, Ehud Barak, a highly respected, decorated soldier and former leader of the Israeli Army. Despite the strong differences voiced during the campaign, both Mr. Barak and Prime Minister Netanyahu deserve our congratulations for articulating thoughtful visions for the people of their country.

As he prepares to leave office, I commend Prime Minister Netanyahu's accomplishments. He stood by his commitment to take Israel down a road of less reliance on U.S. economic assistance and a greater reliance on the powerful forces of capitalism and free markets. I commend him for setting his nation on a course of economic independence. Because of his willingness to work with his fellow citizens and his demonstrated leadership, Israel is a vibrant, strong, self-reliant nation.

The Prime Minister-elect, Ehud Barak, left the ranks of the military just four years ago after a highly distinguished 36-year career as a platoon leader, tank battalion chief, senior intelligence analyst and head of the Israeli Army. As Israel's most decorated soldier, Ehud Barak is perhaps best known as the catalyst of the 1972 storming of a Sabena airliner hijacked by guerrillas at Tel Aviv's airport.

Following his retirement from the military, Mr. Barak served as the Army Chief of Staff and Interior Minister under former Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, then Foreign Minister under Prime Minister Shimon Peres. When I traveled to Israel in 1997, I had a chance to meet with Mr. Barak, who was serving as the leader then of the Labor Party. I was impressed with Mr. Barak's meticulous attention to detail, commitment to important issues, and his construction of an aggressive grassroots political operation. Throughout the campaign, Barak promised, if elected, to continue Yitzhak Rabin's legacy of reviving negotiations with the Palestinians and making an impassioned personal commitment to the peace effort.

I am also impressed with Prime Minister-elect Barak's appreciation and understanding of the American-Israeli partnership, a partnership that goes beyond common political and strategic bonds. Both nations share a common set of values: freedom, individual responsibility, hope and opportunity. It is no coincidence that the birth of Israel coincided with the rise of the United States as the world's preeminent power. Our futures, both the United States' and Israel's, are tightly intertwined. Our shared traditions, which respect and value human rights, democracy, free speech, religious tolerance, are the seeds of a lasting peace throughout the world and in the Middle East.

The elections held yesterday are proof that the people of Israel are determined to withstand pressures and maintain a democracy, build a vibrant economy and achieve peace and security in the entire region. Our Nation has watched and admired a brave, determined and sometimes very divided people build a democracy under difficult circumstances that often have tested their resolve.

Throughout the past decade, Israel has lived and thrived through especially difficult circumstances: the assassination of Israel's great leader Yitzhak Rabin, repeated terrorist attacks, waves of immigrants challenging Israel's complex and the very contentious national elections. Through it all, the people of Israel stood strong, holding to its values and its belief that their country will remain strong and at peace.

I have also been encouraged by Mr. Barak's willingness to return to the land-for-peace Israeli commitments under the Wye River Peace Agreement brokered by President Clinton last October. As the Israeli government now changes hands, I am hopeful that the Middle East peace process can take meaningful steps forward.

It is critical that the United States continue to support Israel's commitment to see an end to terrorist aggression and State-sponsored attacks against its citizens and cities. We must also support Israel's desire to move the peace process by requiring that existing peace agreements be respected by

all sides. We should embrace these conditions, for they have at their core the values of any true democracy, the values of personal freedom.

Now that the citizens of Israel have spoken again, we must work to ensure that the Nation of Israel remains on course towards peace. Because of the perseverance, ingenuity and faith of its people, Israel has overcome the most daunting of challenges and become one of the world's great nations. I am confident that the people of the United States stand ready to help the people of Israel as they continue moving down a road of peace, security and economic self-reliance.

ENFORCE THE WAR POWERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 56 days ago President Clinton launched a massive offensive air campaign against Yugoslavia. Over the past few weeks we have witnessed the capture and release of three United States soldiers. We have seen destruction, lives lost, and hundreds of thousands of men, women and children forced to leave their homes and seek refuge.

Most would call this a war. But Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution grants Congress, not to the Commander in Chief, the authority to declare war. Approaching two months of repeated air strikes, President Clinton has never asked for congressional authorization. Now, in order to proceed with Operation Allied Force, President Clinton must either ask Congress for authorization or remove our troops from the region. Unfortunately, he has made no indication that he is eager to do either.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that President Clinton has violated our Constitution as it pertains to the declaration of war. Therefore, I join the efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and 15 of our colleagues in the House in filing a lawsuit against President Clinton in order to clarify Congress's constitutional war authority. I regret that we are forced to call upon the courts, but until we do, further administrations will continue to violate the Constitution and the War Powers Act.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with many of my colleagues who have very grave doubts about the United States involvement in Operation Allied Force. While I agree that the situation in Kosovo is a tragic one, our national security is not threatened. Our armed services already suffer from years of neglect under this administration. When we continue to commit troops in our limited resources on peacekeeping operations, we undermine our military's primary goals, to protect and defend the citizens of this great country, and we leave ourselves vulnerable in an unstable post-Cold War climate.

Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine recently forwarded to me a letter from Charles Hunter, a military Reservist who served in Bosnia for nine months. I want to share with my colleagues some of what he observed. I feel very strongly that his words and observations will prove much more powerful than my own.

In an open letter to Congress, Mr. Hunter wrote, ''It would be interesting to note what light further history will cast on the actions currently being implemented by this administration and enabled by this Congress.'' Mr. Hunter further states, ''It is interesting to note that this is the first time that we have attacked another sovereign nation unprovoked and uninvited by a host or exiled government.'' He further states, ''To me, this is a huge and pivotal point, the possible effects of which are frightening.'' Mr. Hunter further states, ''Should we some day have a revolution in our land that is an affront to some sort of world entity, we have now forfeited the right to handle things as we as a Nation see fit. If we continue down this road before us, we will be handing national sovereignty, for any Nation, over to some nonelected multinational body.''

Mr. Hunter further states, ''My oath as a soldier and yours as a Senator included the phrase, 'to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.' Never has there been a vow made to an international constitution or treatise, so why the concern over the honor of NATO? Why is Congress not concerned with the honor of the United States?''

Mr. Speaker, these are words of a United States soldier who spent nine months in the Balkans, and he is absolutely correct. We need to restore the honor we once valued and treasured. President Clinton, my colleagues in Congress and I took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution. Especially now, we must keep that oath. Once again, I urge the President to seek congressional authority to declare war or bring our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I will submit the full text of Mr. Hunter's letter for the RECORD. God bless our troops and God bless this Nation.

A BALKANS SOLDIER'S OPEN LETTER

(By Charles W. Hunter)

I am a reservist. I have served in Bosnia for nine months. I am a linguist and interviewed between 100 and 200 people each day while I was there. I have also had the unique experience of losing a job due to my reserve commitment. I do hope that you will take these following points into consideration as you think about the possible future commitment of ground forces to, and our general involvement in, Yugoslavia.

As a point of clarification, I refer to the leader of the United States as ''impeached'' President Clinton, because that is the title that the House of Representatives voted to give him. I am not demeaning the office of the president or the person of William Jefferson Clinton. They, not I, put him in a classification different from recent past presidents.

1. THE YUGOSLAV PEOPLE DO NOT THINK AS WE DO

Due to the unique position and job which I had while I was in Bosnia, I had the opportunity to interview between 100 and 200 people each day for nearly 8 months. These people were mostly Croats and Muslims. However, during the last month of my tour my focus was with the Serbs. Because I had learned the language, these people felt that I was different than the majority of British and American soldiers they met and as a result they opened up to me. All of these people told me that as soon as we leave, if it is in one year, five years, or fifty years, they will go back to killing each other.

All of the sides committed mass executions, as is the case in Kosovo now. Look at the history of the region. I think that you will find it was not too long ago that the KLA was viewed to be a terrorist organization. They were raping, executing, burning and looting the Serbs in an attempt to drive them out of Kosovo. This was not that long ago. Our response at the time was probably tempered by the fact that our Secretary of State was not Serb, as now Mrs. Albright is Albanian. These people do not forget the wrongs done to them. Unless a firm handed dictator is in power, like Tito or perhaps NATO, these people will not live together. Period.

2. HUMANITARIANISM IS A POOR EXCUSE FOR MILITARY DIPLOMACY

If we are to use the humanitarian crisis in the region as a reason for this gunboat diplomacy, then we are setting a dangerous precedent, as well as an inconsistent one. Millions of people have been killed in Sierra Leone in the past couple of years. The ethnic cleansing in Rwanda and Burundi has created over 1 million dead and 3 million refugees. Turkey has been killing the Kurds for years.

The list could go on, as you well know, yet to these tragedies a blind eye is turned. With this current administration it is even blasphemy to mention the abuses occurring in China. Yet, in all of these areas we do nothing. These examples serve only to show the glaring inconsistency of this as U.S. foreign policy. It also sets up a dangerous precedent. China will not renounce the possible use of force in relations to Taiwan. Tensions are still high between Iraq and Iran, India and Pakistan. What of the Taleban in Afghanistan? Will this foreign policy change dictate our future involvement in these areas? Why not?

3. FORGOTTEN LESSONS OF HISTORY

It has been well quoted, ''Those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.'' I am afraid that we are at such a crossroads now.

Some critics of this administration feel that all actions done by Impeached President Clinton are done so to create a legacy for history. It would be interesting to note what light future history will cast on the actions currently being implemented by this administration and enabled by this Congress. It is interesting to note that this is the first time in the history of our once great nation, that we have attacked another sovereign nation unprovoked and uninvited by a host or exiled government. To me, this is a huge and pivotal point, the possible effects of which are frightening.

Should we someday have a revolution in our land that is an affront to some sort of world entity, we have now forfeited the rights to handle things as we as a nation see fit. If we continue down this road before us

we will be handing National Sovereignty, for any nation, over to some non-elected, multinational body. My oath as a soldier and yours as a senator included the phrase ''. . . to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.'' Never has there been a vow made to an international constitution or treatise, so why the concern over the honor of NATO? Why is Congress not concerned with the honor of the U.S.?

The specter of Vietnam is all over this operation. Vietnam started with U.S. bombing, so did this Yugoslav operation. The politically correct response to this is that this is a NATO mission. Yeah, right! 90 percent of the flights are U.S. aircraft, not to mention the cruise missiles. If this is the proportion of U.S. involvement now what precedent is being set for when a ''permissive environment'' is achieved? This is a U.S. mission.

Vietnam had a gradual escalation with no thought-out plan of execution. This is paralleled here as the nation witnesses the AH–64 debacle. No ground troops were to be committed to Vietnam, and then were. Newspaper headlines today are saying the same thing. Congress was misled and half-informed in the '60s with lies and half-truths. Many Congressman from both parties have expressed their frustration over these same problems in this situation. In Vietnam, a war was waged without the understanding of the psyche, intent and motivation of the enemy. By even being optimistic of peace happening between these peoples, a lack of understanding of them is being exemplified.

None of the lessons learned in Vietnam are being applied to any of this administration's military endeavors. From the police action in Southeast Asia three major lessons of military doctrine were learned. These pearls of military doctrine were to: (1) have defined, accomplishable objectives; (2) have a defined or structured period of involvement; (3) have a planned exit strategy. The last two parts of this doctrine are predicated by the first. These lessons were played out to grand effectiveness during the Reagan and Bush years (outside of Beruit). From Grenada to Desert Storm, even Somalia, these three points were practiced.

If one recalls, the U.S. involvement in Somalia was to be ended at a specified time. When Impeached President Clinton was elected, he extended the U.S. withdrawal indefinitely. Several Rangers had to die before Congress forced the end to that mission. U.S. forces are still in Haiti, as was I in '95. What is interesting, is that for the average Haitian all is as it was. Those who have the guns still have the power, yet we are still sending troops and dollars there.

For years Impeached President Clinton has been playing with the Iraqi President. Suddenly, he starts a bombing campaign to force compliance with U.N. weapons inspectors. ''To what end?'' I ask. Are there now, or will there be, U.N. inspectors in Iraq? To gain congressional approval for the operation in Bosnia, Impeached President Clinton outlined a plan for a one-year occupation. He held this claim until the day after his re-election. The day after his re-election he announced an additional 18 months of occupation, then it became an indefinite extension. Where is Congress and why is Impeached President Clinton not held accountable for his word?

Now the U.S. is faced with a police action in Yugoslavia. The Media labels this a war. Only Congress can declare war on another country. A police action can be stopped by Congress by not authorizing funding. In this action against the sovereign nation of Serbia, objectives and conditions for victory have never been defined and have been ever changing. One element which has been consistent is for an indefinite, multinational peace keeping force to be placed on the ground.

The people of this region of the world have a long and great history of hating each other. This hatred is not restricted to the Serbs. I mentioned the atrocities committed by the Albanians against the Serbs earlier. That was only one decade ago. As I would talk to the people in my AO while in Bosnia, I would ask them how the Bosnian conflict started. For an answer I received a history lesson that often started prior to WWII and sometimes would start back with the Ottoman Empire. To a person, everyone I spoke with said that as soon as we leave they will start at it (fighting) again. This is the problem for the current administration.

If the U.S. forces are withdrawn, war in Bosnia will erupt again, highlighting a bad foreign policy. In order for the illusion to be maintained, U.S. presence in the region must be passed on to the next presidency. If that administration were to remove our forces, again, war would start and that administration will get the blame, so the illusion will be maintained. In the end, there might be an administration with enough honor to end the illusion. However, because all of the time, resources and lives spent which will have been wasted, that administration will be through. Again, look at history. Impeached President Clinton says that the current campaign against Serbia is based upon lessons learned from Bosnia. What is clear to me, and to every other soldier who has served there, is that nothing was learned—otherwise we would not now be engaged.

Many historians believe that if Hitler had listened to the advice of his general staff, the war would have gone in favor of Germany. The Washington Times reported that the U.S. military advisors to Impeached President Clinton advised him that this mission would not be successful, but rather, would only exacerbate the conflict. Impeached President Clinton chose rather to listen to the advice of Mrs. Albright. Once so ordered, the military advisers were bound by oath to carry on.

In a fashion which has not been seen since the fall of the Soviet Union, history is being rewritten by this administration. Another reason that Impeached President Clinton gives for this action is the preservation of U.S. interests in Europe by preventing another world war; after WWI and WWII both started in this region. This is false. WWI started here, that is true. I walked the bridge where the Archduke was assassinated. The real cause of the war was the entangling alliances throughout the region. No such alliances exist today outside of the growing relationship of Russia with Serbia. WWII did not start in this area. In truth, Hitler could have done what he wanted if he had not attacked Poland. The attack on Poland brought England into the war. WWII escalated from there.

One point about WWII, which is quite valid, is that the Serbs were the best friends a U.S. pilot had. In addition, ill clothed, ill fed, and ill armed the Serb partisans pinned down 24 German Divisions. The power of the Luftwaffe and the might of the Wehrmacht was all but lost in the terrain of Yugoslavia. Something to consider as you go to cast your vote on the escalation of this conflict and the introduction of U.S. ground forces.

Indeed, ''Those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.''

4. OUR POSITION IN YUGOSLAVIA IS MORALLY WRONG

In setting up this government and finding the principles upon which this Republic was established, the Founders of this country took great inspiration and insight from the Holy Scriptures, among other sources. In his Farewell Address, George Washington wrote, ''Of all the disposition and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality are indispensable supports.'' Up until the early '60s, primers and many secondary school language texts were based on the Bible. So powerful was the union of this country with Scripture, that in 1805 a man was convicted of treason against the United States for blaspheming the name of Jesus Christ. The founders understood well the Sovereignty of God. It was that understanding by which our Constitution was conceived.

By that same great Tome, which so inspired our Founders, our aggression towards Yugoslavia is wrong. Throughout Scripture this is made very clear. In the book of Daniel we are instructed that successions of governments are determined by God. The book of Romans states that ''There is no authority except from God, and those which exist are established by God.'' If one believes in the Sovereignty of Almighty God, then in the course of that same belief, in light of Scripture, as long as Molosevic is acting within his own borders then the only correct position to take is one of neutrality.

As was pointed out by the Chinese Premier, President Lincoln used force to hold this country together. In that war more Americans died than in any since. Both England and France were considering entering the war, but on the side of the South. What would have been the result if that had occurred? Freedom and a living form of democracy cannot be instilled in another people. It must be won by those for whom it is meant.

5. THE OVERSHADOWING OF OTHER REAL ISSUES

The people of this nation by course of the mainstream media are so preoccupied, and thus our elected officials, with the plight of the Albanians that real focus is being lost.

One of the problems with the Gulf War was that victory there was a cheap victory. One hundred thousand casualties and 100,000 prisoners were afflicted upon Iraqi forces while the U.S. suffered only 149 dead in both Desert Shield and Desert Storm. While I have no intent to minimize the sacrifice those brave and proud men gave, or the effect upon the conscience of this country. Desert Storm, like Vietnam was waged in the living rooms of America. However there is one great difference.

Instead of seeing men dying from limbs blown off or sucking chest wounds, the people of this country saw something like a video game on their computer. Bombs guided into windows with amazing accuracy. Deserted tanks being demolished in live-fire exercises. Here, the human element was removed. War became acceptable. What a tragedy.

Our attacks on Serbia are causing untold suffering for the general population of Serbia. This is acceptable because they are the villains, the evil Serbs, the scourge of the world. Has the lust for blood become so strong that we have become that which we hate?

Of greater national interest and security, but that which is all but off of the radar screen, is the ongoing Chinese/Impeached President Clinton saga. Impeached President Clinton opens trade through which missile guidance technology is transferred to the Chinese thereby allowing them to deliver the MRV technology stolen in the late 1980s to the shores of the United States. In 1995, Neutron Bomb technology is stolen by the Chinese. Problems are reported to the Administration in 1996. The suspected individual is allowed to continue working and even given a promotion in the facility. The Justice department head and Impeached President

Clinton appointee, Janet Reno tells her agencies to leave it alone. In 1999 the story breaks, the individual is arrested.

Impreached President Clinton initially states there were security problems, inherited from the Republicans, but that no technology has been stolen by the Chinese on his watch as President. Once the story breaks in full, he denies any knowledge of the events. Subsequently, in a press conference with the Chinese Premier, impeached President Clinton jokes before national news media over the incident. China refuses to commit to a non-military resolution to the Taiwan issue. Impeached President Clinton rebuffs critiques of Chinese human rights policies. In a news conference the Chinese Premier states that there has been enough talk of human rights. He further says that the Chinese just have a different way of looking at things. The media and, apparently Congress, buy off on this as a valid explanation as to the ongoing and increasing human rights atrocities being committed in China (as reported by Amnesty International). Put this together with the campaign fund-raising issue with the Chinese and an interesting puzzle starts to form.

WHY ARE WE BOMBING THE SERBS AND COURTING THE CHINESE? POSSIBLE ANSWER:

Mrs. Albright is Albanian and lost a grandfather and two cousins to Serb cleansing after WWII, as was reported in the New York Times. China was a staunch ally of Albania during the period of the cold war. Impeached President Clinton and China have a strange involved relationship, which is under investigation. Impeached President Clinton has always hated the United States Military. He is quoted as having stated that he loathed the military. Through the course of the policies and practices of the current administration: morale of the military is at a 25-year low; deployments are at an all time high; Reserve and National Guard units are being used on a regular basis in places such as Haiti, Bosnia, Central America and the Sinai; cruise missile and other munitions stores are being completely depleted and not replaced; all branches of the military are under manned; service members are leaving in record numbers; recruitment is at a two-decade low and China has gained 40 years worth of nuclear technology in the last six years.

I believe that the U.S. involvement in Yugoslavia is for only two real reasons:

1. Mrs. Albright's ancestral hatred of the Serbs. Now she is in power as an impeached President Appointee to seek revenge for her people—the Albanians.

2. Impeached President Clinton's ongoing relationship with the Chinese and his M.O. to use the military to divert and confuse the already short and anemic attention span of the American people.

I am not by nature a conspirator. I am a patriot. I am a critical thinker. I doubt that you will agree with my bold answer to my bold question. However, as to my five main points, I do hope that you will muse on them. As a soldier, I will go to wherever I am sent. As with all soldiers, I will do my duty to the best of my ability. I have had a terrible three years of employment since I lost my job due to my military service in Haiti. I was shot at and could have been killed as I stopped a Croat from blowing up his car at my base in Bosnia. I volunteered to go to Desert Storm; as a soldier I felt that I should be with my brothers in arms. I do not want, however, to see my children in a Vietnam-like situation. A situation in which at the end of the day, after the waste of lives, material, resources and National Honor, no difference will have been made.

Would you be willing to possibly die for the United States of America? Impeached President Clinton has clearly answered that question, in a manner quite different from the way the proud men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces today have answered that question. How would you, Senator, answer that question? How about your sons and daughters, would you commit them to possibly die for Old Glory?

Would you be willing to possibly die for Kosovo? When it was Vietnman, many did. In 1974 their deaths became meaningless? If we continue down the present path the same will be true for those who will lose their lives in Yugoslavia. Is this what you want, if it were your son who could die on the Field of the Blackbirds near Pristina? Is this what you want for the lives of the sons and daughters of your constituents?

Congress has not declared a war. Congress can stop this before it becomes a U.S. tragedy. I urge you, for the sake of this country, stop the conflict in Yugoslavia. Pull our forces out of the Balkans. You have the power to either end this or escalate it.

It is not unlike riding a bike up a road that is increasingly getting steeper. One either has to pedal harder, or get off of the bike. Let's get off. At the top of this hill is a cliff.

AMERICAN LEGION URGES WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM YUGOSLAVIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any group that is more respected and has more credibility when it comes to our Nation's veterans than the American Legion. Mr. Speaker, the Legion, representing over 3 million of our Nation's veterans, has gone on record against our involvement in Kosovo.

I would like to share with my colleagues this afternoon a portion of a letter sent to the President by the American Legion about our involvement in Kosovo, and I quote: ''The American Legion, a wartime veterans' organization of nearly 3 million members, urges the immediate withdrawal of American troops participating in Operation Allied Force.''

The letter went on to outline resolution number 44, the American Legion's statement on Yugoslavia that was adopted unanimously by their organization on May 5, 1999:

''This resolution voices grave concern about the commitment of U.S. armed forces to Operation Allied Force unless the following conditions are fulfilled: One, there is a clear statement by the President of why it is in our vital national interests to engage in Operation Allied Force. Two, guidelines be established for the mission, including a clear exit strategy. Three, that there be support of the mission by the United States Congress and the American people. Four, that it be made clear U.S. forces will be commanded by U.S. officers whom we acknowledge are superior military leaders.

The Legion believes that at least three of these conditions have not been met, and if they are not all met, then the President should withdraw American forces immediately.''

Mr. Speaker, I agree with this position.

The President has committed the armed forces of the United States in a joint operation with NATO, Operation Allied Force, but has not yet clearly defined what Americans' vital interests are in this region. The American people have a right to know why we are there. The President, in eight weeks of military action, has not properly defined what the specific objectives of NATO are, nor has the White House defined an exit strategy. And if my colleagues will remember, Mr. Speaker, the President promised our Nation that the U.S. military forces would be out of Bosnia in one year. Three years and six months later, U.S. personnel are still in Bosnia, and I expect that they will continue to be there for years to come.

□ 1300

How long will our forces be in Kosovo? Will the President claim they will be there for just 1 year once again?

I continue to be troubled with America's participation in this conflict. U.S. forces continue to carry the overwhelming share of the military burden, rather than our European NATO allies. Only 13 of NATO's 19 member nations are actively engaged in Operation Allied Force. American pilots are flying some 90 percent of the missions.

It also seem to me that the Clinton administration continues to disregard attempts to reach a diplomatic solution. After a bipartisan congressional delegation met with the parliamentary leaders of Russia in Vienna recently to start formulating terms of a negotiated settlement to establish a cease-fire and establish peacekeeping operations, and after Reverend Jackson's successful trip to release the three American servicemen, the administration has not attempted to follow through on any of these overtures.

Many of us here in Congress are veterans. We swore an oath to defend our country and her interests. But we must remember, wars are fought to protect national security interests, not for human rights. In fact, no major conflict has been waged solely for the purpose of defending a beleaguered people. The United States has a moral interest in Yugoslavia, but we have no national interest.

This conflict violates the conservative principle that goes back to our American Founding Fathers: non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, except to counter threats to our national interest. Our dedication to free markets and democratic institutions are exportable only by example, not by force.

My greatest hope is that we can reach a diplomatic solution to this crisis and bring our men and women home safely.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, the American people are suffering from what I call Clinton fatigue. They question our

reasons for being in Kosovo, and they now question the bases for which the President is choosing his policy.

I include for the RECORD the full text of the American Legion letter of May 5.

The letter referred to is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL COMMANDER,
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 American 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 operations 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.

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 Constitutional 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 3 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 reaffirms 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We place before You, gracious God, the concerns of our hearts and souls. You have invited us to offer our prayers for ourselves and others and You have said that we can place our private petitions before You and seek Your peace. With the confidence of Your presence, O God, we utter our private feelings to You, expressing our hopes and fears, our joys and sorrows, and our faith for a new day. Bless our petitions and our prayers, O God, for it is in You that we place our trust. In Your name we pray. 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. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS 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.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

(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, today I rise to urge my colleagues to support the emergency supplemental bill because this vote will be the first step in putting this Nation's military back on its feet.

America's military is today a hollow force, due in fact to 14 years of consecutive cuts in defense spending while our military operations have increased 300 percent.

For example, Allied Force is the 33rd deployment of U.S. armed forces in the last 9 years. Our military men and women should receive their doctorate degrees in the school of ''doing more and more with less and less.''

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that this Republican Congress has added to the President's defense budget for 4 straight years and that the Committee on Armed Services, in a bipartisan manner, has had the foresight and the will to address these shortfalls.

But today is only the first step. Our forces are stretched to the limit, ammunition supplies are depleted, training funds are used to sustain real-world contingencies, recruiting goals are not being met, and weapons procurement has been delayed.

A ''yes'' vote sends the right message to our troops and to America's enemies around the world that the American military will be properly equipped, properly trained, and ready.

Mr. Speaker, America's security and our military men and women deserve no less.

CHINA BUILDS SUPER MISSILE USING AMERICAN SECRETS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the news is China has built a super missile. The bad news is experts say the missile was built with American secrets and American dollars.

Now, if that is not enough to grab our assets and threaten our liberty, when questioned, the White House said, ''no comment.''

Unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. China steals our secrets and the only response we get is ''no comment.'' Beam me up.

It is time for a congressional investigation into this communist China business. It is time to pass the supplemental and make sure we have an adequate military, because we certainly have a super threat staring us right in the eye.

With that, I yield back any backbone we have left.

FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY FOR ENSLAVED PEOPLE OF CUBA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow at 1 p.m. in Room 2200 of the Rayburn Building, the House of Representatives will have a unique opportunity to meet modern-day heroes.

Angel Cuadra, Carmen Arias, Alberto Grau Sierra, and Ana Lazara Rodriquez are men and women of principle, lovers of freedom and democracy, defenders of human and civil liberties.

In Castro's island prison, they risked their freedom, their lives, to speak out against the inhumanity and brutal injustices that that regime imposes upon the people of Cuba. They bring with them not only a message of hope about the Cuban people's struggle against the cruel nature of the oppressive Castro regime, but also a message from those who still languish in Cuban jails for expressing their God-given rights as free human beings.

I welcome all Members and visitors to join us tomorrow at 1 p.m. in room 2200 of the Rayburn Building to listen to their testimonials and in rendering our support for their continuing struggle for freedom and democracy for the enslaved people of Cuba.

HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN NORTH KOREA

(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, I rise today to protest the horrifying human rights violations in North Korea.

I recently met with three courageous individuals who escaped from prison camps in North Korea. They describe prisoners being beaten, tortured, used as targets for prison guards' practice of martial arts, and forced to watch the execution of ''enemies of the state,'' such as peaceful religious believers.

The government of the North Korea will not discuss the existence of these prison camps, yet we know from eyewitness accounts that these places of death exist. Despite the fact that groups of people are brought to the prison camps each day, the prison camp population remains the same. What happens to these prisoners?

Mr. Speaker, these prison camps must be abolished without further death and destruction to the people inside them. Our government must urge the North Korean government to cease these human rights violations.

TIME IS NOW TO REPEAL THE DEATH TAX

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is time to repeal the death tax.

Under the guise of making the rich pay their fair share, this unfair tax is leading to the demise of small, family-owned businesses and the elimination of good paying jobs.

According to the Center for the Study of Taxation, 70 percent of family businesses do not survive through the second generation and 87 percent cannot survive through the third. This is because family members often must downsize, must liquidate, and sometimes sell the business outright to pay the death taxes, which can reach as high as 57 percent of the estate in question.

It also must be pointed out that the death tax represents double and sometimes triple taxation. While every American has a duty to pay taxes, it is simply wrong for the Federal Government to tax the same money time and time again.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to eliminate the Federal estate tax. This bill will restore fairness to our Tax Code, protect family-owned businesses, and encourage saving and investment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was Mark Twain who once observed that, of all of God's creations, man is the only one who can blush, or needs to.

I raise that issue today as we talk about the emergency supplemental spending bill. In this bill, my colleagues, there are emergencies such as $70 million for livestock assistance, including reindeer research. Now, maybe that is appropriate underneath this Christmas tree. There is $26 million that is an emergency for Alaskan crab fishermen. There is $1.5 million to fill the San Carlos Lake in Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, those are not emergencies, and worse, in that they are not offset with other spending in other parts of the budget. What it means is, unlike the budget resolution which we passed just a little over a month ago, we are going to start taking money out of the Social Security Trust Fund to fund some of these ''emergencies.''

Mr. Speaker, we are losing the battle on the spending caps. We are losing the battle on the Social Security Trust Fund. I hope that we are not going to lose our ability to blush.

CONTINUATION OF EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106–67)

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) 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:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the emergency declared with respect to Burma is to continue in effect beyond May 20, 1999.

As long as the Government of Burma continues its policies of committing large-scale repression of the democratic opposition in Burma, this situation continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force these emergency authorities beyond May 20, 1999.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 18, 1999.*

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1707

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1654, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–147) on the

resolution (H. Res. 174) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1553, NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–148) on the resolution (H. Res. 175) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1553) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 for the National Weather Service, Atmospheric Research, and National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1141, 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 173 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 173

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for 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 purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted a rule to provide for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1141, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 173 should not be controversial. It is a normal conference report rule, allowing for timely consideration of the emergency supplemental bill.

While I suspect that many of us will have strong opinions about the underlying spending bill, let us pass this rule and have the debate on the floor.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague has described, this rule waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 1141, which is the Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1999.

The measure appropriates $15 billion for military operations in Kosovo and other defense spending, humanitarian assistance to refugees and misplaced persons in the Balkans, hurricane-related relief in Central America and the Caribbean, aid to the country of Jordan, assistance to U.S. farmers hurt by low commodity prices, tornado victims in Oklahoma, Kansas, and for other purposes.

Most of the spending is considered emergency, and therefore is not offset by spending cuts in other programs.

Mr. Speaker, there is something for everyone in this massive spending bill. If Members like the bill, they can find critical programs that are funded. If they do not like the bill, they can find wasteful spending and harmful cuts.

I am particularly pleased with the refugee relief and humanitarian assistance provided by the measure. The conference agreement includes $1.1 billion for international assistance programs, refugee resettlement, and State Department funding. This is more than 60 percent above the level approved by the House.

I am grateful to the conferees for including $149.2 million in food assistance to refugees and misplaced persons in the Balkans through the PL–480 Food for Peace program. Failure to include money for this program was a serious omission, and I am glad that this has been corrected in the conference committee. These funds will ensure America provides its share of the food needed in the Balkans through the end of the year 2000.

Equally important, this change follows the longstanding tradition of providing food aid through the Food for Peace program, which is an established channel that benefits America's farmers. This program has proven to be the most effective way to provide the large quantities of food essential to any relief effort.

Including funding for PL–480 food aid is an example of bipartisan leadership at its best, and I am particularly grateful to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The measure also includes $2.2 billion for enhancing military operations and maintenance, and this will improve the readiness of our armed services.

I am concerned about some of the offsets for nonemergency spending. The offsets include cuts in food stamps and Section 8 housing for low-income individuals. Also, I regret that the conferees rejected a Senate proposal to include funding to pay the money the U.S. owes to the United Nations for back dues. I think it is a disgrace that our Nation has not paid our debt to the U.N., and this bill would have been a good vehicle to include that payment.

On the whole, the conference report represents a good compromise, and I say that in a good way. It is much better than the House-passed version, and I intend to support it. Though the measure under consideration is by no means ordinary, this is the standard rule for conference reports.

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

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this supplemental appropriations conference report contains critically needed resources for our armed forces to assure that they continue unchallenged as the finest fighting force in the world for the protection of the people and the freedom of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report, among other things, contains aid for America's farmers, and it contains humanitarian and development assistance for our neighbors in Central America who suffered the recent natural disaster known as Hurricane Mitch.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this Congress today makes a clear demonstration of solidarity with and concern for the well-being of our friends and neighbors in Central America.

I wish at this point to thank all of those who have worked to make this a reality, especially the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT), the gentleman from Florida (Chairman BILL YOUNG), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and all of the congressional leaders who have made this day possible.

It is a day in the best tradition of the generosity of the American people, and I rise to support the rule, as well as the underlying legislation.

□ 1715

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, said, ''This $15 billion bill is

about helping people: American farmers, American troops, storm victims here in the United States and in Central America; and Balkan refugees will all immediately benefit from passage of this essential aid package.''

These are all laudable goals, and I support that. But I want to make the point that this $15 billion emergency spending bill also creates an emergency for the most vulnerable people right here at home. For those who are hungry and homeless right here at home, this bill is a disaster.

What if the American people knew that, in order to fund these laudable goals and a bunch of other things in the bill, that we had to cut programs for the hungry and homeless and those who are in need of subsidized housing?

The bill cuts $350 million from the Housing and Urban Development Section 8 housing program. The HUD says that the loss of this money could create the displacement of approximately 60,000 families right here at home.

We are worried, of course we are, about the displacement of people in Kosovo. We should be. But we also need to worry about the possible displacement of 60,000 families right here at home because of this. It creates a longer waiting list of people who need subsidized housing and increases the number of families in need who are underserved right here at home.

What if the American people knew that this bill cuts $1.25 billion from the food stamp program? I am told that this money is not being spent. Does that mean that there are not hungry people right here? No.

In a 1999 survey of U.S. food banks, a report released in March by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), we discovered that 87 percent of the food banks surveyed indicated that requests were up in the last year. On average, requests for food assistance outstripped food available by 22 percent.

The Midwest Antihunger Network reports that, in Illinois, that there is a drop of 15 sponsors of the summer food service program in 1998. This is a nutrition program for low-income children in the summertime. These sponsors cited welfare reform cuts in meal disbursement rates that Congress instituted among the principal reasons. So there are going to be children this summer who do not have food programs. This is money that is being cut from the food stamp program in order to fund this.

What if the American people knew some of the things that were being funded in this program; that in this supplemental emergency bill, there is $5 billion in defense spending above the President's request, $26 million for Alaska fishermen to compensate for Federal fishing restrictions, $3.7 million to renovate homes for congressional pages, $3 million for commercial reindeer ranchers, $2.2 million for sewers in Salt Lake City for the Olympics, $30 million for renovations to D.C. area airports, $422 million above the President's request for farmers crippled by low prices.

This is a piece of legislation that has many needed things and many things that we do not need and does create an emergency for our hungry and homeless people in need of housing and food right here at home.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as we watch the developing human catastrophe taking place in the Balkans on our television sets night after night, we must not forget that in our own hemisphere our neighbors in Central America have undergone a humanitarian crisis of their own, one caused by a hurricane which ravaged homes and wiped out entire communities.

More than 6 months after Hurricane Mitch swept through Central America, the region is still waiting for the much-needed funds to rebuild their infrastructure and to start healing the wounds that the hurricane left long after the rains and the floods have stopped.

But today we have an opportunity to end their suffering, to help revitalize the economies of our neighbors to the south, to give children back their schools, families back their homes and their churches, communities back their sense of normalcy. The funds are not a handout. They are a helping hand to those who have suffered almost insurmountable hardships.

My district in south Florida has experienced the disastrous effects of a hurricane. It is not an easy task to rebuild, even less so for those who have limited resources on hand. It is within our power and it is indeed our duty and responsibility as brothers and sisters in the greater hemispheric family to help them with this aid and to stop prolonging their suffering.

Supporting this measure is not only beneficial to Central America but to the greater economic stability and prosperity of our hemisphere.

Under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) with this measure, Mr. Speaker, we are helping both American farmers and our American troops as well as storm victims here in the U.S. and in Central America. I urge my colleagues to adopt this measure today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this rule would authorize a resolution that asks for money to support an undeclared war. It would appropriate money for bombs, yet Congress has voted against the bombing. It appropriates money for ground troops, yet Congress opposes the use of troops in Kosovo.

It contains provisions that will enable the prosecution of a wide war against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, even though Congress has expressly voted not to declare war. This war is without constitutional authorization, and it is losing its moral authority as well.

In the name of helping the refugees, NATO has bombed refugee convoys. From the Los Angeles Times a few days ago, I quote: ''Many of the refugees in Korisa were asleep when explosions sprayed shrapnel and flames everywhere, survivors said. Mattresses left behind in covered wagons and in the dirt underneath were soaked with blood.

''At least a dozen children were among the dead. An infant buttoned up in terry cloth sleepers lay among the corpses that filled the local morgue.

''Another child was incinerated in a fire that swept through the camp. The child's carbonized body was still lying on the ground Friday morning beside that of an adult, in the middle of a tangle of farmers' tractors and wagons that were still burning 12 hours after the attack.''

NATO and the United States have been bombing villages to save villages. NATO and this country have bombed passenger trains, buses, an embassy, factories, office buildings. Cluster bombs are raining down and maiming and killing countless children.

Today we are being asked to pay for the bills for this war. We ought to put a stop payment on the checks which will be used to kill innocent civilians and to wage an undeclared war. We ought to stop the bombing and negotiate a withdrawal of Serbian troops and stop the KLA's military activities.

We need an international peacekeeping force in Kosovo as a product of a peace agreement. We need to rebuild the province. Our government should work as vigorously for peace as it does to prosecute a war. This war is rapidly becoming a debacle that rivals Vietnam itself.

We need to stand up and speak out against this war and ask good thinking people everywhere to keep the consciousness of peace alive and keep working for peace. The people in the State Department ought to hear that message first.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, but in opposition to the emergency supplemental appropriation.

The President came to us and promised if we approved his plan for Bosnia that American participation in the operation would last a year and cost about $1 billion. That was nearly 4 years ago and $10 billion ago.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), who I often quote, has said that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again but expecting different results. Well, today we are being asked to drop more tax dollars down this bottomless pit. It

will lead to tens of billions of dollars more being similarly dumped into the Balkans.

Those voting for this bill should realize their fingerprints will be all over this ongoing and misguided commitment. Do not kid yourselves. In the end, tens of billions of dollars will be spent in the Balkans, and it will come right out of the hide of Social Security and Medicare reform, right out of any effort to modestly reduce the tax burden on our people, and right out of the hide of our military personnel who are being put at risk in other areas of the world where our national security interests are at stake, those military personnel who are currently being stretched to the point of exhaustion.

Perhaps the most distasteful part of what we are doing today is that, in order to get even limited help to our vulnerable defenders, we are being told that we must provide $6 billion more for a military operation that is questionable at best.

Even the money that we originally voted for in this House that was supposed to be aimed at improving the overall plight of America's military we now find has been reduced to $4.5 billion, which includes projects that have nothing to do with our national security or improving the lot of our troops and their families.

Military plus-up dollars will be spent, among other things, on naval bases in Portugal, barracks and tank washes in Germany, and base improvements throughout Europe. In other words, it is being spent to keep us mired in Europe's problems and paying for Europe's defense.

We have been suckered in again. For decades we have provided Europe's defense and got little thanks for it. Now that the Cold War is over, they insist that we spend tens of billions of dollars more for their stability and that we must reaffirm our commitment, a very expensive commitment to their security for decades to come.

We have done our part for NATO. We have done our part for Europe. Let us have the Europeans step forward and carry their own load rather than taking it out of the hide of the American people.

I have no doubt that the Serbs are committing the crimes against the people of Kosovo that are claimed. Long ago we should have armed freedom-loving and democracy-loving Kosovars so they can defend themselves as Ronald Reagan did with the Afghans.

Instead of giving into the demands of our European buddies, we are now carrying the full load. We have given into the demands of our European friends, and we end up carrying the full load, leading the fight, emptying our Treasury, and recklessly putting our own forces in other parts of the world in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues not to associate themselves with this irrational and risky strategy, this expensive strategy that is draining our Treasury. Do not be blackmailed into supporting this poorly conceived Balkan operation, this undeclared war.

The issues of plussing up our military should be separate from this wasting of even more of limited defense dollars on such an adventure as we see down in the Balkans.

Vote against this emergency supplemental. Send a message to our European allies. We have carried their burden for too long. Yes, they deserve to be applauded for their emotional pleas that something must be done, but let them do it.

Why is it up to the United States to always lead the charge, to empty our Treasury, to put our people at risk? This is not a case of a dichotomy of either doing nothing and watching the Kosovars go under or sending our troops in and spending $50 billion.

No, we could have helped the Kosovars, or the other option is let the Europeans take care of the problem in their own backyard. This is the responsible position. It is irresponsible for us to continue spending limited defense dollars, stretching our troops out to the point that they are vulnerable everywhere, and just taking it out of the hide of the American people. I ask for this emergency supplemental to be defeated.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, no bill is perfect, as we all know, but this bill is less than perfect. This House passed a much cleaner bill. Our colleagues in the Senate, although the Speaker and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittee chairman worked very hard to take out some of the pork and some of the riders, they did not.

□ 1730

And the facts are we have some environmental riders in this bill that are almost beyond our imagination that they are in the bill. There are three environmental riders, and I think it is important for our colleagues to know that they are in the bill.

One repeals the Mining Act of 1872 and effectively lets open-pit mines take their waste and put it on our Federal land. So we are talking about several hundred acres of pristine Federal land with toxic waste from open-pit mines. It is incredible, it is almost beyond the straight-face test that that is in fact what this legislation does. But that is exactly what this legislation does.

Another thing that it does is it stops hard mining regulations which would have required bonding for open-pit mines, so that when they do not clean up their mess, it cannot get cleaned up.

The third environmental rider deals with oil royalties. All of us know that this is going on. On Federal land there is a 12-percent royalty that is supposed to be paid. And what is being done is there is a gaming of the system, that companies are charging their subsidiaries a price one-tenth of the actual price, eliminating 90 percent of the tax. In effect, we will be saving a hundred million dollars of their money but costing us a hundred million dollars of our money.

These riders ought to be taken out of the bill. We will have that opportunity in a motion to recommit later on this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, there are some things wrong with this bill, but there are other things that are rotten about this bill. What are rotten about this bill is, under the cover of darkness, conferees, folks from the other chamber, are attempting to shove down our throats measures that would never pass the laugh test, the straight-face test, on the floor of this House.

Individuals have a thing called the gag reflex: When they put something down our throats, we can gag on it. And the House of Representatives ought to stand up and gag on these last-minute subterfuges to try to go backwards on the environment. And we will have our chance to do that.

I just wanted to alert other Members, this afternoon we will have a motion to recommit, to strip this bill of the environmental degradation that would go on with it, to make sure we can pass a clean bill. And we are going to do that 24 hours later after we pass this motion to recommit.

I want to say, if my colleagues go out and talk to their constituents about mining, and when they ask them do they think we should go forward on mining reform or backward, they will certainly say we should not go backward, we should go forward.

And on hard rock mining? On the Mining Act of 1872, these provisions do not take a small step backward, they take a giant leap backward. That is why we ought to recommit and pass a clean bill. I want to reiterate, this chamber and the other chamber can do that very quickly.

It would be a travesty for people, in their zeal to hand out special-interest favors against the environment, to take camouflage behind our troops in the field to try to pass this. That would indeed be a sad day in the House of Representatives.

Let us go forward on the environment, not backward. Let us go forward on mining reform, not backward. Let us stand up for people and the troops. Pass our motion to recommit, and then pass the clean bill 24 hours later.

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 me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule but in strong opposition to the supplemental appropriation.

The President came to us and asked us to fund the NATO war, asked for $7.9 billion, but we in the conservative Congress have decided that not only would we give it to him, but we would bump that up to $15 billion, which does not make a whole lot of sense, especially if Congress has spoken out on what they think of the war.

And Congress has. We have had several votes already. We have voted and said that we did not think that ground troops should be sent in. And most military people tell us that the only way we are going to win the war is with ground troops. So we have taken a strong position. We have had a chance to vote on declaration of war and make a decision one way or the other. We have strongly said we are not going to declare war.

We have spoken out on the air war. We did not even endorse the air war. And the President has spent a lot of money. They are hoping to get a lot of this money back from the European nations, but all that makes us are professional mercenaries fighting wars for other people, which I do not agree with.

But here we are getting ready to fund Europe, fund a war that is undeclared. It does not make any sense. We are giving more money to the President than he asked for in a war that cannot be won and a war that we are not even determined to fight. It just does not make any sense. So in order to get enough votes to pass the bill, of course we put a little bit of extras on there to satisfy some special interests in order to get some more votes.

But the real principle here today that we are voting on is whether or not we are going to fund an illegal, unconstitutional war. It does not follow the rules of our Constitution. It does not follow the rules of the United Nations Treaty. It does not follow the NATO Treaty. And here we are just permitting it, endorsing it but further funding it. This does not make any sense.

We have to finally say, ''enough is enough.'' This is how we get into trouble. This is how we make mistakes. And every day we hear of another mistake and apologies being made, innocent people dying. We should not vote for this supplemental funding.

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

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

It is a sad day when, regardless of our feelings about the tragedy in Latin America and the continuing carnage in the Balkans, that the price that we have to pay on the floor of this House is to inflict damage on the American taxpayer and the landscape.

There has been certain reference to the mining law of 1872, which has been an enormous waste of taxpayer dollars. Since that law was enacted, the United States Government has given away almost $250 billion in mineral reserves.

In addition to robbing the Treasury, poorly managed mining operations have severely and permanently damaged public land. It is estimated the cost of cleaning up these polluted mines in the United States is between $32 billion and $72 billion, costs that will not be paid by those who profited from the mining operations.

Finally, the Department of the Interior, not the Members of Congress, are attempting to correct some of the flaws in the mining policy, as Interior recently has denied an application for mining operations in the State of Washington which sought to dump tons of toxic waste on public land. This denial relied on a previously unused section of the 1872 mining law and could be applied to mining operations across this country.

In addition, the Bureau of Land Management has been attempting for the past 3 years to promulgate new mining regulations that would address modern mining practices, impose meaningful environmental standards, and help protect taxpayers from the cost of cleaning up abandoned mines.

I am appalled that the legislation before us today to deal with disaster relief contains environmental riders which would prevent us from cleaning up mining in the United States. The first rider would permit the unsound mining practices to go forward not just in the State of Washington but allows similar practices throughout the United States until the end of the year. And for the third time in 3 years are riders included which delays implementation of the Bureau of Land Management's new mining regulations.

I strongly urge that we oppose this legislation and move to support the motion to recommit.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in ambivalence toward the rule but in strong opposition to the supplemental itself.

Because my dad used to have a saying, and that was that ''the road to hell is paved with good intentions.'' And I think that that fairly well sums up this supplemental, because it may have the best of intentions in a whole lot of different areas within the government, but it is most certainly the road to hell in saving Social Security.

I mean, last fall we spent $20 billion on an ''emergency basis.'' Now we find ourselves about to spend another $13 billion on this ''emergency basis.'' That is $33 billion sucked out of my kids' Social Security account. So I think we really are on the road to hell with these ''emergency bills'' because they are coming out of one pot and that is the Social Security pot.

Now, leaving aside the fact that it has got a lot of strange stuff in it, whether it is $2.2 million for a sewer for the winter Olympics, $3 million to redo dormitories, $100,000 for a YMCA down in Southern California, $330,000 for the minority leader and the majority whip, $25,000 for the chief deputy whips to the Republican and Democrat parties, a lot of stuff that is by no means emergency.

What I think we need to take from this thing is a lesson; and that is, if this same $33 billion was in individual accounts across this country, in individual Social Security accounts across this country, then Washington came up short for the YMCA down in Southern California, or who knows what, and wanted to take that money out of that account, I think people would go berserk.

I think we have really got to look at creating some kind of real firewall between people's Social Security money and political forces in D.C. Because, if not, we are going to continue to go the way these supplemental bills are going.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, certainly there are many sorry provisions in this conference report. It is hard to really concentrate on just one or two of them. But it seems to me the one that has gotten attention from several speakers because of its very adverse environmental consequences, the crown jewel open-pit gold mine, is appropriately placed in this bill.

The problem is that those who are supporting this conference report view the Social Security surplus as the crown jewel open-pit gold mine to fund whatever it is they want to fund. This bill has very little to do with busting Belgrade and a great deal to do with bursting the budget.

Keep in mind that well over $10 billion in this proposal is paid for directly out of the Social Security surplus. This is the same surplus which the Republican leadership was planning to come to the floor this week and lock up in a lockbox. Well, they were ashamed to come out the same week that they are turning on the spigot on the Social Security surplus, because that is just exactly what is happening here when we drain out for short-term, allegedly emergency purposes the Social Security surplus to pay for things that ought not to be paid for by the next generation.

In this particular proposal that we are considering, the Republican Congressional Budget Office only within the last month told us what it would take to fund this war. They said $600 million in the initial phase and about a billion dollars per month to sustain an air campaign. Supposedly in this emergency appropriation we would fund those appropriations necessary to carry us to September 30, when the regular appropriations bill would come into play.

How did that amount of money get blown into almost $15 billion of money? In the way this Congress seems to operate, too often Republicans said that they did not like this war, they were proud to vote against the President on

this war. Well, I have to tell my colleagues, if these generous folks give this much to a war that they do not like, heaven protect the taxpayer from one that they do like.

I think that we do need to provide reasonable humanitarian relief, we need to provide our young men and women in the Balkans with whatever they need to protect themselves and to carry out their mission, whatever that may be. But let us be very clear that the billions of dollars that are the price tag of this bill do not have anything to do with securing our military position in Yugoslavia. They may have something to do with securing the position of some of the Members of this Congress.

Under the Republican leadership, this Congress in the last 4 years has voted to provide the Pentagon with $27 billion more than it requested, and yet only 14 percent of those unrequested monies went for readiness rather than for pork. And so if there has been any emergency created here on readiness, it has been by the priorities of a Congress led by Republicans for the last 4 years.

I do not believe that the money provided to the military in this bill could be spent for purposes in Yugoslavia between now and September 30 if they were dropping it out in bails over Belgrade each night.

□ 1745

No, it funds things like libraries in Germany, a dormitory in the District of Columbia, a road in Bahrain, ATMs on ships, things that have nothing to do with the emergency situation we face in Yugoslavia, all designed to permit a raid on the Social Security surplus rather than to meet the legitimate needs of our military in the Balkans.

I believe that it was a former member of the Committee on Appropriations who said, ''Every emergency is an opportunity.'' Certainly there are those who found great opportunity to deal with many other subjects here. But when all is said and done, it is the taxpayer who must pick up the tab, and in this case it is the Social Security surplus that must feel the pinch.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I support disaster relief for the people of Central America and the Caribbean. This assistance is long overdue. I support funding for our troops in Kosovo. I also support full funding for Census 2000. Nevertheless, I must oppose H.R. 1141, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999. This supplemental bill includes a $1.25 billion cut in food stamp funding, a $350 million cut in the Section 8 affordable housing program, and a $22.4 million cut in unemployment insurance programs. These harmful cuts target the most vulnerable sections of our Nation's population. And they will cause tremendous suffering to numerous low-income Americans. The food stamp cut in this bill is unprecedented and immoral. Excess funds provided to the food stamp program have always been used for other nutrition programs. They have never been transferred to nonnutrition programs. The proposed cut in food stamp funding would take away food from hungry people and set a dangerous precedent for using nutritional assistance as a budgetary offset.

I am also deeply concerned about the $350 million cut in the Section 8 affordable housing program, which provides housing assistance to poor and elderly people, including many of our Nation's veterans. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, this rescission will result in a loss of subsidy for approximately 60,000 families and exacerbate the current waiting list problem on which many families must wait months or years to receive the housing assistance they so desperately need. The rescission could also disrupt the Section 8 program and cause many landlords to opt out of the program altogether.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, the President asked for $7.2 billion for both of the supplementals. This is almost $15 billion. Members have thrown in everything but the kitchen sink. The American taxpayers are tired of this kind of programming, this kind of legislating. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. We cannot move forward with this mess. It is outrageous and we should not want this on our records.

Mr. Speaker, I support disaster relief for the people of Central America and the Caribbean; this assistance is long overdue. I support funding for our troops in Kosovo. I also support full funding for Census 2000. Nevertheless, I must oppose H.R. 1141, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999.

This supplemental bill includes a $1.25 billion cut in food stamp funding, a $350 million cut in the Section 8 affordable housing program and a $22.4 million cut in unemployment insurance programs. These harmful cuts target the most vulnerable segments of our nation's population, and they will cause tremendous suffering to numerous low-income Americans.

The food stamp cut in this bill is unprecedented and immoral. Excess funds provided to the food stamp program has always been used for other nutrition programs; they have never been transferred to non-nutrition programs. The proposed cut in food stamp funding would take food away from hungry people and set a dangerous precedent for using nutrition assistance as a budgetary offset.

I am also deeply concerned about the $350 million cut in the Section 8 affordable housing program, which provides housing assistance to poor and elderly people, including many of our nation's veterans. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, this rescission will result in a loss of subsidy for approximately 60,000 families and exacerbate the current waiting list problem, on which many families must wait months or years to receive the housing assistance they so desperately need. The rescission could also disrupt the Section 8 program and cause many landlords to opt out of the program altogether.

Supporters of these rescissions claim that the funds being cut from housing assistance, food stamps and unemployment insurance will probably not be used during this fiscal year. If this is the case, the money can be rescinded at the end of the fiscal year or used to fund housing, nutrition and unemployment programs for fiscal year 2000.

We know there are unemployed, hungry and homeless people in America today who have been left behind despite recent economic growth. If the funds Congress has provided for these people are not reaching them, it stands to reason that we should improve the outreach of the programs, not cut their funding.

H.R. 1141 is supposed to be an emergency spending bill. Emergency spending bills are not subject to budgetary spending caps and should not require any offsets at all.

The Republicans have been blatantly inconsistent on the subject of offsets in emergency spending bills and they have needlessly politicized the appropriations process. First they included offsets in H.R. 1141, which was originally a bill to provide disaster relief to the victims of Hurricane Mitch in Central America and the Caribbean. Then they included billions of dollars in non-emergency defense spending but no offsets in H.R. 1664, the Kosovo supplemental bill. Now they have combined these two contradictory approaches and included a whole new set of offsets at the expense of the poorest people in America. If the Republicans would stop loading emergency spending bills with non-emergency projects, they would not need to worry about offsets.

I strongly support the extension of funding for the Commerce, State and Justice Departments and the federal court system through September 30, 1999, which is contained in this supplemental appropriations bill. Without this extension, the Commerce, State and Justice Departments and the federal court system could be shut down completely for the remainder of the fiscal year. However, if the Republican majority had fulfilled its responsibility to appropriate the funds that were necessary to operate these departments last year, the Republicans would not have needed to include this extension in an emergency spending bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act and oppose the disastrous offsets, which could cause tremendous harm to poor, hungry and unemployed people throughout the United States.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Congress has failed to authorize the ongoing war in Kosovo but the House and Senate Republican leaders are happy enough to see the President's $7 billion request for emergency funding and raise him $8 billion. That is right. $15 billion of so-called emergency funding, every penny of which will come from the Social Security trust funds. $15 billion in pork and special interest waivers under the guise of a military emergency in Kosovo. Something stinks. I guess that is why this bill includes $2.2 million for sewers in Salt Lake City for the Olympics. That is an emergency. And a mining giveaway in Washington State. Waiver of

environmental laws. That is an emergency under this bill. Special breaks for oil and gas producers who just raised the price of gas 50 cents a gallon. That is an emergency. $3.7 million for the page dorm. $3 million for reindeer ranchers. $23 million for fishers in Alaska. Hundreds of thousands for Democratic and Republican leaders. These are not emergencies. Say no to this legislation.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill, but I do so with great reluctance. I so very much wanted to vote for this emergency bill because just as it addresses an emergency situation in Kosovo and Central America, it also addresses an emergency situation for farmers all across this Nation. My reluctance is due to the fact that the bill contains vitally needed funding for domestic farm aid and I along with others from rural America have pleaded with Congress to provide these funds for months. This vitally needed farm aid is well overdue. The operating funds for the Farm Service Agency are vital and will help that agency to help farmers.

Mr. Speaker, small farmers are having a difficult time, struggling to survive in America. Most are losing money and fighting to stay in the farming business. In North Carolina, hogs, the State's top farm commodity, have experienced a 50 percent drop. Wheat is down 42 percent. Soybeans are down 36 percent. I can go on and on. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is no commodity that is making money for farmers in my State.

The conference report includes language that prohibits the Federal Government from using the tax settlement. That is important to my State. So it is with great reluctance that I oppose this conference report. Yet in spite of my reluctance, I am firm in my opposition. I am firm in my opposition to this conference report because it contains undue and unnecessary offsets. The offsets are undue because the funds being taken away are critically needed. The offsets are unnecessary because this is an emergency supplemental seeking to address true emergencies. Therefore, no offset is required. The offset is particularly onerous because it takes $1.25 billion from food stamps. It takes food stamps. It takes funds from Section 8. You are taking from the poor to take care of the farmer. This is unnecessary. It is unworthy of us. I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill, but I do so with great reluctance. I so very much wanted to vote for this emergency bill because just as it addresses an emergency situation in Kosovo and Central America, it also addresses an emergency situation with farmers all across this nation.

My reluctance is due to the fact that the bill contains vitally needed funding for domestic farm aid and I along with others from rural America have pleaded with Congress to provide these funds for months.

This vitally needed farm aid is well overdue.

Included in the $574 million in emergency agricultural assistance is $109.6 million for FSA Loan Programs and $42.75 million for FSA salaries and expenses. These loan funds are critically important to farmers who need capital just to stay in business.

And, the operating funds for the Farm Service Agency are vital and will help that Agency to help the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, small farmers are having a difficult time, struggling to survive in America.

Most are losing money and fighting to stay in the farming business.

In North Carolina, hogs, the state's top farm commodity, have experienced a fifty percent drop in prices since 1996.

Wheat is down forty-two percent; Soybeans down thirty-six percent; Corn—thirty-one percent; peanuts—twenty-eight percent.

Turkey and cotton prices are down twenty-three percent, since 1996.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is no commodity in North Carolina that makes money for farmers.

The conference report also includes language that prohibits the Federal Government from recovering part of the tobacco settlement reached by the states.

In addition, it includes language permitting the states to use this money, without restriction.

Those are important provisions for my state.

So, it is with great reluctance that I oppose this conference report.

Yet, despite my reluctance, I am firm in my opposition.

I am firm in my opposition because the conference report contains undue and unnecessary offsets.

The offsets are undue because the funds being taken away as offsets are critically needed funds.

The offsets are unnecessary because this is an Emergency Supplemental, seeking to address true emergencies, and therefore, no offset is required.

The offsets are particularly onerous because they take $1.25 billion from the Food Stamp Program.

By this deed, the report fails to recognize that hunger in America is more than just a word.

Many of our citizens, including many children, still live without proper nutrition and sufficient food.

The offsets also include $350 million from the Section 8 Housing Program. And, in what seems to be a contradiction, the offsets include $22.5 million from the Agricultural Research Service.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this conference report.

We can respond to emergencies, especially those of our farmers, without creating emergencies among our children and the poor.

We can provide food, shelter, hurricane and other aid to our friends abroad, as we should, without creating a storm here at home.

We can help those in Kosovo and Central America, as we should, without requiring an offset, because this is a true emergency.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time. It has been intimated to the Members that the offsets in this bill are to take from the poor to give to, I presume, the rich. Let me just try to set the record straight here.

First of all, the offsets on the food stamps, the $1.2 billion, was offered by the White House. So if Members have a problem with using the food stamps as an offset, they better call Mr. Lew down at the White House because they suggested these. By the way, these are surplus funds. On the issue of $350 million for Section 8 housing, I would remind my colleagues that no one, and I repeat, no one has ever lost their housing or their housing voucher because of rescissions in Section 8. This is something that has happened each and every Congress. The money has always been restored. Are we going to have a problem? Is it going to be challenging? Absolutely. But we are committed to making sure that that Section 8 money is put back in. Let me just respond on this issue of the supplemental.

There are a lot of things in this supplemental to hate, there is no question. I think quite frankly the House did a far better job than the Senate. The Senate wanted to throw everything in but the kitchen sink. I suppose if the kitchen sink came from Alaska, it would be in here. But the fact of the matter is, we held them back and tried to keep this money in check and keep the spending responsible and in terms of emergencies.

I would conclude by saying if the President and the administration had taken care of the defense establishment of this country and funded each and every adventure that we are seeing around the globe over the past 6 or 7 years, we would not be at this point right now. Sure this is a supplemental and there are additional expenditures in here, but we tried very hard to keep this as small a dollar amount as we could, targeted at the war and at the other emergencies that we face.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency gets some additional funds. That is what this supplemental was meant to provide. There was an issue that was also raised about Federal Emergency Management funding going to Central America. Some people support that. Some do not. But the fact of the matter is, FEMA funds were for American emergencies, not Central American emergencies. But many of us felt that since these were serious, that people were damaged and harmed by this, that we would reach out to them. But those funds had to be offset under our rules. So we had to go out and find additional offsets. The White House offered the food stamps offsets. The Section 8 offsets will be put back in. We are committed to that.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly compliment the dedication of

the Committee on Appropriations in this body and the other to bringing forth legislation. But what troubles me is that this legislation has become a Trojan horse for many other unwarranted projects in an emergency spending bill. How can we justify the litany of projects that have been disclosed here this afternoon in an emergency bill, projects that ought to be funded in the normal appropriations process, projects which are essentially coming out of the Social Security trust fund. This is obscene. How do we explain to the seniors of this country or to the young people who are concerned about the Social Security program this abuse of the emergency supplemental process?

I would also like to emphasize that part of what is happening here is we are busting the budget caps. We have paid lip service to our commitment to observe these caps and balance the budget. But, in fact, what we are doing is we are shoehorning into an emergency bill billions of dollars in spending that was otherwise expected to have to be calculated and fit into the normal process. This is an abuse of the budget process. This is Exhibit A of the need for budget reform in this Congress.

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill today. Let us take a look at the emergencies this bill contains. Money for sewers. Money for dormitories. Money for fish in Alaska. Money for reindeer. I mean, is Santa in trouble? Is there some reindeer emergency that I am not aware of that requires millions of dollars? Or how about the extra money that goes to the minority leader and the majority whip? Is there some emergency going on in those offices that none of us are aware of that has not been reported in Roll Call?

Mr. Speaker, we should provide for our service men and women the resources they need. But the Department of Defense requested $6 billion to fulfill its obligation. This bill doubles what the military experts said they needed. There is nearly $2 billion for a military pay raise. Mr. Speaker, we need to address that issue, but not in an emergency spending bill. Some say, ''Well, we offset this by $2 billion.'' Yes, billions of dollars from food stamps. We can forget about reducing the national debt if we keep spending down the Social Security surplus with this kind of uncontrolled emergency spending.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience vote for an emergency spending bill loaded up with nonemergency spending provisions and unrelated environmental policy decisions.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, there are good riders and there are bad riders, and of course beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

These appropriation bills more often than not contain riders which seek to overturn rulemakings which seek to protect overall public interests. Those are bad riders. In the case of the pending legislation there are two riders concerning hard rock mining on Western public lands.

In the pending legislation there is, in effect, a provision which actually changes the operation of the Mining Law of 1872. This provision would waive mining law requirements as they relate to the amount of public land around mining claims that can be used to dispose of mining wastes. My colleagues from Florida and Washington have already spoken to this, and if they offer their motion to recommit, I will support it.

I can certainly understand they need to provide jobs by mining employment in the Western lands. I have a similar concern in my area where coal mining prevails in southern West Virginia. But the rider on this bill is not limited to one particular mine. This is no small issue. We are talking about sizable quantities of public land. What is particularly galling is that after years and years of resistance to negotiating any reforms to Mining Law of 1872, we are faced with a rider that is stuck deep in the bowels of this emergency appropriation bill that favors one company.

I urge recommittal.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the supplemental appropriations conference report and in support of the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE). The people of Oregon sent me 2,500 miles away to be careful with both their budget and with the environment. This bill is bloated on the budgetary side and is just flat wrong in the process and the substance of the decisions made in its environmental riders.

Mr. Speaker, substantive environmental legislation should not be passed in the dark of night. They deserve full review by this body and by the Senate, and, quite frankly, the substantive decision to open up mining in the Crown Jewel Mine is something that I do not believe my constituents or the people of America would support as an independent freestanding bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the motion to recommit submitted by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a perfect bill. It certainly is a much better bill than passed this House last week by far. It supports our troops in a very important way, a vital way. It helps with hurricane relief in the Caribbean and Central America. It helps tornado victims in Oklahoma and Kansas. It helps the refugees in the Balkans and hurting people as a result of the tremendous amount of oppression and genocide that is going on there.

The humanitarian aid has been increased 1 percent in this bill, mainly as a result of increases in food aid to the refugees for the next few months. It brings the total humanitarian package in this bill to 5 percent of the total package. This money is important and vital. I urge Members to support the conference committee.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, apparently there has been some discussion on the floor about environmental riders in this bill. We resisted some of those that were included in the Senate bill. We tried to have a balanced bill.

On the case of the finalizing of hard rock mining regulations, the facts are that there is a National Academy of Sciences, which is an independent agency, doing a study to give us an analysis of the provisions that are being proposed in these regulations. This report is due out by July 31, and there is a 120-day comment period thereafter.

So what we are really saying in this bill is give us time to get the report from the National Academy of Sciences, give the people, both sides, time to comment, which is also provided in that arrangement, and then we will decide what the national policy should be. And all this bill does is to put a moratorium on until such time as we get that information.

On the Crown Jewel Mine issue, again this is retroactive. The Crown Jewel Mine is a mining company that has crossed every T, dotted every I, has had all the permits issued by the Federal and the State government. They are ready to go forward.

It was pointed out in the debate on the supplemental that several State retirement systems and State governmental agencies had invested in this mine, and if it were not allowed to go forward, there would be a total loss of money to these retirement systems. So my colleagues are talking about taking money away from public retirement programs if they were to allow this Crown Jewel Mine to be shut down.

Now it is not as if this was prospective. This mine has been okayed by everybody, had a NEPA statement filed, done everything required by the law of both the State of Washington as well as the Federal Government, and all we

have said in this bill is they can go forward so that these large groups of investors, such as the retirement systems, do not suffer huge losses and because it is the right thing to do. They have done everything required by law.

That is an issue that this Congress will have to address. Whether or not we choose to preclude mining in the United States in the future is a policy issue that will continue to be before this body in the future. But at least in fairness we should not legislate retroactively, and that is what has been attempted by the Solicitor's opinion. We are simply putting a stay on that so that those companies that have abided by the law in every way, have made huge investments, $80 million investments provided by funds from the groups that I mentioned, are allowed to continue operating.

So I think these are responsible amendments. We did have some that were anti-environment, and we did not approve those. There were amendments from the other body that were denied in the conference because they were not constructive environmental actions.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it, and I appreciate the gentleman putting the best spin possible on these riders. But I would still, as my colleagues know, mention to the gentleman that the Solicitor's opinion would prevent these open pit mines from putting toxic waste on our lands, on Federal lands, and by the rider that we have put in the bill, which I am sure it was not at the gentleman's initiative that it was put in the bill, it would exactly do that. It would allow hundreds of acres of pristine Federal lands to be stacked up with waste product, toxic waste product. I mean it is beyond comprehension that we are allowing that to happen.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled as to why the Environmental Protection Agency of this administration would approve it under the circumstances the gentleman from Florida has just outlined.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I mean he is legislating. That overrides every other piece of legislation that exists that specifically allows that to occur.

Mr. REGULA. Now wait a minute. The mining law provides for regulation. This is rather ironic. This administration has been opposed to the 1872 Mining Act, and yet they found an obscure provision in that particular act that the Solicitor used to make his opinion valid. He used the mining law to bring this about.

But the point is that all the agencies of this administration had okayed it, and if we think it is wrong, we ought to change the law. We should not allow a company to invest $80 million of investors' money and then change the reules. They should not be required to suffer a huge loss because of this obscure provision that is being interpreted. A Solicitor's opinion is not law, and I think if we just tried to deal with this single issue problem, if it is wrong, we should have a bill put in here and amend the law.

Mr. DEUTSCH. If the gentleman would continue to yield, again I think if our concern is the teachers' unions, there will be a lot better ways, and I think the teachers of America and the children of America and the American people would be a lot happier dealing with that investment a different way.

I mean we are talking about hundreds of acres of land that you and I own as American citizens, pristine national forest areas.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I do not know, and I have not been out there so I have not looked at it, and I do not know all the nuances of the law. I just know that the agencies of this administration approved it, told them to go ahead and make the investment. They did everything required by the laws of the United States and the State of Washington, and what more can we ask of a company? And again, if we think this is wrong, we have a responsibility to deal with it in a policy decision in this body.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for taking this action because let us put this into perspective. This was a mine in north central Washington that had invested some $80 million with the full expectation that, if they followed the rules as was laid out in current law, that they would be able to mine for this gold. They passed every hoop that the State of Washington put, every barrier the State of Washington put up, everything that the Federal Government put up, and they passed it until it got here and the Solicitor simply said, ''I'm sorry.''

What happened was that the Solicitor said, ''I'm sorry, we're going to take a provision that had never been enforced, never been enforced in the 1872 Mining Law,'' and said for that reason we are going to completely shut down this mine, again, after it had gone through all the barriers that were required under current law.

Now I might add it does have an effect, as the gentleman mentioned, on retirement funds, but also it has an impact on employment of about 150 to 200 people in a county frankly that is crying for more employment. So in fairness is the real reason why this provision was put into law, because it deals with this specific mine and mines that are in existence already, that were playing by the rules that we thought they should be playing by when they started their endeavor and made that investment.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for the work he did on that because I think he did the right thing.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, if I have any time, I would just say that the provision that was put in by the other body was very sweeping. The House conferees narrowed it, and got it very narrow in its application.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, some of us have our differences with this bill, including myself. As my colleagues know, the Senate added pork, no question, everything but the kitchen sink, and it is certainly not emergencies. But everyone needs to support this rule so we can have an open and honest debate on the floor during the general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

□ 1815

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and I think it is important for us to get back to the reason that we are here right now. We are going to be, once we pass this measure, discussing a $15 billion emergency supplemental appropriations bill, which is absolutely necessary to offset the very significant costs of the Kosovo campaign, as well as to provide emergency aid to America's farmers, disaster victims here in the United States and Central America and to Balkan refugees.

Now I would like to compliment the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and specifically our great Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who did a superb job facing much adversity, and I can say I was in on a number of these meetings over the past several weeks on this issue and it has been a challenging time but both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) have done an absolutely superb job.

As my friend, the gentlewoman from Charlotte, North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) just said, it is true our colleagues in the other body have clearly added many things to this measure which should not be there, but this conference report takes a very important first step towards reversing that very dangerous 10-year path that we have had of diminishing the capability of our Nation's defenses.

With the ongoing missions that are taking place, both in Kosovo, Korea and Iraq, our forces are being asked to do much more with much less. The bill puts $2.65 billion directly into the pipeline for spare parts, readiness, depot maintenance and recruitment.

Along with many others, many others in this House and around this country, I have had serious doubts as to the

effectiveness of our air-only campaign. Whatever the arguments for U.S. involvement in Kosovo were, it is now a very clear national interest that both the United States of America and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance prevail in this conflict. The price of NATO and American failure is simply too great at this point.

Therefore, I urge support of both this rule, which is the standard rule waiving points of order against the conference report, and we will have a full hour of debate led by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and I think at the end of the day we should have a very strong bipartisan vote for this.

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. THORNBERRY). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. 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 315, nays 109, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—315

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—109

Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berman
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Holt
Hooley
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lee
Lipinski
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Rahall
Rangel
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Sherman
Slaughter
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—9

Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Condit
Gutierrez
Quinn
Serrano
Sessions
Weldon (PA)

☐ 1837

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. SCHAFFER changed his 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.

RULES OF COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT FOR THE 106TH CONGRESS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (as contemplated by clause 2(a)2 of rule XI) of the rules adopted by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule XI, which have duly governed the proceedings of the Committee since their adoption on January 20, 1999, and subsequent amendment on March 10, 1999 and on April 14, 1999.

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

There was no objection.

RULES: COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

FOREWORD

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is unique in the House of Representatives. Consistent with the duty to carry out its advisory and enforcement responsibilities in an impartial manner, the Committee is the only standing committee of the House of Representatives the membership of which is divided evenly by party. These rules are intended to provide a fair procedural framework for the conduct of the Committee's activities and to help insure that the Committee serves well the people of the United States, the House of Representatives, and the Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives.

PART I—GENERAL COMMITTEE RULES

Rule 1. General Provisions

(a) So far as applicable, these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the Committee and any subcommittee. The Committee adopts these rules under the authority of clause 2(a)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 106th Congress.

(b) The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed by a vote of a majority of the Committee.

(c) When the interests of justice so require, the Committee, by a majority vote of its members, may adopt any special procedures, not inconsistent with these rules, deemed necessary to resolve a particular matter before it. Copies of such special procedures shall be furnished to all parties in the matter.

Rule 2. Definitions

(a) ''Committee'' means the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

(b) ''Complaint'' means a written allegation of improper conduct against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives filed with the Committee with the intent to initiate an inquiry.

(c) ''Inquiry'' means an investigation by an investigative subcommittee into allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives.

(d) ''Investigative Subcommittee'' means a subcommittee designated pursuant to Rule 8 to conduct an inquiry to determine if a Statement of Alleged Violation should be issued.

(e) ''Statement of Alleged Violation'' means a formal charging document filed by an investigative subcommittee with the Committee containing specific allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives of a violation of the Code of Official Conduct, or of a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities.

(f) ''Adjudicatory Subcommittee'' means a subcommittee of the Committee comprised of those Committee members not on the investigative subcommittee, that holds an adjudicatory hearing and determines whether the counts in a Statement of Alleged Violation are proved by clear and convincing evidence.

(g) ''Sanction Hearing'' means a Committee hearing to determine what sanction, if any, to adopt or to recommend to the House of Representatives.

(h) ''Respondent'' means a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives who is the subject of a complaint filed with the Committee or who is the subject of an inquiry or a Statement of Alleged Violation.

(i) ''Office of Advice and Education'' refers to the Office established by section 803(i) of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989. The Office handles inquiries; prepares written opinions in response to specific requests; develops general guidance; and organizes seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefit of the House of Representatives.

Rule 3. Advisory Opinions and Waivers

(a) The Office of Advice and Education shall handle inquiries; prepare written opinions providing specific advice; develop general guidance; and organize seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefit of the House of Representatives.

(b) Any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives, may request a written opinion with respect to the propriety of any current or proposed conduct of such Member, officer, or employee.

(c) The Office of Advice and Education may provide information and guidance regarding laws, rules, regulations, and other standards of conduct applicable to Members, officers, and employees in the performance of their duties or the discharge of their responsibilities.

(d) In general, the Committee shall provide a written opinion to an individual only in response to a written request, and the written opinion shall address the conduct only of the inquiring individual, or of persons for whom the inquiring individual is responsible as employing authority.

(e) A written request for an opinion shall be addressed to the Chairman of the Committee and shall include a complete and accurate statement of the relevant facts. A request shall be signed by the requester or the requester's authorized representative or employing authority. A representative shall disclose to the Committee the identity of the principal on whose behalf advice is being sought.

(f) The Office of Advice and Education shall prepare for the Committee a response to each written request for an opinion from a member, officer or employee. Each response shall discuss all applicable laws, rules, regulations, or other standards.

(g) Where a request is unclear or incomplete, the Office of Advice and Education may seek additional information from the requester.

(h) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to take action on behalf of the Committee on any proposed written opinion that they determine does not require consideration by the Committee. If the Chairman or Ranking Minority member requests a written opinion, or seeks a waiver, extension, or approval pursuant to Rules 3(l), 4(c), 4(e), or 4(h), the next ranking member of the requester's party is authorized to act in lieu of the requester.

(i) The Committee shall keep confidential any request for advice from a Member, officer, or employee, as well as any response thereto.

(j) The Committee may take no adverse action in regard to any conduct that has been undertaken in reliance on a written opinion if the conduct conforms to the specific facts addressed in the opinion.

(k) Information provided to the Committee by a Member, officer, or employee seeking advice regarding prospective conduct may not be used as the basis for initiating an investigation under clause 3(a)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, if such Member, officer, or employee acts in good faith in accordance with the written advice of the Committee.

(l) A written request for a waiver of clause 5 of House Rule XXVI (the House gift rule), or for any other waiver or approval, shall be treated in all respects like any other request for a written opinion.

(m) A written request for a waiver of clause 5 of House Rule XXVI (the House gift rule) shall specify the nature of the waiver being sought and the specific circumstances justifying the waiver.

(n) An employee seeking a waiver of time limits applicable to travel paid for by a private source shall include with the request evidence that the employing authority is aware of the request. In any other instance where proposed employee conduct may reflect on the performance of official duties, the Committee may require that the requester submit evidence that the employing authority knows of the conduct.

Rule 4. Financial Disclosure

(a) In matters relating to title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, the Committee shall coordinate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Legislation Resource Center, to assure that appropriate individuals are notified of their obligation to file Financial Disclosure Statements and that such individuals are provided in a timely fashion with filing instructions and forms developed by the Committee.

(b) The Committee shall coordinate with the Legislative Resource Center to assure that information that the Ethics in Government Act requires to be placed on the public record is made public.

(c) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to grant on behalf of the Committee requests for reasonable extensions of time for the filing of Financial Disclosure Statements. Any such request must be received by the Committee no later than the date on which the statement in question is due. A request received after such date may be granted by the Committee only in extraordinary circumstances. Such extensions for one individual in a calendar year shall not exceed a total of 90 days. No extension shall be granted authorizing a nonincumbent candidate to file a statement later than 30 days prior to a primary or general election in which the candidate is participating.

(d) An individual who takes legally sufficient action to withdraw as a candidate before the date of which that individual's Financial Disclosure Statement is due under the Ethics in Government Act shall not be required to file a Statement. An individual shall not be excused from filing a Financial Disclosure Statement when withdrawal as candidate occurs after the date on which such Statement was due.

(e) Any individual who files a report required to be filed under title I of the Ethics in Government Act more than 30 days after the later of—

(1) the date such report is required to be filed, or

(2) if a filing extension is granted to such individual, the last day of the filing extension period, is required by such Act to pay a late filing fee of $200. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to approve requests that the fee be waived based on extraordinary circumstances.

(f) Any late report that is submitted without a required filing fee shall be deemed procedurally deficient and not properly filed.

(g) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to approve requests for waivers of the aggregation and reporting of gifts as provided by section 102(a)(2)(C) of the Ethics in Government Act. If such a request is approved, both the incoming request and the Committee response shall be forwarded to the Legislative Resource Center for placement on the public record.

(h) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to approve blind trusts as qualifying under section 102(f)(3) of the Ethics in Government Act. The correspondence relating to formal approval of a blind trust, the trust document, the list of assets transferred to the trust, and any other documents required by law to be made public, shall be forwarded to the Legislative Resource Center for such purpose.

(i) The Committee shall designate staff counsel who shall review Financial Disclosure Statements and, based upon information contained therein, indicate in a form and manner prescribed by the Committee whether the Statement appears substantially accurate and complete and the filer appears to be in compliance with applicable laws and rules.

(i) Each Financial Disclosure Statement shall be reviewed within 60 days after the date of filing.

(k) If the reviewing counsel believes that additional information required because (1) the Statement appears not substantially accurate or complete, or (2) the filer may not be in compliance with applicable laws or rules, then the reporting individual shall be notified in writing of the additional information believed to be required, or of the law or rule with which the reporting individual does not appear to be in compliance. Such notice shall also state the time within a response is to be submitted. Any such notice shall remain confidential.

(l) Within the time specified, including any extension granted in accordance with clause (c), a reporting individual who concurs with the Committee's notification that the Statement is not complete, or that other action is required, shall submit the necessary information or take appropriate action. Any amendment may be in the form of a revised Financial Disclosure Statement or an explanatory letter addressed to he Clerk of the House of Representatives.

(m) Any amendment shall be placed on the public record in the same manner as other Statements. The individual designated by the Committee to review the original Statement shall review any amendment thereto.

(n) Within the time specified, including any extension granted in accordance with clause (c), a reporting individual who does not agree with the Committee that the Statement is deficient or that other action is required, shall be provided an opportunity to respond orally or in writing. If the explanation is accepted, a copy of the response, if written, or a note summarizing an oral response, shall be retained in Committee files with the original report.

(o) The Committee shall be the final arbiter of whether any Statement requires clarification or amendment.

(p) If the Committee determines, by vote of majority of its members, that there is reason to believe that an individual has willfully failed to file a Statement or has willfully falsified or willfully failed to file information required to be reported, then the Committee shall refer the name of the individual, together with the evidence supporting its finding, to the Attorney General pursuant to section 104(b) of the Ethics Government Act. Such referral shall not preclude the Committee from initiating such other action as may be authorized by other provisions of law or the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Rule 5. Meetings

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month, except when the House of Representatives is not meeting on that day. When the Committee Chairman determines that there is sufficient reason, a meeting may be called on additional days. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held when the Chairman determines there is no business to be considered.

(b) The Chairman shall establish the agenda for meetings of the Committee and the Ranking Minority Member may place additional items on the agenda.

(c) All meetings of the Committee or any subcommittee shall occur in executive session unless the Committee or subcommittee, by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members, open the meeting or hearing to the public.

(d) Any hearing held by an adjudicatory subcommittee or any sanction hearing held by the Committee shall be open to the pubic unless the Committee or subcommittee, by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members, closes the hearing to the pubic.

(e) A subcommittee shall meet at the discretion of its Chairman.

(f) Insofar as practicable, notice for any Committee or subcommittee meeting shall be provided at least seven days in advance of the meeting. The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee may waive such time period for good cause.

Rule 6. Committee Staff

(a) The staff is to be assembled and retained as a professional, nonpartisan staff.

(b) Each member of the staff shall be professional and demonstrably qualified for the position for which he is hired.

(c) The staff as a whole and each individual member of the staff shall perform all official duties in a nonpartisan manner.

(d) No member of the staff shall engage in any partisan political activity directly affecting any congressional or presidential election.

(e) No member of the staff or outside counsel may accept public speaking engagements or write for publication on any subject that is in any way related to his or her employment or duties with the Committee without specific prior approval from the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member.

(f) No member of the staff or outside counsel may make public, unless approved by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, any information, document, or other material that is confidential, derived from executive session, or classified and that is obtained during the course of employment with the Committee.

(g) All staff members shall be appointed by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee. Such vote shall occur at the first meeting of the membership of the Committee during each Congress and as necessary during the Congress.

(h) Subject to the approval of the Committee on House Administration, the Committee may retain counsel not employed by the House of Representatives whenever the Committee determines, by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, that the retention of outside counsel is necessary and appropriate.

(i) If the Committee determines that it is necessary to retain staff members for the purpose of a particular investigation or other proceeding, then such staff shall be retained only for the duration of that particular investigation or proceeding.

(j) Outside counsel may be dismissed prior to the end of a contract between the Committee and such counsel only by a majority vote of the members of the Committee.

(k) In addition to any other staff provided for by law, rule, or other authority, with respect to the Committee, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member each may appoint one individual as a shared staff member from his or her personal staff to perform service for the Committee. Such shared staff may assist the Chairman or Ranking Minority Member on any subcommittee on which he serves. Only paragraphs (c), (e), and (f) shall apply to shared staff.

Rule 7. Confidentiality Oaths

Before any member or employee of the Committee may have access to information that is confidential under the rules of the Committee, the following oath (or affirmation) shall be executed in writing:

''I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose, to any person or entity outside the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, any information received in the course of my service with the Committee, except as authorized by the Committee or in accordance with its rules.''

Copies of the executed oath shall be provided to the Clerk of the House as part of the records of the House. Breaches of confidentiality shall be investigated by the Committee and appropriate action shall be taken.

Rule 8. Subcommittees—General Policy and Structure

(a) Upon an affirmative vote of a majority of its members to initiate an inquiry, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall designate four members (with equal representation from the majority and minority parties) to serve as an investigative subcommittee to undertake an inquiry. At the time of appointment, the Chairman shall designate one member of the subcommittee to serve as the chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall designate one member of the subcommittee to serve as the ranking minority member of the investigative subcommittee or adjudicatory subcommittee. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may serve as members of an investigative subcommittee, but may not serve as non-voting, ex-officio members.

(b) If an investigative subcommittee, by a majority vote of its members, adopts a Statement of Alleged Violation, members who did not serve on the investigative subcommittee are eligible for appointment to the adjudicatory subcommittee to hold an Adjudicatory Hearing under Committee Rule 24 on the violations alleged in the Statement.

(c) The Committee may establish other noninvestigative and nonadjudicatory subcommittees and may assign to them such functions as it may deem appropriate. The membership of each subcommittee shall provide equal representation for the majority and minority parties.

(d) The Chairman may refer any bill, resolution, or other matter before the Committee to an appropriate subcommittee for consideration. Any such bill, resolution, or other matter may be discharged from the subcommittee to which it was referred by a majority vote of the Committee.

(e) Any member of the Committee may sit with any noninvestigative or nonadjudicatory subcommittee, but only regular members of such subcommittee may vote on any matter before that subcommittee.

Rule 9. Quorums and Member Disqualification

(a) The quorum for an investigative subcommittee to take testimony and to receive evidence shall be two members, unless otherwise authorized by the House of Representatives.

(b) The quorum for an adjudicatory subcommittee to take testimony, receive evidence, or conduct business shall consist of a majority plus one of the members of the adjudicatory subcommittee.

(c) Except as stated in clauses (a) and (b) of this rule, a quorum for the purpose of conducting business consists of a majority of the members of the Committee or subcommittee.

(d) A member of the Committee shall be ineligible to participate in any Committee or subcommittee proceeding in which he is the respondent.

(e) A member of the Committee may disqualify himself from participating in any investigation of the conduct of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives upon the submission in writing and under oath of an affidavit of disqualification stating that the member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. If the Committee approves and accepts such affidavit of disqualification, or if a member is disqualified pursuant to Rule 18(g) or Rule 24(a), the Chairman shall so notify the Speaker and ask the Speaker to designate a Member of the House of Representatives from the same political party as the disqualified member of the Committee to act as a member of the Committee in any Committee proceeding relating to such investigation.

Rule 10. Vote Requirements

(a) The following actions shall be taken only upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate:

(1) Issuing a subpoena.

(2) Adopting a full Committee motion to create an investigative subcommittee.

(3) Adoption of a Statement of Alleged Violation.

(4) Finding that a count in a Statement of Alleged Violation has been proved by clear and convincing evidence.

(5) Sending a letter of reproval.

(6) Adoption of a recommendation to the House of Representatives that a sanction be imposed.

(7) Adoption of a report relating to the conduct of a Member, officer, or employee.

(8) Issuance of an advisory opinion of general applicability establishing new policy.

(b) Except as stated in clause (a), action may be taken by the Committee or any subcommittee thereof by a simple majority, a quorum being present.

(c) No motion made to take any of the actions enumerated in clause (a) of this Rule may be entertained by the Chair unless a quorum of the Committee is present when such motion is made.

Rule 11. Communications by Committee Members and Staff

Committee members and staff shall not disclose any evidence relating to an investigation to any person or organization outside the Committee unless authorized by the Committee. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall have access to such information that they request as necessary to conduct Committee business. Evidence in the possession of an investigative subcommittee shall not be disclosed to other Committee members except by a vote of the subcommittee.

Rule 12. Committee Records

(a) The Committee may establish procedures necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any testimony or other information received by the Committee or its staff.

(b) Members and staff of the Committee shall not disclose to any person or organization outside the Committee, unless authorized by the Committee, any information regarding the Committee's or a subcommittee's investigative, adjudicatory or other proceedings, including, but not limited to: (i) the fact of or nature of any complaints; (ii) executive session proceedings; (iii) information pertaining to or copies of any Committee or subcommittee report, study, or other document which purports to express the views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the Committee or subcommittee in connection with any of its activities or proceedings; or (iv) any other information or allegation respecting the conduct of a Member, officer, or employee.

(c) The Committee shall not disclose to any person or organization outside the Committee any information concerning the conduct of a respondent until it has transmitted a Statement of Alleged Violation to such respondent and the respondent has been given full opportunity to respond pursuant to Rule 23. The Statement of Alleged Violation and any written response thereto shall be made public at the first meeting or hearing on the matter that is open to the public after such opportunity has been provided. Any other materials in the possession of the Committee regarding such statement may be made public as authorized by the Committee to the extent consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(d) If no public hearing or meeting is held on the matter, the Statement of Alleged Violation and any written response thereto shall be included in the Committee's final report on the matter to the House of Representatives.

(e) All communications and all pleadings pursuant to these rules shall be filed with the Committee at the Committee's office or such other place as designated by the Committee.

(f) All records of the Committee which have been delivered to the Archivist of the United States shall be made available to the public in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Rule 13. Broadcasts of Committee and Subcommittee Proceedings

(a) Television or radio coverage of a Committee or subcommittee hearing or meeting shall be without commercial sponsorship.

(b) No witness shall be required against his or her will to be photographed or otherwise to have a graphic reproduction of his or her image made at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any witness, all media microphones shall be turned off, all television and camera lenses shall be covered, and the making of a graphic reproduction at the hearing shall not be permitted. This paragraph supplements clause 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(c) Not more than four television cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing or meeting room. The Committee may allocate the positions of permitted television cameras among the television media in consultation with the executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(d) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the Committee, or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(e) Television cameras shall not be placed in positions that unnecessarily obstruct the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

PART II—INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY

Rule 14. House Resolution

Whenever the House of Representatives, by resolution, authorizes or directs the Committee to undertake an inquiry or investigation, the provisions of the resolution, in conjunction with these Rules, shall govern. To the extent the provisions of the resolution differ from these Rules, the resolution shall control.

Rule 15. Committee Authority to Investigate—General Policy

Pursuant to clause 3(b)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee may exercise its investigative authority when—

(a) information offered as a complaint by a Member of the House of Representatives is transmitted directly to the Committee;

(b) information offered as a complaint by an individual not a Member of the House is transmitted to the Committee, provided that a Member of the House certifies in writing that he or she believes the information is submitted in good faith and warrants the review and consideration of the Committee;

(c) the Committee, on its own initiative, establishes an investigative subcommittee;

(d) a Member, officer, or employee is convicted in a Federal, State, or local court of a felony; or

(e) the House of Representatives, by resolution, authorizes or directs the Committee to undertake an inquiry or investigation.

Rule 16. Complaints

(a) A complaint submitted to the Committee shall be in writing, dated, and properly verified (a document will be considered properly verified where a notary executes it with the language, ''Signed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on (date) by (the name of the person)'' setting forth in simple, concise, and direct statements—

(1) the name and legal address of the party filing the complaint (hereinafter referred to as the ''complainant'');

(2) the name and position or title of the respondent;

(3) the nature of the alleged violation of the Code of Official Conduct or of other law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of duties or discharge of responsibilities; and

(4) the facts alleged to give rise to the violation. The complaint shall not contain innuendo, speculative assertions, or conclusory statements.

(b) Any documents in the possession of the complainant that relate to the allegations may be submitted with the complaint.

(c) Information offered as a complaint by a Member of the House of Representatives may be transmitted directly to the Committee.

(d) Information offered as a complaint by an individual not a Member of the House may be transmitted to the Committee, provided that a Member of the House certifies in writing that he or she believes the information is submitted in good faith and warrants the review and consideration of the Committee.

(e) A complaint must be accompanied by a certification, which may be unsworn, that the complainant has provided an exact copy of the filed complaint and all attachments to the respondent.

(f) The Committee may defer action on a complaint against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives when the complaint alleges conduct that the Committee has reason to believe is being reviewed by appropriate law enforcement or regulatory authorities, or when the Committee determines that it is appropriate for the conduct alleged in the complaint to be reviewed initially by law enforcement or regulatory authorities.

(g) A complaint may not be amended without leave of the Committee. Otherwise, any new allegations of improper conduct must be submitted in a new complaint that independently meets the procedural requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Committee's Rules.

(h) The Committee shall not accept, and shall return to the complainant, any complaint submitted within the 60 days prior to an election in which the subject of the complaint is a candidate.

(i) The Committee shall not consider a complaint, nor shall any investigation be undertaken by the Committee, of any alleged violation which occurred before the third previous Congress unless the Committee determines that the alleged violation is directly related to an alleged violation which occurred in a more recent Congress.

Rule 17. Duties of Committee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member

(a) Unless otherwise determined by a vote of the Committee, only the Chairman or Ranking Minority Member, after consultation with each other, may make public statements regarding matters before the Committee or any subcommittee.

(b) Whenever information offered as a complaint is submitted to the Committee, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall have 14 calendar days or 5 legislative days, whichever occurs first, to determine whether the information meets the requirements of the Committee's rules for what constitutes a complaint.

(c) Whenever the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member jointly determine that information submitted to the Committee meets the requirements of the Committee's rules for what constitutes a complaint, they shall have 45 calendar days or 5 legislative days, whichever is later, after the date that the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member determine that information filed meets the requirements of the Committee's rules for what constitutes a complaint, unless the Committee by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members votes otherwise, to—

(1) recommend to the Committee that it dispose of the complaint, or any portion thereof, in any manner that does not require action by the House, which may include dismissal of the complaint or resolution of the complaint by a letter to the Member, officer, or employee of the House against whom the complaint is made;

(2) establish an investigative subcommittee; or

(3) request that the Committee extend the applicable 45-calendar day period when they determine more time is necessary in order to make a recommendation under paragraph (1).

(d) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member may jointly gather additional information concerning alleged conduct which is the basis of a complaint or of information offered as a complaint until they have established an investigative subcommittee or the Chairman or Ranking Minority Member has placed on the agenda the issue of whether to establish an investigative subcommittee.

(e) If the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member jointly determine that information submitted to the Committee meets the requirements of the Committee rules for what constitutes a complaint, and the complaint is not disposed of within 45 calendar days or 5 legislative days, whichever is later, and no additional 45-day extension is made, then they shall establish an investigative subcommittee and forward the complaint, or any portion thereof, to that subcommittee for its consideration. If at any time during the time period either the Chairman or Ranking Minority Member places on the agenda the issue of whether to establish an investigative subcommittee, then an investigative subcommittee may be established only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee.

(f) Whenever the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member jointly determine that information submitted to the Committee does not meet the requirements for what constitutes a complaint set forth in the Committee rules, they may (1) return the information to the complainant with a statement that it fails to meet the requirements for what constitutes a complaint set forth in the Committee's rules; or (2) recommend to the Committee that it authorize the establishment of an investigative subcommittee.

Rule 18. Processing of Complaints

(a) If a complaint is in compliance with House and Committee Rules, a copy of the complaint and the Committee Rules shall be forwarded to the respondent within five days with notice that the complaint conforms to the applicable rules and will be placed on the Committee's agenda.

(b) The respondent may, within 30 days of the Committee's notification, provide to the Committee any information relevant to a complaint filed with the Committee. The respondent may submit a written statement in response to the complaint. Such a statement shall be signed by the respondent. If the statement is prepared by counsel for the respondent, the respondent shall sign a representation that he/she has reviewed the response and agrees with the factual assertions contained therein.

(c) The Committee staff may request information from the respondent or obtain additional information pertinent to the case from other sources prior to the establishment of an investigative subcommittee only when so directed by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member.

(d) At the first meeting of the Committee following the procedures or actions specified in clauses (a) and (b), the Committee shall consider the complaint.

(e) The Committee, by a majority vote of its members, may create an investigative subcommittee. If an investigative subcommittee is established, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall designate four members to serve as an investigative subcommittee in accordance with Rule 20.

(f) The respondent shall be notified in writing regarding the Committee's decision either to dismiss the complaint or to create an investigative subcommittee.

(g) The respondent shall be notified of the membership of the investigative subcommittee and shall have ten days after such notice is transmitted to object to the participation of any subcommittee member. Such objection shall be in writing and shall be on the grounds that the subcommittee member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. The subcommittee member against whom the objection is made shall be the sole judge of his or her disqualification.

Rule 19. Committee-Initiated Inquiry

(a) Notwithstanding the absence of a filed complaint, the Committee may consider any information in its possession indicating that a Member, officer, or employee may have committed a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or any law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the conduct of such Member, officer, or employee in the performance of his or her duties or the discharge of his or her responsibilities. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member may jointly gather additional information concerning such an alleged violation by a Member, officer, or employee unless and until an investigative subcommittee has been established.

(b) If the Committee votes to establish an investigative subcommittee, the Committee shall proceed in accordance with Rule 20.

(c) Any written request by a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives that the Committee conduct an inquiry into such person's own conduct shall be processed in accordance with subsection (a) of this Rule.

(d) An inquiry shall not be undertaken regarding any alleged violation that occurred before the third previous Congress unless a majority of the Committee determines that the alleged violation is directly related to an alleged violation that occurred in a more recent Congress.

(e) An inquiry shall be undertaken by an investigative subcommittee with regard to any felony conviction of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives in a Federal, state, or local court. Notwithstanding this provision, an inquiry may be initiated at any time prior to sentencing.

Rule 20. Investigative Subcommittee

(a) In an inquiry undertaken by an investigative subcommittee—

(1) All proceedings, including the taking of testimony, shall be conducted in executive session and all testimony taken by deposition or things produced pursuant to subpoena or otherwise shall be deemed to have been taken or produced in executive session.

(2) The Chairman of the investigative subcommittee shall ask the respondent and all witnesses whether they intend to be represented by counsel. If so, the respondent or witnesses or their legal representatives shall provide written designation of counsel. A respondent or witness who is represented by counsel shall not be questioned in the absence of counsel unless an explicit waiver is obtained.

(3) The subcommittee shall provide the respondent an opportunity to present, orally or in writing, a statement, which must be under oath or affirmation, regarding the allegations and any other relevant questions arising out of the inquiry.

(4) The staff may interview witnesses, examine documents and other evidence, and request that submitted statements be under oath or affirmation and that documents be certified as to their authenticity and accuracy.

(5) The subcommittee, by a majority vote of its members, may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other items as it deems necessary to the conduct of the inquiry. Unless the Committee otherwise provides, the subpoena power shall rest in the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee and a subpoena shall be issued upon the request of the investigative subcommittee.

(6) The subcommittee shall require that testimony be given under oath or affirmation. The form of the oath or affirmation shall be: ''Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this subcommittee in the matter now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth (so help you God)?'' The oath or affirmation shall be administered by the Chairman or subcommittee member designated by the Chairman to administer oaths.

(b) During the inquiry, the procedure respecting the admissibility of evidence and rulings shall be as follows:

(1) Any relevant evidence shall be admissible unless the evidence is privileged under the precedents of the House of Representative.

(2) The Chairman of the subcommittee or other presiding member at any investigative subcommittee proceeding shall rule upon any question of admissibility or pertinency of evidence, motion, procedure or any other matter, and may direct any witness to answer any question under penalty of contempt. A witness, witness's counsel, or a member of the subcommittee may appeal any evidentiary rulings to the members present at that proceeding. The majority vote of the members present at such proceeding on such appeal shall govern the question of admissibility, and no appeal shall lie to the Committee.

(3) Whenever a person is determined by a majority vote to be in contempt of the subcommittee, the matter may be referred to the Committee to determine whether to refer the matter to the House of Representatives for consideration.

(4) Committee counsel may, subject to subcommittee approval, enter into stipulations with the respondent and/or the respondent's counsel as to facts that are not in dispute.

(c) Upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the subcommittee members, and an affirmative vote of a majority of the full Committee, an investigative subcommittee may expand the scope of its investigation.

(d) Upon completion of the investigation, the staff shall draft for the investigative subcommittee a report that shall contain a comprehensive summary of the information received regarding the alleged violations.

(e) Upon completion of the inquiry, an investigative subcommittee, by a majority vote of its members, may adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation if it determines that there is substantial reason to believe that a violation of the Code of Official Conduct, or of a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities by a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives has occurred. If more than one violation is alleged, such Statement shall be divided into separate counts. Each count shall relate to a separate violation, shall contain a plain and concise statement of the alleged facts of such violation, and shall include a reference to the provision of the Code of Official Conduct or law, rule, regulation or other applicable standard of conduct governing the performance of duties or discharge of responsibilities alleged to have been violated. A copy of such Statement shall be transmitted to the respondent and the respondent's counsel.

(f) If the investigative subcommittee does not adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation, it shall transmit to the Committee a report containing a summary of the information received in the inquiry, its conclusions and reasons therefor, and any appropriate recommendation. The Committee shall transmit such report to the House of Representatives.

Rule 21. Amendments of Statements of Alleged Violation

(a) An investigative subcommittee may, upon an affirmative vote of a majority of its members, amend its Statement of Alleged Violation anytime before the Statement of Alleged Violation is transmitted to the Committee; and

(b) If an investigative subcommittee amends its Statement of Alleged Violation, the respondent shall be notified in writing and shall have 30 calendar days from the date of that notification to file an answer to the amended Statement of Alleged Violation.

Rule 22. Committee Reporting Requirements

(a) Whenever an investigative subcommittee does not adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation and transmit a report to that effect to the Committee, the Committee may by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members transmit such report to the House of Representatives;

(b) Whenever an investigative subcommittee adopts a Statement of Alleged Violation but recommends that no further action be taken, it shall transmit a report to the Committee regarding the Statement of Alleged Violation; and

(c) Whenever an investigative subcommittee adopts a Statement of Alleged Violation, the respondent admits to the violations set forth in such Statement, the respondent waives his or her right to an adjudicatory hearing, and the respondent's waiver is approved by the Committee—

(1) the subcommittee shall prepare a report for transmittal to the Committee, a final draft of which shall be provided to the respondent not less than 15 calendar days before the subcommittee votes on whether to adopt the report;

(2) the respondent may submit views in writing regarding the final draft to the subcommittee within 7 calendar days of receipt of that draft;

(3) the subcommittee shall transmit a report to the Committee regarding the Statement of Alleged Violation together with any views submitted by the respondent pursuant to subparagraph (2), and the Committee shall make the report, together with the respondent's views, available to the public before the commencement of any sanction hearing; and

(4) the Committee shall by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members issue a report and transmit such report to the House of Representatives, together with the respondent's views previously submitted pursuant to subparagraph (2) and any additional views respondent may submit for attachment to the final report; and

(d) Members of the Committee shall have not less than 72 hours to review any report transmitted to the Committee by an investigative subcommittee before both the commencement of a sanction hearing and the Committee vote on whether to adopt the report.

Rule 23. Respondent's Answer

(a)(1) Within 30 days from the date of transmittal of Statement of Alleged Violation, the respondent shall file with the investigative subcommittee an answer, in writing and under oath, signed by respondent and respondent's counsel. Failure to file an answer within the time prescribed shall be considered by the Committee as a denial of each count.

(2) The answer shall contain an admission to or denial of each count set forth in the Statement of Alleged Violation and may include negative, affirmative, or alternative defenses and any supporting evidence or other relevant information.

(b) The respondent may file a Motion for a Bill of Particulars within 10 days of the date of transmittal of the Statement of Alleged Violation. If a Motion for a Bill of Particulars is filed, the respondent shall not be required to file an answer until 20 days after the subcommittee has replied to such motion.

(c)(1) The respondent may file a Motion to Dismiss within 10 days of the date of transmittal of the Statement of Alleged Violation or, if a Motion for a Bill of Particulars has been filed, within 10 days of the date of the subcommittee's reply to the Motion for a Bill of Particulars. If a Motion to Dismiss is filed, the respondent shall not be required to file an answer until 20 days after the subcommittee has replied to the Motion to Dismiss, unless the respondent previously filed a Motion for a Bill of Particulars, in which case the respondent shall not be required to file an answer until 10 days after the subcommittee has replied to the Motion to Dismiss. The investigative subcommittee shall rule upon any motion to dismiss filed during the period between the establishment of the subcommittee and the subcommittee's transmittal of a report to the Committee pursuant to Rule 20 or Rule 22, and no appeal of the subcommittee's ruling shall lie to the Committee.

(2) A Motion to Dismiss may be made on the grounds that the Statement of Alleged Violation fails to state facts that constitute a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or other applicable law, rule, regulation, or standard of conduct, or on the grounds that the Committee lacks jurisdiction to consider the allegations contained in the Statement.

(d) Any motion filed with the subcommittee pursuant to this rule shall be accompanied by a Memorandum of Points and Authorities.

(e)(1) The Chairman of the investigative subcommittee, for good cause shown, may permit the respondent to file an answer or motion after the day prescribed above.

(2) If the ability of the respondent to present an adequate defense is not adversely affected and special circumstances so require, the Chairman of the investigative subcommittee may direct the respondent to file an answer or motion prior to the day prescribed above.

(f) If the day on which any answer, motion, reply, or other pleading must be filed falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, such filing shall be made on the first business day thereafter.

(g) As soon as practicable after an answer has been filed or the time for such filing has expired, the Statement of Alleged Violation and any answer, motion, reply, or other pleading connected therewith shall be transmitted by the Chairman of the investigative subcommittee to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

Rule 24. Adjudicatory Hearings

(a) If a Statement of Alleged Violation is transmitted to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member pursuant to Rule 23, and no waiver pursuant to Rule 27(b) has occurred, the Chairman shall designate the members of the Committee who did not serve on the investigative subcommittee to serve on an adjudicatory subcommittee. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall be the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the adjudicatory subcommittee unless they served on the investigative subcommittee. The respondent shall be notified of the designation of the adjudicatory subcommittee and shall have ten days after such notice is transmitted to object to the participation of any subcommittee member. Such objection shall be in writing and shall be on the grounds that the member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. The member against whom the objection is made shall be the sole judge of his or her disqualification.

(b) A majority of the adjudicatory subcommittee membership plus one must be present at all times for the conduct of any business pursuant to this rule.

(c) The adjudicatory subcommittee shall hold a hearing to determine whether any counts in the Statement of Alleged Violation have been proved by clear and convincing evidence and shall make findings of fact, except where such violations have been admitted by respondent.

(d) At an adjudicatory hearing, the subcommittee may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other items as it deems necessary. Depositions, interrogatories, and sworn statements taken under any investigative subcommittee direction may be accepted into the hearing record.

(e) The procedures set forth in clause 2(g) and (k) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to adjudicatory hearings. All such hearings shall be open to the public unless the adjudicatory subcommittee, pursuant to such clause, determines that the hearings or any part thereof should be closed.

(f)(1) The adjudicatory subcommittee shall, in writing, notify the respondent that the respondent and his or her counsel have the right to inspect, review, copy, or photograph books, papers, documents, photographs, or other tangible objects that the adjudicatory subcommittee counsel intends to use as evidence against the respondent in an adjudicatory hearing. The respondent shall be given access to such evidence, and shall be provided the names of witnesses the subcommittee counsel intends to call, and a summary of their expected testimony, no less than 15 calendar days prior to any such hearing. Except in extraordinary circumstances, no evidence may be introduced or witness called in an adjudicatory hearing unless the respondent has been afforded a prior opportunity to review such evidence or has been provided the name of the witness.

(2) After a witness has testified on direct examination at an adjudicatory hearing, the Committee, at the request of the respondent, shall make available to the respondent any statement of the witness in the possession of the Committee which relates to the subject matter as to which the witness has testified.

(3) Any other testimony, statement, or documentary evidence in the possession of the Committee which is material to the respondent's defense shall, upon request, be made available to the respondent.

(g) No less than five days prior to the hearing, the respondent or counsel shall provide the adjudicatory subcommittee with the names of witnesses expected to be called, summaries of their expected testimony, and copies of any documents or other evidence proposed to be introduced.

(h) The respondent or counsel may apply to the subcommittee for the issuance of subpoenas for the appearance of witnesses or the production of evidence. The application shall be granted upon a showing by the respondent that the proposed testimony or evidence is relevant and not otherwise available to respondent. The application may be denied if not made at a reasonable time or if the testimony or evidence would be merely cumulative.

(i) During the hearing, the procedures regarding the admissibility of evidence and rulings shall be as follows:

(1) Any relevant evidence shall be admissible unless the evidence is privileged under

the precedents of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Chairman of the subcommittee or other presiding member at an adjudicatory subcommittee hearing shall rule upon any question of admissibility or pertinency of evidence, motion, procedure, or any other matter, and may direct any witness to answer any question under penalty of contempt. A witness, witness' counsel, or a member of the subcommittee may appeal any evidentiary ruling to the members present at that proceeding. The majority vote of the members present at such proceeding on such an appeal shall govern the question of admissibility and no appeal shall lie to the Committee.

(3) Whenever a witness is deemed by a Chairman or other presiding member to be in contempt of the subcommittee, the matter may be referred to the Committee to determine whether to refer the matter of the House of Representatives for consideration.

(4) Committee counsel may, subject to the subcommittee approval, enter into stipulations with the respondent and/or the respondent's counsel as to facts that are not in dispute.

(j) Unless otherwise provided, the order of an adjudicatory hearing shall be as follows:

(1) The Chairman of the subcommittee shall open the hearing by stating the adjudicatory subcommittee's authority to conduct the hearing and the purpose of the hearing.

(2) The Chairman shall then recognize Committee counsel and the respondent's counsel, in turn, for the purpose of giving opening statements.

(3) Testimony from witnesses and other pertinent evidence shall be received in the following order whenever possible:

(i) witnesses (deposition transcripts and affidavits obtained during the inquiry may be used in lieu of live witnesses if the witness is unavailable) and other evidence offered by the Committee counsel,

(ii) witnesses and other evidence offered by the respondent,

(iii) rebuttal witnesses, as permitted by the Chairman.

(4) Witnesses at a hearing shall be examined first by counsel calling such witness. The opposing counsel may then cross-examine the witness. Redirect examination and recross examination may be permitted to the Chairman's discretion. Subcommittee members may then question witnesses. Unless otherwise directed by the Chairman, such questions shall be conducted under the five-minute rule.

(k) A subpoena to a witness to appear at a hearing shall be served sufficiently in advance of that witness' scheduled appearance to allow the witness a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Chairman of the adjudicatory subcommittee, to prepare for the hearing and to employ counsel.

(l) Each witness appearing before the subcommittee shall be furnished a printed copy of the Committee rules, the pertinent provisions of the Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to the rights of witnesses, and a copy of the Statement of Alleged Violation.

(m) Testimony of all witnesses shall be taken under oath or affirmation. The form of the oath or affirmation shall be: ''Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this subcommittee in the matter now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth (so help you God)?'' The oath or affirmation shall be administered by the Chairman or Committee member designated by the Chairman to administer oaths.

(n) At an adjudicatory hearing, the burden of proof rests on Committee counsel to establish the facts alleged in the Statement of Alleged Violation by clear and convincing evidence. However, Committee counsel need not present any evidence regarding any count that is admitted by the respondent or any fact stipulated.

(o) As soon as practicable after all testimony and evidence have been presented, the subcommittee shall consider each count contained in the Statement of Alleged Violation and shall determine by a majority vote of its members whether each count has been proved. If a majority of the subcommittee does not vote that a count has been proved, a motion to reconsider that vote may be made only by a member who voted that the count was not proved. A count that is not proved shall be considered as dismissed by the subcommittee.

(p) The findings of the adjudicatory subcommittee shall be reported to the Committee.

Rule 25. Sanction Hearing and Consideration of Sanctions or Other Recommendations

(a) If no count in a Statement of Alleged Violation is proved, the Committee shall prepare a report to the House of Representatives, based upon the report of the adjudicatory subcommittee.

(b) If an adjudicatory subcommittee completes an adjudicatory hearing pursuant to Rule 24 and reports that any count of the Statement of Alleged Violation has been proved, a hearing before the Committee shall be held to receive oral and/or written submissions by counsel for the Committee and counsel for the respondent as to the sanction the Committee should recommend to the House of Representatives with respect to such violations. Testimony by witnesses shall not be heard except by written request and vote of a majority of the Committee.

(c) Upon completion of any proceeding held pursuant to clause (b), the Committee shall consider and vote on a motion to recommend to the House of Representatives that the House take disciplinary action. If a majority of the Committee does not vote in favor of the recommendation that the House of Representatives take action, a motion to reconsider that vote may be made only by a member who voted against the recommendation. The Committee may also, by majority vote, adopt a motion to issue a Letter of Reproval or take other appropriate Committee action.

(d) If the Committee determines a Letter of Reproval constitutes sufficient action, the Committee shall include any such letter as a part of its report to the House of Representatives.

(e) With respect to any proved counts against a Member of the House of Representatives, the Committee may recommend to the House one or more of the following sanctions:

(1) Expulsion from the House of Representatives.

(2) Censure.

(3) Reprimand.

(4) Fine.

(5) Denial or limitation of any right, power, privilege, or immunity of the Member if under the Constitution the House of Representatives may impose such denial or limitation.

(6) Any other sanction determined by the Committee to be appropriate.

(f) With respect to any proved counts against an officer or employee of the House of Representatives, the Committee may recommend to the House one or more of the following sanctions:

(1) Dismissal from employment.

(2) Reprimand.

(3) Fine.

(4) Any other sanction determined by the Committee to be appropriate.

(g) With respect to the sanctions that the Committee may recommend, reprimand is appropriate for serious violations, censure is appropriate for more serious violations, and expulsion of a Member or dismissal of an officer or employee is appropriate for the most serious violations. A recommendation of a fine is appropriate in a case in which it is likely that the violation was committed to secure a personal financial benefit; and a recommendation of a denial or limitation of a right, power, privilege, or immunity of a Member is appropriate when the violation bears upon the exercise or holding of such right, power, privilege, or immunity. This clause sets forth general guidelines and does not limit the authority of the Committee to recommend other sanctions.

(h) The Committee report shall contain an appropriate statement of the evidence supporting the Committee's findings and a statement of the Committee's reasons for the recommended sanction.

Rule 26. Disclosure of Exculpatory Information to Respondent

If the Committee, or any investigative or adjudicatory subcommittee at any time receives any exculpatory information respecting a Complaint or Statement of Alleged Violation concerning a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives, it shall make such information known and available to the Member, officer, or employee as soon as practicable, but in no event later than the transmittal of evidence supporting a proposed Statement of Alleged Violation pursuant to Rule 27(c). If an investigative subcommittee does not adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation, it shall identify any exculpatory information in its possession at the conclusion of its inquiry and shall include such information, if any, in the subcommittee's final report to the Committee regarding its inquiry. For purposes of this rule, exculpatory evidence shall be any evidence or information that is substantially favorable to the respondent with respect to the allegations or charges before an investigative or adjudicatory subcommittee.

Rule 27. Rights of Respondents and Witnesses

(a) A respondent shall be informed of the right to be represented by counsel, to be provided at his or her own expense.

(b) A respondent may seek to waive any procedural rights or steps in the disciplinary process. A request for waiver must be in writing, signed by the respondent, and must detail what procedural steps the respondent seeks to waive. Any such request shall be subject to the acceptance of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(c) Not less than 10 calendar days before a scheduled vote by an investigative subcommittee on a Statement of Alleged Violation, the subcommittee shall provide the respondent with a copy of the Statement of Alleged Violation it intends to adopt together with all evidence it intends to use to prove those charges which it intends to adopt, including documentary evidence, witness testimony, memoranda of witness interviews, and physical evidence, unless the subcommittee by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members decides to withhold certain evidence in order to protect a witness, but if such evidence is withheld, the subcommittee shall inform the respondent that evidence is being withheld and of the count to which such evidence relates.

(d) Neither the respondent nor his counsel shall, directly or indirectly, contact the subcommittee or any member thereof during the period of time set forth in paragraph (c) except for the sole purpose of settlement discussions where counsels for the respondent and the subcommittee are present.

(e) If, at any time after the issuance of a Statement of Alleged Violation, the Committee or any subcommittee thereof determines that it intends to use evidence not provided to a respondent under paragraph (c) to prove the charges contained in the Statement of Alleged Violation (or any amendment thereof), such evidence shall be made immediately available to the respondent, and it may be used in any further proceeding under the Committee's rules.

(f) Evidence provided pursuant to paragraph (c) or (e) shall be made available to the respondent and his or her counsel only after each agrees, in writing, that no document, information, or other materials obtained pursuant to that paragraph shall be made public until—

(1) such time as a Statement of Alleged Violation is made public by the Committee if the respondent has waived the adjudicatory hearing; or

(2) the commencement of an adjudicatory hearing if the respondent has not waived an adjudicatory hearing; but the failure of respondent and his counsel to so agree in writing, and therefore not receive the evidence, shall not preclude the issuance of a Statement of Alleged Violation at the end of the period referenced to in (c).

(g) A respondent shall receive written notice whenever—

(1) the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member determine that information the Committee has received constitutes a complaint;

(2) a complaint or allegation is transmitted to an investigative subcommittee;

(3) that subcommittee votes to authorize its first subpoena or to take testimony under oath, whichever occurs first; and

(4) the Committee votes to expand the scope of the inquiry of an investigative subcommittee.

(h) Whenever an investigative subcommittee adopts a Statement of Alleged Violation and a respondent enters into an agreement with that subcommittee to settle a complaint on which the Statement is based, that agreement, unless the respondent requests otherwise, shall be in writing and signed by the respondent and the respondent's counsel, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee, and the outside counsel, if any.

(i) Statements or information derived solely from a respondent or his counsel during any settlement discussions between the Committee or a subcommittee thereof and the respondent shall not be included in any report of the subcommittee or the Committee or otherwise publicly disclosed without the consent of the respondent;

(j) Whenever a motion to establish an investigative subcommittee does not prevail, the Committee shall promptly send a letter to the respondent informing him of such vote.

(k) Witnesses shall be afforded a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Committee or subcommittee, to prepare for an appearance before an investigative subcommittee or for an adjudicatory hearing and to obtain counsel.

(l) Except as otherwise specifically authorized by the Committee, no Committee member or staff member shall disclose to any person outside the Committee the name of any witness subpoenaed to testify or to produce evidence.

(m) Prior to their testimony, witness shall be furnished a printed copy of the Committee's Rules of Procedure and the provisions of the Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to the rights of witnesses.

(n) Witnesses may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights. The Chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional responsibility on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House of Representatives for contempt.

(o) Each witness subpoenaed to provide testimony of other evidence shall be provided such travel expenses as the Chairman considers appropriate. No compensation shall be authorized for attorney's fees or for a witness' lost earnings.

(p) With the approval of the Committee, a witness, upon request, may be provided with a transcript of his or her deposition or other testimony taken in executive session, or, with the approval of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, may be permitted to examine such transcript in the office of the Committee. Any such request shall be in writing and shall include a statement that the witness, and counsel, agree to maintain the confidentiality of all executive session proceedings covered by such transcript.

Rule 28. Frivolous Filings

If a complaint or information offered as a complaint is deemed frivolous by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, the Committee may take such action as it, by an affirmative vote of its members, deems appropriate in the circumstances.

Rule 29. Referrals to Federal or State Authorities

Referrals made under clause 3(a)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives may be made by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the Committee.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 692

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) from the list of cosponsors for my bill, H.R. 692. The gentleman from Wisconsin's name was placed on the list in error.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1141, 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 173, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 173, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 14, 1999 at page H3175.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1141, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1845

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the exciting debate that took place as we considered the rule. During that exciting debate, one comment struck me that I thought I really should comment on. It was the comment about having made these decisions in the dark of the night.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we did work in the dark of the night, because we worked for 3 full days and 3 long nights, one night going to as late as 1:30 in the morning, and the final night we went to approximately 10:30. So yes, we did, we worked all day, and we worked all night to resolve the many differences that existed between the House and Senate.

But in the conference room, it was very bright. It was very bright because the television cameras were in that room to record every word that was said in a live telecast. So the truth of the matter is, while it might have been dark on the clock, anybody that wanted to watch the television was able to see everything said and done. That was a first, the first time we had done that, when we did the conference committee in front of live TV.

I want to pay a special tribute to every one of the conferees on the House side. We had some differences, Mr. Speaker, but we worked them out as Members of Congress in a very logical and very respectful way.

I want to especially compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the leader of the minority party in the conference. Again, we had differences, but the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) helped to make this procedure work. He believes in the institution, as do I, and as do most of our Members in this House.

We did come up with a conference report that I would be willing to stand here and make a speech against, just like other Members have done during consideration of the rule, because there are things in this bill that I did not want to be here.

But when we go to conference, for any Member who has ever gone to conference with the Senate, we understand that there is give and take. We got basically what the House asked for in the two supplementals that we sent to conference. The Senate added a lot of riders. We took off most of those riders, and the ones that were left, we watered down. They are not nearly as bad as some of the speakers would have us believe they are.

Mr. Speaker, we need to emphasize what is good about this bill. The question was raised, how did we get to this number of $15 billion of spending. We got to this number, Mr. Speaker, because we added two supplementals together. Together, those two supplementals, as they passed the House with overwhelming numbers, were over $14 billion.

The truth of the matter is, we did add some additional money to this bill in conference. However, some of those items that were added that were nonemergency, that came from the other body, and were offset. They were not new money. They were not emergency money. They are offset.

What does this bill do? Whether we declared a war or not, whether Members approve of what is happening in the Balkans or not, the truth of the matter is that American forces are fighting a war in and over Kosovo and Serbia, and that war is very expensive. The President has asked us to provide money not only to replace the munitions that are being used, to replace the spare parts that are necessary to keep our airplanes flying, but the truth of the matter is it is a great expense to fight this war.

Mr. Speaker, our forces are stretched very thin in order to fight this war. This bill provides a lot of the money that is needed to recover the wearing down of our forces, the wearing down of our troops, the wearing down of our equipment.

The first supplemental we passed was an emergency to deal with Hurricane Mitch disaster in Central America. We funded all of that at the request of the President. Also, the President had asked for $152 million for agricultural emergencies in our own country. We not only did what the President asked for but we increased it by $422 million, at the request of those who have responsibility for agriculture programs in this Congress.

After we passed the bills in the House and went to conference, there was a terrible tragedy in Oklahoma. We added additional money to FEMA to take care of tragedies like in Oklahoma and other tragedies in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, we have a good bill here. It is not a clean as the bills that were passed in the House originally, but we had to go to conference. We had to deal with the other body. So the bill is not as clean as we would like, but it is a good bill. It deserves our support. It addresses the real emergencies that exist today that Americans have a great interest in.

As I said, those items that are not emergencies are offset. I will say that again: Those matters included in this bill that are not emergencies are offset.

Mr. Speaker, the House passed this bill and the Kosovo bill in clean forms that included $14.303 billion in spending including $1.855 in advance appropriations. The conference report that we have brought back has $15.144 billion in spending including $1.91 in advance appropriations. The major increases are: $900 million for FEMA, $422 million additional for aid to American farmers, $71 for additional migration and refugee assistance, $70 million for the U.S. Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund, $149 million additional for food aid, $45 million for Assistance to Eastern Europe and the Balkan States, $45 million for the census, and $100 million for temporary resettlement of displace Kosovo Albanians. Major reductions to the House passed versions include $1.044 billion for defense and $596 million for military construction.

While the House passed versions included offsets of $1.121 billion, the conference agreement includes offsets of $1.995 billion. This means the level of net spending in this conference agreement is $17 million less than the House passed bills.

There has been some concern about the Food Stamp and Section 8 Assisted Housing offsets. While significant amounts are being taken from these accounts there will not be any impact on these programs for the remainder of this fiscal year. The funds are excess to projected needs. I would hope we would not make judgments on offsets on the importance of individual accounts, but rather on whether the funds are needed. This is a critical distinction. The Administration supports these offsets.

As I stated earlier, the house passed versions of these bills were clean. The Senate version included many riders. We were able to delete many of these, especially the most contentious ones.

Mr. Speaker, the pentagon will be out of money in some critical accounts by the end of May. In addition to solving this problem, this conference agreement will begin to restore our Nation's defenses. It addresses all known needs in the areas of natural disasters, agriculture, defense and humanitarian assistance.

Mr. Speaker, we started H.R. 1141 over two months ago. We had a protracted conference with the Senate for over three long days and late nights last week. It has been a tough bill, but it is a good bill. It deserves broad support, and it needs to pass now.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a table showing the details of this conference agreement.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 1141)

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate 1/	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	TITLE I - EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS						
	CHAPTER 1						
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
	Office of the Secretary						
.....	Emergency grants to assist low-income migrant and seasonal workers (contingent emergency appropriation	.....	.....	25,000	20,000	+20,000	-5,000
	Agricultural Marketing Service:						
.....	Marketing Services (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	700	.....	.....	-700
.....	Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	150,000	145,000	+145,000	-5,000
	Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	.....	.....	150,700	145,000	+145,000	-5,700
	Farm Service Agency						
106-32	Salaries and expenses (emergency appropriations)	42,753	42,753	42,753	42,753	.....	.....
	Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:						
	Loan authorizations:						
	Farm ownership loans:						
106-32	Direct	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	.....	.....
106-32	Guaranteed	(350,000)	(350,000)	(350,000)	(350,000)	.....	.....
	Subtotal	(550,000)	(550,000)	(550,000)	(550,000)	.....	.....
	Farm operating loans:						
106-32	Direct	(185,000)	(185,000)	(185,000)	(185,000)	.....	.....
106-32	Guaranteed subsidized	(185,000)	(185,000)	(185,000)	(185,000)	.....	.....
	Subtotal	(370,000)	(370,000)	(370,000)	(370,000)	.....	.....
106-32	Emergency farm loans	(175,000)	(175,000)	.....	.....	(-175,000)	.....
.....	Emergency disaster loans	.....	.....	(175,000)	(175,000)	(+175,000)	.....
	Total, Loan authorizations	(1,095,000)	(1,095,000)	(1,095,000)	(1,095,000)	.....	.....
	Loan subsidies:						
	Farm ownership loans:						
106-32	Direct (emergency appropriations)	29,940	29,940	29,940	29,940	.....	.....
106-32	Guaranteed (emergency appropriations)	5,565	5,565	5,565	5,565	.....	.....
	Subtotal	35,505	35,505	35,505	35,505	.....	.....
	Farm operating loans:						
106-32	Direct (emergency appropriations)	12,635	12,635	12,635	12,635	.....	.....
106-32	Guaranteed subsidized (emergency appropriations)	16,169	16,169	16,169	16,169	.....	.....
	Subtotal	28,804	28,804	28,804	28,804	.....	.....
106-32	Emergency farm loans (emergency appropriations)	41,300	41,300	.....	.....	-41,300	.....
.....	Emergency disaster loans (emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	41,300	41,300	+41,300	.....
	Total, Loan subsidies	105,609	105,609	105,609	105,609	.....	.....
	ACIF expenses:						
106-32	Administrative expenses (emergency appropriations)	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	.....	.....
	Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account	109,609	109,609	109,609	109,609	.....	.....
.....	Emergency conservation program (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	30,000	28,000	+28,000	-2,000
	Total, Farm Service Agency	152,362	152,362	182,362	180,362	+28,000	-2,000
	Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:						
.....	Livestock indemnity program (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	3,000	3,000	+3,000	.....
	Natural Resources Conservation Service:						
.....	Watershed and flood prevention operations (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	100,000	95,000	+95,000	-5,000
.....	Rural community advancement program (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	30,000	30,000	+30,000	.....

1/ Sections 4016(a) and 4017 of the Senate amendment nullify the emergency designation by the Congress for the Senate.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 1141)— Continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate 1/	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Rural Housing Service:						
	Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:						
	Loan authorizations:						
.....	Single-family (sec. 502)	.....	.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(+10,000)	.....
.....	Housing repair (sec. 504)	.....	.....	(1,000)	(1,000)	(+1,000)	.....
	Total, loan authorizations	.....	.....	(11,000)	(11,000)	(+11,000)	.....
	Loan subsidies:						
.....	Single-family (sec 502.) (Contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	1,182	1,182	+1,182	.....
.....	Housing repair (sec. 504) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	352	352	+352	.....
	Total, Loan subsidies	.....	.....	1,534	1,534	+1,534	.....
.....	Rural housing assistance grants (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	1,000	1,000	+1,000	.....
	Total, Rural Housing Service	.....	.....	2,534	2,534	+2,534	.....
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
.....	CCC conservation program technical assistance (Sec. 11 cap exception) (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 102)	.....	.....	28,000	28,000	+28,000	.....
.....	Livestock disaster assistance fund (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 104)	.....	.....	70,000	70,000	+70,000	.....
	Total, General provisions	.....	.....	98,000	98,000	+98,000	.....
	Total, Chapter 1:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	152,362	152,362	591,596	573,896	+421,534	-17,700
	Emergency appropriations	(152,362)	(152,362)	(152,362)	(152,362)	.....	.....
	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	(439,234)	(421,534)	(+421,534)	(-17,700)
	(Loan authorizations)	(1,095,000)	(1,095,000)	(1,106,000)	(1,106,000)	(+11,000)	.....
	CHAPTER 2						
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
	Immigration and Naturalization Service						
106-27	Salaries and expenses: Enforcement and border affairs (emergency appropriations)	80,000	80,000	.....	80,000	.....	+80,000
	CHAPTER 3						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
	Military Personnel						
.....	Reserve personnel, Army (emergency appropriations)	.....	2,900	.....	2,900	.....	+2,900
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	5,100	.....	5,100	.....	+5,100
.....	National guard personnel, Army (emergency appropriations)	.....	6,000	.....	6,000	.....	+6,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	1,300	.....	1,300	.....	+1,300
.....	National guard personnel, Air Force (emergency appropriations)	.....	1,000	.....	1,000	.....	+1,000
	Total, Military personnel	.....	16,300	.....	16,300	.....	+16,300
	Operation and Maintenance						
.....	Operation and maintenance, Army (emergency appropriations)	.....	69,500	.....	50,000	-19,500	+50,000
.....	Operation and maintenance, Navy (emergency appropriations)	.....	16,000	.....	13,900	-2,100	+13,900
.....	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps (emergency appropriations)	.....	300	.....	300	.....	+300
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	2,100	+2,100	+2,100
.....	Operation and maintenance, Air Force (emergency appropriations)	.....	8,800	.....	8,800	.....	+8,800
.....	Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide (emergency appropriations)	.....	46,500	.....	21,000	-25,500	+21,000
.....	Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	20,000	+20,000	+20,000
.....	Overseas humanitarian, disaster, and civic aid (emergency appropriations)	.....	37,500	.....	37,500	.....	+37,500
106-27	Disaster relief transfer fund (emergency appropriations)	188,500	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	New Horizons exercise transfer fund (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	46,000	+46,000	+46,000
	Total, Operation and maintenance	188,500	178,600	.....	199,600	+21,000	+199,600
	Total, Chapter 3:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	188,500	194,900	.....	215,900	+21,000	+215,900
	Emergency appropriations	(188,500)	(188,500)	.....	(141,400)	(-47,100)	(+141,400)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	(6,400)	.....	(74,500)	(+68,100)	(+74,500)

1/ Sections 4016(a) and 4017 of the Senate amendment nullify the emergency designation by the Congress for the Senate.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 1141)— Continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate 1/	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	CHAPTER 4						
	EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE						
	EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES						
.....	Subsidy appropriation (by transfer) (contingent emergency appropriation)	.....	.....	.....	(10,000)	(+10,000)	(+10,000)
	BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
	Agency for International Development						
106-27	International disaster assistance (emergency appropriations)	25,000	25,000	.....	25,000	.....	+25,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	35,000	.....	.....	-35,000
.....	Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development (by transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(5,000)	.....	(6,000)	.....	.....	(-6,000)
.....	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	(5,000)	.....	(5,500)	(+500)	(+5,500)
106-27	Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General (by transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(1,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	(2,000)	.....	(1,500)	(-500)	(+1,500)
	Other Bilateral Economic Assistance						
106-3 106-24	Economic support fund (emergency appropriations)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	.....	.....
106-3 106-24	Advance appropriations	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
106-27	Central America and the Caribbean Emergency Disaster Recovery Fund (emergency appropriations)	621,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	621,000	611,000	621,000	.....	+10,000
	Total, Other bilateral economic assistance	721,000	671,000	661,000	671,000	.....	+10,000
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	Department of State						
.....	International narcotics control (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	23,000	23,000	+23,000	.....
	Department of the Treasury						
106-27	Debt restructuring (emergency appropriations)	41,000	41,000	41,000	41,000	.....	.....
	Total, Bilateral economic assistance	787,000	737,000	760,000	760,000	+23,000	.....
	MILITARY ASSISTANCE						
	Foreign Military Financing Program:						
	Grants:						
106-3 106-24	Other (emergency appropriations)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	.....	.....
106-3 106-24	Advance appropriations	150,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total, Foreign military assistance	200,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	.....	.....
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
.....	Economic support fund (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 403)	.....	.....	.....	6,500	+6,500	+6,500
	Total, Chapter 4:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	987,000	787,000	810,000	816,500	+29,500	+6,500
	Emergency appropriations	(787,000)	(166,000)	(141,000)	(166,000)	.....	(+25,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	(621,000)	(669,000)	(650,500)	(+29,500)	(-18,500)
	Advance appropriations	(200,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(6,000)	.....	(6,000)	.....	.....	(-6,000)
	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	(7,000)	.....	(17,000)	(+10,000)	(+17,000)
	CHAPTER 5						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
.....	Construction (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	12,612	12,612	+12,612	.....
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
.....	Reconstruction and construction (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	5,611	.....	5,611	.....	+5,611
	RELATED AGENCY						
	United States Holocaust Memorial Council						
.....	Holocaust Memorial Council (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	2,000	2,000	+2,000	.....

1/ Sections 4016(a) and 4017 of the Senate amendment nullify the emergency designation by the Congress for the Senate.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 1141)— Continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate 1/	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
.....	Glacier Bay (sec. 501)	.....	.....	3,000	.....	.....	-3,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	26,000	+26,000	+26,000
	Total, Chapter 5:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	5,611	17,612	46,223	+40,612	+28,611
	CHAPTER 6						
	INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
	Federal Emergency Management Agency						
106-61	Disaster relief (contingent emergency appropriations)	372,000	.....	.....	900,000	+900,000	+900,000
.....	Disaster assistance for unmet needs (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	313,600	230,000	+230,000	-83,600
	Total, Chapter 6:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	372,000	.....	313,600	1,130,000	+1,130,000	+816,400
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
	Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Act:						
.....	Loan subsidy (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	140,000	.....	.....	-140,000
.....	Administrative expenses (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 1401)	.....	.....	5,000	.....	.....	-5,000
	Emergency oil and gas guaranteed loan program (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 1402)	.....	.....	125,000	.....	.....	-125,000
	Total, General provisions	.....	.....	270,000	.....	.....	-270,000
	Total, title I:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	1,779,862	1,219,873	2,002,808	2,862,519	+1,642,646	+859,711
	Emergency appropriations	(1,207,862)	(586,862)	(293,362)	(539,762)	(-47,100)	(+246,400)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(372,000)	(633,011)	(1,706,446)	(2,322,757)	(+1,689,746)	(+616,311)
	Advance appropriations	(200,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(6,000)	.....	(6,000)	.....	.....	(-6,000)
	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	(7,000)	.....	(17,000)	(+10,000)	(+17,000)
	(Loan authorizations)	(1,095,000)	(1,095,000)	(1,106,000)	(1,106,000)	(+11,000)	.....
	TITLE II - EMERGENCY NATIONAL SECURITY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS						
	CHAPTER 1						
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
	Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:						
	Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:						
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	149,200	+149,200	+149,200
	CHAPTER 2						
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
	Administration of Foreign Affairs						
106-50	Diplomatic and consular programs (emergency appropriations)	17,071	17,071	.....	17,071	.....	+17,071
106-50	Security and maintenance of United States missions (emergency appropriations)	5,000	5,000	.....	5,000	.....	+5,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	45,500	.....	45,500	.....	+45,500
106-50	Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service (emergency appropriations)	2,929	2,929	.....	2,929	.....	+2,929
	Total, Department of State	25,000	70,500	.....	70,500	.....	+70,500
	RELATED AGENCY						
	United States Information Agency						
106-50	International information programs (by transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(450)	(450)	.....	(450)	.....	(+450)
	Total, Chapter 2:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	25,000	70,500	.....	70,500	.....	+70,500
	Emergency appropriations	(25,000)	(25,000)	.....	(25,000)	.....	(+25,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	(45,500)	.....	(45,500)	.....	(+45,500)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(450)	(450)	.....	(450)	.....	(+450)

1/ Sections 4016(a) and 4017 of the Senate amendment nullify the emergency designation by the Congress for the Senate.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 1141)—Continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	CHAPTER 3						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
	Military Personnel						
106-50	Military personnel, Army (emergency appropriations)	2,920	2,920		2,920		+2,920
106-50	Military personnel, Navy (emergency appropriations)	7,660	7,660		7,660		+7,660
106-50	Military personnel, Marine Corps (emergency appropriations)	1,586	1,586		1,586		+1,586
106-50	Military personnel, Air Force (emergency appropriations)	4,303	4,303		4,303		+4,303
	Total, Military personnel	16,469	16,469		16,469		+16,469
	Operation and Maintenance						
106-50	Overseas contingency operations transfer fund (emergency appropriations)	4,591,600	3,907,300		3,907,300		+3,907,300
106-50	Contingent emergency appropriations	850,000	1,311,800		1,100,000	-211,800	+1,100,000
	Total, Operation and maintenance	5,441,600	5,219,100		5,007,300	-211,800	+5,007,300
	Procurement						
	Weapons procurement, Navy (emergency appropriations)		431,100			-431,100	
	Contingent emergency appropriations				431,100	+431,100	+431,100
	Aircraft procurement, Air Force (emergency appropriations)		40,000			-40,000	
	Contingent emergency appropriations				40,000	+40,000	+40,000
	Missile procurement, Air Force (emergency appropriations)		178,200			-178,200	
	Contingent emergency appropriations				178,200	+178,200	+178,200
	Procurement of ammunition, Air Force (emergency appropriations)		35,000			-35,000	
	Contingent emergency appropriations				35,000	+35,000	+35,000
	Operational rapid response transfer fund (contingent emergency appropriations)		400,000		300,000	-100,000	+300,000
	Total, Procurement		1,084,300		984,300	-100,000	+984,300
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
106-50	Sec. 8005 additional transfer authority (sec. 2001)	(800,000)	(800,000)		(350,000)	(-450,000)	(+350,000)
	Spare parts (sec. 2007) (contingent emergency appropriations)		1,339,200		1,124,900	-214,300	+1,124,900
	Depot maintenance (sec. 2008) (contingent emergency appropriations)		927,300		742,500	-184,800	+742,500
	Recruiting (sec. 2009) (contingent emergency appropriations)		156,400		100,000	-56,400	+100,000
	Readiness training (sec. 2010) (contingent emergency appropriations)		307,300		200,200	-107,100	+200,200
	Base operations (sec. 2011) (contingent emergency appropriations)		351,500		182,400	-169,100	+182,400
	Pay and retirement (sec. 2012) (contingent emergency appropriations) (advance appropriations)		1,838,426		1,838,426		+1,838,426
	Total, General provisions		4,920,126		4,188,426	-731,700	+4,188,426
	Total, Chapter 3:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	5,458,069	11,239,995		10,196,495	-1,043,500	+10,196,495
	Emergency appropriations	(4,608,069)	(4,608,069)		(3,923,769)	(-684,300)	(+3,923,769)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(850,000)	(4,793,500)		(4,434,300)	(-359,200)	(+4,434,300)
	Advance appropriations		(1,838,426)		(1,838,426)		(+1,838,426)
	(Transfer authority)	(800,000)	(800,000)		(350,000)	(-450,000)	(+350,000)
	CHAPTER 4						
	BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
	Agency for International Development						
106-50	International disaster assistance (emergency appropriations)	71,000					
	Contingent emergency appropriations		163,000		163,000		+163,000
	Other Bilateral Economic Assistance						
106-50	Economic support fund (emergency appropriations)	105,000	105,000		105,000		+105,000
106-50	Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States (emergency appropriations)	170,000	75,000		120,000	+45,000	+120,000
	Total, Other bilateral economic assistance	275,000	180,000		225,000	+45,000	+225,000
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	Peace Corps						
106-50	(By transfer) (emergency appropriation)	(500)	(500)		(500)		(+500)

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 1141)— Continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Department of State						
106-50	Migration and refugee assistance (emergency appropriations)	125,000					
	Contingent emergency appropriations		195,000		266,000	+71,000	+266,000
106-50	United States emergency refugee and migration assistance fund (emergency appropriations)	95,000	95,000			-95,000	
	Contingent emergency appropriations				165,000	+165,000	+165,000
	Total, Department of State	220,000	290,000		431,000	+141,000	+431,000
	Total, Chapter 4:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	566,000	633,000		819,000	+186,000	+819,000
	Emergency appropriations	(566,000)	(275,000)		(225,000)	(-50,000)	(+225,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations		(358,000)		(594,000)	(+236,000)	(+594,000)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(500)	(500)		(500)		(+500)
	CHAPTER 5						
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
	Administration for Children and Families						
	Refugee and entrant assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)				100,000	+100,000	+100,000
	CHAPTER 6						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
	NATO Security Investment Program (contingent emergency appropriations)		240,000			-240,000	
	Military construction transfer fund (contingent emergency appropriations)				475,000	+475,000	+475,000
	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 6:						
	New budget (obligational) authority		1,071,000		475,000	-596,000	+475,000
	CHAPTER 7						
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
	Coast Guard						
	Operating expenses (contingent emergency appropriations)				200,000	+200,000	+200,000
	Total, title II:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	6,049,069	13,014,495		12,010,195	-1,004,300	+12,010,195
	Emergency appropriations	(5,199,069)	(4,908,069)		(4,173,769)	(-734,300)	(+4,173,769)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(850,000)	(6,268,000)		(5,998,000)	(-270,000)	(+5,998,000)
	Advance appropriations		(1,838,426)		(1,838,426)		(+1,838,426)
	(Transfer authority)	(800,000)	(800,000)		(350,000)	(-450,000)	(+350,000)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(950)	(950)		(950)		(+950)
	TITLE III - SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS						
	CHAPTER 1						
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
	Immigration and Naturalization Service						
	Salaries and expenses: Enforcement and border affairs			80,000			-80,000
	RELATED AGENCY						
	Office of the United States Trade Representative						
	Salaries and expenses				1,300	+1,300	+1,300
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
	Bureau of the Census						
	Periodic censuses and programs				44,900	+44,900	+44,900

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 1141)— Continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
106-3	Operations, research, and facilities	1,880		3,880	1,880	+1,880	-2,000
106-3	Fisheries finance program account	3,120					
	Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	5,000		3,880	1,880	+1,880	-2,000
	Total, Department of Commerce	5,000		3,880	46,780	+46,780	+42,900
	THE JUDICIARY						
	Supreme Court of the United States						
	Salaries and expenses		921	921	921		
106-3	Emergency appropriations	921					
	Total, Chapter 1:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	5,921	921	84,801	49,001	+48,080	-35,800
	Appropriations	(5,000)	(921)	(84,801)	(49,001)	(+48,080)	(-35,800)
	Emergency appropriations	(921)					
	CHAPTER 1A						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE						
	Military Personnel						
	Reserve personnel, Army			2,900			-2,900
	National guard personnel, Army			7,300			-7,300
	National guard personnel, Air Force			1,000			-1,000
	Total, Military personnel			11,200			-11,200
	Operation and Maintenance						
	Operation and maintenance, Army			50,000			-50,000
	Operation and maintenance, Navy			16,000			-16,000
	Operation and maintenance, Air Force			8,000			-8,000
	Operation and maintenance, Defense-Wide			21,000			-21,000
	Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard			20,000			-20,000
	Overseas humanitarian, disaster, and civic aid			37,500			-37,500
	New Horizons exercise transfer fund			46,000			-46,000
	Total, Operation and maintenance			198,500			-198,500
	Total, Chapter 1A:						
	New budget (obligational) authority			209,700			-209,700
	CHAPTER 2						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
	Corps of Engineers - Civil						
	Construction general			500			-500
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	Bureau of Reclamation						
	Water and related resources			5,000	1,500	+1,500	-3,500
	Total, Chapter 2:						
	New budget (obligational) authority			5,500	1,500	+1,500	-4,000
	CHAPTER 3						
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	Department of State						
	National Commission on Terrorism				840	+840	+840
	United States Commission on International Religious Freedom		3,000	3,000	3,000		
	Total, Department of State		3,000	3,000	3,840	+840	+840
	Department of the Treasury						
	International affairs technical assistance				1,500	+1,500	+1,500
	Total, Chapter 3:						
	New budget (obligational) authority		3,000	3,000	5,340	+2,340	+2,340

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 1141)—Continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	CHAPTER 4						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	Bureau of Land Management						
	Bureau of Indian Affairs						
.....	Operation of Indian programs (by transfer)	.....	.....	(1,136)	(1,136)	(+1,136)	.....
	Departmental Offices						
106-3	Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians	6,800	21,800	6,800	21,800	.....	+15,000
106-39	(By transfer)	(15,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	CHAPTER 5						
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
	Office of the Secretary						
.....	General departmental management	.....	.....	1,400	1,000	+1,000	-400
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
.....	Education for the disadvantaged (advance appropriation)	.....	.....	.....	56,377	+56,377	+56,377
.....	Higher education (by transfer)	.....	.....	.....	(1,500)	(+1,500)	(+1,500)
	RELATED AGENCY						
106-3	Corporation for Public Broadcasting	11,000	30,600	18,000	30,700	+100	+12,700
106-3	Advance appropriations	37,000	17,400	.....	17,300	-100	+17,300
	Total, Chapter 5:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	48,000	48,000	19,400	105,377	+57,377	+85,977
	Appropriations	(11,000)	(30,600)	(19,400)	(31,700)	(+1,100)	(+12,300)
	Advance appropriations	(37,000)	(17,400)	.....	(73,677)	(+56,277)	(+73,677)
	(By transfer)	.....	.....	.....	(1,500)	(+1,500)	(+1,500)
	CHAPTER 6						
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES						
	Salaries and Expenses						
	Salaries, Officers and Employees						
.....	Office of the Chief Administrative Officer	.....	.....	.....	3,521	+3,521	+3,521
.....	Rescission	.....	.....	.....	-3,521	-3,521	-3,521
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL						
	Capitol Buildings and Grounds						
.....	House office buildings	.....	5,560	.....	5,560	.....	+5,560
	Total, Chapter 6:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	5,560	.....	5,560	.....	+5,560
	Appropriations	.....	(5,560)	.....	(9,081)	(+3,521)	(+9,081)
	Rescission	.....	.....	.....	(-3,521)	(-3,521)	(-3,521)
	CHAPTER 7						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE						
.....	Military construction, Army National Guard	.....	.....	14,500	6,400	+6,400	-8,100
.....	Family housing, Army	.....	.....	.....	25,000	+25,000	+25,000
	Total, Chapter 7:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	.....	14,500	31,400	+31,400	+16,900
	CHAPTER 8						
	RELATED AGENCY						
	National Transportation Safety Board						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	.....	2,300	+2,300	+2,300
	CHAPTER 9						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
	Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	.....	4,500	+4,500	+4,500
	POSTAL SERVICE						
	Payments to the Postal Service						
106-3	Payments to the Postal Service Fund	29,000	29,000	.....	29,000	.....	+29,000

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 1141)—Continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
	Federal Drug Control Programs						
.....	High intensity drug trafficking areas program	.....	.....	1,250	2,500	+2,500	+1,250
	Total, Chapter 9:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	29,000	29,000	1,250	36,000	+7,000	+34,750
	CHAPTER 10						
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
	Community Planning and Development						
.....	Community development block grants fund (by transfer)	.....	.....	(3,400)	.....	.....	(-3,400)
	Federal Housing Administration						
	FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:						
.....	(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	.....	.....	.....	(30,000,000)	(+30,000,000)	(+30,000,000)
	Government National Mortgage Association						
	Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:						
.....	(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	.....	.....	.....	(50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	Court of Veterans Appeals						
106-3	Salaries and expenses	372	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Environmental Protection Agency						
.....	State and tribal assistance grants (by transfer) (sec. 3016)	.....	.....	(1,300)	(1,300)	(+1,300)	.....
	Total, Chapter 10:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	372	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	(By transfer)	.....	.....	(4,700)	(1,300)	(+1,300)	(-3,400)
	(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	.....	.....	.....	(80,000,000)	(+80,000,000)	(+80,000,000)
	CHAPTER 11						
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
.....	Ellsworth AFB claims (sec. 3029)	.....	.....	8,000	8,000	+8,000	.....
.....	General Services Administration (sec. 3034 and 3035)	.....	.....	.....	1,700	+1,700	+1,700
	Total, Chapter 11:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	.....	8,000	9,700	+9,700	+1,700
	Total, title III:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	90,093	108,281	352,951	267,978	+159,697	-84,973
	Appropriations	(52,172)	(90,881)	(352,951)	(197,822)	(+106,941)	(-155,129)
	Rescission	.....	.....	.....	(-3,521)	(-3,521)	(-3,521)
	Emergency appropriations	(921)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Advance appropriations	(37,000)	(17,400)	.....	(73,677)	(+56,277)	(+73,677)
	(By transfer)	(15,000)	.....	(5,836)	(3,936)	(+3,936)	(-1,900)
	(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	.....	.....	.....	(80,000,000)	(+80,000,000)	(+80,000,000)
	TITLE IV - RESCISSIONS AND OFFSETS						
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
	Farm Service Agency						
.....	Emergency conservation program (P.L. 105-174) (rescission)	.....	.....	-700	.....	.....	+700
	Food and Nutrition Service						
.....	Food stamp program (rescission)	.....	.....	-521,000	-1,250,000	-1,250,000	-729,000
	Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:						
.....	Loan subsidies (Title I) (rescission)	.....	-30,000	.....	.....	+30,000	.....
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
.....	Office of Inspector General (rescission)	.....	.....	-5,000	.....	.....	+5,000
	Immigration and Naturalization Service						
	Salaries and expenses:						
.....	Enforcement and border affairs (rescission)	.....	.....	-40,000	.....	.....	+40,000
.....	Citizenship and benefits, immigration support and program direction (rescission)	.....	.....	-25,000	.....	.....	+25,000
	Total, Immigration and Naturalization Service	.....	.....	-65,000	.....	.....	+65,000
	Total, Department of Justice	.....	.....	-70,000	.....	.....	+70,000

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 1141)— Continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
.....	Operations, research and facilities (rescission)	.....	.....	-1,000	.....	.....	+1,000
.....	Procurement, acquisition and construction (rescission)	.....	.....	-2,000	.....	.....	+2,000
	Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	.....	.....	-3,000	.....	.....	+3,000
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
	International Organizations and Conferences						
.....	Contributions to international organizations (rescission)	.....	.....	-25,000	.....	.....	+25,000
.....	Contributions for international peacekeeping activities (rescission)	.....	.....	-21,000	.....	.....	+21,000
	Total, International Organizations and Conferences	.....	.....	-46,000	.....	.....	+46,000
	RELATED AGENCY						
	United States Information Agency						
.....	International Broadcasting Operations (rescission)	.....	.....	-1,000	.....	.....	+1,000
.....	Buying power maintenance (rescission)	.....	-20,000	.....	-20,000	.....	-20,000
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
	Operation and Maintenance						
106-3	Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide (contingent emergency appropriations (sec. 1001) 2/	-82,000	-40,000	.....	.....	+40,000	.....
.....	Rescission	.....	.....	-217,700	.....	.....	+217,700
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
	Corps of Engineers - Civil						
.....	Construction, general (rescission)	.....	.....	-5,500	.....	.....	+5,500
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
	Atomic Energy Defense Activities						
.....	Other defense activities (rescission of emergency appropriations)	.....	-150,000	.....	.....	+150,000	.....
	EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE						
.....	Export-Import Bank of the United States (rescission)	.....	-25,000	.....	.....	+25,000	.....
.....	Trade and development agency (rescission)	.....	-5,000	.....	.....	+5,000	.....
	Total, Export and Investment Assistance	.....	-30,000	.....	.....	+30,000	.....
	BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
	Agency for International Development						
.....	Development assistance (rescission)	.....	-40,000	.....	.....	+40,000	.....
	Other Bilateral Assistance						
.....	Economic Support Fund (rescission)	.....	-17,000	-10,000	-5,000	+12,000	+5,000
.....	Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States (rescission)	.....	-20,000	-10,000	.....	+20,000	+10,000
.....	Assistance for the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union (rescission)	.....	-25,000	-10,000	.....	+25,000	+10,000
	Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance	.....	-102,000	-30,000	-5,000	+97,000	+25,000
	MILITARY ASSISTANCE						
106-14	Foreign Military Financing Program (rescission)	-18,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	Peacekeeping operations (rescission)	.....	-10,000	.....	.....	+10,000	.....
	MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
	Funds Appropriated to the President						
	Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:						
.....	Contribution to the Global Environment Facility (rescission)	.....	-25,000	-60,000	-25,000	.....	+35,000
.....	Reduction in callable capital appropriations (rescission)	.....	-648,000	.....	.....	+648,000	.....
.....	International organizations and programs (rescission)	.....	-10,000	-10,000	.....	+10,000	+10,000
	Total, Multilateral Economic Assitance	.....	-683,000	-70,000	-25,000	+658,000	+45,000
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	Bureau of Land Management						
106-14	Management of lands and resources (rescission)	-6,800	-6,800	-6,800	-6,800	.....	.....
	National Park Service						
.....	Construction (deferral) (sec. 2319)	.....	.....	-3,000	.....	.....	+3,000
	Total, Department of the Interior	-6,800	-6,800	-9,800	-6,800	.....	+3,000

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 1141)—Continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR						
	Employment and Training Administration						
106-3	State unemployment insurance and employment service operations (trust fund) (offset)	-5,700	-21,000	-17,400	-22,400	-1,400	-5,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
	Health Resources and Services Administration						
.....	Federal capital loan program for nursing (rescission)	.....	-2,800	.....	-2,800	.....	-2,800
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
.....	Education research, statistics, and improvement (rescission)	.....	-6,800	-8,000	-6,500	+300	+1,500
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
.....	Military construction, Army (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000
.....	Military construction, Navy (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000
.....	Military construction, Air Force (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000
.....	Military contruction, Defense-wide (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000
	Total, Military construction	.....	.....	.....	-10,000	-10,000	-10,000
.....	Family housing, Army (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-8,000	-8,000	-8,000
.....	Family housing, Navy (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000
.....	Family housing, Air Force (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-4,000	-4,000	-4,000
	Total, Family housing	.....	.....	.....	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000
.....	Base realignment and closure account, Part IV (rescission)	.....	.....	-14,500	-6,400	-6,400	+8,100
	Total, Department of Defense - Military	.....	.....	-14,500	-31,400	-31,400	-16,900
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
	Office of the Secretary						
.....	Payments to air carriers (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	.....	-815	.....	-815	.....	-815
	Federal Highway Administration						
.....	State infrastructure banks (rescission)	.....	-6,500	.....	-6,500	.....	-6,500
	Federal Transit Administration						
.....	Trust fund share of transit programs (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	.....	-665	.....	-665	.....	-665
.....	Interstate transfer grants - transit (rescission)	.....	-600	.....	-600	.....	-600
	Total, Federal Transit Administration	.....	-1,265	.....	-1,265	.....	-1,265
	Total, Department of Transportation	.....	-8,580	.....	-8,580	.....	-8,580
	DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY						
	Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms						
.....	Salaries and expenses (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-4,500	-4,500	-4,500
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT						
106-3	Unanticipated needs (rescission)	-10,000	-10,000	.....	-10,000	.....	-10,000
	Federal Drug Control Programs						
.....	Special forfeiture fund (rescission)	.....	.....	-1,250	.....	.....	+1,250
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
	Public and Indian Housing						
.....	Housing certificate fund (deferral)	.....	.....	-350,000	.....	.....	+350,000
.....	Annual contributions for assisted housing (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-350,000	-350,000	-350,000
	Community Planning and Development						
.....	Community development block grants fund (rescission of emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	-313,600	-230,000	-230,000	+83,600
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development	.....	.....	-663,600	-580,000	-580,000	+83,600
	INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
	Environmental Protection Agency						
.....	Science and technology (rescission)	.....	.....	-10,000	.....	.....	+10,000

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 1141)—Continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
	Rescission of Non-Defense emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277):						
.....	(Sec. 1105(b))	.....	.....	-250,000	.....	.....	+250,000
.....	(Sec. 1403(f))	.....	.....	-125,000	.....	.....	+125,000
.....	(Sec. 3002)	.....	.....	-343,000	.....	.....	+343,000
.....	(Sec. 4016(b))	.....	.....	-2,250,000	.....	.....	+2,250,000
.....	FY 1999 Non-Defense discretionary (sec. 3003) (rescission)	.....	.....	-100,000	.....	.....	+100,000
.....	Agricultural Research Service (P.L. 105-277) (sec. 3001(a)) (emergency offset)	.....	.....	-23,000	-22,466	-22,466	+534
	Total, General Provisions	.....	.....	-3,091,000	-22,466	-22,466	+3,068,534
	Total, title IV:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	-122,500	-1,120,980	-4,780,450	-1,995,446	-874,466	+2,785,004
	Rescissions	(-34,800)	(-908,500)	(-1,105,450)	(-1,719,100)	(-810,600)	(-613,650)
	Rescission of contract authorization	.....	(-1,480)	.....	(-1,480)	.....	(-1,480)
	Deferrals	.....	.....	(-353,000)	.....	.....	(+353,000)
	Offsets	(-5,700)	(-21,000)	(-17,400)	(-22,400)	(-1,400)	(-5,000)
	Emergency offsets	.....	.....	(-23,000)	(-22,466)	(-22,466)	(+534)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(-82,000)	(-40,000)	.....	.....	(+40,000)	.....
	Rescission of emergency appropriations	.....	(-150,000)	(-3,281,600)	(-230,000)	(-80,000)	(+3,051,600)
	Grand total, all titles:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	7,796,524	13,221,669	-2,424,691	13,145,246	-76,423	+15,569,937
	Appropriations	(52,172)	(90,881)	(355,951)	(197,822)	(+106,941)	(-158,129)
	Rescissions	(-34,800)	(-908,500)	(-1,105,450)	(-1,722,621)	(-814,121)	(-617,171)
	Rescission of contract authorization	.....	(-1,480)	.....	(-1,480)	.....	(-1,480)
	Deferrals	.....	.....	(-353,000)	.....	.....	(+353,000)
	Offsets	(-5,700)	(-21,000)	(-17,400)	(-22,400)	(-1,400)	(-5,000)
	Emergency offsets	.....	.....	(-23,000)	(-22,466)	(-22,466)	(+534)
	Emergency appropriations	(6,407,852)	(5,494,931)	(293,362)	(4,713,531)	(-781,400)	(+4,420,169)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(1,140,000)	(6,861,011)	(1,706,446)	(8,320,757)	(+1,459,746)	(+6,614,311)
	Rescission of emergency appropriations	.....	(-150,000)	(-3,281,600)	(-230,000)	(-80,000)	(+3,051,600)
	Advance appropriations	(237,000)	(1,855,826)	.....	(1,912,103)	(+56,277)	(+1,912,103)
	(Transfer authority)	(800,000)	(800,000)	.....	(350,000)	(-450,000)	(+350,000)
	(By transfer)	(15,000)	.....	(5,836)	(3,936)	(+3,936)	(-1,900)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(6,950)	(950)	(6,000)	(950)	.....	(-5,050)
	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	(7,000)	.....	(17,000)	(+10,000)	(+17,000)
	(Loan authorizations)	(1,095,000)	(1,095,000)	(1,106,000)	(1,106,000)	(+11,000)	.....

2/ The President's Budget proposed defense spending reductions of $882 million, which offset proposed supplemental spending. Since only a portion of the proposed spending is considered in this bill, the defense reductions are adjusted to be comparable to the spending.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do want to compliment my friend, the gentleman from Florida, the distinguished chairman of the committee. I do not think much of the product that the committee brought forth, but I do want to say that it was obvious to everyone in that conference that he, as chairman of the conference, handled it extremely well. He was absolutely, totally fair with everyone, and sometimes that took a lot of patience. I think that he did the House proud and the committee proud in the way he conducted that operation.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a lot that is good in this bill. It is far from the worst bill that the House has ever produced. But I am going to vote no, and I want to tell the Members why.

Some of the good things in it, it finally, after a considerable delay, is providing much needed help to our American farmers who suffered crop damage as well as collapsing prices. It is finally producing action to help recover from the horrible hemispheric weather that we had in Hurricane Mitch.

We no longer have the threats to the IFIs, the international financial institutions, that were represented by the original offsets in this bill, and this bill no longer threatens our ability to conclude a negotiation with Russia on the disposal of weapons-grade plutonium, a provision which unwisely was included in the original House bill.

It also eliminated a number of riders that should have not been in this bill in the first place. I am pleased about that. But there are a number of things in this bill still that should not be here.

As I said in the conference, my main problem with this bill is that it is a symbol of the mendacity that dominates the Federal budget process. We have a two-tier system for determining budgets in the Congress. In the spring we adopt a budget resolution produced by the Committee on the Budget. That establishes overall spending levels, and it is largely political in nature. As a result, in my view, those numbers are highly unrealistic, and have been for years.

Then we have a second level that has to take over in the process, represented by the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations. Those committees are then asked to produce real pieces of legislation under the guidelines set by the Committee on the Budget.

The problem is that because the first set of numbers are not real, we are then, for the remainder of the year in the appropriations process, forced to engage in accounting tricks in order to find the votes to pass various appropriation bills.

Last year, for instance, in October, after going through a year-long charade, we wound up adding $22 billion to spending above the amounts allowed in the budget resolution, and now this bill adds more than $14 billion to that. That means that we have a total of $37 billion that will be spent in this fiscal year above the level that would be allowed by those so-called budget caps.

Example: We have $5 billion in military spending above and beyond the amount needed to pursue the war in Kosovo. Why do we have that? I will tell the Members why. In conference, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget from the other body revealed the game plan. He told the conference that we had to pour as many dollars as possible into this bill because it will be labeled an emergency and will not count against the spending limits, or else, he said, the spending caps, which his own committee imposed on this House just a month ago, would not work, in his words, not mine.

Members will be told that there is no military pork in this bill. That is largely true. It is not fully true, but it is largely true. But the real point is that on the military side, this bill shovels a lot of regular items into a so-called emergency bill. That means that it frees up, in essence, about $5 billion worth of room for pork in the defense appropriation bill which will shortly follow. That is the problem.

Secondly, and perhaps the worst and most expensive provision in this bill, is an amendment to the Medicaid law, which is not even in the Committee on Appropriations' jurisdiction, which will allow State governments over the course of the next 25 years to keep $150 billion in Federal funds with no requirement whatsoever that those funds be used for health.

Under existing law, the Federal Government pays more than half of the cost of State Medicaid programs. In return, that law requires the States to act as the principal agent for both themselves and the Federal Government in recovering overpayments and collecting payments from third parties when they are liable for care that has been paid for by the Medicaid system.

But this emergency bill rewrites that longstanding provision of law. Federal funds that have been recovered by States in recent tobacco legislation can be retained totally by States and used for whatever purposes the various Governors and legislatures deem appropriate, even though those funds were recovered for health reasons, and in my view should be used by the States if they keep the money in order to deal with health problems.

The Federal funds involved would be sufficient to expand health care coverage to millions of Americans who are presently not under Medicaid and have no form of insurance, but this conference report precludes that.

I think it is a further outrage that this crucial decision is being made on an emergency appropriation, brought to the floor primarily for a military action in Europe and hurricane relief in Central America. There were no hearings or the normal opportunities to debate this issue. The Committee on Commerce that has jurisdiction over this entitlement spending was not even involved in the decision.

In addition, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) has pointed out, there are three anti-environmental riders contained in this bill. One, the crown jewel, is a mine provision. One blocks new rules on determining the value of crude oil which is extracted from taxpayer-owned public lands. That provision costs taxpayers $75 million. And we also have a provision in this bill which prevents the updating of ancient rules on hardrock mining, something which this committee in my view had no business doing, as well.

Lastly, it adds, again, to the mendacity of the process as a sop to some of the budget hawks in this House because it pretends to pay for some of the costs associated with this bill, such as the hurricane in this hemisphere, by cutting $1.2 billion out of food stamps.

□ 1900

The fact is those cuts save not $1, because that money would never have been spent, even if the committee had not touched it. So despite those cuts, because the food stamps are required by law to be paid at whatever level that the demand requires, if in fact there is additional demand for that program, the Federal Government will have to pay out additional money. So there is no saving whatsoever to be had by that offset. I think it adds further to the general disingenuousness which generally accompanies the overall budget process.

So as I said earlier, we have passed worse bills. This one bothers me more than most because war is being used as an excuse to, on a number of occasions in this bill, rip off the taxpaying public. It is also being used as a vehicle by which we will ignore the health care needs of millions of Americans. It adds to the phoniness of the budget process overall.

I think we can do better; and until we do, I will vote no. I recognize that there will not be very many no votes cast against this provision. But I think in defense of the integrity of the budget process, what little there is left of it, I am at least going to vote no.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article for the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, May 18, 1999]

MEDICAL OUTCASTS: DOES ANYONE CARE?

(By David S. Broder)

It is quite a trick for something to grow larger and at the same time become more invisible. But that is what's happening to the health care problem in the United States. The greater the number of people without medical insurance, the less the politicians want to talk about it—let alone deal with it.

In 1992, when the plight of the uninsured became a major issue in the presidential campaign, there were 38 million non-covered Americans below Medicare age. Five years

later, according to a report released last week, the number has grown by 5 million. And the rate of increase is accelerating, from an average of half a million annually in the first two years to an average of 1.2 million annually in the three most recent years.

But last week, when the National Coalition on Health Care, a bipartisan group headed by former presidents Bush, Carter and Ford, put out its latest report on ''The Erosion of Health Insurance Coverage in the United States,'' it barely made a ripple. Monica Lewinsky's appearance on ''Saturday Night Live'' drew more coverage than the fact that in the most recent year cited by the report, 1.7 million Americans were added to the ranks of the uninsured.

Why is this happening? The report's authors, Steven Findlay and Joel Miller—who had the assistance of Tulane University's Kenneth Thorpe, probably the country's leading authority on this question—say the legions of the uninsured are rising because of fundamental economic and demographic forces, which, by themselves, are certain to make the problem worse. The authors say that ''even if the rosy economic conditions prevalent since 1992 prevail for another decade, a projected 52 million to 54 million nonelderly Americans—one in five—will be uninsured in 2009.'' If a recession occurs, that number likely will jump to 61 million—one in four.

Most of the uninsured have jobs, but increasingly, they work in small businesses or in service sectors that either do not cover employees or require them to pay so much for health insurance that they cannot afford it. The growing numbers of self-employed, part-timers and contract workers swell the totals.

It is a double whammy. Between 1996 and 1998, the percentage of small firms (with fewer than 200 employees) offering health insurance dropped from 59 percent to 54 percent. On average, their employees were required to pay almost half (44 percent) of the policy premiums for themselves and their families. Faced with those costs, more workers are declining health insurance.

The economic changes are exacerbated by demographics. Minorities—who have higher unemployment rates and tend to work in lower-wage jobs—are twice as likely to be uninsured as whites; as the minority's percentage of the population increases, so will this problem.

Even government policy is adding to the crisis. The welfare reform bill of 1996 supposedly provided a Medicaid cushion for women making the transition from welfare to work. But, as the authors report, ''there are strong early signs that many former welfare recipients are not gaining coverage at new jobs and that those dropping off the welfare rolls are losing Medicaid coverage.'' In New York State, for example, the number of Medicaid enrollees dropped by 300,000 between 1995 and 1998, but in the same three years the number of uninsured rose by 450,000.

The study also notes that it is increasingly difficult for the uninsured to get health care. In one survey of more than 10,000 doctors, those receiving no income from managed care companies reported spending about 10 hours a month treating indigents. But those who get the bulk of their income from these companies gave up only half as much of their time to charity. As cost-containment pressures increase, the uninsured face ever greater medical risks.

In language that is remarkably calm, given the contents of their report, the authors conclude, ''The accelerating decline in health insurance coverage in the United States is a serious problem, affecting the financial security and health of millions of Americans every day. * * * Despite strong economic growth and low unemployment, employer-sponsored health insurance coverage has continued to erode throughout the past decade.''

When more and more Americans cannot pay their own medical bills, it threatens the quality of health care that those with insurance receive. Cost, quality and access are linked as inextricably today as they were when the Clintons took their unsuccessful run at the problem six years ago.

You'd think it would be an issue every presidential candidate would address. Instead, what we hear is silence. The last sentence in the report is: ''We continue to ignore this problem at our peril.'' And yet, we continue to ignore it.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield such time as he may consume to the very distinguished gentlemen from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, who was a solid, strong leader throughout this entire effort. I thank him very much for the strength that he had added to the process.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for his hard work on this good piece of legislation. I also want to congratulate the other chairmen of the subcommittees that had jurisdiction.

I want to extend my congratulations to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who just spoke a minute ago. He certainly has his views on this bill; but if it was not for his work and cooperation, we would not have the bill today, so I thank him for that.

This has been a rough road to travel. Many of the competing interests have struggled mightily to be included in this legislation. As the gentleman from Wisconsin just got done laying out the litany of some of them, we find that most of those had come from the Senate.

So we worked hard to make sure that we could provide a bill that was focused on the issues at hand, true issues of emergency, and that we would get back in return a bill that would be focused on the true issues of emergency.

But it is not the time to fight for special interests. It is the time for Congress to promote the national interests. This bill serves, in my opinion, the national interests.

It provides resources to our servicemen and women who work so hard to defend this country who we ask to go to the far points of this Earth to defend American interests. It provides necessary relief to our farmers who have been devastated by an ailing farm economy. These farmers put food on the tables of American people, and they deserve the support of the American people.

It helps our neighbors to the south who were devastated by Hurricane Mitch and our citizens in the Midwest who were devastated by vicious tornados.

Mr. Speaker, we are elected to Congress to represent our constituents, but we are also elected to serve the American people. This legislation fulfills our constitutional duties to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty for the American people. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time and, as always, for his extraordinary leadership and now on this bill as well.

Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues would have all been very proud of the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) as he chaired the conference on this bill, for this emergency supplemental bill. He represented our House with great dignity and great humor and great patience, and we all commended him for that.

Of course we are always proud of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and his advocacy for his point of view, a point of view that many of us share.

In saying the compliments that I have extended to the chairman, it makes me all the more reluctant to rise in opposition to this bill. Certainly it is about time for us to provide the emergency funding for the victims of the hurricanes in Central America. It is 7 months since those hurricanes struck, and they exacted the worst natural disaster in this century in this hemisphere. Here we are 7 months later finally coming to the floor, but, hallelujah, here we are.

It does provide assistance to our farmers and FEMA for the devastation in our own Midwest and Oklahoma and Kansas. But I object to the fact that that emergency assistance must be offset.

This is an emergency supplemental bill. Of its nature, it does not need to be offset. Part of my opposition to the bill springs from the fact that we are making the exception for these disasters in our own hemisphere while we are spending billions of dollars; and I do not think that should be offset either, I fully support the spending that we are doing in Kosovo. How is it offset? By nearly $1 billion in cuts in food stamps and $350 million in section 8 housing.

I take the word of my colleagues when we say that this will not have an impact on the delivery of food stamps and housing, nutrition and housing for the poor people in our country, and that this is excess funds appropriated, uncommitted funds that will not be spent this year. I understand that, and I respect that.

But I do not understand why we have to go to that pot. Certainly there is

other uncommitted appropriated funds. There are other appropriated uncommitted funds we can go to without sending a message that, not only do we take exception to offset funding for hurricane disasters in our own hemisphere and in Central America and offset it from the poorest of the poor account in our country, there should have been a better place for the offsets if we needed them in the first place.

Then I support, of course, the substantial assistance to refugees. But, again, we are talking about spending so much more money that is not an emergency.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) did a great job on the riders, but not a complete job. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the supplemental.

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

Mr. Speaker, I take this additional minute to respond to the comments of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) about Hurricane Mitch. Immediately upon the incident of that hurricane, America responded to Central America. We sent our military forces there quickly. They saved lives. They pulled people out of the swollen rivers, out of mud slides. They brought potable water so people could have something to drink or cook with. They provided sanitary conditions. So the United States responded immediately.

The supplemental request did not come from the administration until much later following that disaster. Actually, there was some delay in getting to conference on the Hurricane Mitch bill, but we combined the two bills, the Mitch bill and the Kosovo bill, into one supplemental so that we were not spending all of our time dealing with supplementals every week. That is the reason for some delay.

I would like to say to the gentlewoman that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) has been all over my case ever since we filed that first supplemental to get it done. So I say to the gentlewoman, it is completed. It is here today. Vote for it, and the money will begin to flow.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 17 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 21½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the gentleman from Florida yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise first to express my deep appreciation to both the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member. They have shepherded this bill through a very difficult process and I must say they reflected the will of the House in an especially effective manner as we dealt with the other body.

As has been described here, this bill has been merged with the earlier emergency bill that passed the House. There has been a good deal of concern about additions placed on that original bill. I must say first and foremost that the chairman and the ranking member worked very hard to play a role in eliminating the most egregious of those problems from the other body.

In the meantime, they provided a very important leadership role in making sure that our efforts, especially relative to Kosovo, remain very, very clean. As these items dealing with funding for national defense left the House, they return to the House—a clean product.

This bill is committed to funding our effort in Kosovo. While it does not provide all the funding that I might have called for and as was reflected in the work of the initial bill that passed the House, it remained a clean bill; and it demonstrates our commitment to making sure that our men and women who are in harm's way are adequately supported in that effort.

We do have within the Kosovo part of this package a total of almost $11 billion worth of funding for defense purposes, an amount that is in excess of that which the President requested, but an amount that is very apparent is needed by our military for our national defense.

As we move into the months ahead, none of us can predict what the cost might be. But this bill is a reflection of the fact that the House wants to make sure that adequate funding is present no matter how long the war itself may extend itself.

Beyond the President's request, there are a number of critical items that are necessary and that have been provided for in this bill. To illustrate that to some extent, above and beyond the President's basic requests, we have added $4.74 billion to address critical shortfalls in a number of areas that include items like munitions, where there is $250 million to replace munitions that have been used and are in short supply; rapid response procurements in the amounts of $300 million; and operation and maintenance funds in the amount of $2.35 billion. The O&M funding includes needed funds for spare parts and depot maintenance, items that are critical to our forces being able to carry out their mission.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, one of the messages we are sending here to our troops that is especially important involves the advanced funding of pay adjustments for the troops. That essentially tells them in clear terms that the House is not only supporting their effort in Kosovo, but intends to continue to support their service for the country as long as it might continue in the months and the years ahead. That portion of the bill, Mr. Speaker, came to us with great support and cooperation of the authorizing committee, and I want to thank those members of the Armed Services Committee who also provided us with their assistance throughout this process. In closing, I strongly urge all members, on both sides of the aisle, to support this bipartisan, essential bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the supplemental spending bill.

Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to vote on the Conference Report to provide spending for military aid and hurricane disaster relief, Members should be aware of a thus far successful effort by the mining industry and its supporters in the Other Body to include in the conference report yet another anti-environmental rider.

This time, the rider would stop the Secretary of the Interior from properly carrying out his duties under the 1872 Mining Law by allowing mining companies to claim an unlimited number of acres of public land for waste disposal.

The issue arose from a March 25, 1999, joint decision by the U.S. Departments of Interior and Agriculture denying a large open-pit, cyanide-leach gold mine in eastern Washington State which had illegally claimed hundreds of acres of public land as ''millsites.''

Millsite claims were originally intended for structures to process the mined ore from the mineral claims; now they are usually used to dump waste rock and tailings (what's left after the mineral has been extracted).

To be valid, millsites cannot contain a valuable mineral. The mining law holds that millsite claims are limited to 5 acres in size and allows only one 5-acre millsite claim per mineral claim. Before the March 25th decision mining companies were often permitted, albeit illegally, as many millsite claims as they needed, no matter how many mineral claims they had. And the modern mining industry generally needs many more millsite claims than mineral claims. Since this decision to fully and consistently enforce the law, 5 acres of millsite claim waste disposal space is all that is available per mineral claim.

The decision by the Department of the Interior is significant because of the precedent it sets—enforcing a provision of the 1872 Mining Law that limits the amount of public land, adjacent to mines, which can be used to dump waste from mining.

With enforcement, the decision gives federal land managers the right to deny mine permits that propose to dump excessive amounts of mine wastes on valuable public lands and it may make economically marginal ore deposits unprofitable to develop.

The space required to dump the massive waste rock piles produced at many of today's mines exceeds the legal limits under the 1872 Mining Law which Congress should have reformed years ago. Mine waste dumps pollute surface and groundwater resources with acid

mine drainage and heavy metals such as arsenic.

Permitting more such waste to be dumped on public lands is simply not an acceptable solution. That's what the industry wants and that's what this rider would do. It would legalize waste-dumping that is now illegal.

The 1872 mining law has given away billions of dollars of the nation's mineral wealth while paying taxpayers, who own the minerals, not one cent in royalties. And the law has only minimal limited environmental safeguards.

Polls show that a significant majority of Americans continue to support strong mining law reform. But instead of an open debate on the mining law, the industry wants an exemption from this part of the law that they've discovered is no longer to their liking.

Instead of engaging in back-room politics, the mining industry should engage in an open public debate about reforming all of the mining law, not just the part it doesn't like. And Congress should not permit a last-second, stealth rider to be added to a non-germane bill with no public debate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today's vote on the supplemental budget for Kosovo has so little to do with Serbia and Kosovo that it no longer makes any sense. Members are being asked to approve a cornucopia of projects much beyond the amount that President Clinton asked.

There are so many outrages in this bill that it is kind of hard to pick one out, but let me pick one out. It is the antienvironmental rider, sponsored by the senior Senator from Washington State, and the well-financed mining lobby, which will trade American foreign policy, the safety of millions of Kosovars, and the welfare of hurricane victims in Central America for the right to strip-mine a sensitive and scenic area in north central Washington.

This rider will grant a Texas company the right to operate a strip-mine in Okanogan County. This mine will operate a cyanide leaching pit mine to spread its waste over hundreds of acres of public land, threaten the county's water supply, and threaten tribal lands.

It orders the Interior Department not to enforce the 1872 mining law. There is no doubt that that mining law needs to be reformed. It is much too generous to the mining companies. However, the solution is comprehensive reform of the law. It is clearly wrong to suspend part of the law to allow more dumping of wastes, and the mechanism is hardly an emergency appropriations bill.

□ 1915

The only opportunity that Members of this House will have to vote against this is to vote on the motion to recommit. And I urge all of them to vote ''yes'' on the motion to recommit and ''no'' on the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I just want to point out something that I find so ironic with the debate from the previous speaker and the debate on the rule. Here we are debating the bill that deals with our national defense, deals with our agriculture industry, and deals with aid to Central America, which I think is needed, otherwise this body would not take it up. And yet we hear the rhetoric from the other side and specific Members that we are decimating our environmental laws.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Let us put this into perspective, exactly what happened. Under existing law, a gold mine in Washington State opened up 11 years ago, invested $80 million under existing rules, jumped over every hoop, every barrier, went through every environmental hoop from the State, from the Federal Government, and they said proceed, until it got to Washington, D.C. and a solicitor took existing statute that had never been interpreted this way before, never been interpreted this way before, and said we are going to shut down this gold mine after an $80 million investment.

This happened about 6 weeks ago. It had to be fixed in a timely manner because people have invested in this enterprise, pension funds; there is about 150 to 200 jobs at stake in north central Washington. So this fix had to be done in an emergency manner, and that is why this vehicle was fixed. It does not, I have to repeat, this does not decimate any environmental laws. It takes care of this one specific project and those projects that are in place right now.

I urge support of this supplemental budget.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that one of the offsets being used in this bill is $350 million from the Section 8 housing program. I understand that these are monies that are not expected to be spent this year. But the future use of these funds was considered when HUD calculated how much to request for fiscal 2000.

It is my understanding that the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the chairman, plans to appropriate sufficient funds to renew all Section 8 contracts in the fiscal 2000 VA–HUD appropriations bill; and if I might, I would like to engage him in a colloquy at this point on that matter. My concern is that funding be sufficient to ensure that those currently using the Section 8 program will in fact have the necessary housing provided for them and their families.

Is it the intention of the chairman to appropriate funds sufficient to renew all Section 8 contract renewals?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern of the gentleman. We also have concern with this important housing issue, and I agree that the Section 8 program is very important for ensuring that the poorest of the poor have adequate housing. Consequently, I fully intend to appropriate adequate funds for Section 8 renewal.

And I would remind my good friend that no one has lost their housing vouchers, and I have no intention of letting that happen.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I support the intention of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) to provide for all the Section 8 renewals even though, as we are all well aware, the budget resolution we are working under requires difficult choices in many of the appropriations bills, including the VA–HUD bill. I believe it will be up to the Members of the subcommittee to determine the best manner in which to allocate these funds.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairmen of both the full committee and the subcommittee. I agree with both of them that it is going to be a very difficult, very challenging process to fund those programs under our responsibilities.

I am concerned that this rescission could make that more difficult for the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and my colleagues to find the funds necessarily adequately to fund both Section 8 and all the important programs we oversee.

In conclusion, it is going to be difficult to find the funds to fund Section 8 fully, and all of these important programs we are overseeing. It is vitally important to do this, though; and I pledge my cooperation to getting it done.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

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

I think we are losing sight of the fact that the purpose of this bill is to support our troops overseas. They did not ask to be sent there. But now that they are there, therefore I think we should get the necessary funds to provide the adequate equipment that they need and all the supplies so that they can be protected in performing their duty. And we are getting diverted in this debate.

But let me also address one issue, and that is the Byrd provision which was in the Senate bill to establish a loan guarantee program. I think that amendment is important. It would deal with the question of steelworkers and their jobs.

But I did not think we would want to lose this bill or have it delayed, since it is so vital to young American men and women in the military, by retaining this amendment. I believe that this should be addressed with a separate bill. That bill with the Byrd language has been introduced in the House by myself. The Speaker has agreed that there will be a vote on it. A similar action is being accomplished in the Senate, and there will be a vote there on the Byrd amendment.

I would hope that the Senate will pass the quota bill, as it is the most effective solution to stopping dumping and job loss. It is a problem. Four steel companies have filed for bankruptcy protection since the steel import crisis began. We have 10,000 steelworkers out of their jobs, and that does not include people in the ancillary industries.

We can deal with those problems with the quota bill, which would be far more effective in saving steelworker jobs. And I think it is important that we get on with passing this bill to make sure that our young men and women overseas and in the United States that have been called upon to protect their country, to serve their country, are adequately taken care of.

I urge the Members to pass this bill promptly.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I first want to say how proud I am as a new member of the Committee on Appropriations of the work that our House did. If my colleagues notice, the conference committee, the leadership in that conference committee, was certainly on the House side, and I appreciate the work on it of both sides of the aisle.

This is the first spending bill that we have voted off the House floor this year, and I think it reminds me of that old adage that is in a song that says, ''You can't always get what you want but sometimes you get what you need.'' There are a lot of political needs out there in this country and across the world, and Congress does not have always a good record of getting the money to the people.

I have agreed with some of those who point out the wrongs in this bill. There are certainly some wrongs. And they have an option of voting to recommit. But the politics of compromise is that along with the bad comes the good, and we have to weigh our judgment on how we are going to vote. Is there more good in this bill than bad? And we have been hearing people emphasize what they think is the bad. Let me emphasize what I think is the good.

Certainly, a long overdue pay raise for our military and the Coast Guard; $1.1 billion for Kosovo refugees; $900 million for U.S. tornado victims in the FEMA account; $687 million in Central America, and I visited there, for school building and road development and debt restructuring; and $10 million relief for the Colombians after that horrible earthquake that they had.

There is also money in here for other great causes. There is $574 million for U.S. farmers hit by low commodity prices. There is a lot in here to like even for nondomestic emergency funding.

Credit Union Liquidity.

Public Broadcasting: There is money in here for National Public Radio.

Mortgage Insurance Limits: There is money in here for mortgage insurance limits.

House Page Dormitory: For the pages' dormitories for these pages that serve us, so they can have a decent place to live.

Japanese Reparations: There is money in here for Japanese reparations. The list goes on and on for good things to support.

Postal Service.

Indian Affairs.

Russian Leaders: The agreement establishes a pilot program within the Library of Congress to bring up to 3,000 emerging Russian political leaders to the United States for up to 30 days each. The Senate is transferring $10 million of its own funds to finance the program during 1999.

Religious Freedom.

Export Controls.

Drug Trafficking.

National Commission on Terrorism.

Pan Am Trial.

I urge my colleagues to make a sufficient vote, vote ''yes.''

Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult and emotional time for the world community and me personally. We have found ourselves faced with unconscionable atrocities in Kosovo and no easy way to stop them. We all wish that we were not faced with the need to make choices such as those we face in Kosovo, we wish to options available were different. However, I believe we do not have the option of standing by and letting the genocide continue.

My outlook on humanity has been shaped by my national service in Colombia with the Peace Corps. During my time in Colombia I gained an appreciation for other cultures and an understanding that, no matter what your nationality or ethnicity, we are all human. We all deserve the right to basic freedoms. We all deserve the right to be safe in our homes and not be fearful of our government. We all deserve the right to expect that we will not be forced out of our homes and country. We all deserve the right to live freely.

The international community has been attempting to reach a diplomatic end to Slobodan Milosevic's terror of the non-Serbian population in Yugoslavia for years. The Rambouillet accords offered Mr. Milosevic one last opportunity to stop the genocide in Kosovo and avoid international conflict. With his refusal, the international community was faced with the awful decision of sitting by and allowing Milosevic to continue displacing, terrorizing, and murdering Kosovars, or take action to stop him. I have had many sleepless nights thinking about the situation in Kosovo, recalling what I saw first hand in Bosnia and imaging the plight of the Kosovars. I believe that chosing to act was the right decision.

I do not feel the United States could have, or should have, stood idly by while people in Kosovo continue to lose their homes, their families and their lives. Whether or not you agree with my position, I want you to know that I don't take it lightly.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I love this place. It is so interesting to come and to see both sides of the aisle use demagoguery to talk about what is wrong with everything.

If my colleagues want to find a reason to vote against this bill, it is very simple. Since the introduction of C-SPAN, we no longer debate issues, we use oneupmanship, hoping that someone back in our respective districts might be listening and they might be impressed.

This glass is nine-tenths full. How many of my colleagues want to go home and say that they want to deny the refugee assistance that is in this bill for the refugees coming out of Kosovo? How many of my colleagues want to go home and say they do not want to help the people who are devastated by Hurricane Mitch? Not one of them. How many of my colleagues will want to go home and tell their farmers that there was something wrong with this bill, that they disagreed with something the Senate put in there, therefore, they were against assistance to the farmers?

We have got to look at the nine-tenths of the glass and recognize that we are doing humanitarian assistance, we are doing the right thing, we are improving the capabilities of our military.

We can demagogue it all we want. We can say that we are 7 months behind in appropriating the money for Hurricane Mitch. But the President did not send the request over here for 4 months. So I can demagogue, too. But let us look at the fact that we have aid to farmers, we have aid to Latin America, $700 million, we have aid to Jordan.

The King of Jordan is here this week. I have not heard one of my colleagues jump up and say this is not an emergency. No, because they do not want to demagogue it in that respect. They want to nitpick. They want to go in and say we are taking the money away from Section 8 housing. We are not. But it sounds good, I realize, back home to their constituents.

Say what they want, but when it comes down to the final vote on this bill, vote your conscience, vote for

what is right. Vote for the refugees. Vote for the assistance to Latin America. Vote for the increased assistance to the military. And vote, as well, your conscience that will indeed make this a better world and have the United States of America more respected.

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

Mr. Speaker, I say in response to the gentleman who just spoke that I believe that those supporting this bill are trying to have it both ways on the issue of offsets at the same time.

First of all, they tell the conservative action group on the Republican side of the aisle, do not worry, we have offset a piece of this bill because we are cutting food stamps and cutting Section 8 and that is how we are going to offset the cost. Then when they get an argument from the other end and people say, gee, but if we cut those two programs, we are going to hurt people, they say, oh, but by the way, do not believe it because we are not actually going to cut a dime because this money would not be spent anyway.

Now, that may either say something about the hypocrisy of those who offer the amendment, which I doubt, or it may say something about the hypocrisy of the process. Either way, I think people can be forgiven for being concerned that when they put a cut in the bill, they just might really mean it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). THE GENTLEMAN FROM FLORIDA (MR. YOUNG) has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1141, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act Conference Report. Certainly, every Member should and can vote for this. If they support a clean supplemental, they will vote for this bill.

This is the cleanest supplemental appropriation bill since I came to Congress 17 years ago. Is it perfect? Is it perfectly clean? I think the House bill was quite clean when it left, but it obviously is not completely clean now that it has come back as a conference report, but we did everything we could.

And I give the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Bill YOUNG) superb credit for holding firm in trying to keep this a clean bill. We stripped out virtually all of the pork that was laden in the Senate bill. We did not get it all out, of course, but we tried.

□ 1930

If Members support helping the victims of Hurricane Mitch, they will support this bill. If they support helping the American farmers who are devastated by a disastrous farm economy, then they will vote for this bill. If they believe we have systematically gutted our defense budget, if they believe it is time to increase manpower and rebuild our weapons stockpile to provide for spare parts to avoid cannibalism, then they will vote for this bill. If they support our troops in Kosovo even though they disagree with the President's deployment to Kosovo as I do, they will vote for this bill. Congress cannot abandon our troops just because the President deploys unwisely. If they support providing relief for the refugees in Kosovo, they will vote for this bill.

They have more reason to vote for this bill by far than they have to vote against it. I support it. I hope my colleagues will, also.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H.R. 1141, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act Conference Report for 1999.

As a Conferee who helped craft this important legislation, I want to assure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that H.R. 1141 is a strong bill that every Member can and should support.

Mr. Speaker, there are few Members more committed than I to cutting waste and saving taxpayer dollars. I know how important it was to bring to the House a conference agreement free of excess spending and I am proud of what we have accomplished. Despite much pressure, Chairman Young held firm and helped this Congress produce the best possible legislation to address the needs now facing our nation. The fact is, H.R. 1141 is as clean and as tight as possible largely because Chairman Young would accept nothing less. I am pleased to support this legislation and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for its approval.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1141 provides necessary funding for our most pressing emergencies. American soldiers, America's farmers, storm victims, and Balkan refugees all will immediately benefit from passage of this legislation. Most importantly, H.R. 1141 supports America's troops, and regardless of whether you agree with the policies of this Administration, we can't afford to neglect the needs of those who must carry them out.

Like many of my colleagues, I have made no secret of my opposition to this President's use of American military force in the Balkans. I continue to believe that Operation Allied Force lacks well-defined goals and a clear strategy to accomplish them. However, my differences with this President do not erase the fact that our troops in the field are dangerously low on both munitions and spare parts; or that we are currently unable to fully staff many of our naval vessels due to personnel shortages. Mr. Speaker, Congress cannot abandon our troops just because the President deploys them unwisely.

The truth is, American service personnel are stretched farther around the world today than at any other time in history. Successive deployments in both the Middle East and the Baltics have revealed a true national emergency that must be addressed as soon as possible. We cannot continue to put American soldiers in harm's way without the tools and training necessary to bring them home safely.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support our troops, our farmers and those devastated by recent storms by approving this critical legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that this supplemental is for a good cause but the offsets are very bad, particularly the ones that are in housing. I do not think too many people have thought of the fact that you are just exacerbating the current waiting list which we have for vouchers. It takes families years and years to get this assistance. By your offsetting, using the money from vouchers and from housing, it is going to cause a terrible problem for the people I represent and the poor people of this country.

I want Members to think about that even though we all know that it is a good cause. Think of the fact that it is going to have that kind of effect in the year 2000. There is going to be a shortfall in the year 2000. There is already a shortfall because there are about 5 million families that are already underserved by HUD section 8. So in dealing with reality, no matter how you place this, it is going to have a devastating effect on the poor people in this country who are already affected by housing. We need to think of that. We are going in the wrong direction by doing this. It will reverse the down payment Congress made last year on addressing the needs. We are just backtracking for the good things that we did last year.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is pretty plain to most Americans that what is happening here is like what has been happening all year long. That side of the aisle is opposed to anything that this side of the aisle proposes. Look what they are opposing here. In this bill, there is aid for not only the military personnel of America in the Kosovo region, there is also aid to help protect our American diplomats working under extremely dangerous conditions all through the Kosovo region, all seven embassies in that region. This bill contains $70.5 million to help protect Americans working in our embassies and consulates in that region, including in Tirana, where we need a brand new embassy to try to house the Americans working there.

Regarding the census. In this bill, we lift the fence off the funding for the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Federal judiciary and all their other agencies covered by the Commerce-State-Justice bill. Otherwise, those agencies will simply shut

down on June 15. In this bill we simply lift the fence, let the moneys be spent, keep the Justice Department operating, keep the courts operating, keep the Commerce Department operating, keep the Federal courts, including the Supreme Court and all the Federal courts across the country, in operation.

Also the Immigration and Naturalization Service says unless they get an additional $80 million, they are going to have to release onto your streets the criminal illegal aliens now being held by the INS. They are out of money. Those criminals will be released on our streets and our roads and highways throughout this country. If Members want that to happen, vote ''no'' on this bill, because we put $80 million in this bill for the INS to continue to keep in jail the criminal aliens who would otherwise roam the streets of this country.

And so I urge Members to support this bill. You can find any reason to oppose it. You can find every reason to be for it.

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

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I support our troops, our service men and women who serve this country. I support the people in Central America who were devastated by Hurricane Mitch. I support the American farmers who have made it possible for us to eat and to export and to feed the world. I also support FEMA and Oklahomans and all those who have been devastated by the recent tragedy. But I also support the millions and millions of Americans who need housing, who need the assistance from our community development block grant program, who need transit opportunities so they can get to their doctors, to buy their food and the like, people who need housing. This is a wonderful supplemental, but it leaves out too much of my district. I cannot support it. It is unfortunate that we have a $15 billion supplemental, $13 billion of which is not offset, and $2 billion which is offset. Too much pain for those in America who need it. Vote no.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the Subcommittee on Defense.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last week I took to the well and said that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I were friends and a reporter asked me off the floor, ''Are you and the gentleman from Wisconsin really friends?'' I said, ''Yes. We just disagree on some issues.'' But I would like to enlighten my friend on national security spending. I know he is aware of it. We may just disagree.

Mr. Speaker, we have a national security budget. When we had an extension of Somalia, many of us opposed to it said that those that want to go into Somalia, you have to be ready to pay for it. The same thing with Haiti. We were opposed. We did not think there was any national security issue of going into Haiti. We got kicked out of Somalia. In Haiti we are still spending $20 million a year building roads and schools in Haiti, much money we would like to spend on section 8 housing and the rest of it. But if you take a look at Bosnia, Bosnia has cost us $16 billion. That does not even account for next year. Four times hitting Iraq. Now we have got Kosovo. And the Sudan. The President just agreed to a settlement of some $45 million to give the Sudanese because we bombed an aspirin plant. All of this money comes out of the national security account. We have emergency supplementals but it only covers about one in four dollars that we expend. Our national security, to give Members an idea, the Navy fighter weapons school had 12 of 23 airplanes down, 137 parts missing. Eight of those were for engines. The Air Force 414th was very similar. We are in a hollow force right now. The money that we want to expend for national security in this bill, I am very proud of what we did, like the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) said that what we passed in the House. I am not so proud of what is in this bill. But I look at the glass like the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) said, I think it is nine-tenths full. But we do need the national security dollars and there is a reason.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring attention to one provision in this conference report regarding education.

Chapter Five of the Conference Report contains an appropriation of $56.377 million for the Department of Education, providing a sort of ''hold-harmless'' to certain schools in the Title I Concentration Grants program. I want to state my objection to this legislative rider which was in neither the House nor the Senate bills. I understand that my own Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman, JOHN PORTER, shares my opposition to this type of legislation which prevents Congress for targeting scarce funds to those with greatest need.

I oppose this provision for three reasons.

First, the appropriation is unjustified. Since 1994, local school districts have known that in the current fiscal year, FY 1999, the Title I Concentration Grants would be distributed to local school districts whose eligibility would be determined using census update estimates of school-age population and poverty. The provision was clearly written in the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994. In defense of the 1,400-some schools scheduled to lose Title I Concentration Grants eligibility except for this rider, the Department of Education has been tardy in assembling this important data. Some schools are asserting that they were caught off-guard, or by surprise. But the Department's lateness does not justify such funding or the rider itself; in fact, schools have had notice of this change for five years.

Second ''hold-harmless'' legislative riders on appropriations bills have unintended consequences. They hurt other states and districts. They affect states unequally and unfairly. In this case, this particular hold-harmless counters Congress' clearly stated principle in the Title I authorization that the dollars should generally follow the children. Given scarce resources, money should be targeted to areas of greatest need. By contrast, this rider provides additional funding to schools that are otherwise not eligible for the Title I Concentration Grant money. That is wrong. The fact that ''100 percent special hold-harmless'' legislative riders have been attached to omnibus and other appropriations conference reports in the past—riders that disadvantage children who are immigrants, minorities or poor based on their state of residence—does not make this rider right.

And third, this is a midnight legislative rider. It was not in the House or Senate bills. It was not the subject of hearings. It was not raised in House debate on the supplemental appropriations bill. It was not raised in the hearings of the House Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee for the FY2000 budget, and as a Member of that Subcommittee I assure Members that plenty of opportunity for this was available. It was not raised in the authorizing committee, to my knowledge, where this type of issue truly belongs. I am assured, however, that this is the one and only time that this particular legislative rider will be sought.

Mr. Speaker, this legislative rider, in the whole scheme of things, is relatively minor. But it sets a precedent that is problematic and unfair to all of those Members who work in good faith to authorize these programs. Members simply need to know that this is the case.

I fully expect that when the FY2000 Labor-HHS-Education bill is written and then sent to conference with the Senate, there will be yet another attempt to apply a ''100 percent special hold-harmless'' to the Title I Basic State Grants program, which I understand is different from this Concentration Grants program issue. This other hold-harmless impacts every growing state, and every state with a growing number of disadvantaged children—often including immigrant and minority children. The House has, in the past, resisted such legislative riders on appropriations bills, and we should continue to do so.

The legislative language of the H. Rept. 106–143 reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For additional amounts to carry out subpart 2 of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, $56,377,000, which shall be allocated, notwithstanding any other provision of law, only to those local educational agencies that received a Concentration Grant under the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 1998, but are not eligible to receive such a grant for fiscal year 1999: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Education shall use the funds appropriated under this paragraph to provide each such local educational agency an amount equal to the Concentration Grant the agency received in fiscal year 1998, ratably reduced, if necessary, to ensure that local educational agencies receiving funds under this supplemental appropriation receive no greater share of their hold-harmless amounts than is received by other local educational agencies: *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall become available on October 1, 1999 and

shall remain available through September 30, 2000, for the academic year 1999–2000: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall not take into account the funds appropriated under this paragraph in determining State allocations under any other program administered by the Secretary in any fiscal year.

And the provision from the report reads as follows:

The conference agreement includes $56,377,000 for Concentration grants under the Title I program as a fiscal year 2000 advance appropriation to become available on October 1, 1999 for academic year 1999–2000.

The conferences understand that the Department of Education has interpreted a 'hold harmless' provision included in the fiscal year 1999 appropriations bill to apply only to school districts that first qualify for Concentration grants on the basis of the percentage or number of poor children within the school district. Only after a school district meets the eligibility criteria would the Department apply the hold harmless and award the Concentration grant. Under the Department's interpretation, over 1500 school districts would lose their Title I Concentration grant in academic year 1999–2000.

The conference agreement includes language that clarifies the fiscal year 1999 appropriations law to direct the Department of Education to hold harmless all school districts that received Title I Concentration grants in fiscal year 1998. The conference agreement further clarifies that the allocations made through applying this hold harmless will not be taken into account in determining allocations under other education programs that use the Title I formula as a basis for funding distribution. Neither the House nor the Senate bills contained these provisions.

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

The gentleman acts as though those of us on this side of the aisle are not for funding national security items. The amendment that I offered for national security purposes was $4 billion above the request by the White House. I know that that is pocket change for some people in this House, but from where I come from, that is still a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time. I rise before my colleagues to express my outrage today at what my colleagues and I are asked to vote on. First of all, the supplemental contains many proposals which I support, aid to the Kosovo refugees, aid to Americans, including our farmers who are victims of disasters, aid to Central American Hurricane Mitch victims and military personnel pay raises. But, Mr. Speaker, this bill is sinister and it is cynical. The offsets in this bill are outrageous. In order to support the good proposals in this bill, we would be forced to create an emergency here at home. Cutting over $1.2 billion in the food stamp program forces many Americans to go hungry. $350 billion in section 8 housing programs forces huge numbers into shelters and onto already crowded streets. $230 million from community development block grant programs which our neighborhoods need badly would be cut. This bill is terribly sinister to force these massive cuts onto our own citizens in a budget which will fund a military operation in Yugoslavia. It is cynical. It forces us to choose between humanitarian and disaster assistance for those here and abroad. I ask for a ''no'' vote.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT).

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Let me focus the House's attention on a figure, $148 billion. The Joint Chiefs of Staff came before the Senate at the end of last September and said, we are $148 billion short of what we need over the next 6 years to maintain minimal standards of readiness in the armed services. Nobody disputes that figure. The Secretary of Defense agrees with it. He has testified that we either need more troops or fewer missions. Mr. Speaker, we have soldiers on food stamps. This bill is a modest down payment on doing our duty under the Constitution and the laws to the men and women who protect our families and our security.

I have heard many arguments against the bill. They change. It funds Kosovo. It does not fund Kosovo. It has offsets. It does not have offsets. It is an emergency. It is not an emergency. And now it changes the rules regarding a gold mine in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, let me put this in perspective. I was talking the other day with the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), who serves on the Committee on Armed Services with me. Her neighbor is the wife of a Navy flier. Her neighbor stopped the gentlewoman from Florida in the grocery store and said, ''My husband has to land his F–18 on an aircraft carrier at night on a pitching deck and he is not getting the training hours he needs because the budget has been cut. He might crash. What are you going to do to help my husband?''

Mr. Speaker, the men and women in America's armed services count on us to protect them as they protect our families and our children and our Nation's security. This bill is the first time in 6 years that we are stepping up to our duty. Let us get rid of the politics, let us get rid of the excuses. The Committee on Appropriations held tough and stood fast in the conference committee. Let us vote for this bill and begin the road back to protecting America's security.

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

I would simply say if our friends on the majority side of the aisle were so concerned about readiness, why is it that out of the $27 billion that they have added to the President's defense budget the last 4 years that only $3.5 billion of that went to readiness and the rest went for pork?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time. I am reminded of a song that I think my colleagues on the other side are singing. I remember in earlier times when they would be very critical of the appropriations process, of the excesses that were sent in, of the long time it took. I think they have now decided to sing a song, anything we can do, they can do worse. We are told that we should fall to the hostage theory: ''This has some good things in it; therefore, you should ignore the bad things.'' The gentleman from Alabama said that the glass was nine-tenths full. One of my friends on the Committee on Appropriations said, ''No. The trouble with this glass is that it's overflowing.'' We are told that if we are for aid to the hurricane victims, if we are for the troops, we have to vote for it and never mind all the bad stuff. I have heard that before. I thought it was one of the things they were going to change.

So this notion that because there are some good things in a bill that has fewer bad things than it used to have, we have to vote for it makes no sense. As for people who tell me we are in a real rush to do these things, I think I remember voting for some of these things several weeks ago. I was not holding it up. Yes, I would vote for a clean bill very soon. But what is even worse is the offsets. The gentleman from Wisconsin correctly pointed out, the offsets either are very powerful reductions in spending when they are trying to sell the bill to the conservatives, or they are nothing when they talk about their real impact. Well, unfortunately they are not nothing. I wish they were. Yes, it is true, and I thank the gentleman from New York and the appropriations subcommittee and others, we will be protecting the people who now live in housing with section 8s. But any Member of this House who has told a constituent, ''Gee, I'm sorry you don't get a section 8, I'm going to try and get you one,'' anyone here who has looked at an elderly constituent and said, ''Gee, ma'am, I really feel for you, I'm going to do what I can,'' who then votes for this cancellation of $350 million of section 8 vouchers that could otherwise go to new people is guilty of the worst kind of inaccuracy.

□ 1945

My colleagues can vote to cancel $350 million of Section 8 if they want to, but they should not then go back to their districts and lament and weep for those who are not adequately housed because actions do have consequences. Yes, it will keep existing people in housing, but all of my colleagues who have talked to people on the waiting lists, who have talked to others and said, ''Gee, I would love to help you,'' it is like the old reverse Houdini.

Mr. Speaker, Houdini used to get tied up in knots, and his trick was to get

himself out of the knots. This bill ties ourselves in knots, and then we tell people we cannot help them because we are all tied up in knots.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we really have a good opportunity here in a few moments jointly on a bipartisan basis, and that is to pass a motion to recommit which will take a scalpel out and remove some of the warts from this bill, and I speak of one wart or three in the anti-environmental riders; my colleagues may have others.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) and I will not be allowed to offer our motion to recommit, and that is just fine. We have no pride of authorship here. But we do have outrage, and I have outrage as a new Member of this Chamber, to say that we are going to allow this type of chicanery to go on in this House, Mr. Speaker.

As my colleagues know, for folks to argue on these environmental riders that they are really not environmental, they think Americans sort of fell out of the back of the rutabaga truck. Do we think that our pilots in the F–18s want to come home and have us reduce their environmental protections? I do not think that is what we are asking us to do. Do we want the sailors on those ships, are they sending us E-mail asking us to reduce environmental protection? I do not think they want that. If my colleagues believe that environmental riders are wrong, they should vote for this motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, there are problems in the supplemental appropriation bill. As a member of the Committee on International Relations, I have been actively involved in working to secure funding for earthquake relief in Columbia and military and humanitarian aid for Operation Allied Force. I represent one of the largest Columbian-American constituencies in the United States, and I adjoin an area in the Bronx which has the largest concentration of Albanian-Americans in the U.S. I spoke in favor of this resolution when it first came to the House floor. Unfortunately though this bill has changed considerably when it went to the conference with the Senate. The Senate had added anti-environmental riders along with a host of individual projects which have no business in this bill. I support the funding for hurricane relief in Central America and earthquake relief in Columbia, I support the 6 billion in funding for our military involvement in Yugoslavia and humanitarian relief for the front line countries effected by the flow of refugees escaping Kosovo, and I support the $100 million to Jordan to help implement the Wye Peace Agreement. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I will not be able to support this legislation because of the anti-environment and what it does to the poor of this country.

Mr. Speaker, there are problems in this supplemental appropriations bill.

As a member of the International Relations Committee, I have been actively involved in working to secure funding for earthquake relief in Colombia and military and humanitarian aid for Operation Allied Force. I represent one of the largest Colombian-American communities in the United States, and I adjoin an area in the Bronx which has the largest concentration of Albanian-Americans in the United States.

I spoke in favor of this resolution when it first came to the House Floor. Unfortunately though, this bill has changed considerably when it went to Conference with the Senate.

The Senate has added anti-environmental riders along with a host of individual projects, which have no business in a bill, designated ''emergency spending''

I support the funding for Hurricane Relief in Central America and earthquake relief for Colombia. I support the $6 billion in funding for our military involvement in Yugoslavia and humanitarian relief for the front line countries affected by the flow of refugees escaping Kosovo. And I support the $100 million to Jordan to help implement the Wye Peace agreement. And I support our United States Military who deserve a pay raise for the hard work they do to protect our freedom at home and abroad.

These are a few of the good things, now let's talk about the bad things: $9.2 million for car washes in Germany and bachelor quarter housing in Southwest Area, three anti-environmental riders which provide sweetheart deals to mining companies and cheat American taxpayers, $1.2 billion cuts from Food Stamps, $350 million cuts from Section-8 housing and a variety of spending that was not even included in the Pentagon's 5-year budget plan.

Mr. Speaker, because of these offsets and the budget busting spending, I will have to vote to oppose this supplemental bill and encourage my colleagues to defeat this bill, go back to conference and produce a better bill that will gain the support of all of our members.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in opposition to the emergency supplemental appropriation conference report.

This bill is loaded with non-emergency spending that undermines the budget appropriation process but satisfies the special interests. While I strongly support the emergency funding for our military in Kosovo and for a pay raise for our troops and for disaster relief efforts, I strongly object to the unnecessary spending disguised as emergency spending for such things as 3.8 million for the House Page Dormitory, establishing a pilot program within the Library of Congress to bring up 3,000 emerging Russian political leaders to the United States, 475 million in unrequested funds for overseas military construction, 3 million for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedoms.

While these in and of themselves are not bad, they are not emergencies.

What is equally troubling is that the vital programs that poor and elderly people rely on have been cut dramatically to pay for this bill, 1.2 billion in food stamp programs, 350 million in Section 8 and 22 million for the labor and health.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to do what Americans expect us to do: Vote no.

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

Mr. Speaker, I simply take this time to notify the House I will be offering a straight motion to recommit.

If my colleagues believe that we should not be unnecessarily abusing the environment, if they believe that we should not be unnecessarily hurting our ability to help people who desperately need health care, if they believe that we should not abuse the emergency designation in the budget process, then I would invite them to vote yes for the motion to recommit.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to compliment the Chair for having kept and maintained order throughout this debate. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the members of the minority party for the responsible way in which they have conducted themselves in this debate and certainly my colleagues on the Republican side for having stood strong for the legislation that we were able to put together over a lengthy process of conference, and I would also like to thank, Mr. Speaker, the staff of the Committee on Appropriations, the majority staff and the minority staff, and I can tell my colleagues they worked. The Members thought they worked long, hard hours, and the staff worked longer and harder hours because when we made the decisions, staff had to put them on paper and get them ready to present to the House. I want to thank the Committee on Rules for being willing to wait for us late Thursday night and being willing to come in yesterday when there was no business in the House in order to actually meet and grant a rule for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the President of the United States because he supports this bill, and I would also like to thank the President of the United States for not only supporting the offsets that have become somewhat controversial here this evening, but having recommended the one major offset that has received so much attention, and that is the food stamp offset. America's economy is good. The demand for food stamps has been reduced. There is a substantial amount of funds for fiscal year 1999 in the food stamp program that will not be spent, and so we have agreement with the administration to use that as the basis for our offsets, and I would point out that the

nonemergency sections of this bill are offset.

Now many have stood here and said they would vote against the bill, but they refer the farmers, they refer the soldiers and the sailors. Do not vote against them. If colleagues are for them, do not vote against them. A no vote on this conference report is going to be a vote against America's farmers who need help and who need it today, and this bill addresses that aggressively. A no vote will be a vote against the victims of disasters not only here at home in the United States, but at our friends and neighbors in Central America. A no vote will be sending a message to Milosevic that we are not really serious about bringing him to heal. He does not need to get that message, he has got enough problems already. A no vote will be against those soldiers and sailors and airmen and marines and coastguardsmen who are involved in this conflagration, or war, or call it what you will in the Balkans, and, yes, the Coast Guard is involved. When America goes to war, the Coast Guard goes to war, and there are two Coast Guard ships tonight steaming toward the Balkans to join other Coast Guard vessels that are already there dealing with the Bosnian issues. And a no vote would be against reinvesting some of our resources to start to rebuild our national defense capabilities that have been stretched so thin that, if one of the other MRCs in the Korea region or Iraqi region were to happen tonight or tomorrow, we would be in trouble.

So, if colleagues are for all of these things, they cannot vote against the bill.

So I would hope that everyone will seriously explore their conscience and understand that the things they disagree with are minor compared to the good things that this bill provides. America needs this bill. Our soldiers, and sailors, and airmen, and marines and coastguardmen need this bill.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reluctantly support this legislation, because I am in favor of its original goal of providing assistance to three important and deserving groups: our troops abroad and at home, our farmers who have endured brutal economic conditions, and hurricane victims in Central America and the Caribbean. Ultimately, I believe these true emergencies still deserve our support, and I will not vote against them. I will vote for the motion to recommit, because I know we can do better.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is an example of Washington at its worst, of a spending mentality that still pervades, and highlights budget rules that must be amended. We have again seen the conference process lead to excess, with the result being a bill that has become the vehicle for too many pet projects. While many environmental riders were removed, three still remain: an extension of moratoriums on new oil and gas royalties regulations and new mining regulations, and a green light for operations to commence at the ''Crown Jewel'' mine in Washington state. The President requested a $6 billion dollar bill, and we will send him a $15 billion dollar bill that the majority readily admits is being used to dodge the budget caps for fiscal year 2000. In addition, this measure contains funding for numerous items that can with little credibility be defined as emergencies, that will sadly enough be paid for with Social Security surpluses. We must take Social Security off-budget and reform the procedures for emergency spending.

Mr. Speaker, as disappointing as they are, these facts do not change the fact that our farmers are hurting, and that they have waited too long to get the relief this bill contains. There are people in the Midwest that are trying to repair their lives after devastating natural disasters, and I believe the federal government should do all it can to assist them. This country currently has young men and women engaged in military actions overseas, and we owe it to them to provide the necessary resources to keep them as safe as possible. At the same time, our troops have for too long lived on substandard wages and we must honor the commitment they made to this country with their service. While I have little good to say about the process that has brought us to this point, these are worthy efforts, and I will support them.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. The House should move quickly to approve the urgently needed funding to continue NATO's military operations against Slobodan Milosevic's forces in Kosovo. In addition, the conference report contains emergency funds to assist the Kosovar refugees who are the innocent victims of Milosevic's aggression. Finally, this legislation includes long overdue disaster relief for the Central American countries that were devastated last year by Hurricanes Mitch and Georges.

Although I will vote for the bill, I want to state for the record that I strongly oppose the spending offsets contained in the conference report. It is my understanding that we have offset only about ten percent of this bill and of that ten percent, the lion's share will be financed on the backs of our nation's working poor.

I am particularly concerned abut the $1.25 billion rescission in funding for the food stamp program. We have seen disturbing statistics in my state of Michigan and across the country that the food stamp case loads have been dropping at an alarming rate. Indeed, census data shows that food stamp case loads are dropping far faster than the rate of poverty.

Studies show that one of the key reasons for the decline in the food stamp caseloads and the resulting unspent programmatic dollars is that states have done a poor job in letting people leaving the welfare rolls know that they are still eligible for food stamps, even though their wages leave their families in need and eligible for Food Stamps. A recently published Florida study showed that 58 percent of people leaving the TANF rolls did not know that they were eligible for food stamps.

We are all acutely aware of the actual withholding of food stamps from eligible individuals in New York City. As those who are eligible for food stamps are kept from accessing the program, we are seeing a marked increase in the use of soup kitchens and food pantries. In Milwaukee, a full 50 percent of those people who are using these facilities for food are children. This is a disgrace.

We have also been withholding food stamp eligibility for hard working legal immigrants. I have proposed legislation, ''The Fairness for Legal Immigrants Act'' to rectify this unfair treatment. These unspent dollars could be going to correct this injustice, rather than offsetting a bill that does not require offsets and is only 10 percent offset, anyway.

Rather than revoking funds that should be spent on providing food to America's working poor, we should be focusing on making certain that all children and families who are eligible and require food assistance have access to what they are entitled to.

I also object to several of the legislative riders attached to this bill. Included among the many non-germane elements to the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, the provision related to the state-tobacco settlement is one of the most perplexing. There is bipartisan support for letting the dollars won in these lawsuits to remain with the states, but what is disturbing is the exclusion of any guidelines on how states can spend these monies in the provision included in this bill. Logically, the tobacco money should be used to fund states' health care programs and related tobacco-prevention programs. This money should not be used to build highways or post offices.

Despite the inclusion of such unwelcome legislative riders, I urge my colleagues to approve the conference report. Failure to act on this bill would have a severe and negative impact on our nation's efforts to stop Slobodan Milosevic's aggression in the Balkans and bring relief to Kosovar refugees.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Census Subcommittee, I am glad to see that this measure provides for the continuation of the Census beyond the June 15 deadline; I support our nation's efforts towards NATO's peacekeeping goals; and I support relief for those victims in Central America and the Caribbean. However, I cannot tell my constituents back home that I turned my back on some of our nation's most vulnerable, some of my district's most vulnerable. The poor who need food stamps or section-8 assistance.

Mr. Speaker, when I grew up, I was taught that patience is a virtue, do unto others as you would have them do unto you and that a nation can only be as great as its weakest and most vulnerable because their voices often are not heard in the great decision and influence-making centers of our society. The attack on the nation's poor is alarming. These constituents don't have the money to hire a slick lobbyist to cut a deal for them in order to secure their interests. Public housing residents are easy targets. Oftentimes they are poor,

uneducated, un-employed, unskilled, un-organized, un-registered, under-fed, undernourished and physically segregated.

Mr. Speaker, the 7th Congressional District of Illinois has more public housing residents than any other Congressional District in the nation, second to only one district in New York. Two-thirds of all public housing residents in Chicago, reside in the 7th Congressional District. If the people in public housing were a separate city in Illinois, it would be Illinois' second largest city. When the Section 8 list opened in July of 1997, the Chicago Housing Authority Corporation (CHAC) received over 150,000 applicants; only 25,000 applicants were allowed to be placed on the list via lottery; of that 25,000 on the lottery list—only approximately 3,000 have received Section 8 certificates, to date.

What we don't know is how many women, children and families in the absence of Section 8 will have no other alternative.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of fairness and justice; in the name of commitment to all Americans—rich or poor, black or white; and in the name of one nation—rather than 2—rather than a nation divided between the haves and the have-nots; I cannot support this attack on some of our nation's most poverty-stricken citizens. I cannot support this cut in section 8 housing and good stamps. Therefore, I cannot support this emergency supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1141, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report. This bill contains a myriad of provisions of the worst sort—riders slipped in without ever being considered by the full House.

One rider stands out among the rest as being particularly ill-conceived and short-sighted: the provision to completely give up the federal share of the tobacco settlement without any commitment by the states to improve public health.

Ten years from now, people will look back on this legislation and ask how Congress could give away nearly $140 billion federal health care dollars without guaranteeing that even a single penny would be spent on public health. They will ask how Congress could overturn thirty years of Medicaid law—without a single hearing so that members could understand the ramifications of the legislation and without any action by the full House so that Members could debate and vote on the issue.

This provision has no business being on an emergency supplemental appropriations bill that provides disaster aid for Central America and funds for military operation and refugee relief in Kosovo.

It is not an emergency appropriation issue in any sense. What it is, however, is one of the biggest giveaways of federal health care dollars I have seen in my entire congressional career.

The size of this giveaway is breathtaking. Nearly $140 billion federal health care dollars are being given to the states to spend as they please. That is enough to pay for the existing out-of-pocket prescription drug costs for every single Medicare beneficiary who currently lacks prescription drug coverage. Yet these federal health care dollars are being relinquished with absolutely no commitment that the states spend the money on improving prevent youth smoking, improving public health, or increasing access to health care.

Mr. Speaker, when history looks back on this legislation, it will be seen as a deal that served the tobacco interest, not the public health interest. I strongly believe that it is the height of irresponsibility for the Congress to give away billions of federal health care dollars for nothing. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 1141.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I voted for both supplemental appropriation bills.

I voted for the bill to assist Hurricane Mitch victims because this House made a good faith effort to offset the spending costs.

I voted for the defense spending package because there is a war in Kosovo and we need to pay for it.

But this Conference Report reflects the old, tired ways I thought we had put to an end when the Republican majority was elected in 1994.

Mr. Speaker, last week, 381 Members voted for the Upton Motion to Instruct Conferees to pass a clean emergency spending resolution.

When I spoke on the floor during debate, I said that if we are sent a conference report that does not abide by what we were saying there, that we vote against it and defeat it.

Today, the consistent vote for those 381 Members is for the Motion to Recommit this Conference Report because it clearly does not abide by what we said.

In fact, it includes three egregious anti-environmental riders. None of which was included in the House-passed legislation, and one of which was not in either the House or the Senate bill.

The most harmful rider allows the Crown Jewel mine in Washington State to proceed with a mining proposal despite the rejection for a permit by the Department of the Interior.

This rider would allow the Crown Jewel mine to blast off the top of Buckhorn mountain to extract only a pickup truck worth of gold.

Another one prevents the Bureau of Land Management from issuing its final hardrock mining regulations until well in 2000.

Thus tacitly sidelining environmental protections for more than a year, giving companies carte blanche mining privileges on public land.

And the last one also delays environmental protection regulations designed to close the loophole allowing big oil companies to continuing evading their responsibilities in paying off their share of off-shore oil drilling.

Oil companies have been undervaluing oil royalties for years, and this rider bars the Mineral Management Service from promulgating regulations prohibiting this practice.

I urge the rank and file members of this House to stand up and oppose this conference report.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, over the past three weeks the House debated the current situation in Kosovo. Our discussion began with a debate on Congress' role in the foreign policy decision making process and concluded with funding proposals for the ongoing military operations in Kosovo.

During the first week of debate, I opposed three resolutions that I believe sent the wrong message to our troops, allies, and enemies. The message was that the United States was not committed to ending the tragedy in Kosovo. Last week I voted in favor of the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. I did so to show my continued support of our troops and because I believe it is important to provide them with the tools they need to complete their mission.

However, I am disappointed that within that emergency supplemental appropriations bill there were substantial increases in defense spending, above what the President requested and outside of the normal process by which those items would be funded.

This appropriations bill nearly doubled the amount the Department of Defense and the President requested for the Kosovo operation. Included in the bill were many programs and projects that are not, in my view, emergencies. I do not question the validity of these projects or programs, in fact I would likely support some of them. However I am opposed to highjacking the process by which the House normally considers such expenditures.

We have many issues to address including social security, medicare, home health, educating our children, making our communities more livable, preserving our national resources, and the list goes on. Whatever your particular view on these issues they should be debated and prioritized through the normal budget process. Using emergency appropriations bills to fund programs normally considered through the regular authorization/appropriations process means there will be fewer resources to address the issues of great national importance. In addition, the critical nature of future emergencies is diminished.

The full House should have the opportunity to debate what our national priorities are and at what level to fund them. Corrupting the normal budget process by using emergency spending bills does not provide the House with the opportunity to sufficiently consider and prioritize many worthy programs.

Again, I am voting in favor of the Kosovo supplemental appropriations bill because I believe it is absolutely necessary to provide our troops with the tools and support they need to complete their mission. I do not, however, support abusing this bill and the legislative process.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, the post World War II, culturally diverse Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was comprised of a number of different ethnic groups living together under the rule of Josip Broz Tito. The death of Tito and the ensuing breakdown of the communist world led to the partitioning of the Yugoslav federation into semi-autonomous states. The partitioning of the federation led to increased instability and animosity between the different ethnic groups.

In 1987, Slobodan Milosevic came to power as Yugoslav president. The different provinces of Yugoslavia had been treated as equal entities, but in 1989 Milosevic abolished the semi-autonomous status of Kosovo, which is comprised of 90% ethnic Albanians. Although Albanians are the overwhelming majority, the Serbs consider Kosovo to be an historic landmark where their ancestors attempted to fend off the assault of the Ottoman Empire, and these conflicting interests have led to great controversy and fighting.

In 1991, Slovenia, Croatia, and Bosnia declared independence from Yugoslavia. Although Milosevic had sought to protect the Serb influence in those countries, the Serb populations were so small in Slovenia and Croatia that it was not feasible to fight for political control. Milosevic was, however, a major instigator of the all-out war for control of Bosnia, where there was a very large Serbian population. A peace agreement to end the Bosnian war was signed by the warring parties in late 1995.

The conflict over Kosovo has continued to heighten. When Milosevic revoked its autonomy, many Kosovars said they would settle for nothing less than complete independence, and since 1995, the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) and Serb policemen have been fighting for political control. Milosevic's desire to maintain the integrity of the Yugoslavian territory and the historical value of Kosovo, coupled with the Kosovar Albanians' drive for independence has evolved into today's conflict.

Aggression has continued to escalate, and after failed attempts at a diplomatic resolution, NATO air strikes began on March 24, 1999. The air strikes, however, have neither prevented nor hindered Milosevic's violent reign. Indications are, in fact, that violence has accelerated since the air strikes began.

While humanitarian issues are of grave concern, the effectiveness of the NATO air strikes remains questionable. Having recently traveled to Tirana, Albania, and Skopje, Macedonia, I have witnessed first-hand the humanitarian crisis facing Europe. I have also participated in extensive briefings on the crisis by Supreme Allied Commander—Europe (SACEUR) General Wesley Clark. There is no question that the situation on the Balkan Peninsula is grim. The question that remains is what the United States and its European partners in NATO should do to end the violence and help rebuild the lives of hundreds of thousands of Kosovar Ablanians that have been driven from their homes.

Slobodan Milosevic is a shrewd and experienced military commander who has used military power to expel the Kosovar Albanian rebels (the Kosovar Liberation Army or KLA) from Kosovo and to put extensive defenses in place in Kosovo, significantly enhancing his military position on the ground. President Clinton and the other 18 NATO leaders have, on the other hand, allowed political considerations to govern military decisions in the air campaign. In spite of the campaign, ethnic cleansing has accelerated and the FRY military has now fortified its southern defenses, presenting a greater threat to a potential invasion force today than was present when NATO bombing began.

Because NATO air strikes have little chance of accomplishing their stated goals, and because the human and economic costs of launching a ground campaign far outstrip the potential benefits of such an action, I believe that the NATO air campaigns must stop immediately. It is time for NATO to seek a negotiated settlement that will allow the Kosovar Albanians to begin to rebuild their lives.

I have represented the views of many of my constituents throughout this crisis and have exercised my conscience and judgment in doing everything possible to end the Balkan conflict. I voted against sending ground troops to the area. I voted against continuation of air strikes, I voted to withdraw our troops, and I voted to prohibit the President from sending ground troops without the express authorization of Congress. However, despite the clear messages of opposition form the U.S. House of Representatives, the war continues. Now only two people can stop it: President Clinton or Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic. Congress has no means of direct recourse against Milosevic, so we are left to deal with the other leader, our Commander in Chief, who has chosen to continue the engagement.

I believe the President's actions are dangerous to this country. He has placed our men and women in harms way, yet continues to oppose providing the resources to support them. He has yet to recognize the ramifications of his drastic downsizing of our military. But his deployment in the Balkans has exposed the critical nature of the situation. The armed forces' ability to prevail in two major theaters of conflict in a reasonable amount of time and with minimum casualties has long been the acceptable level of defense. The President has created a third combat theater of contingency operations which the military is not prepared to handle.

It has been reported:

—The U.S. Army conducted 10 operational events from 1960–1991, 31 years. Since 1991, the Army has conducted 26 operational events. At the same time, the President has drastically reduced our military capabilities.

—Since 1987, active duty military personnel have been reduced by more than 800,000. In 1992, there were 18 Army divisions. Today there are 10. In 1992, there were 24 fighter wings. Today there are 13. In 1992, there were 546 Navy ships. Today there are less than 330.

—On recent inspection of one base, Lemoore Naval Air Station, in California, it was found that 43% of the Hornet strike fighters were ''not flyable'' due to a lack of parts. The squadrons had 61% fewer jet engines than needed to keep all their aircraft flying.

—In order to carry out operations in Kosovo, the President ordered a temporary suspension of enforcement in the Iraqi Northern no fly zone; removed a carrier battle group from the Western Pacific; called 33,102 reservists; and committed nearly 7 of the American military's 20 combat air wings.

—If there were another military flare-up somewhere else in the world, the U.S. would not have the military resources to respond.

Over the past many months, I have joined other Members of the House and Senate in exercising my Constitutional duty to prevent Presidential actions detrimental to our country. This extended to voting to impeach. However, all efforts to curtail these actions have failed. I can assure you, however, I will not fail in my Constitutional duty to protect the security and freedom of this nation, and most importantly, to protect those who defend it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report for several reasons. First and foremost, it is a runaway train of unauthorized spending that circumvents the regular appropriations process. There is additional spending in this bill I would support under the normal appropriations process such as the military pay raise. But there are many more proposals I would not support and I will not be railroaded into voting for them as part of a catchall spending bill.

While I oppose our current intervention in Kosovo and I firmly believe we should stop the bombing right now and work towards peace, I understand and support the necessity of paying for our past commitments. But I do not support a blank check for unlimited defense spending, I do not support adding billions of dollars of pork barrel projects, and I certainly do not support trying to use this must-pass bill as a sneak attack on our environment.

Yes, let's help the refugees and provide the limited funding originally requested by the President for the Kosovo crisis. Let's also provide the other emergency funding needed to pay for agriculture disasters and for the damage caused by Hurricane Mitch. And that's all we should be paying for.

The fact that the majority is trying to use this bill to circumvent mining laws and line the pockets of oil companies is a perfect example of how this bill has gotten out of control. I for one will not stand for this assault on our environment. I call on the majority to take this bill back to the drawing board and remove these anti-environmental provisions as well as the extra billions of dollars in unrelated spending that they put in it. No to pork barrel projects, no to unlimited defense spending, and no to environmental riders.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this supplemental appropriations agreement.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report, and in support of the motion to recommit offered by Congressman DEUTSCH and Congressman INSLEE.

This bill contains anti-environmental riders inserted in dark of the night.

Mr. Speaker, I have only served in this House for four months, but I can tell you already that this is NOT how we should go about passing substantive legislation.

The people of Oregon, three thousand miles away from this House today—have entrusted me with the responsibility to represent them—and to keep a watchful eye out for this kind of reckless activity.

Mr. Speaker, none of these provisions—which are so damaging to our natural environment—passed either the House OR the Senate.

We have a system of public scrutiny and accountability in America—this bill attempts to sneak by those mechanisms.

This attempt to sneak anti-environmental stealth riders under the noses of the American people is unacceptable. The three anti-environmental riders that have been included in conference, have not had to face public scrutiny.

One of the stealth riders inserted behind closed doors will effect my constituents who live along the Columbia River in Oregon.

By reversing the Interior Solicitor's opinion to limit the size and number of waste sites associated with hardrock mining, river and groundwater sources will be jeopardized by acid mine drainage and heavy metals, such as arsenic.

Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility to the American people to call this legislation for what it is—back-room—stealth destruction of our natural environment.

I urge my colleagues to support the Deutsch-Inslee motion to recommit.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report because it is fiscally irresponsible. While I supported the supplemental bill that passed the House last week because it provided funding for our troops, I nevertheless hoped the Conferees would keep the emergency funding for emergency reasons only. I was hopeful that in matters of war and peace, life and death, this House would play it straight and work in a bipartisan fashion to support true emergency items. This bill, however, has become a back-door loophole to increase spending for non-emergency items.

While I support legitimate emergency funding items—aid to disaster victims in Central America and tornado ravaged communities in the central United States, relief for struggling family farmers, and resources to support our troops in Kosovo—this body has unfortunately resorted to old-styled pork barrel politics. Members should not load up this emergency bill with their own pet projects.

This bill contains over $5 billion in excess funding, anti-environmental riders and cuts to important programs to offset a portion of the excess spending. The so-called ''emergency'' items in this Conference report include $1.3 million for a world trade conference in Seattle, over $3 million to refurbish the dorm for House pages, and a $700,000 increase for House leadership office budgets. These items may be necessary, and can be debated in the normal authorization and appropriations process, but they certainly are not emergency projects.

It is fiscally irresponsible to fund non-emergency budget items using the Social Security surplus in an attempt to circumvent the budget caps. And it is just plain wrong to take advantage of our troops in the field and victims of real disasters to spend taxpayer dollars recklessly and carelessly. We should defeat this report and instead pass a true emergency funding bill.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1141, the Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report, which includes provisions to protect state tobacco settlement recoveries from seizure by the federal government. As Chairman of the Health and Environment Subcommittee, I have worked on a bipartisan basis to protect the settlement funds obtained by Florida and other states in their lawsuits against the tobacco industry.

The language of the conference report is similar to H.R. 351, legislation I introduced in the House earlier this year. This proposal enjoys the bipartisan support of over 130 cosponsors. It has also been endorsed by the National Governors Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the National Association of Attorneys General.

The conference report provisions were originally adopted as an amendment in the other body, and they were retained by the conferees in the bill before us. These provisions prohibit the Department of Health and Human Services from treating funds recovered by the states from tobacco companies as an overpayment under the Medicaid program.

As approved by the other body and incorporated in the conference report, this language does not restrict the use of state funds. The choice before us, then, is simple. Members can either support this measure and prevent a raid on state treasuries—or, they can oppose the bill and let the federal government seize over half of their states' hard-earned recoveries.

As background, the Health Care Financing Administration first asserted a claim to states' settlement recoveries in a letter to state Medicaid directors in late 1997. The agency based its assertion on provisions of the federal Medicaid statute which allow recoupment of ''overpayments.''

In a subsequent hearing before my Health and Environment Subcommittee, the Administration agreed to withhold attempts to recover state settlement funds until Congress had an opportunity to address the subject in federal legislation. At that time, only three states—Florida, Mississippi and Texas—had secured tobacco settlement agreements.

Last year, 46 states and the District of Columbia negotiated a multi-state agreement under which the industry will pay $206 billion over the next 25 years. Previous settlements by the states of Florida, Texas, Mississippi and Minnesota will total $40 billion over the same period.

These funds are now in serious jeopardy, however, because the Department of Health and Human Services has renewed its plans to seize a large portion of the states' recoveries. The President's Fiscal Year 2000 budget proposes to withhold almost $5 billion per year from federal Medicaid payments to states beginning in Fiscal Year 2001. This amount represents about half of what the states would receive under the multi-state settlement.

This proposal to raid states' settlement funds is a thinly-veiled attempt at highway robbery. A number of states did not even assert Medicaid claims in their tobacco lawsuits. Other states' Medicaid claims were dismissed by the courts, and some states did not sue at all. In addition, states' lawsuits raised a variety of claims, including consumer protection, racketeering, antitrust, and civil penalties for violations of state laws.

Ironically, the dispute regarding the status of these funds—and resulting budgetary uncertainty—has prevented states from moving forward with new initiatives to reduce teen tobacco use and improve public health. Many state legislatures are currently in session, and budget negotiations are reaching conclusion. Congressional action is needed to ensure that state legislatures can appropriate settlement funds with confidence.

We should also recognize that state officials are just as accountable to the voters as federal representatives. States don't need to be told to fund public health programs—they are already doing it.

In my own State of Florida, all settlement proceeds are dedicated to funding important public health initiatives, including an innovative advertising campaign targeted at reducing tobacco use by minors. Federal seizure of a portion of these funds would essentially ''defund'' these critical programs.

In addition, the Florida Legislature recently approved funding for the Lawton Chiles Endowment Fund proposed by Governor Jeb Bush. The endowment sets aside $1.7 billion of the state's tobacco recoveries to provide a perpetual source of funding for children's health programs, child welfare, community-based health and human services, and research.

Other states are also directing significant resources to smoking cessation efforts. Many states have invested years in program design, modification, and evaluation to determine the best ways to prevent young people from using tobacco.

However, states have not yet received any funds under the multi-state settlement. With no much money in question, not only is it unwise for states to obligate these funds, some states are constitutionally unable to appropriate them.

For this reason, states are establishing trust funds, endowments, and foundations as mechanisms for receiving the settlement funds, many of which will be targeted to tobacco prevention and other health-related programs. Over a dozen states have already committed to creating a dedicated trust fund or devoting considerable settlement revenues to smoking cessation programs.

In Maryland, for example, a fund was recently established to receive the state's share of the multi-state settlement. By law, the funds must be spent through the annual budget process, and the Governor must include either $100 million or 90 percent of the funds estimated to be available, whichever is less, in the proposed state budget.

North Carolina, one of the largest tobacco-producing states, recently enacted a proposal that dedicates 25 percent of its settlement recoveries to benefit public health.

The State of Utah, which has one of the lowest rates of tobacco usage in the nation, has spent millions of dollars to implement aggressive initiatives. A restricted account has been established for the use of tobacco settlement funds, with high priority given to funding tobacco prevention and cessation programs, particularly among teens.

California also devotes considerable resources to programs to discourage smoking. In 1988, California took the lead in promoting tobacco-related health education by passing Proposition 99. Through the initiative, California spends nearly $370 million per year on health and tobacco-related education and research programs.

Proposals to require states to dedicate a portion of their tobacco settlement funds to anti-smoking programs ignore the fact that states are already investing in tobacco control and other public health initiatives.

Clearly, states have been leaders in the tobacco debate. Their landmark lawsuits against the tobacco industry were solely state efforts. States assumed the financial risk of legal action to pursue these claims, and their taxpayers are entitled to the reward.

In fact, the federal government was invited to participate in these lawsuits, but it declined. In a letter to then-Florida Governor Chiles dated June 6, 1995, Attorney General Janet Reno stated: ''At my request, the Department's Civil Division has been monitoring the tobacco litigation. Thus far we have not been persuaded that participation would be advisable. We will continue to actively monitor these cases, however, and will reconsider this decision should circumstances persuade us otherwise.''

The Department did not reconsider, and states were forced to bear all of the expense and risk of litigation. It is important to note that these were unprecedented lawsuits against a well-financed industry—with a highly uncertain likelihood of success.

States assumed the financial risk of lawsuits to recover tobacco-related health care costs, and their taxpayers are entitled to the reward. The federal government should not be allowed to raid state tobacco settlement recoveries.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support passage of H.R. 1141, the Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill. This legislation rushes aid to people in need all over the world and here at home. It also provides badly needed funds to modernize and improve our military readiness and to support NATO so that we can bring the conflict in Kosovo to a speedy and successful conclusion.

And while I routinely oppose legislative riders on appropriations bills, I also support the legislative language included in this bill to address the treatment of the State tobacco settlement funds under Medicaid. This language, identical to the bill introduced by the Chairman of the Health and Environment subcommittee, Mr. Bilirakis, amends the Medicaid statute to clarify that the States will be permitted to keep the tobacco settlement funds for the benefit of their own citizens. He deserves a great deal of credit for his hard work on this issue.

All of us have heard from our governors, our State legislators, and attorneys general about how important this language is to our States and our constituents. They told us about their plans to reduce smoking among the youth, and to improve access to healthcare for children. They have argued that they were the ones who took the risk to recover these funds, and the Federal Government should leave the States alone. These are all excellent arguments, but the most important argument for why we must act now is the reality of the situation.

Some States, like Florida, settled their suits against the tobacco companies before the States entered into the ''master settlement agreement'' and have already received their first payments from the tobacco companies. The other States expect their first installments by the year 2002. The States are trying to make budget decisions while the Administration has reversed course and is indicating that it will seek reimbursement for it's share of the Medicaid costs. The States disagree with the Administration's assessment, and have drawn a line in the sand.

Without legislation, we face many years of protracted litigation between the States and the Federal Government. The first issue that would have to be resolved in any litigation would be whether the Federal Government has any claim to this money at all. While the Administration believes that this is an open and shut case, the States do not agree and would likely take this to the Supreme Court.

And even assuming that the Administration would prevail, the next question would be even more complicated—determining what portion of the settlement award represents reimbursement for Medicaid expenses. In their lawsuits, the States brought many different causes of action, including state antitrust and consumer protection law violations. Courts would have to determine what portion of each State's settlement funds represent Medicaid expenses, and to what portion of the settlement the Federal Government is entitled. This question is even more complicated when considering States like Virginia, which never brought a suit but participate in the settlement, or the numerous other States which did bring suits but had their Medicaid claims tossed out of court.

The end result is that the funds—which everyone agrees should be used in large part to reduce youth smoking and improve public health—will sit in bank accounts doing nothing well into the next century. That is a result that none of us wants.

I have every confidence that other States, if they are allowed to proceed with their plans, will follow the lead of my own State of Virginia. Virginia has already pledged most of these funds to reduce smoking among teens and young adults, to improve access to healthcare for children, and to assist tobacco farmers and workers in their transition to other industries. Many States have similar programs planned or underway, while others are waiting for Congress to resolve the question of who can lay claim to the money.

Mr. Speaker, if Members believe that we need to do more to discourage youth smoking, they need to vote for this bill and support this language. They need to resist efforts to earmark a percentage of these funds to their favorite project. They need to trust the States to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, to support this language, and to oppose efforts to strip out this language.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report before us today. I oppose this $15 million bill because it contains authorizations that do not belong in an emergency bill and it includes spending provisions for non-emergency purposes that should be debated in the normal appropriations process.

The authorizations in this conference report should be contained in authorizing legislation, not in an emergency appropriations bill. These provisions include prohibiting the federal government from both recovering part of the $246 billion tobacco settlement and placing restrictions on how states could use such funds; removing the restriction on FY 1999 funding for the Census Bureau; extending an existing moratorium on revising the way crude oil from federal lands is valued in order to determine federal royalities from the leases; and exempting a proposed mine in Washington State from a recent Interior Department ruling that would have blocked the mine's development.

The conference report also contains $268 million worth of non-emergency spending provisions that—although offset by cuts in other programs—should not be considered as part of an emergency spending measure. Among these are $29 million for the Postal Service's subsidized mail program, $48 million to replace a public broadcasting satellite, $3.8 million to renovate the House Page dormitory here on Capitol Hill, and $1.3 million for the World Trade Organization Ministerial meeting in Seattle. These provisions and their offsets should be debated on their merits in the normal appropriations process, not when we are trying to provide funding for our forces in Yugoslavia and those who have been devastated by natural disasters.

The legislative process through which this bill was crafted reminds me of the back-door deals and spending pile-ons that characterized the pork-laden Omnibus Appropriations bill last fall. At that time, then-Chairman of the Appropriations Committee Bob Livingston said ''We on the Committee on Appropriations are not happy doing our business that way. We are prepared to work with anyone willing to restore the integrity of the process.'' Apparently that integrity has yet to be restored.

Mr. Speaker, how quickly we have forgotten the lessons of last fall. I regret being put in a position of voting against poorly crafted legislation that includes some goals I support. I remind my colleagues that the Administration originally requested $7.3 billion total for Kosovo and natural disasters. Today's legislation has been ballooned to $15 billion. I urge a vote against this bill. Let's support our troops and assist those victims of natural disasters who are truly in a state of emergency, but let's do it the right way.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report for H.R. 1141, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, contains good news for northeastern striped bass and blue fish fishermen. That's because important food sources for these species—herring and mackerel—have been protected by virtue of a provision in this bill.

The provision would prohibit the National Marine Fisheries Service from issuing permits to allow large factory-type trawlers into the herring and mackerel fisheries without the expressed consent of the governing Fishery Management Council under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Why is Congressional intervention in management of these two species needed? Herring and mackerel are two fisheries on the East Coast that have not been fished to the limit—YET, and these fish are a major food source for at least two near shore species, stripers and bluefish, that are favorites of recreational fishermen.

Over the last several years, mackerel world market prices have increased substantially because Eastern European countries can no longer depend on government price supports, which kept prices artificially low for decades. This has created new fishing pressure. Herring populations have recently recovered from severely low numbers. The population collapsed in 1978 after years of over fishing, mostly by foreign factory trawlers. Now, largely because of the exclusion of foreign vessels under the original Magnuson Act and the lack of a major U.S. market for herring, the population appears to be healthy. However, four large factory trawlers are trying to enter the herring and mackerel fisheries. One of these vessels alone is capable of harvesting more herring than the entire existing fishery in the Gulf of Maine. Similarly, the vessel is capable of harvesting one-third of the estimated long-term sustainable catch for mackerel.

During the herring recovery, New England fishermen had to find alternative fisheries to survive. They increasingly turned to cod and haddock at Georges Bank. Sadly, the story is too familiar—the populations of these fish in Georges Bank have since crashed. Now, herring are being targeted again.

The Atlantic herring and mackerel fisheries are facing a new disastrous threat because large fishing vessels are poised to enter these fisheries. High prices and the apparent abundance of these species have attracted the attention of fishermen and businessmen throughout the world, who have responded by investing in large fishing vessels to harvest this American resource for sale overseas. The capacity of each of these vessels exceeds 50 metric tons per year. Coincidentally, the total take in these fisheries, for the entire herring and mackerel fleet is just about 50 metric tons, IN TOTAL.

It is therefore imperative that we establish safeguards to prevent another fishing disaster like those suffered by redfish, shark, striped bass, cod and haddock. I introduced legislation last Congress and again this year to close the herring and mackerel fisheries to new large vessels until a stock assessment could be completed, and until fishery management plans for the two species were in place that specifically allowed for large vessels. In the last Congress, that bill passed the House but was not acted on in the Senate. This year, the measure has been approved by my subcommittee, and it awaits full Resources Committee action.

The moratorium on large fishing vessels is a good idea. This provision allows the councils, with concurrence of the Secretary, to decide when and how it is appropriate to let these large vessels into the fishery. The councils need the time to react to what could be a sudden, unsustainable increase in harvest. This bill gives them the time to develop fishery management plans. Sadly, the NMFS seems content to wait until the stocks crash before taking action to protect these fisheries. As someone who has witnessed the pain and economic suffering experienced by those fishermen in New England, I do not believe that we should fish now and pay later. We must end this cycle of destroying our resources without knowing how much fishing pressure they can endure. This provision will help to conserve our Atlantic herring and mackerel stocks, and preserve the food source for stripers and bluefish.

I urge the adoption of this important measure.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern about the $350 million rescission in Section 8 affordable housing reserves, contained in this supplemental spending bill.

Just two weeks ago, HUD announced an affordable housing mark-up-to-market initiative, designed to preserve our affordable housing stock for lower-income seniors, disabled, and families in expensive rental markets.

This initiative had strong bi-partisan support, with a commitment from Republican leaders to work with HUD to develop long term funding to preserve affordable rental properties and to protect those tenants living in properties we are unable to preserve.

So, just two weeks later, it is disconcerting to see the majority party cutting $350 million from the same Section 8 account that would be used to implement these housing preservation and tenant protection activities.

This rescission is especially disturbing, in light of the draconian domestic discretionary cuts adopted in this year's budget resolution. A $350 million rescission of Section 8 reserves eliminates a source of funds that could be used to soften the blow of such spending cuts, and to fund critical initiatives.

This rescission calls into question the commitment in last year's pubic hosing bill to add 100,000 incremental vouchers in Fiscal year 2000, on top of the 50,000 incrementals funded last fiscal year. For example, the $350 million being rescinded today could fund 60,000 of these 100,000 vouchers.

I hope that appropriators will find the resources to fund our commitment to affordable housing. If not, I fear we will look back at today's action as a major reason we ran out of money in the effort to meet this commitment.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the supplemental moves us closer to providing funds to assist Maine's recovery from the ice storm that devastating the Northeast in January, 1998.

The conferees agreed to transfer $230 million of funds appropriated last year for disaster assistance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Federal Emergency Management Agency. This action leaves at HUD about $83.6 million in FY 1998 and FY 1999 disaster funds.

Distribution of this money has been delayed too long. HUD has already announced how it will allocate the remaining money. The conferees left this funding with HUD so that the allocations would be honored. They directed HUD to ''award the remaining funds in accordance with announcements made heretofore by the Secretary, including allocations made pursuant to the March 10, 1999, notice published in the Federal Register, as expeditiously as possible.''

Announced allocations for the state of Maine include $2,118,000 in March 1999, and an additional $17,088,475 on May 4, 1999, pursuant to the March 10 notice in the Federal Register. I am including for the record a letter I received from the Department dated May 4, which states that these funds can be used to address the largest unmet need in my state—to provide relief to electric ratepayers from the costs of restoring essential services in the wake of the storm.

We appreciate the work of the conferees in the effort. The next step is to ensure that these funds are made available without further delay to be used by the State for the unmet needs remaining from the disaster that hit Maine more than 16 months ago.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT,

Washington, DC, May 4, 1999.

Hon. JOHN P. BALDACCI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BALDACCI: Thank you for your joint letter of April 22, 1999, with Senators Snowe and Collins and Representative Allen, regarding Maine's submission of additional information for Community Development Block Grant supplemental disaster funding. The deadline for submitting such information was April 26, 1999.

I am writing to inform you that the state of Maine would receive an additional $17,088,475 in 1999 HUD Disaster Recovery Initiative funds to address unmet disaster recovery needs resulting from severe ice storms, rain and high winds (FEMA–1198–DR). This is based on your state's submission of additional information, under the March 10, 1999, *Federal Register* notice. This amount is in addition to amounts of $2,185,000 and $2,118,000, in 1998 HUD Disaster Recovery Initiative funds previously allocated, making a total of $21,391,475 for Maine. These funds could be used for utility reimbursement as discussed.

All amounts, except for the initial $2,185,000 allocation are subject to Congressional action which may transfer $313.6 million in Community Development Block Grant supplemental disaster appropriations from HUD. The Department has been asked by Congress not to take further action until final resolution of H.R. 1141, the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.

With these HUD resources, I am committed to participating in the efforts to help communities rebuild from the devastation caused by major disasters.

Sincerely,

CARDELL COOPER,
Assistant Secretary.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBEY. I most certainly am, Mr. Speaker, but certainly not for the reasons the gentleman indicated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the conference report accompanying the bill H.R. 1141 to the Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. OBEY. 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 182, nays 243, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—182

Abercrombie	Cummings	Holden
Ackerman	Danner	Holt
Allen	Davis (FL)	Hooley
Baird	Davis (IL)	Hoyer
Baldacci	DeFazio	Inslee
Baldwin	DeGette	Jackson (IL)
Barrett (WI)	Delahunt	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Becerra	DeLauro	Jefferson
Bentsen	Deutsch	Johnson, E. B.
Berkley	Dicks	Jones (NC)
Berman	Dixon	Jones (OH)
Blagojevich	Doggett	Kanjorski
Blumenauer	Dooley	Kaptur
Bonior	Doyle	Kelly
Boswell	Engel	Kennedy
Boucher	Eshoo	Kildee
Brown (FL)	Evans	Kilpatrick
Brown (OH)	Farr	Kind (WI)
Bryant	Fattah	Kingston
Campbell	Filner	Kleczka
Capps	Ford	Klink
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Cardin	Gejdenson	LaFalce
Carson	Gonzalez	Lampson
Chabot	Goode	Lantos
Clay	Gordon	Larson
Clayton	Green (TX)	Lee
Clement	Gutierrez	Levin
Clyburn	Hall (TX)	Lewis (GA)
Condit	Hastings (FL)	Lipinski
Conyers	Hill (IN)	Lofgren
Costello	Hilliard	Luther
Coyne	Hinchey	Maloney (CT)
Crowley	Hoeffel	

Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Phelps
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
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
Wynn

NAYS—243

Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
King (NY)
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sandlin
Saxton
Schaffer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Gephardt
Lowey
Pelosi
Serrano
Weldon (PA)

□ 2014

Mrs. MYRICK and Messrs. GANSKE, GOSS, BOEHLERT and BISHOP changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. SCARBOROUGH changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 269, nays 158, not voting 7,, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—269

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Chambliss
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
King (NY)
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
Larson
Latham
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Scott
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Udall (NM)
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—158

Aderholt
Archer
Baird
Baldwin
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Bilbray
Blumenauer
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Burr
Campbell
Capuano
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Coble
Coburn
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Crane
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeMint
Doggett
Doolittle
Duncan
Ehlers
Eshoo
Ewing
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Ganske
Gekas
Goode
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Holt
Hooley
Hulshof
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Luther
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Owens
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Portman
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Rivers
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stark
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—7

Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Dunn
Pelosi
Serrano
Weldon (PA)

□ 2032

Mr. HILLEARY and Mr. WEINER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during recent votes on H.R. 1141, the FY 99 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act Conference report, I was unavoidably detained in an extended meeting. As a result, I am not recorded as voting on rollcall 131, 132, and 133. Had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall No. 131, the vote on the rule for the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill, no on rollcall No. 132, the motion to recommit the conference report, and yes on rollcall No. 133, the vote on adoption of the conference report.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING THE CONDITION AND HUMANITARIAN NEEDS OF REFUGEES WITHIN KOSOVO

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 161) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the condition and humanitarian needs of refugees within Kosovo, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the sponsor of this resolution, for an explanation of it.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman from California yielding to me. As a member of the Committee on International Relations, I have appreciated her hard work on these and other issues affecting the globe.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important, bipartisan, and timely measure that supports the humanitarian mission into Kosovo to assess the humanitarian and emergency needs of the more than 600,000 ethnic Albanians trapped within the embattled Yugoslavian province.

While hundreds of thousands of families have fled Kosovo, an equal number remain, fighting disease and starvation while lacking water and medical care. They need hope, and the world needs to know now their true condition so we stand a chance of saving their lives.

According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the last food delivery to the displaced and at-risk Kosovo population occurred 8 weeks ago. Hiding in the hills without food, water, medical care for nearly 2 months, these families and their children are fighting to survive. Every day counts for them.

It is timely because the 13-member U.N. humanitarian delegation, which includes the International Red Cross and U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, is in Belgrade today. It is headed by Sergio Vierira de Mello, the United Nations Undersecretary General for Humanitarian Affairs. It is expected to head to Kosovo in the morning.

They are attempting to provide the first very important independent confirmation of conditions within Kosovo and Montenegro. They will also provide great help to the international community as we prepare for the potentially massive emergency needs of the estimated 600,000 to 800,000 ethnic Albanians remaining in Kosovo.

This measure urges the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to provide this delegation a safe and secure passage, as well as freedom of access to do their job. It also encourages NATO and its member nations to consider reasonable measures to enhance the safety of this international delegation during its brief humanitarian mission.

I would simply say that this measure offers hope to people who need it desperately.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for bringing this matter before our committee and before the entire House.

This measure addresses a critical situation concerning the tens of thousands of displaced persons within Kosovo that have been cut off from the rest of the world by the brutal military offensive of Mr. Milosevic's military forces. The gentleman is very timely in bringing this measure at this time as we try to be of help to those hundreds of thousands of Kosovars still within the borders of Kosovo.

While the world's attention has been fixed upon the hundreds of thousands of Kosovars driven from their homes into the neighboring countries of Macedonia and Albania, we need to be mindful that many other Kosovars, perhaps exceeding the numbers who have become refugees outside of Yugoslavia, are internally displaced in Kosovo.

Since the exit of the international private aid organizations that have been providing assistance to the internally displaced persons, IDPs, as they have become known, in Kosovo, they have had to fend for themselves, and very little has been able to be determined as to their welfare and their situation. From reports of those of their friends and relatives who have arrived outside of Kosovo's border, however, we know that their situation is dire.

It has become critical for the U.N. and the International Committee of the Red Cross to try to gain entry into Kosovo and all of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to assess the humanitarian situation there. This resolution simply calls upon the FRY authorities to permit these organizations entry, which has now occurred over the last weekend, to have complete access, and to take measures to ensure their safety.

This is not a political issue. It is one simply of human decency. While it may be too much to expect such decency from the perpetrators of the outrages that we are witnessing in Kosovo, we do have a moral obligation in our Nation to demand it from them.

Accordingly, I urge the Members of the House to support this measure, to support the Brady measure, a humanitarian measure.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I would say that we can only guess what the conditions are like for the civilians remaining in Kosovo. Many of the civilians who remain in the province have likely left their homes and are camped in fields and on mountainsides to find shelter.

Amid this terror, unconfirmed accounts suggest that the situation inside of Kosovo points to a severe lack of food and medicine. We are hopeful that an international humanitarian mission in Yugoslavia this week can give us a better sense of what conditions are like inside of Kosovo and what the international community can do to meet the needs of the people who remain.

As we continue to see media coverage of the plight of the Albanians who have left Kosovo, this resolution draws our attention to the Kosovar Albanians who we cannot see, and those are those inside of Kosovo. I urge adoption of this resolution.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her support, as well as the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) for permitting this timely bill to come to the floor.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 161

Whereas international humanitarian organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees provide a vital role in assessing and responding to the humanitarian needs of refugees around the world and, most recently, of the hundreds of thousands who have fled Kosovo;

Whereas, according to unconfirmed reports, hundreds of thousands of refugees remain in Kosovo at risk for their lives and requiring immediate food, shelter, and medicine;

Whereas it is the belief of the House of Representatives that the safety and lives of these undetermined legions of refugees within Kosovo are equal to the safety and lives of the many refugees who have fled the region;

Whereas the international community is committed to providing humanitarian assistance to current and future Kosovo refugees, while uncertain of how vast that need may be;

Whereas during an April 19, 1999, interview in Belgrade with Dr. Ron Hatchett of the University of St. Thomas, Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic agreed to and subsequently permitted representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross to meet with and examine the condition of the three captured American prisoners of war;

Whereas in the same interview, President Milosevic agreed to permit representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees into Kosovo to provide aid and assess the humanitarian needs of refugees within Kosovo and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia;

Whereas on May 4, 1999, with the assent of the United Nations Security Council, of which the United States is a member, United Nation's Secretary General Kofi Annan initiated a United Nations interagency assessment mission to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to assess emergency relief and rehabilitation needs within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and to identify the means for providing such critical relief and rehabilitation assistance;

Whereas this humanitarian mission seeks to objectively assess critical needs in the areas of human rights and protection, food, security, nutrition, health, water and sanitation, and condition of the civilian population, and also seeks to accurately determine the number, location, and requirements of the people in Kosovo and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia needing immediate and future humanitarian aid; and

Whereas this humanitarian mission is working diligently to depart for Kosovo and others sectors of Yugoslavia on May 8, 1999, if appropriate security assurances are provided by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that Yugoslavian President Slobodan Milosevic should provide the necessary security assurances to the United Nations interagency mission to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to permit them to safely and accurately provide the international community with an objective, first-hand assessment of the condition of refugees inside of Kosovo and all sectors of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; and

(2) the House of Representatives encourages member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to weigh the value of this humanitarian mission toward ending human suffering in Kosovo, and to consider reasonable measures to enhance the safety of this international delegation during its brief humanitarian mission within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute offered by Mr. BRADY of Texas:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

That—

(1) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that Yugoslavian President Slobodan Milosevic provide the necessary security assurances and freedom of access to the United Nations interagency mission to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia so the international community can be provided with an accurate, objective, first-hand assessment of the condition of the internally displaced persons inside of Kosovo and all sectors of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; and

(2) the House of Representatives encourages member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to weigh the value of this humanitarian mission toward ending human suffering in Kosovo, and to consider reasonable measures to enhance the safety of this international delegation during its brief humanitarian mission within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Mr. BRADY of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the preamble offered by Mr. Brady of Texas:

Strike the premable and insert the following:

Whereas international humanitarian organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees provide a vital role in assessing and responding to the humanitarian needs of refugees around the world and, most recently, of the hundreds of thousands who have fled Kosovo;

Whereas, according to unconfirmed reports, hundreds of thousands of internally displaced persons remain in Kosovo at risk for their lives and requiring immediate food, shelter, and medicine;

Whereas it is the belief of the House of Representatives that the safety and lives of these undetermined legions of internally displaced persons within Kosovo are equal to the safety and lives of the many refugees who have fled the region;

Whereas the international community is committed to providing humanitarian assistance to current and future Kosovo refugees, while uncertain of how vast that need may be;

Whereas during an April 19, 1999, interview in Belgrade with Dr. Ron Hatchett of the University of St. Thomas, Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic agreed to and subsequently permitted representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross to meet with and examine the condition of the three captured American prisoners of war;

Whereas in the same interview, President Milosevic agreed to permit representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees into Kosovo to provide aid and assess the humanitarian needs of internally displaced persons within Kosovo and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia;

Whereas on May 4, 1999, with the assent of the United Nations Security Council, of which the United States is a member, United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan initiated a United Nations interagency assessment mission to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to assess emergency relief and rehabilitation needs within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and to identify the means for providing such critical relief and rehabilitation assistance;

Whereas this humanitarian mission seeks to objectively assess critical needs in the areas of human rights protection, food, security, nutrition, health, water and sanitation, and condition of the civilian population, and also seeks to accurately determine the number, location, and requirements of the people in Kosovo and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia needing immediate and future humanitarian aid;

Whereas on May 14, 1999, the United Nations Security Council adopted Security Council Resolution 1239 by a vote of 13–0, inviting the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and other international humanitarian relief organizations to extend relief assistance to the internally displaced persons in Kosovo, the Republic of Montenegro, and other parts of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; and

Whereas the brief United Nations humanitarian mission that was initiated on May 4, 1999, subsequently departed for Kosovo and other sectors of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on May 15, 1999: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. BRADY of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the preamble be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the preamble offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SUPREME COURT'S UNANIMOUS DECISION IN BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 176) recognizing the historical significance of the Supreme Court's unanimous decision in Brown v. Board of Education, repudiating segregation, and reaffirming the fundamental belief that we are all ''one Nation under God, indivisible,'' and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 176 simply recognizes the historical significance of the Supreme Court unanimous decision in Brown vs. Board of Education repudiating segregation and reaffirming the fundamental belief that we are all one Nation, under God, indivisible.

One such person was Linda Brown. In 1951, this little girl was in the third grade. Although there was an elementary school seven blocks from her house, young Linda was forced to walk over 1 mile to another elementary school. The reason to make a little girl walk through a railroad switchyard on her way to school? She was black, and the school located 7 blocks from her house was for white students only.

□ 2045

Many years ago, George Santayana wrote, ''Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.'' Because I revere the warning contained in these precedent words today, 45 years later, I am introducing a resolution to recognize the historical significance of the Supreme Court's decision in Brown v. Board of Education.

In 1954, the United States Supreme Court in a unanimous decision voted to strike down segregation laws in public schools and upheld the equal protection laws guaranteed to all Americans by the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving my right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) for this opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution with regard to Brown v. Board of Education. In 1954, I was 5 years old, attending the Cleveland public schools. Forty-five years later, I stand here blessed to be able to speak in favor of Brown v. Board of Education.

The desegregation order provided many opportunities for African-American people in this country, even though as we stand today in many cities across this country desegregation and busing orders destroyed many of the neighborhood school systems.

I had a chance to attend Cleveland public schools and was prepared for what I do now, law school and public office.

I celebrate people like Thurgood Marshall, late Justice Thurgood Marshall. I celebrate Dean Charles Houston of the Howard University Law School wherein he taught young African-American lawyers that it was important not to be a parasite on the community but to be a spokesman for justice.

I celebrate Nathaniel Jones, retired Sixth Circuit judge who worked on these cases, and James Hardiman, an attorney who represented young people in the Cleveland Board of Education desegregation.

As we stand here today, it is important to remember history, as the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) had previously said, and we need to stand here and celebrate the importance of equal rights for all.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD).

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed privileged to be here to discuss and to support this resolution. The Supreme Court, when it struck down Plessy v. Ferguson, a decision that was made by a constitutional court in 1896 as being unconstitutional, it was a lethal blow for Jim Crow, for segregation, as well as for discrimination.

But it also was a blow for democracy because it started the snowball that has gathered strength and force as it has continued to roll over the forces, the dark forces of evil, the dark forces of segregation, and the dark forces of discrimination.

Even though we have come a long ways from the decision in Plessy v. Ferguson as announced in the decision of Brown v. The Board of Education, we still have many more miles to go.

Unless all of us realize that in America no one is free until all of us are free, until we all realize that we still have people that do not believe in freedom for everyone, that we still have people gunning down people because of the color of their skin or because of their race, we still have ethnic cleansing in places all over the world just because someone is different.

So this resolution comes at a very important time, not only in the history of America but in the history of this world. So I am indeed happy that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) brought forth this resolution, and I support it, and I support him in what he is doing.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, further reserving my right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by commending the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) for his outstanding work on behalf of this particular resolution but also on the outstanding work that he has performed on behalf of the citizens of this Nation throughout his tenure here in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a ruling in the Brown v. Board of Education case that literally changed the course of American history. They ruled that separate is inherently unequal.

Today, 45 years later, separate is still unequal, and it is our responsibility as this Nation's lawmakers to make sure that we never ever allow laws or policies to exist that will threaten to take us back to those dark days of Americans and American history.

So today, as we commemorate the Brown v. Board of Education decisions, let us as Members of this body recommit ourselves to keeping alive the spirit of the historic ruling.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the maker of this particular resolution for his outstanding work on behalf of this resolution.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, further reserving my right to object, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from the State of Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi and great leader of this House for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I was 15 years of age, I was in high school at Suitland High School, just about 15 minutes from where we stand; that school was a segregated school. The county was segregated. I represent a district where all the schools were segregated at that point in time.

My generation was a generation, or my cohorts, slightly older than the President, slightly older than those in their early 50s now. For them, the Vietnam War was a central compelling fact in their life. For me, it was the civil rights movement of the 1950s. Rosa Parks showed so much courage. Martin Luther King had a dream. He conveyed that dream to all of us.

But I rise not only as a member of that generation but as also somebody from the State of Maryland. The reason a Marylander rises is because Thurgood Marshall is one of Maryland's most honored sons.

Thurgood Marshall, as all of my colleagues know, was a member of the Supreme Court of the United States. There is a statue now between the Capitol and the Governor's mansion of Thurgood Marshall in testimony to, not only his service to the United States as a Justice on the Supreme Court, but also the role, the very central role that he played in Brown v. Board of Education as counsel.

For those seeking justice in America, for those seeking an open door to opportunity, it is ironic that we just read in the papers about Thomas Jefferson's family and who is a part of that family. It is really a metaphor for America, because all of those individuals are members of the family.

Jefferson said in the Declaration of Independence that this Nation was founded on the premise that all men, and indeed he would have added today women, are created equal and that we honored each one of them and that they would do equal justice under law.

Maryland, unfortunately, not unfortunately, he was great in many ways, but a captive of his times perhaps, is home to Roger Brook Taney. His statue stands right outside the Supreme Court. He was the author of, of course, the Dred Scott decision. Two Marylanders, two different conclusions; one in my opinion wrong, one right.

It is appropriate that we honor this historic case. I thank my colleagues for

allowing me to join in in saying that Brown v. Board of Education was nine justices saying that America, as Martin Luther King had said in 1963, needs to live out the realities of that which it claims to be its creed, equal justice under law for all its citizens, in their diversity and in their ability to add so substantively to the quality of this country.

I am pleased on behalf of all of us who loved Thurgood Marshall, who believed that Brown v. Board of Education led us to a new and better day and who recognized that the central premise of Brown v. Board of Education is still at question today.

It is important that we stand and speak out for an America that believes that every one of us is due respect which God endowed in us, not the state, not our fellow citizens, endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) for giving me this opportunity to join him in noting the historic contribution made by Brown v. Board of Education and the courageous and able people who saw it to the Supreme Court through some very difficult times and to whom this country owes us a great debt.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, there are some other individuals who would like to speak on this; however, in the interest of time, let me indicate that they are in full support of the resolution: the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) also.

But what I would like to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is that in submitting this legislation is to remind all of us that we have a moral obligation to purge the diverse evils of racism out of the fabric of harmony, justice, and equality that is our share of the American legacy. We have a responsibility to not only remember the past, but to learn from it.

I also would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE) for allowing me to come and present this resolution at this time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to commemorate the 45th anniversary of Brown versus Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I believe century that is now ending began with a proclamation by W.E.B. Du Bois "The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line." I believe many people would not dispute this.

As I stand before this body in honor of the 45th anniversary of Brown versus Board of Education, I have been constantly reminded of what Mr. Dubois meant. The haunting acts of church burnings, police brutality, and the grave disparities in criminal executions have made it hard to forget.

As a result, some people feel the policies that were put into place to solve the race problem have failed. I believe they have failed not as a result of flawed policies, rather it is the individuals who implement them that are flawed.

For instance, common sense dictates that when one third of young African American males are either in prison, on parole or under correctional supervision, liberty's blind justice has been distributed with one open eye. We must remind ourselves that America will not prosper if a large segment of population sees that they have no stake in it. In 1954, the Supreme Court understood this and corrected the horrid decisions of 1896 when Plessy versus Fergusion was written.

However, in the aftermath of that decision, the progress of America has slowed largely because some individuals feel we no longer need to provide resources and support to help people help themselves. This is nothing new. Frederick Douglass, years ago warned Congress of the potential for what he called the "de facto re-enslavement of African Americans." He, said, "Should the South's antebellum political system remain intact America will indirectly renslave African Americans. Recognizing this injustice, Douglass further urged Congress to pass a civil-rights amendment affirming the equality of blacks and whites in the United States. Douglass recognized then, what as we recognize today that this country must bear the responsibility to actively change the structures that constrain Aftican Americans.

Mr. Speaker I and the other members here today understand, like Douglass, the necessity of government backed decisions to help encourage the will of America to respond positively to the structures that constrain African American. This resolution does just that. I agree Congress must recognize the historical significance of the Supreme Court's unanimous decision in Brown versus Board of Education. This is why I have joined In signing this important resolution and urge all members to do the same.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of this resolution to commemorate the historic decision of Brown versus the Board of Education. This landmark court decision ended years of the separate but unequal education of African American students in the United States. It also played a role in instigating the larger Civil Rights Movement. This decision is a prime example of how one person who sees an injustice can use our legal system to make that situation more tolerable.

Oliver Brown was distressed that his young daughter had to walk across town and over dangerous railroad tracks to attend school when a perfectly adequate school sat just blocks from their home. Rather than accepting the status quo Oliver Brown took matters in his own hands and sued the school system that refused to let his daughter attend the neighborhood school because she was black.

Mr. Brown is an example to all parents and citizens in the United States. When injustices occur it often is our response to accept it and move on. Progress has never occurred using that philosophy. I ask our parents to become involved in their children's education. If you see problems with your schools or problems with the police in your town or neighborhood—speak out against these injustices.

While the laws that created segregation and discrimination have been lifted, these terrible acts still occur. We must make our voices be heard and let the United States government know that we will not tolerate de facto segregation and discrimination anywhere in this nation, not in our schools, not in our government, not in our workplace and not on our highways or in our police stations.

We must take the commemoration of this landmark legal decision which sparked the beginning of the end of legal separate but equal laws and use it to end the segregation and discrimination that still exists in our country today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 176

Whereas in 1951 Linda Brown was a third-grader and an African-American who was forced to endure hardships such as walking a mile through a railroad switchyard to get to her black elementary school, even though a white elementary school was only 7 blocks away;

Whereas the Reverend Oliver Brown, Linda Brown's father, was turned away when he tried to register his daughter at the nearby white school, simply because the little girl was black;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall, special counsel for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and a protégé of Howard University Law Professor Charles Houston, successfully argued that the "separate but equal" doctrine, established by the Supreme Court in its *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* decision in 1896, was unconstitutional;

Whereas Chief Justice Earl Warren read aloud, from the Court's unanimous decision: "We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does. . . . We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment";

Whereas the *Brown* v. *Board of Education* decision struck a pivotal blow against Jim Crow laws, as well as the dark forces of racism and segregation; and

Whereas the interaction of students of all races promotes better understanding and the acceptance of racial differences: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the historical significance of the Supreme Court's unanimous decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*;

(2) heralds this watershed in our shared history as a significant advancement of the most basic American principles of freedom, justice, and equality under the law; and

(3) repudiates racial segregation as antithetical to the noble ideals upon which this great Nation was founded, and reaffirms the fundamental belief that we are all "one Nation under God, indivisible."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 176 and House Resolution 161.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 987

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from H.R. 987 as an original cosponsor.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2100

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

AVIATION BILATERAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a piece of legislation entitled the Aviation Bilateral Accountability Act.

The Aviation Bilateral Accountability Act is a bill that will require congressional review of all U.S. bilateral aviation agreements. International aviation is governed by a series of bilateral civil aviation agreements between nations. This means that if an air carrier from the United States wants to fly into or out of another country, the United States Government must first negotiate with the government of that foreign country to determine the terms under which the carriers from both countries will operate.

U.S. bilateral aviation agreements are executive agreements. They are negotiated and signed by representatives from the Department of State and from the Department of Transportation. In fact, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and Transportation Secretary Rodney Slater recently joined representatives from the People's Republic of China in signing a new U.S.-China civil aviation agreement.

The new agreement will govern aviation policy between the United States and China for the next 3 years. Unfortunately, like all bilateral aviation agreements, Congress did not play any official role in the review or the approval of this new agreement.

As ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Aviation, I strongly believe that Congress deserves to play a role in reviewing and approving bilateral aviation agreements. As Members of Congress, we represent the business person, the leisure traveler, the consumer, and the flying public in general. We should have the right to make sure that bilateral aviation agreements are negotiated to give U.S. consumers the most access to international aviation markets at the best prices possible.

For example, the new U.S.-China civil aviation agreement increases U.S. access to China by doubling the number of scheduled flights and designating one additional U.S. carrier. However, many industry observers believe that U.S. negotiators should not have settled for anything less than access for two additional U.S. carriers through this very large Chinese market.

Therefore, I am introducing the Aviation Bilateral Accountability Act, a bill to require congressional review of all U.S. aviation bilateral agreements. International aviation, which is based on bilateral aviation agreements, has a tremendous impact on the U.S. economy and U.S. citizens. Congress should not be excluded from agreements of such magnitude.

Under the Aviation Bilateral Accountability Act, the executive branch must submit each new and updated bilateral aviation agreement to Congress. Then a Member of Congress must introduce a disapproval resolution within 20 days after receiving the agreement. If a disapproval resolution is not introduced within 20 days, the bilateral agreement is automatically approved and can be implemented.

However, if a disapproval resolution is introduced, Congress then has 90 days to review the bilateral agreement and enact a disapproval resolution if necessary. If a disapproval resolution is not enacted by the end of the 90-day period, the bilateral agreement is then automatically approved and can and will be implemented.

As elected representatives of the people, we owe it to the American consumer to look out for his or her best interest. My legislation will help Members of Congress better represent the flying public by giving Congress a vital role in the review and approval of U.S. bilateral agreements.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank the 13 Members who have joined me as original cosponsors of this important legislation, including the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JOHN DUNCAN, JR.) Chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

I urge all Members of the House to join us in cosponsoring the Aviation Bilateral Accountability Act.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. SOUDER 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.)

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING REVISIONS TO THE 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. H.R. 1141, the conference report to accompany the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act for fiscal year 1999, adjusts the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations to reflect $12,782,000,000 in additional new budget authority and $3,582,000,000 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 by the conference report for H.R. 1141. Overall, the allocation to the Appropriations Committee will increase to $585,555,000,000 in budget authority and $580,059,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999.

I also submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an adjusted fiscal year 2000

allocations to the House Committee on Appropriations to reflect $1,881,000,000 in additional new budget authority and $1,806,000,000 in additional outlays for designated emergency spending. In addition, the outlay effect of the fiscal year 1999 budget authority of H.R. 1141 will result in additional outlays of $5,452,000,000 for fiscal year 2000. The rescission of funds previously appropriated for arrearages will result in $2,000,000 less in outlays for fiscal year 2000. Overall, the allocation to the Appropriations Committee will increase to $538,152,000,000 in budget authority and $578,201,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000.

The House Committee on Appropriations submitted the report for H.R. 1141, the conference report to accompany the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act for fiscal year 1999, which includes $12,757,000,000 in budget authority and $3,580,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 designated defense and non-defense emergency spending. H.R. 1141 includes $1,881,000,000 in budget authority and $7,256,000,000 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.

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

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

HOW LONG MUST BOMBINGS IN YUGOSLAVIA CONTINUE?

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, how long must the bombings in Yugoslavia continue? NATO has been bombing now for over 54 days. For what purpose? Why?

The President, Vice President, and Secretary of State's stated policy was to stop the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo Albanians. They said they must act to forestall a new round of ethnic cleansing by Mr. Milosevic. That was the reason the bombings started. But the policy has failed. The bombings have not worked.

Today there are nearly 800,000 refugees in Macedonia, another 500,000 internally displaced within Kosovo, thousands have been murdered, Macedonia has been destabilized, and our foreign relations with Russia and China are severely strained.

Furthermore, in today's Washington Post it was written that in Latin America, Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and other regions with little direct interest in the conflict, opposition to the bombings is surfacing in statements by elected officials, in newspaper editorials of the opinion polls, and by public protest.

From a policy point, it is difficult to imagine how the situation could be much worse than it is today. Clinton administration spokesmen and women have criticized Milosevic forces for killing innocent civilians, and rightfully so, because Serb forces have killed innocent civilians. However, our bombings have killed and may be killing innocent civilians in Yugoslavia today.

Mr. Milosevic's forces have destroyed much of the infrastructure in Kosovo. That is true. However, our bombings are destroying the infrastructure in Yugoslavia today. So today we have death, refugees, displaced persons, pain and suffering among the Kosovo Albanians, but we also have death, refugees, displaced persons, and pain and suffering among the Serbs of Yugoslavia today.

As Mr. Michael Dobbs wrote in Sunday's Washington Post, this administration's oversimplistic comparison between Kosovo and Bosnia and Mr. Milosevic and Hitler has helped transform what would otherwise have been a Balkan crisis into a global crisis, the ramifications of which are being felt not only in Yugoslavia, not only in Kosovo, but throughout the entire world.

I would say to the President, what does he want? The Yugoslav Government said today it is open to peace proposals by the G–8 foreign ministers for ending the crisis over Kosovo. How many more bombs must be dropped and how many more deaths must be brought before we admit this policy has not worked?

I would say to the President, stop the bombings, give negotiations an opportunity to work. How long must the bombings in Yugoslavia continue?

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, May 16 to 21 is National Transportation Week. During National Transportation Week, I will honor the many accomplishments of the Department of Transportation and our dedicated transportation workers. I will highlight the human factors, the technology, education, and safety accomplishments that make our transportation system one of the best in the world.

Usually when we discuss transportation we comment on the aspects of the industry, such as highways, airplanes, and railroads. But what about the people? The people are the element that make transportation work and have firmly established the United States transportation system as one of the safest and most efficient in the world.

The bus drivers, the airline pilots, ships' captains, locomotive engineers, air traffic controllers, and truck drivers, to name just a few, function in a fast-paced dynamic environment that requires skill and talent to build, operate and maintain.

And so, it is today that we pause to thank those persons who rise every day to carry out the mission of providing all Americans with the freedom of movement, a very basic freedom which is often taken for granted: Transporting children to schools, workers to work, vacationers to various leisure locations all over the country.

Simply stated, we thank our transportation workers for bringing life to life. We know that guaranteeing an efficient transportation system requires the best and brightest in our transportation workforce. While new technologies are expanding career opportunities in the transportation industry, much of the seasoned transportation workforce is retiring.

In 1997, the Department of Transportation launched an innovative program to combat this problem. Spearheaded by Secretary Rodney Slater, the Garrett A. Morgan Technology and Transportation Futures Program is a national education program designed to reach and challenge one million students of all ages to focus on their math, science, and technology skills.

The Department's program was named after Garrett A. Morgan, an African-American entrepreneur who invented the automated gas mask and traffic signal, a device that for more than 75 years remains the primary safety tool for managing automobile traffic. Despite his economically poor background and lack of education, his lifetime of achievement is a model of dedication to public service, public safety, and technology innovation.

The Garrett A. Morgan program builds a foundation for success in the twenty-first century transportation industry. Designing and implementing satellite navigation and positioning devices, intermodal transportation facilities, advanced highway construction, magnetic levitation technology, and ''smart growth'' community planning are but a few of the critical needs for transportation and global engagement in the new millennium.

In unveiling the program, Secretary Slater stated, ''We want to inspire students to choose careers in transportation so that this Nation will have the skilled workforce needed to operate and maintain the world's best transportation system.''

I urge my colleagues to salute the transportation workforce for what they do every day and for the service they will provide in the future.

RETIREMENT SECURITY

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to talk about retirement security.

With Americans living longer and 76 million baby-boomers soon to begin

their retirement years, solving Social Security's fiscal problems has to be and should be a top priority of this Congress. And I think it is. I think it is a top priority of the President, as well. I encourage that, and I hope that we come up with a Social Security solution even this year.

But we also have to realize that Social Security is not going to solve all of our retirement security problems. Social Security was never meant to handle all the retirement needs of Americans and, in fact, for most Americans it does not. Rather, it is just one leg of a three-legged stool that people rely on in their retirement.

As my colleagues can see from this chart here, Social Security, employer provided pensions, and personal savings is the three-legged stool that Americans rely on for their retirement. This is a critical issue for all Americans, by the way, not just those Americans who are in retirement but those approaching those retirement years.

We must move forward with policies that make a real difference in terms of providing overall retirement security for all Americans. It will mean for many Americans the difference between mere subsistence or even poverty in retirement, on the one hand, and real prosperity and a comfortable retirement, on the other hand.

□ 2115

I am going to talk tonight about this leg of the retirement stool called employer-provided pensions. This is 401(k) plans, it is 457 plans, 403(b) plans and other defined contribution plans. It is also the defined benefit plans, profit sharing plans and so on. Pension savings are already, as this chart shows, an important part of Americans' retirement security, but not all is well with our pension program today. Only half of all Americans, for example, even have a pension today.

What really concerns me as we look from 1983 until 1993 where we should have made a lot of progress in this area, we have roughly stayed the same. Only half of Americans today in the workforce have any kind of pension at all. That is anything, a 401(k), a simple plan, a profit sharing plan, anything. To me that is a major problem, one that we should address here in the United States Congress, who want to give Americans more access to a comfortable retirement.

This means, by the way, that about 60 million Americans have no pension, no private retirement savings through their employer. It is even worse than that really because when we look at so many of the jobs that are being created in our economy today, it is in the smaller businesses. This chart shows that among smaller companies, the percentage of companies that offer any kind of a pension is even smaller. These two blocks together would be all companies of 25 or fewer employees. This shows that only 19 percent of them on average offer any kind of a pension plan at all. Those people who work in smaller businesses again where most of our jobs are being created in our economy even have a lower possibility of having any kind of retirement savings through their employer.

This is all happening, incidentally, at a time when savings in our country is at an all-time low. The pension plans around the country would normally be contributing to higher savings but they simply are not as accessible as they should be. This shows the U.S. personal savings over time starting with 1935. Actually today we are at the lowest level at least since the Great Depression. Some economists think we are at our lowest savings rate ever. That is another reason we need to reform our pension laws, because pensions again are a major part of retirement savings but also of our overall savings in this country which is so important. We have a plan to try to change this.

I have come up with this plan with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) who is also with us tonight. What this will do is it will provide for an increase in contribution levels and compensation levels and in benefit limits for all employees. It enables us, in other words, to let people save a lot more for their own retirement. It also takes out a lot of the well meaning but very restrictive rules and regulations that have come in place with our pension policy.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. First let me thank the gentleman from Ohio for taking this time. I know we do not have much time tonight. The point that he makes which is so important that, yes, we need to resolve Social Security, that is very important. But we also need to deal with private retirement in our community. I congratulate the gentleman on the work on the legislation that he introduced. His point is so well taken, that we have to make it easier for small business to provide employer-sponsored retirement plans for their employees. We have to increase the limits, not reduce, in which people can put away for their personal retirement. We must make it easier for portability in today's market where people change jobs to be able to combine their pension plans to make it easier for them. We have got to remove a lot of these complexities that we have put in the law that are preventing employers from even having pension plans to help their employees. I just really wanted to emphasize the point that he was making that we need to act in this Congress on private retirement as well as Social Security.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the gentleman very much.

RETIREMENT SECURITY

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank my colleague from Maryland for yielding. We have been laboring at this for a couple of years now. We have worked with a lot of different groups around the country who are concerned with people being able to have a secure retirement. This includes incidentally for this proposal we are talking about tonight the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, as well as the AFL–CIO. To have that kind of a broad cross-section on any legislation around here is rather unusual. Why are all these groups supporting this proposal? For one very simple reason. They all have people they are representing who want to provide retirement security for workers. This proposal is common sense changes, as the gentleman from Maryland said, to permit, for example, portability where you can be able to take your pension from job to job, responding to the increasingly mobile workforce out there. It also again goes into the pension rules and regulations which have become so burdensome that many small employers simply will not offer a plan at all. It cuts down on those rules and regulations to the point that smaller businesses are now going to be able to get into this business. It also cuts down some of the liability for our smaller businesses. Finally, very important, as the gentleman from Maryland said, it has the ability for people to save more for their own retirement. One that I particularly like that the gentleman from Maryland is very supportive of is the catch-up provision, for people who are over 50 years old coming back into the workforce. This would be a lot of working moms who stayed home to take care of kids and are now coming back into the workforce, we allow them to contribute an additional $5,000 a year to their retirement plan. This will help a lot of people to be able to build up that nest egg that is necessary for retirement.

Mr. CARDIN. Let me just if I might in concluding, it is important for us to act on private retirement for many reasons. One is that yes, we are very pleased with the growth of our economy. We are projecting budget surpluses. We have low rates of inflation, low unemployment rates. We are very pleased by the signs that we see in our economy. But there is one statistic that the gentleman from Ohio pointed out which is not good for our future and, that is, the amount of savings that we have as a Nation. Among the industrial nations, we rank near the bottom on the amount that we save on a per capita basis. The chart that the gentleman used earlier showed that we are actually saving less today than we did 10 years ago. We should be saving more, particularly when we look at how strong our economy is. We need to

adopt here in this body policies that will make it easier for Americans to save for the future, that is good for their security when they retire. It is good for economic growth in this Nation. It makes sense. It is not a partisan issue. It is a bipartisan issue. I urge this body during this session to take up legislation that will make it easier for Americans to save for their future. The Portman-Cardin bill is a major step forward in this direction. We hope that we would consider it this year.

Mr. PORTMAN. I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to talk to the gentleman from Maryland, talk to me. H.R. 1102 is the name of the legislation. We have a number of cosponsors. We are looking for more. If we can come together again on a bipartisan basis to solve this problem and get this legislation passed, it will make the difference in people's lives. It will allow for millions of Americans to have real security in retirement rather than mere subsistence. It is something that we can do this year. Of course we all want to solve Social Security's problems. That may be a little more difficult to do in this environment. But this is one where we should be able to come together to provide for people to be able to save more for their retirement even outside of Social Security, even while we are working on the Social Security problem.

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

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

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS IN ARMENIA

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 Sunday, May 30, the Republic of Armenia will hold parliamentary elections. In these last 2 weeks leading up to election day, the parties and candidates are intensifying their campaigns and are holding rallies, meetings and using free TV air time as well as paid commercials to get their message out to the voters. Both domestic and international observers will closely scrutinize the conduct of the election to ensure that it is free and fair. Armenia's Central Elections Commission has promised equal treatment for all parties and has vowed to penalize anyone who commits illegal or fraudulent acts connected to the election.

Mr. Speaker, we Americans may take for granted the idea of free and fair elections, but in Armenia as a former captive nation under the Soviet Union, the progress of democracy and the establishments of the institutions of a civil society in less than a decade of independence is nothing short of remarkable. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, given the fact that many of Armenia's neighbors are ruled by authoritarian governments, some of which maintain a hostile and aggressive attitude, the determination of the Armenian people to work towards a democratic political system is all the more impressive.

Armenian voters last went to the polls in March of 1998 to elect a President. The winner of that election, President Robert Kocharian, was here in Washington last month as part of the NATO summit. He also came to Capitol Hill to meet with Members of Congress to discuss the prospects for U.S.-Armenia relations and our role in promoting stability and economic development in the Caucasus region. Armenia's central location in the heart of this region at the crossroads of Europe, Russia, the Middle East and Central Asia will make it an increasingly important country for the U.S. strategic considerations in the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, for a country with less than 4 million people living in an area about the size of the State of Maryland, Armenia has an extremely diverse group of political parties representing a wide range of ideologies. More than 800 individual candidates and 21 political parties are vying for 131 seats in the parliament; 75 seats will be contested in single-candidate constituencies, while 56 seats are reserved for a system of proportional representation.

According to a recent report, 11 political parties and blocs have used the free TV air time that has been allotted to them. Media outlets representing diverse ideologies are covering the elections. For the first time, the campaign and election will be covered on the Internet. Paid political advertisements for this election cycle have exceeded the levels of all previous election campaigns. A survey by the Armenian Sociological Association indicated that voter turnout would be as high as 75 percent, although other polls suggest figures could be somewhat lower than that. The polls indicate that at least six parties and blocs would be able to garner the 5 percent threshold of votes needed to be represented in the Parliament. The major issue is expected to be the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to stress that in the first few elections held in the first few years after Armenia became a democracy, there were admittedly some problems. But last year's presidential elections showed the world that Armenia has made significant progress in just a few years despite the legacy of 70 years of Communist dictatorship. After the resignation of Armenia's first President, Levon Ter-Petrosian, in early 1998, the transition was handled in an orderly manner according to the nation's constitution. The presidential election conducted in two rounds was peaceful and well-organized, and the legitimacy of the outcome was accepted by the vast majority of observers inside and outside Armenia.

Later this month, Armenia will once again find itself under heavy international scrutiny because of the elections. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe on April 26 set up a monitoring mission with 15 long-term observers deployed around the country to monitor the election campaign and administrative preparation, and to assess the implementation of the new electoral code.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the Armenian people will demonstrate once again during this election on May 30 their commitment to building a society based on civility, the rule of law and tolerance for each other's opinions. This election I think will go far once again to show the progress of Armenia's democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

MANAGED CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, here it is, the middle of May, and no movement by the House leadership on fixing HMO abuses. Time is passing by quickly this year. Yet the chairmen of the committees of jurisdiction have done virtually nothing to move this forward.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked on this problem along with many others in this House for over 4 years. We have had debates and debates and debates. The issues are laid out. They have been laid out in a debate last year. There is no excuse why we should not move managed care reform to the floor soon. There is a real reason for this. There are people that are being injured by HMO abuses today.

Let me give my colleagues a couple of examples of people who have had problems with their HMOs. A few years ago, a young woman was hiking in the Shenandoah mountains just a little ways west of Washington, D.C. She fell off a 40 foot cliff. She was lucky she did not fall into the rocky pond where she might have drowned. But she fractured her skull, she broke her arm, and she broke her pelvis. She is laying there at the bottom of this 40 foot cliff semicomatose. Fortunately a hiking companion had a cellular phone and they airlifted her into the emergency room. She was treated in the hospital, in the intensive care unit for quite a while, was in the hospital I think for over a month. When she was discharged, she found that her HMO was not going to pay her bill.

Why, Mr. Speaker? The HMO said this young woman, Jackie Lee is her name, did not phone ahead for prior authorization.

Now, think about that. Was she supposed to know that she was going to fall off that 40 foot cliff? Or maybe when she was laying there, semicomatose at the bottom of the cliff with a broken skull, a broken arm, a broken pelvis, she was supposed to rouse herself, maybe with her nonbroken arm pull out of her pocket a cellular phone and dial a 1–800 number to her HMO and say, ''Hey, you know, I just fell off a 40 foot cliff. I need to go to the hospital.''

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, fortunately she was able to get some help from her State insurance commissioner, and she was able to get that HMO's decision reversed, but as my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, a lot of people would not have that basic protection because most of the people in this country receive their insurance through their employer, and when they get their insurance through their employers, their State insurance commissioner does not have any jurisdiction because of a past Federal law.

Now, if my colleagues think the case of Jackie Lee was bad, let me tell my colleagues about another case. This was about a little 6-month-old boy named James Adams.

A couple years ago, about 3:00 in the morning, James' mother, Lamona, was taking care of him. He was pretty sick. He had a temperature of over 104. He was crying, he was moaning. As a mother can tell, her little baby was really sick. So Lamona phones that 1–800 number for her HMO. She explains: ''My little baby is sick and needs to go to the emergency room soon.''

She gets an authorization from this bureaucrat, but the authorizer says, ''I'm only going to allow you to take little Jimmy to the Shriner's Hospital.''

Lamona says, ''Well, where is that?''

This disembodied voice a thousand miles away says, ''Well, I don't know. Find a map.''

Well, Lamona, the Adams family, lived way to the east of Atlanta, Georgia. The hospital that they were authorized to go to was on the other side of Atlanta, 70-some miles away.

It is a stormy night, so Mr. And Mrs. Adams wrap up little Jimmy, get in the car and start their trek. About halfway there, as they are going through Atlanta, Georgia, they pass Baptist Hospital, Piedmont, Emory Hospital, all with world-renowned medical facilities and emergency rooms that could have taken care of little Jimmy Adams. But they do not have an authorization from their insurance company, from their HMO, and they know that if they stop, then they are going to be stuck with the bill which could be thousands of dollars.

So, not being medical professionals, they think, ''Well, we can push on.'' About 23 miles from the Shriner's Hospital little Jimmy has a cardiac arrest in the car. Picture his dad driving along frantically trying to find the hospital, picture his mother trying to save her little baby's life.

Turns out that little Jimmy is a pretty tough guy. They manage to eventually get him to the hospital alive. But because of that delay in treatment, that cardiac arrest, little Jimmy ends up with gangrene of both hands and both feet, and both hands and both feet have to be amputated, all because of the delay caused by that medical decision that that HMO made.

I talked to Jimmy's mother about a month ago, asked her about how little Jimmy was coming along now. As my colleagues know, despite wonderful prostheses that we have now, it is safe to say that Jimmy is not going to be an athlete, and I know that when he grows up and gets married he is not going to be able to caress the check of the woman that he loves with his hand because he has bilateral hook prostheses. He is able to pull on his leg prostheses now with his arms' stumps, but he cannot get on both bilateral arm prostheses without a lot of help from his parents.

Jimmy will live the rest of his life without his hands and his feet, and do you know that in a similar situation, if you receive your insurance through your employer and your HMO has made that type of medical decision that has resulted in the loss of the hands and feet of your little baby, that that HMO by prior Federal law is liable for nothing? Hard to believe?

That is all the result of a law that Congress passed 20-some years ago that gives total immunity for liability to an HMO that makes that type of devastating medical decision that has resulted in loss of hands and feet or maybe even loss of life. The only thing under Federal law that that plan is responsible for is the cost of the treatment that would be rendered, and after all, Jimmy made it to the hospital, so he got his treatment.

Turns out a Federal judge looked at the margin of safety for that HMO, and I will never forget the quote. The judge said the margin of safety for that HMO in this instance was razor thin, quote, unquote; I would say, Mr. Speaker, about as razor thin as the scalpel that had to cut off little Jimmy's hands and feet.

Mr. Speaker, I am far from alone in holding that view that we need real HMO reform. Last week, for example, Paul Elwood gave a speech at Harvard University on health care quality, HMO quality. Now, Mr. Speaker, Paul Elwood is not exactly a household name, but he is considered the father of the HMO movement.

Elwood told a surprised group of people that he did not think health care quality would improve without government imposed protections. Market forces, he told the group, quote, ''will never work to improve quality, nor will voluntary efforts by doctors and health plans.'' Nor will voluntary efforts by doctors and health plans.

Elwood went on to say, and I quote: ''It doesn't make any difference how powerful you are or how much you know, patients get atrocious care.''

Remember, this is the father of the HMO movement. He is saying patients get atrocious care and can do very little about it.

He goes on: ''I have increasingly felt that we've got to shift the power to the patient. I am mad,'' he said, ''in part because I've learned that terrible care can happen to anyone.''

Mr. Speaker, maybe Paul Elwood was thinking about Jackie Lee. Maybe he was thinking about little Jimmy Adams.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the commentary of a mother whose child was injured by her HMO's refusal to give appropriate care. It is not the statement of a doctor who could not get requested treatment for a patient. Mr. Speaker, these words suggesting that consumers need real protections from HMO abuses come from the father of managed care.

Now I am tempted to stop here and just let his words speak for themselves, but I think it is important to share with my colleagues an understanding of the flaws in the health system that led Paul Elwood to reach his conclusion.

Cases involving patients who lose their limbs or even their life are not isolated examples. They are not just mere, quote, anecdotes, unquote. I mean those anecdotes, if they have a finger, and you prick it, they bleed.

Mr. Speaker, on May 4 USA Today ran an excellent editorial on this very subject. It was entitled: ''Patients Face Big Bills as Insurers Deny Emergency Claims.'' After citing a similar case involving a Seattle woman, USA Today made some telling observations. Quote: ''Patients facing emergencies might feel they have to choose between putting their health at risk and paying a huge bill they may not be able to afford.''

That was exactly the situation that Mr. and Mrs. Adams were in as they were driving along the highway with a really sick infant. They were not trained medical professionals. They knew if they stopped, though, at that unauthorized emergency room, they were going to be stuck with the bill.

The editorial goes on to say, quote: ''All patients are put at risk if hospitals facing uncertainty about payment are forced to cut back on medical care,'' and this is hardly an isolated problem. The Medicare Rights Center in New York reported that 10 percent of complaints for Medicare HMOs related to denials for emergency room bills.

The editorial noted that about half the States have enacted a prudent lay person definition for emergency care in the last 10 years, and Congress has passed such protection in Medicare and in Medicaid, but nevertheless the USA Today editorial concludes that the current patchwork of laws would be much strengthened by passage of a national prudent lay person standard that applies to all Americans. And that is why

in my bill, the HMO Reform Act of 1999, and the bill of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the Patient Bill of Rights, we have a provision in there that would have prevented the type of occurrence that we had with little Jimmy Adams, because it says if the average lay person would think that this is truly an emergency, you can take that patient or you can go yourself directly to the emergency room and the HMO has to pay the bill.

The final sentence of that editorial from USA Today reads, quote: ''Patients in distress should not have to worry about getting socked with big health bills by firms looking only at their bottom line.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the full text of this editorial be included in the RECORD at this point:

[From USA Today, May 4, 1999]

PATIENTS FACE BIG BILLS AS INSURERS DENY EMERGENCY CLAIMS

Early last year, a Seattle woman began suffering chest pains and numbness while driving. The pain was so severe that she pulled into a fire station seeking help, only to be whisked to the nearest hospital, where she was promptly admitted.

To most that would seem a prudent course of action. Not to her health plan. It denied payment because she didn't call the plan first to get ''pre-authorized,'' according to an investigation by the Washington state insurance commissioner.

The incident is typical of the innumerable bureaucratic hassles patients confront as HMOs and other managed care companies attempt to control costs. But denial of payment for emergency care presents a particularly dangerous double whammy:

Patients facing emergencies might feel they have to choose between putting their health at risk and paying a huge bill they may not be able to afford.

All patients are put at risk if hospitals, facing uncertainty about payment, are forced to cut back on medical care.

Confronted with similar outrages a few years ago, the industry promised to clean up its act voluntarily, and it does by and large pay up for emergency care more readily than it did a few years ago. In Pennsylvania, for instance, denials dropped to 18.6% last year from 22% in 1996.

That's progress, but not nearly enough. Several state insurance commissioners have been hit with complaints about health plans trying to weasel out of paying for emergency room visits that most people would agree are reasonable—even states that mandate such payments. Examples:

Washington's insurance commissioner sampled claims in early 1998 and concluded in an April report that four top insurers blatantly violated its law requiring plans to pay for ER care. Two-thirds of the denials by the biggest carrier in the state—Regence BlueShield—were illegal, the state charged, as were the majority of three other plans' denials. The plans say those figures are grossly inflated.

The Maryland Insurance Administration is looking into complaints that large portions of denials in that state are illegal. In a case reported to the state, an insurance company denied payment for a 67-year-old woman complaining of chest pain and breathing problems because it was ''not an emergency.''

Florida recently began an extensive audit of the state's 35 HMOs after getting thousands of complaints, almost all involving denials or delays in paying claims, including those for emergency treatments.

A report from the New York-based Medicare Rights Center released last fall found that almost 10% of those who called the center's hotline complained of HMO denials for emergency room bills.

ER doctors in California complain that Medicaid-sponsored health plans routinely fail to pay for ER care, despite state and federal requirements to do so. Other states have received similar reports, and the California state Senate is considering a measure to toughen rules against this practice.

The industry has good reason to keep a close eye on emergency room use. Too many patients use the ER for basic health care when a much cheaper doctor's visit would suffice.

But what's needed to address that is better patient education about when ER visits are justified and better access to primary care for those who've long and had no choice other than the ER, not egregious denials for people with a good reason to seek emergency care.

Since the early 1990s, more than two dozen states have tried to staunch that practice with ''prudent layperson'' rules. The idea is that if a person has reason to think his condition requires immediate medical attention, health plans in the state are required to pay for the emergency care. Those same rules now apply for health plans contracting with Medicare and Medicaid.

A national prudent layperson law covering all health plans would help fill in the gaps left by this patchwork of state and federal rules.

At the very least, however, the industry should live up to its own advertised standards on payments for emergency care. Patients in distress should not have to worry about getting socked with big health bills by firms looking only at their own bottom line.

Mr. Speaker, there are few people in this country who have not personally had a difficult time getting health care from an HMO. Whether we are talking about cases like little Jimmy Adams or Jackie Lee or we are talking about people that we work with or even members of our family, the HMO industry has earned a reputation with the public that is so bad that only tobacco companies are held in lower esteem.

Let me give my colleagues a few statistics. By more than 2 to 1 Americans support more government regulation of HMOs. Last month the Harris poll revealed that only 34 percent of Americans think managed care companies do a good job of serving their customers. That is down significantly from 45 percent of a year ago, but 45 percent is certainly no statistic that I would be proud of if I were the HMO industry.

Even more amazing were the results when Americans were asked whether they trusted a company to do the right thing if they had a serious safety problem. Mr. Speaker, this is an amazing statistic. When Americans were asked whether they trusted HMOs to do the right thing if they had a serious problem, by 2 to 1 Americans would not trust HMOs in such a situation, and that level of confidence is far behind other industries such as hospitals, airlines, banks, even the automobile manufacturers.

In fact, about the only industry that fared worse than HMOs was the tobacco industry, and anyone who still needs proof about what the public thinks about it just needs to go to that movie ''As Good As It Gets.'' Audiences clapped and cheered, when I went and saw that movie with my wife, when Academy Award winner Helen Hunt expressed a strong expletive about the lack of care her asthmatic son was getting from their HMOs. And no doubt the audience's reaction was fueled by dozens of articles and stories very critical of managed care, bolstered by real-life experiences.

In September 1997 the Des Moines Register ran an op-ed piece entitled, quote, The Chilly Bedside Manner of HMOs, unquote, by Robert Reno, a Newsweek writer.

The New York Post, and I see my colleague from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) sitting here waiting, she knows the New York Post ran a series, a week-long series of articles on managed care, and some of the headlines were: ''HMO's Cruel Rules Leave Her Dying for the Doc She Needs.''

Another headline blared out: ''Ex New Yorker Is Told: Get Castrated So We Can Save Dollars.''

Or how about this one: ''What His Parents Didn't Know About HMOs May Have Killed This Baby.''

Or how about the 29-year-old cancer patient whose HMO would not pay for his treatments? Instead, the HMO bureaucrat reviewer told him to hold a fund-raiser. A fund-raiser? Mr. Speaker, I thought we were talking about patient protection legislation, not campaign finance reform.

□ 2145

To counteract this, some health plans have even taken to bashing their own colleagues. Here in Washington one ad declared, ''we do not put unreasonable restrictions on our doctors. We do not tell them that they cannot send you to a specialist.''

In Chicago, Blue Cross ads proclaimed, ''we want to be your health plan, not your doctor.'' In Baltimore, an ad for Preferred Health Network assured customers, ''at your average health plan cost controls are regulated by administrators but at PHN doctors are responsible for controlling costs.''

Mr. Speaker, advertisements like these demonstrate that even the HMOs know that there are more than a few rotten apples in the barrel. In trying to stave off Federal legislation to improve health care quality, many HMOs have insisted that the free market will help cure whatever ails managed care.

Mr. Speaker, I am a firm believer in benefits to a free market, but the health care market is anything but a free market. Free markets are not dominated by third parties paying first dollar coverage. Free markets do not reward customers for giving less service. Is there any other industry in this country that gets paid for doing less? And free markets do not feature limited competition, either geographically or because an employer says here is

your health plan, take it or leave it. Some choice a consumer has in that situation, and that is about the way it is for about 50 percent of the people in this country who get their insurance through their employers.

The Washington Business Group on Health recently released its fourth annual survey report on purchasing value in health care. Here are a few examples of how the market is working to improve quality care. Fifty-one percent of employers believe cost pressures are hurting quality. This is not employees. These are the employers. In evaluating and selecting health plans, 89 percent of employers considered cost. Less than half consider accreditation status and only 39 percent consider consumer satisfaction reports. Employees are given limited information about their plans. Only 23 percent of companies tell employees about appeals and grievance processes. In the last 3 years, the percentage of businesses giving employees consumer satisfaction results has dropped from 37 percent to 15 percent. So much for the quality aspect. Over half of employers offer employees an incentive to select plans with lower costs, but just 15 percent of plans offer financial inducements to their employees to purchase a higher quality plan.

Mr. Speaker, a recent Court of Appeals decision in the case Jones v. Kodak explains just how dangerous the ''free market'' is to patients. Mrs. Jones received health care through her employer Kodak. The plan denied her request for inpatient substance abuse treatment, finding she did not meet their protocols. The family took the case to an external reviewer, who agreed that Mrs. Jones did not meet the criteria for the benefits of the plan, but the reviewer observed, ''the criteria are too rigid and they do not allow for individualization of case management.'' In other words, the criteria were not appropriate.

In denying Mrs. Jones' claims, the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals held that the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA, does not require plans to state the criteria used to determine when a service is medically necessary. On top of that, the Court ruled that unpublished criteria are a matter of plan design and structure, rather than implementation. Therefore, they are not reviewable by the judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, think about this for a minute. The implications of this decision, I think, are breathtaking. Jones v. Kodak provides a road map to health plans to deny any type of care they want. Under Jones v. Kodak, health plans do not need to disclose to potential or even to current enrollees the specific criteria they use to determine whether a patient will get treatment. There is no requirement that a health plan use guidelines that are applicable or appropriate to a particular patient's case.

Most important to the plans, the decision ensures HMOs that if they are following their own criteria then they are shielded from court review.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I so vigorously opposed the bill that passed this House last year because there was a provision in that bill that basically said the health plan can determine any definition of medical necessity that it wants. Because of this law that Congress passed 25 years ago, ERISA, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, the courts are holding that they can do that, they can totally disregard generally accepted prevailing standards of medical care. They can have their own secret protocols.

As a reconstructive surgeon I have taken care of a lot of children with cleft lips and palates. In their own internal plan they can say, well, yes, we will cover cleft lip surgery but we are not going to allow it until the kid is 16 years old.

There would be nothing under current law that could prevent them from doing that. It is totally contrary to generally accepted principles of medical care. If you were the parents, think about this. Here your baby is born with a great big hole in the middle of his face, his lip is separated that far, he has a hole in the roof of his mouth, he can't speak, but according to these court cases on the interpretation of ERISA those health plans can do anything they want to and they do not even need to share the information with the beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 719, the Managed Care Reform Act, and it addresses these problems. It gives patients meaningful protections. It creates a strong and independent review process. It removes the shield of ERISA which health plans have used to prevent State court negligence actions.

It has received a lot of support, Mr. Speaker. It has been endorsed by consumer groups like the Center for Patient Advocacy, the American Cancer Society, the National Association of Children's Hospitals, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society. It has also been supported by many health care provider groups such as the American Academy of Family Physicians whose members are on the frontlines. They are the gatekeepers. They have seen how faceless HMO bureaucrats thousands of miles away, bureaucrats who have never examined a patient, denied needed medical care because it does not fit their plan ''criteria.''

I want to focus on one small aspect of my bill as it relates to liability. It has been a firm principle of this Republican Congress that people should be responsible for their actions. In the individual insurance market, if Blue Cross Blue Shield sells a plan to an individual and Blue Cross Blue Shield makes a medical decision that results in negligence, then they are liable. That is current law. That is the way it is in the States.

According to this law that Congress passed 25 years ago, if that plan is a self-insured plan they skate free. They do not have that responsibility. That is wrong. Congress created that loophole and Congress needs to fix it.

On the other hand, I do not want to see these cases simply end up ex post facto in the courts. It does not do Jimmy Adams any good. He cannot get his hands and his feet back after the fact.

So what do we need? We need to have an internal and an external appeals process so that those disputes are resolved before someone ends up with the injury.

I believe there is a reasonable compromise that should be supported on this issue, and it works like this and it is in my bill: If there is a dispute on a denial of coverage between the patient and his health plan, then go through an internal appeals process. If there is still a dispute, then either the patient or the health plan can take that dispute to an independent peer panel for a binding decision on the health plan.

There is another difference from last year's GOP bill. One could go to that independent review panel but it was not binding on the plan, their decision. So in the end the HMO could end up doing what they want. That should be changed. It should be binding on the plan and there should not be a conflict, any conflict of interest, between that independent review panel. So the benefit to the patient of that is that they get to have a second opinion that is free of any taint of conflict of interest on the part of either the doctor or the health plan.

The benefit to the plan is this, and when I talked about this with the CEO of my own Blue Cross Blue Shield plan in Iowa, he said, Greg, we are implementing the patient bill of rights. It is costing us almost nothing. We will see no premium increases from that. On that issue of liability, if there is a dispute on a denial of care, I could see going to an independent panel for an external review and I could see that panel determining medical necessity, and I could see it being binding on us, but if an independent panel has made that decision and it is binding on us, and we did not make that decision, i.e., the health plan did not make the decision, then we should be free of punitive damages liability. That is what I put into the bill.

So there is a carrot to the patient to get that second opinion but there is also on a dispute an incentive for the health plan to take it to that independent panel.

Let us say that a patient asks for apricot juice in order to treat cancer and the health plan very appropriately says, no scientific evidence for that, but that patient is still unhappy. The plan knows that they have an unhappy camper. In this situation, if my bill were law, the health plan could take that to the independent panel. They would know that they are going to get confirmation to support their decision, but in so doing they would also protect

themselves from any punitive damages liability. If they do not follow that independent panel's decision, then they are liable for punitive damages. I think that is the essence of the compromise that we should have on this bill.

In fact, this was recently written about in the Hartford Courant by an editorialist named John MacDonald, and I would insert his editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

[From the Hartford Courant]

A COMMON-SENSE COMPROMISE ON HEALTH CARE

(By John MacDonald)

U.S. Rep. Greg Ganske is a common-sense lawmaker who believes patients should have more rights in dealing with their health plans. He has credibility because he is a doctor who has seen the runaround patients sometimes experience when they need care. And he's an Iowa Republican, not someone likely to throw in with Congress' liberal left wing.

For all those reasons, Ganske deserves to be heard when he says he has found a way to give patients more rights without exposing health plans to a flood of lawsuits that would drive up costs.

Ganske's proposal is included in a patients' bill of rights he has introduced in the House. Like several other bills awaiting action on Capitol Hill, Ganske's legislation would set up a review panel outside each health plan where patients could appeal if they were denied care. Patients could also take their appeals to court if they did not agree with the review panel.

But Ganske added a key provision designed to appeal to those concerned about an explosion of lawsuits. If a health plan followed the review panel's recommendation, it would be immune from punitive damage awards in disputes over a denial of care. The health plan also could appeal to the review panel if it thought a doctor was insisting on an untested or exotic treatment. Again, health plans that followed the review panel's decision would be shielded from punitive damage awards.

This seems like a reasonable compromise. Patients would have the protection of an independent third-party review and would maintain their right to go to court if that became necessary. Health plans that followed well-established standards of care—and they all insist they do—would be protected from cases such as the one that recently resulted in a $120.5 million verdict against an Aetna plan in California. Ganske, incidentally, calls that award, ''outrageous.''

What is also outrageous is the reaction of the Health Benefits Coalition, a group of business organizations and health insurers that is lobbying against patients' rights in Congress. No sooner had Ganske put out his thoughtful proposal than the coalition issued a press release with the headline: Ganske Managed Care Reform Act—A Kennedy-Dingell Clone?

The headline referred to Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., and Rep. John D. Dingell, D-Mich., authors of a much tougher patients' rights proposal that contains no punitive damage protection for health plans.

The press release said: ''Ganske describes his new bill as an affordable, common sense approach to health care. In fact, it is neither. It increases health care costs at a time when families and businesses are facing the biggest hike in health care costs in seven years.''

There is no support in the press release for the claim of higher costs. What's more, the charge is undercut by a press release from the Business Roundtable, a key coalition member, that reveals that the Congressional Budget Office has not estimated the cost of Ganske's proposal. The budget office is the independent reviewer in disputes over the impact of legislative proposals.

So what's going on? Take a look at the coalition's record. Earlier this year, it is said it was disappointed when Rep. Michael Bilirakis, R-Fla., introduced a modest patients' rights proposal. It said Sen. John H. Chafee, R-R.I., and several co-sponsors had introduced a ''far left'' proposal that contains many extreme measures. John Chafee, leftist? And, of course, it thinks the Kennedy-Dingell bill would be the end of health care as we know it.

The coalition is right to be concerned about costs. But the persistent No-No-No chorus coming from the group indicates it wants to pretend there is no problem when doctor-legislators and others know better.

This week, Ganske received an endorsement for his bill from the 88,000 member American Academy of Family Physicians. ''These are the doctors who have the most contact with managed care,'' Ganske said. ''They know intimately what needs to be done and what should not be done in legislation.''

Coalition members ought to take a second look. Ganske's proposal may be the best deal they see in a long time.

I want to address a couple of issues before finishing. The first is the opponents to this legislation say this is going to be too costly, this legislation would cause premiums to just go up, skyrocket and then people would lose their insurance. That is not true.

Mr. Speaker, my bill will come in at a CBO estimate less than last year's patient bill of rights because I have removed some of the bureaucratic reporting requirements and also because of the punitive damages provision that I have in.

Even last year's patient bill of rights was scored by the Congressional Budget Office, as an estimate, for an increase of premiums of 4 percent over 10 years. That is significantly different from the advertising campaign that we are seeing around the country now where the HMO industry is saying 4 percent per year. Wrong.

Furthermore, Texas passed a bill, a strong patient bill of rights, that included a stronger liability law than in my bill.

The Scott and White Health Plan asked their actuaries how much should we increase our premiums because of that liability provision? The answer, 34 cents per member per month.

I would estimate that my bill will come in at a cost increase of somewhere around $3 per month for a family of four. That is about $36 a year for a family of four.

A survey by the National Federation of Independent Business, members of small businesses, employers, found that more than 95 percent of those employers would continue to cover their employees with health insurance even if the premiums increased by double that amount. We are talking about a small cost in order for people to be secure in knowing that the large amount of money that they are spending on their health care premiums, when they get sick, will actually mean something.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked about liability. We have talked about cost. Finally I want to say one thing about what my bill does not do. Recently I had a large employer from the upper Midwest come into my office and say we have businesses in every State. If your bill passes, then we would not be able to design a uniform medical benefits package for all of our companies' employees.

I was flabbergasted, Mr. Speaker. That is not what my bill does. ERISA will continue. I only change ERISA in terms of when a health plan makes a medical decision, in terms of their liability, but there is nothing in my bill that would say a multistate business would have to follow the State mandates of every State that it was in.

□ 2200

They could continue, let me repeat, they could continue to design a uniform benefits package, and they would continue to be exempted from individual State benefit mandates.

Now, there are some who are looking at this legislation now and they want to add some untested and untried, and, in my opinion, some dangerous ideas to this legislation to try to kill the legislation. Some of these ideas are things like health marts. Health marts are sort of geographic association health plans. They are very similar to what Hillary proposed, Mrs. Clinton proposed in 1993, called HIPCS, Health Insurance Purchasing Coops. That was not an idea that I thought was appropriate at that time, and I do not think it is appropriate now, and I will tell my colleagues why.

Let me read from a letter to Congress from June 1997 by the American Academy of Actuaries. ''While the intent of the bill,'' and they are referring to the Republican bill, ''is to promote association health plans or health marts as a mechanism for improving small employers' access to affordable health care, it may succeed in doing so for employees with certain favorable risk characteristics. Furthermore, this bill contains features which may actually lead to higher insurance costs.''

The Academy went on to explain how those plans could undermine State insurance reforms. Quote: ''The resulting segmentation'' that would result from ideas such as an association health plan or a health mart, ''The resulting segmentation of the small employer group into higher and lower cost groups would be exactly the type of segmentation that many State reforms have been designed to avoid. In this way, exempting them from State mandates would defeat the public policy purposes intended by State legislatures.''

Those concerns have been echoed by the National Governors Association, the National Conference on State Legislatures, the National Association of

Insurance Commissioners. They argue that AHPs, and I might add health marts, quote, ''substitute critical State oversight with inadequate Federal standards to protect consumers and to prevent health plan fraud and abuse,'' unquote.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of patients like Jimmy Adams who lost his hands and feet because an HMO would not let his parents take him to the nearest emergency room, I am going to continue to fight efforts to derail managed care reform by adding those sorts of untested and potentially harmful provisions to a clean managed care reform bill. I pledge to do whatever it takes to ensure that opponents of reform are not allowed to mingle those issues.

Do I think that we could do something on the tax side to help improve access to care? You betcha. We could make available tomorrow 100 percent deductibility for individuals to purchase their own health insurance, and we should. But, Mr. Speaker, adding these other issues into this mix, in my opinion, is a poison pill.

Now, recently I and the gentleman from Oklahoma, (Mr. COBURN) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) have given to the chairman of my committee a draft, a consensus draft on patient protection legislation, and the American Medical Association has written me a letter that contains high praise for that draft. Mr. Speaker, I submit at this time full text of that letter:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, IL, May 12, 1999.

Hon. GREG GANSKE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GANSKE: On behalf of the 300,000 physician and student members of the American Medical Association (AMA), I would like to thank you for your efforts in drafting a compromise patient protection package for the Commerce Committee. The draft proposal, developed by Representatives Tom Coburn, MD (OK) and Charles Norwood, DDS (GA), and you, is a significant milestone in the advancement of real patient protections through the Congress. We look forward to working with you to perfect the draft bill through the committee process and to pass a comprehensive, bipartisan patient protection bill this year.

It is imperative that a patient protection bill be reported out of committee and be considered on the floor prior to the July 4th recess. The AMA stands ready to help further advance these important patient protections through the committee process, the House floor and final passage.

The AMA applauds the inclusion of ''medical necessity'' language that is fair to patients, plans and physicians alike. We are particularly pleased with the non-binding list of medical necessity considerations that you have incorporated into the draft bill.

The AMA is pleased with the incorporation of the ''state flexibility'' provisions that allow patient protections passed by various states to remain in force. Allowing preexisting patient protection laws to remain in force is critical to the success of federal patient protection legislation such as the draft bill.

The draft bill also offers patients a real choice by incorporating a ''point of service'' option provision. The AMA supports this important patient protection because it puts the full power of the free market to work to protect consumers.

We applaud your inclusion of a comprehensive disclosure provision that allows consumers to make educated decisions as they comparison shop for health care coverage. The AMA also notes with great appreciation the many improvements that the draft bill makes over last year's Patient Protection Act.

The draft bill expands consumer protections with a perfected ''emergency services'' provision. By eliminating the cost differential between network and out-of-network emergency rooms, the draft bill offers expanded protection for patients who are at their most vulnerable moments.

We support the strides the draft bill takes in protecting consumers with a comprehensive ban on gag practices. This is an important consumer protection that the AMA has been seeking for more than six years.

We commend the improvements incorporated in the ''appeals process'' provisions of the draft bill. The bill represents a major step toward guaranteeing consumers the right to a truly independent, binding and fair review of health care decisions made by their HMO.

The April 22nd draft copy of the bill makes a strong beginning for the Commerce Committee and the 106th Congress on the issue of patient protection and reaffirms the leadership role that you have assumed in the process. While you have raised some concerns about the process, the AMA stands ready to assist in completion of this legislative task. The AMA wishes to thank you for your efforts and work with you and the minority to pass a comprehensive, bipartisan patient protection bill this year. We look forward to working with you toward this goal.

Respectfully,

E. RATCLIFFE ANDERSON, JR., MD.

Mr. GANSKE. I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the chairmen of these committees of jurisdiction will not substantively change that draft and that they will keep it clean. We need to move this issue in a reasonable time frame. A strong patient protection bill should be debated under a fair rule on the floor soon; not in the fall, but in the next few months. There are an awful lot of people, our constituents out there, who today are being harmed by managed care decisions.

Mr. Speaker, we need to fix this now, and I look forward to working with all of my colleagues to see that real HMO reform is signed into law this Congress.

HEALTH CARE REFORM AND NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY AND POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for the remainder of the Majority Leader's hour of approximately 23 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I first want to comment and compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GANSKE) on his Special Order and on his proposal to deal with some of the problems we have seen relating to HMOs and health care. I do want to comment, before I get into my Special Order on the topic of illegal narcotics, about what the previous speaker has been discussing, and he did bring up towards the end some of the proposals relating to the Patients' Bill of Rights.

I would like to pass on to the Speaker and my colleagues this information: In the previous Congress I had the opportunity, actually for 4 years, to chair the House Subcommittee on Civil Service. In that capacity I oversaw the largest health care plan in the country, which is made up of almost 2 million Federal employees and 2.2 million Federal retirees and some 4 million to 5 million additional dependents; about 9 million people participating in the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program. Part of my responsibilities of chair of that subcommittee was to look at that program, and I remember several years ago when President Clinton proposed a Patients' Bill of Rights to the Congress to be passed to resolve, he said, the issues and problems we have with HMOs, and it was going to be his saving grace for these programs.

Well, we conducted a hearing, and I will never forget that hearing. We had the administration officials in, OPM officials in, and we asked about the President's proposed Patients' Bill of Rights. To a single individual who testified, every single individual who testified said that there was no medical benefit for the proposals under the President's Patients' Bill of Rights, but there was more reporting, more mandates, more requirements, and they possibly predicted more costs. That was several years ago when he proposed that to our subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Civil Service.

Now, he could not pass his so-called Patients' Bill of Rights, and it sounds great, through the Congress. So what he did, and a lot of people did not pay attention to it but we did on the Civil Service Subcommittee, he submitted another one of his fiats. By Executive Order he imposed his Patients' Bill of Rights where he could, and that is on our Federal employees' HMO plans.

Well, lo and behold, before I left that chairmanship, I conducted another hearing just at the end of last fall, and one of the purposes of that hearing was to see what had happened with the imposition of the President's Patients' Bill of Rights on the Federal employees' health care plan. Well, my goodness. We experienced over a 10 percent, on average, increase in premiums, not entirely all due to the President's Patients' Bill of Rights; prescription drugs, I must say, were part of that, but there were very substantial costs that were passed on, and they contributed to almost a record increase in employee health costs. While the rest of the industry was experiencing a 2.6 to 3 percent increase, our Federal employees, Members of Congress too, were getting a 10 percent-plus, on average, increase in their premiums.

One of the things that has made our Federal Employees' Health Benefits Program so good is we have had over 350 different vendors providing a package. We sat and developed a package of

benefits, and then folks bid on it, different companies, and they participated and there was good competition. Lo and behold, at our hearing, again, we got a surprise. Instead of 350 participating, competing plans, we had about 60-plus drop out. So we had increased premiums and we had lower competition.

I just raise that tonight as a good example of a bad proposal by the President as far as his so-called, and it sounds great, Patients' Bill of Rights. That did not even include, his provision by Executive Order did not include the most oppressive part of his plan, which was allowing expansion of lawsuits, an additional cost through litigation and no medical benefits. So if we had adopted the whole plan, there is no telling how high the premiums would have escalated and how many more in free competition would have been forced out.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa for just a moment, and I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that premiums are increasing by HMOs this year. If my colleagues read the articles in the Wall Street Journal, it is not because Congress passed HMO patient protection legislation, because we did not. We did not pass it last year.

The reason why we have seen an increase in premiums is because the HMOs have mismanaged their risks, and their investors are now saying to them, you have to increase your premiums because we want profits from those HMOs. All of the medical and health experts that I know in this country attribute the increase in premiums by HMOs this year to their own management failures, and do not attribute this to patient protection legislation, which has yet to pass.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, again, that has failed to pass the Congress. I cite only, and I repeat for the gentleman, our experience with the Federal Employees' Health Benefit Program where the President imposed his own Patients' Bill of Rights by Executive Order and we did see substantial costs directly related to the program. I point that out because we do not want to make the same mistakes he has made by fiat, by legislation.

Of course, that is not the only problem that we have with HMOs and we do need to address some of the mismanagement, some of the lack of access, some of the other problems that we have with it. Again, I cite it as an experience that we conducted hearings on and have very definite facts relating to in our Subcommittee on Civil Service.

Mr. Speaker, my other reason for coming forward tonight is again to speak on the question of our national drug control strategy and policy. Tonight, I am very concerned that in a pattern of repeated mistakes by this administration and failure to properly manage our international narcotics control efforts, we face another disaster. We have had a series of repeated foreign policy disasters, and if I may just run through them, and again, I do not mean to do this in a partisan manner, but this is factual and we have had a history of just disastrous foreign policy decisions by this administration. I will close tonight by citing the most recent.

First, of course, when I came here, President Bush had instituted a policy in Somalia of trying to provide human relief, humanitarian relief in that country that had civil conflict. It is unfortunate that this administration from the very beginning turned that humanitarian relief into a nation-building effort which turned into a foreign policy disaster with several dozen Americans slaughtered needlessly. And what is really sad, if we look at the situation in Somalia just a few weeks ago, we have had the same conflict and civil war going on, over 50 killed, and a skirmish just recently, and again disorganization and civil war in that area. It may be a lesson we should learn about. They too had atrocities committed on both sides.

The next experience I had in this Congress was with Haiti, and Haiti certainly has to be a glowing example of bad foreign policy. Repeatedly I took to the well of the floor and spoke against the imposition of sanctions against Haiti, which is the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere, and those sanctions in fact destroyed the few jobs, maybe 50,000, 60,000 jobs, many related to United States industry, that actually fed over a million population.

□ 2215

We spent over $3 billion on that fiasco. We have traded one corrupt government for another. There is complete disorganization in that country. What is absolutely startling is that now that country which we have done so much for is becoming one of the major Caribbean routes for trafficking in illegal narcotics. So a failed policy, an expensive lesson, and now just kicking dirt in our face by being a partner in illegal narcotics trafficking.

Bosnia is another example. I served in this Congress over 3 years ago when our president said we would be there for a matter of months and be out. We are now into 3-plus years. This excursion and incursion has cost us dearly, billions upon billions, probably $10 billion plus. We still have over 6,000 troops there, 20,000 support troops.

What is absolutely astounding is that now Bosnia has turned into, probably after South America, the second largest conduit and transit source of illegal narcotics coming up through Afghanistan, some through Pakistan, through Turkey, and then through the Balkans in a wide open fashion.

So here we have spent an incredible amount of money going in, after a quarter of a million people were slaughtered in a civil war, and actually we went in much too late. We kept sides from properly defending themselves. We ended up with a series of graveyards across the Bosnia landscape that should be a reminder to everyone of this administration's failed policies. Not until after those graveyards were planted with the Bosnian souls in Croatia and other areas there did we ever take any action. Now we see, even with the forces that we have there, that the situation relating to illegal narcotics trafficking is disastrous.

Rwanda is another example. Again I took to the floor many times trying to get this administration off center. Almost 1 million human beings were slaughtered in Rwanda. This administration not only had a failed policy, they had a counterproductive policy, a policy that actually, I think, brought on one of the true genocides of our time where almost 1 million people were slaughtered.

This administration blocked in the United Nations a panAfrican, all African force, when we knew there was going to be trouble there. They actually blocked this force from going in and stopping the slaughter in advance of 1 million souls losing their lives most tragically.

Then, of course, we come to Kosovo, the latest in a series of unbelievable missteps in foreign policy. This administration, this Congress, was advised that it was not the time. We were not prepared to go in. The worst time you go into the Balkan regions and into Kosovo would be when we did, when we have overcast February and March skies in that area, and it is clouded in.

When you are doing an air campaign, and a surveillance campaign to make an air campaign successful, we could not have picked a worse time, taking us 4 weeks to get helicopters there, helicopters still not secured, properly trained. They knew we were short, and yet they went in; another disaster.

Tonight, finally, one of the crowning disasters of this administration, I received just a few hours ago a report from my subcommittee staff. I now chair the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform.

I have been involved, since taking that responsibility in January, in trying to get our drug policy together. More heroin and cocaine is coming from South America than any other source in the world by far, just an incredible amount.

The place that we have had as far as protection and surveillance of those activities has been Howard Air Force base in Panama. We have known since Jimmy Carter's administration that this year we would be forced to give up the canal. What we did not know is what assets we would lose in 1999. This administration has been negotiating the change in United States assets, what assets would go to Panamanians, for over 3 years.

When I took over the subcommittee responsibility in January, we started, of course, examining what would happen in Panama, because all of our international South American, Central American, and Caribbean operations were housed and located and took off from Howard Air Force Base.

So we went down there the first couple of months and examined what was going to happen. We were told by this administration that they were negotiating other locations. They did not believe the negotiations were going to succeed. We got advance warning of that, and we tried to do everything we could to encourage the administration, DOD, Department of State, to move forward or cut a deal.

As it turned out, they failed in their negotiations. They failed in developing a treaty. We were kicked out May 1. We have known for some weeks now that negotiations by this administration did fail.

We were told in hearings that we conducted, not only on our visit but on hearings we conducted, and we conducted a House subcommittee hearing on May 4, that things were in place and in order; that we would move at a cost to the taxpayers of $73 million, plus another $45 million that was presented to the committee, to Aruba, Curacao, and to Ecuador.

These were the charts that were presented. The coverage with potential new forward operating locations, one in Ecuador and the other in the Curacao area, this is what we were told would be the coverage. It would give us very good coverage. This was May 4. When they came in, it was supposed to be in place. These were estimates we were given.

These charts are by our SOUTHCOM. They told us that we would have, in the beginning of May 1999 estimate, a 50 percent coverage, and within our agency augments, May 1, 1999, 70 percent coverage May 1. With Curacao, Ecuador, forward operating locations we would go up to 80 percent. Then later on we would go even better if they could get Costa Rica.

Unfortunately, the coverage I have been told as of today is absolutely zero, absolutely zip. Let me read this report very briefly. Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me read what we have learned again this afternoon.

Representatives of SOUTHCOM, our southern command, conceded to me that our worst fears have been realized. After the United States closed down Howard Air Force Base on May 1, since May 1 there have been zero, absolutely zero counterdrug flights out of any one of the other three forward operating locations that were proposed in which the United States was to have memoranda of understanding.

Despite both State Department and DOD indicating in our May 4 hearing that the transition in counterdrug overflights would be smooth and flights would just be modestly scaled back, the specific forward operating location facts are these: In Ecuador there have been, again, zero since May 1; since we got kicked out of Panama, zero counterdrug flights for the entire month of May, including the day of our hearing, May 4. We asked how many took off that day. They could not answer. I could answer today because we have had our investigators check.

In Aruba, while we have two small custom Citation planes on the ground, I am told this afternoon, as well as one P–3 and one P–3 dome which arrived on May 12, there have been zero counterdrug flights by any of these planes out of Aruba from May 12 through May 17.

In Curacao, while there is one F–17 dedicated to counterdrug flights, there have been zero counterdrug flights out of this location.

In short, poor planning by the Department of State, Defense, and the inability to compensate for the loss of Howard Air Force Base, basically being kicked out of Panama, has already cost us dearly coverage, as follows.

First, we have endangered the intelligence-gathering power of our South American allies in this war, and in particular, we basically are closing down our Peru shootdown policy, because we provide them with information that allows them that strategy and that action.

This administration will bear the blame, since they have shown a 45 percent reduction in coca cultivation over the past 2 years based on intelligence-gathering. In other words, Peru is one of our success stories. Through this information that is shared, a shootdown policy and surveillance, they have eliminated 45 percent of the cocaine production. This program basically is out of order because of our inaction and maladministration.

We have also eliminated intelligence monitoring and detection of drug trafficking flights out of South America since May 1. This is an incredible scandal. This is really one of the worst days and one of the worst missteps of this administration, and probably one of the worst events to ever take place in our effort to put back together the war on drugs that we started in the eighties that was dismantled in 1993 by this administration, by the Democrat House, Senate, and White House, which they did an incredible amount of damage from 1993 to 1995, which we have tried to restore in the last 2 years.

All this action sends a go signal to drug traffickers. Every one of our forward operating locations are down and out. This, again, I believe is an incredible scandal. It is with great regret that I announce this to the House tonight, and to the American people.

What makes this even worse is the information I was provided with, again within the last few hours, that our Southern Command could make no prediction about when these assets will come on line with counterdrug flights in the future.

We have to remember that last year over 15,000 flights took off from Panama and conducted all of this counternarcotics activity. There is nothing more cost-effective than stopping drugs at their source, eradicating them at their source, or stopping them and interdicting them as they come from the source. It is much more difficult when they get into our streets, into our communities, and into our schools.

So again, this unfortunately is a disastrous occurrence. I intend to hold the Department of State, the Department of Defense to account. We will conduct hearings and somehow we will restart this effort with the funds that we have restored to put this program back together that have been appropriated. We must have the cooperation of this administration in bringing back these flights and restoring a real war on drugs.

COMPETITION

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about competition. In this Chamber the word ''competition'' is often used in the context of the phrase ''making government run more like a business.'' Together these two words are used repeatedly and loosely because they sound good. But the fact is that no one who uses these phrases really ever knows what it actually means.

''Competition'' and the term ''making government work more like a private industry'' is not only the mantra for some politicians, it also comes from the mouths of representatives of private industry that usually want something.

☐ 2230

For example, earlier this year, the National Commission on the Future of Medicare, on which I sat, failed to recommend a proposal to strengthen the long-term solvency of the Medicare program.

However, some members of the Commission advocated a radical proposal called, quote, premium support, which is really just a euphemism for a voucher program; that is, its proponents say it would bring competition to the Medicare program so that it could run like a business. Many observers from the health care industry agree. They, too, say they want to bring competition to Medicare so that it will run more like a business.

The irony of all this, of course, is that Congress has already passed laws that establish demonstration projects for both traditional Medicare and Medicare plus choice; that is, those plans that have managed care in them that would inject some competition into the Medicare bidding process.

The Health Care Financing Administration, we call it HCFA around here, the agency that runs Medicare dutifully, is attempting to implement

these demonstration projects because it will help Congress understand what competition in Medicare really means. So when it comes time to be serious about Medicare reform, we will know what works and what does not work.

Unfortunately, none of these demonstration projects have been fully implemented due to both legal and political challenges. What is appalling to me is that the same people who say they want to bring the magic word ''competition'' to Medicare are the same people who are desperately trying to kill any attempt to determine what Medicare competition really means.

Last Friday, Laurie McGinley of the Wall Street Journal wrote an article, an excellent article, detailing how the industry working with Federal law matters is seeking to prevent Medicare competition in Phoenix, Arizona. She also notes that similar demonstration projects were stopped by the health care industry in Denver and Baltimore, most likely with help from Members in Congress, before HCFA got close to getting started.

In addition to the attempts by the industry to prevent Medicare competition reported by the Wall Street Journal, just yesterday the Kansas City Business Journal reported that industry representatives in Kansas City also are seeking to derail Medicare competition because they fear it will disrupt the ability of Medicare beneficiaries to receive care.

So why is the health care industry afraid of Medicare competition? The answer: because it will cost them money. For years now, HMOs in most areas have been living off overpayments from the Federal Government. It has been estimated by HCFA that they overpay private health plans by 6 percent a year, an overpayment of roughly $2 billion to $3 billion in subsidies to the HMO industry.

Earlier this year, in fact, the industry successfully lobbied the administration to delay the implementation of risk adjustment. Now, if an HMO takes a patient and they do not cost them very much, they get a benefit because they got a lot of money, but they did not have to pay anything. If they get a sick patient, then they have to put out a lot of money or they just get a little bit and they spend a lot more.

So the industry said we want to have risk adjustment. If we take sick patients, we should get more money. If we take healthier patients, we should get less money. But when the Congress passed the law and said we want to do this and HCFA began to try and implement it, the industry successfully lobbied the administration to delay the implementation of risk adjustment, the variation of reimbursements to reflect the amount of care given that was mandated by the Congress in 1997. They did not want the very thing they asked for.

This delay will cost the taxpayers $5 billion over the next 5 years, and some in Congress want to delay risk adjustment altogether, a giveaway to the health care industry of over $11 billion.

So the moral of this story without morals is that ''competition,'' unless it's done in a way the industry wants it to be done; where it protects their overpayments and protects their ability to ''cherry pick'' healthy beneficiaries and leave the sick to be treated by the government, would mean plans get less, not more, money.

So, that is the irony. On the one hand, industry and politicians say they want to bring ''competition'' to Medicare so that it can ''run more like private industry.''

On the other hand, the same industry and those same politicians are fighting tooth and nail to derail any attempt to ensure that plans get paid for the care they actually provide.

Either you want competition and you want Medicare to run more like a business or you don't.

But, what is simply dishonest, disingenuous, an disconcerting, is the hypocrisy of the for-profit HMO industry and their protectors in Congress to continue to speak from both sides of their mouths.

Let's give HCFA a chance to do their job. Let's see what Medicare ''competition'' really means. Until then, I would caution members to think twice before they rant about bringing so-called ''competition'' to Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I think everybody ought to think about competition.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the two articles which I recommended my colleagues to read, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Business Journal, May 17, 1999]

BUSINESS GROUP SUSPENDS LOCAL MEDICARE COVERAGE PROJECT

(By Bonar Menninger)

A local group charged with overseeing a controversial Medicare pilot program voted unanimously this week to seek an indefinite suspension in the project's timetable until safeguards are established to limit widespread disruptions in Medicare HMO services for approximately 50,000 area residents.

The vote represents a significant setback for the Health Care Financing Administration, which is relying on the Area Advisory Committee for assistance in implementing the project, called the Competitive Pricing Demonstration Project, by Jan. 1, 2000.

Although work on the project's components will continue, it remains unclear whether the fast-track deadline will be met. Wednesday's vote was prompted by mounting concerns among committee members about the program's potential impact on beneficiaries.

On a separate front, the head of the American Association of Health Plans was in Kansas City this week to warn that the local Medicare HMO market—already weakened by federal budget cuts—could deteriorate rapidly if the pilot project goes forward.

Kansas City and Phoenix are test sites for an experimental process that will, for the first time, use a competitive bidding mechanism to set the HMO reimbursement rate.

HCFA, overseer of the Medicare program, contends the approach will increase health care options for beneficiaries while reducing federal expenditures.

But committee members apparently are increasingly skeptical that the former goal can be achieved through the proposed benefits package developed for the demonstration project within the constraints of HCFA's specifications.

''With the proposed benefit package, beneficiaries are going to see less benefits and higher costs than virtually every plan in the market right now,'' said Kathleen Sebelius, Kansas Insurance Commissioner and member of the AAC. ''That's 100 percent negative disruption, and I'm not very comfortable with that. I think we're making a step back, not forward.''

Following a recommendation by committee member Dick Brown, president and chief executive officer of Health Midwest, the AAC voted to recommend that HCFA suspend the implementation timetable until it can be determined at what level disruptions caused by the project will become untenable for enrollees.

That process will be undertaken by the AAC, HCFA and Competitive Pricing Committee, the HCFA advisory body that developed the Kansas City and Phoenix projects.

Separately, Karen Ignagni, president and chief executive officer of the Washington-based American Association of Health Plans, said this week that the experiment likely will exacerbate financial pressures many area Medicare HMOs already face as the result of payment cuts triggered by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

Ultimately, Ignagni said, this reimbursement squeeze could lead to disruptions in retiree benefit plans, higher costs and fewer benefits for enrollees, and a retreat from the Medicare marketplace by managed care firms. Ignagni was in Kansas City as part of a multicity tour aimed at drawing attention to the growing problems in the Medicare HMO marketplace nationwide.

''There is a fundamental design flaw in (the Kansas City demonstration project), and I think it ought to be fixed before we roll it out in any community,'' Ignagni said. ''People need to think very carefully about what the inadvertent consequences of this policy will be.''

Ignagni said the demonstration projects in both Kansas City and Phoenix, along with the ratcheting-down of Medicare HMO reimbursement rates nationwide, inadvertently will undermine the one portion of the Medicare program that has produced the greatest savings and benefit enhancements in recent years.

At the same time, she said, no significant efforts are being made to rein in the traditional fee-for-service side of Medicare, which accounts for approximately 87 percent of enrollees nationwide and the vast proportion of Medicare's $220 billion annual budget.

''We don't mind competition, but we want a level playing field,'' Ignagni said. ''If you want cost reductions and you want to test competitive bidding, then fee-for-service should be part of it.''

The Balanced Budget Act does mandate some reductions in Medicare fee-for-service reimbursements, but the cuts on the managed care side are considerably deeper, Ignagni said.

The resulting disparity between the amount paid for HMO service and the amount paid for fee-for-service will widen to $1,200 per person in Kansas City by 2004, according to statistics compiled by the American Association of Health Plans.

''At that rate, it becomes extremely difficult to retain the best doctors, to retain the best hospitals and to remain competitive,'' Ignagni said. ''And the beneficiaries will be the losers.''

Nationwide, more than 100 managed care firms have downsized, adjusted or withdrawn their Medicare HMOs from the market in response to the first wave of reimbursement reductions triggered by the Balanced Budget Act, Ignagni said. Approximately 450,000 beneficiaries have been affected.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

MEDICARE TESTS OF COMPETITIVE BIDDING RILE HMOS FEARING A DROP IN PAYMENTS

(By Laurie McGinley)

The health-care industry loves to say Medicare should act more like a business. But now that the program is trying to adopt private-sector strategies, many in the industry are squawking.

Consider Medicare's efforts to try out alternative payment schemes for health-maintenance organizations. Currently, HMOs are paid according to a complicated formula set by Congress. But the 1997 Balanced Budget Act directed Medicare to experiment with competitive bidding to see if it would be a cheaper, more efficient way of reimbursing HMOs for caring for the elderly.

As a first step, federal advisers to Medicare selected Phoenix and Kansas City as sites for pilot projects for competitive bidding. Under the plan, Medicare HMOs must submit bids indicating how much they would accept from the government for each patient. Even though the effort has barely started, one result is in: The HMOs are unhappy.

In Phoenix, where 40% of seniors are enrolled in HMOs, health plans and local officials have been demanding the project be delayed at lest a year or killed outright. In Kansas City, where HMOs have a smaller chunk of the seniors' market, health plans have been unenthusiastic but less vocal. At a meeting in Detroit yesterday, federal advisers to Medicare rejected the Phoenix requests, but agreed to allow a delay of as long as three months, until next April, for implementing the pilot projects in the two cities.

In opposing the projects, the Phoenix health plans argue that the market already is highly competitive because senior citizens have a number of HMOs to choose from, all offering generous benefits. The competitive bidding process. they claim, would drive down their federal payments, forcing them to charge seniors premiums or reduce benefits. ''We think our customers are being penalized and told, 'We will use you as an experiment in an effort to figure out how to continue to cut Medicare,'" says Gay Ann Williams, executive director of the Arizona Association of Health Plans.

A similar flap involves medical equipment. Currently, Medicare sets prices for a wide range of durable medical equipment, including wheelchairs and hospital beds. To simplify the byzantine system and save money, the program launched a competitive-bidding demonstration project in Polk County, Fla. Supplies are to be selected on price and quality.

But the Florida Association of Medical Equipment Services, an Orlando group that represents equipment suppliers, says the bidding process inevitably will reduce prices and hurt small suppliers. The group sued to block the effort but was recently rebuffed by a federal judge.

The Health Care Financing Administration, which runs Medicare, has long been urged by the health-care establishment, as well as Congress and health analysts, to become a savvier buyer. But the industry opposition to competitive bidding shows how hard it is to make fundamental changes in the federal health program for 39 million elderly and disabled. The Medicare system is due to run out of money by 2015, and both Congress and the Clinton administration are weighing alternatives to overhaul the program.

The bottom line, says Ira Loss, senior vice president at Washington Analysis, an equities-research firm, is that Medicare providers are ''interested in the free market only if it means the government is getting away from bothering them. But when it comes to the government actually forcing them to compete for business, they are unhappy about it.''

HMO officials vehemently dispute that. Karen Ignagni, president of the American Association of Health Plans, which represents HMOs, says the government's bidding procedure is flawed—''a jury-rigged proposal masquerading as free-market competition.'' She says the bidding process isn't fair, because it doesn't include Medicare's traditional fee-for-service program, so the HMOs would bear the brunt of any payment reductions.

No matter what the fate of the pilot projects, HMO officials are determined to prevent competitive bidding from being used on a national scale. The industry says any reduction in payments to health plans will roil the HMO market, which already is grappling with reductions in federal reimbursements. Some believe the competitive bidding could cause more HMOs to drop out of Medicare. Instead, HMOs want Medicare to stop spending more on patients in the traditional fee-for-service program than on those in HMOs. Such a move, though, would force people in the traditional program to pay more for their care, Medicare officials say.

The contretemps is occurring even as there is widespread agreement that Medicare's reimbursement system is cumbersome. Some government studies, moreover, have suggested Medicare has overpaid HMOs and medical-equipment suppliers. ''Who benefits from competitive bidding?'' asks Robert Reischauer, a senior fellow with the Brookings Institution and a member of the advisory board on competitive bidding. ''The taxpayer. But the taxpayer doesn't always have a voice in this.''

In Phoenix where 158,000 senior citizens are enrolled in HMOs, the health plans have enlisted an array of allies, including the Chamber of Commerce, doctors and beneficiaries. They all believe the current system works fine: HMOs offer generous benefit packages that include prescription-drug coverage—and no supplemental premium.

In a recent letter to HCFA Administrator Nancy-Ann DeParle, the entire Arizona congressional delegation warned that competitive bidding ''would only disrupt a market in which competition is already vigorous, costs are low and participation is high.'' The lawmakers have signaled they may block the project by legislation.

Such resistance irks those who believe Medicare badly needs to experiment with new cost-containment tools, including increased competition among health plans. Given the debate over Medicare, ''this is the kind of demonstration that is directly relevant and should be conducted to give Congress information about what way the program should go,'' says Robert Berenson, a top HCFA official.

In 1996 and 1997, the HCFA was forced to abandon HMO bidding projects in Baltimore and Denver because of industry opposition.

Here's how competitive bidding would work: No matter what they bid, all HMOs would be permitted to take part in Medicare, as they generally are now. The government would then calculate a median of all the submitted bids and pay every HMO that amount. The health plans are worried that such a system would further reduce their reimbursements, forcing them to either charge a premium or reduce benefits, making them less competitive. HCFA officials say that benefits won't decline but acknowledge some patients may have to pay premiums for services they now get for free.

SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND GUN CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. McCarthy) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her leadership, and I am particularly delighted to join her this evening for a brief comment on a topic that we all have been confronting and as well to acknowledge the desire to continue to work with her and the women of this Congress along with our colleagues on something that has really touched the hearts and minds of most Americans. We say and we call it Littleton. Littleton, Colorado.

We first offer again, as we have done over the past couple of weeks, our deepest sympathy to that community. We are so appreciative of their resolve and their commitment to healing that community. But as well, we realize that, as Members of the United States Congress, as the highest legislative body of this Nation, we also know that they are asking us for answers and solutions.

So I join this evening to particularly support legislation dealing with gun safety. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) has been very much a viable part of, over the years that she has been in Congress, and she likes to say she has been here only a short while, focusing on the need for gun safety.

So many of us have a role in this arena. I have taken the position that this is not a time to point fingers in opposite directions. Whose fault is it that two young men whose homes we believe were steady, who attended church, some were Members of the Boy Scouts, we understand were known members of their high school community, although we understand that they were in a group that may have been a little out of the ordinary, maybe a group in order to belong, but still we understand as well they were good students.

Yet, now we have 15 young people dead, some 40 that were injured, a valued and beloved teacher that was so admired lost his live, and the question is why.

I believe that there can be no more important agenda than moving forward on some of the legislative initiatives that have already been promoted. So I am supporting the proposed initiative by the President who has adopted much of the legislative initiatives of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) as it relates to what I would like to call this evening gun safety, the common sense approach to answering the concerns of our children.

Why are they the concerns of our children? Because I have heard them

say it. Just last Friday in my district, I had a forum on the issue of school violence, ''how do we help our children.'' I was joined by Secretary of Education Richard Riley.

We participated at Scarborough High School with an auditorium full of young people. I tell my colleagues they asked us pointed questions: Why can we not be safe? Why can we not have gun safety? Why do young people talk about each other? Why is there not someone in our schools, although we have good relationships with our teachers, why do guidance counselors have overloaded dockets and desks with issues dealing with paperwork and career counseling and we do not have people in place that can deal with our psychological and sociological needs? Why can we not have more peer-to-peer counseling and mentoring?

They ask these hard questions, and I believe we have to give them solutions. Why are there so many guns, 260 million guns here in America, more than the number of citizens here? Why are individual between 18 and 21 still able to purchase handguns? Why can we not in a package promote gun safety by passing the legislation that includes safety locks, that includes background checks, instant checks at gun shows, that takes the, if you will, loophole out of the numbers of assault weapons we still have because foreign manufacturers are able to present them?

All of this I think can be answered if we would join together, as the women of this House have demanded, and ask that we pass gun safety legislation before Father's Day. We asked the question prior to Mother's Day. We pleaded on behalf of the mothers of the deceased children, the mothers whose children died in Littleton, the mothers whose children have died in Pennsylvania, in Arkansas, in Mississippi and places where we cannot call because of gun violence, the numbers of inner city children who have died because of gun violence, the number of rural children who have died, suburban children. We know this is not a pointed issue toward one community.

Let me simply close by saying this, and I promised the gentlewoman that I will look forward to joining her in weeks to come with other Members of the Women's Caucus or Members of this body who are women who would like to join us as they were planning to do this evening, to talk about solutions, and then again let me qualify that, as we are talking, demand action.

Because I think all of us who are mothers, who are parents, who are just plain Americans have said to ourselves let us not one more morning rise up with the news of some tragic circumstance. We cannot answer the question, what have we done? I have made that commitment to myself on trying to design solutions.

I hope as we move toward the White House conference on mental health, I will be able to present to this body and to that summit a comprehensive omnibus bill on mental health services for children, the Give a Child a Chance Mental Health Prevention Act of 1999, which will speak to the issue of providing resources in our schools, of training mental health professionals in our schools that can detect early warning signs, that will provide incentives for school districts who are aware of the fact that children from K to 12 need good mental health services, sociological and psychological services, as well that we could have caught and helped a child like Eric Harris, even though he looked like the picture of health early on; and that we could have not only helped Eric but that we could have helped his family, that we could embrace a holistic approach to deal with the family concerns, why there was such a destructive sense on the part of this young man and the young man who was with him.

I hope that we will again answer these questions, not with the finger pointing, but with working together. That means the entertainment industry. They know what they are doing wrong. Are they showing relationships between families that are not humorous, joking, butthead commentary on how our family relationships are, or are we really seriously trying to bring family relationships together?

So to the gentlewoman from New York, it is certainly my honor and pleasure to say to her that I hope that we will be doing this again. But as we do it, let me qualify that in the remarks that I have heard her often say, we join together on this.

Mine was looking in the mirror and saying I do not want so see this image one more time in the mirror without being able to say we have some solutions and one saying, when are we going to fix this? We need to fix it now.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman McCARTHY for arranging this forum on the special order on school violence. I am honored to be joined here today by other Members of Congress who show a sincere concern and effort in eradicating school violence by addressing the mental well being of our youth.

I have been a strong advocate of mroe mental health services for children. Although, as a country, we often focus on children who are at risk for trouble or those children who are already troubled, all children need access to mental health services. It is estimated that two-thirds of all young people are not getting the mental health treatment they need.

In light of the recent events in Colorado and other violent school attacks from the past 18 months, our children need us to pay close attention to the early signs of mental disorders. We also need to provide services that screen and treat mental disorders in our childrenb efore it is too late.

Schools should be safe and secure places for all students, teachers and staff members. All children should be able to go to and from school without fearing for their safety .

According to news reports, these young suspects from Colorado were outcasts in the school community. During the shooting, the suspects reportedly said that they were ''out for revenge'' for having been made fun of last year. This is truly a cry for help that was not heard in time.

When children's mental health needs are not met, young people often get caught in the child protection or juvenile justice system. Almost 60 percent of teenagers in juvenile detention have behavioral, mental or emotional disorders.

There are 13.7 million or 20 percent of America's children with diagnosable mental or emotional disorder. These disorders range from attention deficit disorder and depression to bipolar disorder and schizophrenia.

We all are aware of the great devastation that the lack of mental health services ahs on our young people. We must provide services that address diagnosable emotional or behavioral health disorders.

An adolescence is a confusing time for many young people, the adults that are a part of their lives—parents, teachers, counselors, coaches and others need to be keenly aware of changes in behavior or attitude that may indicate the possibility of poor mental health. We all need to pay close attention for any warning signs of trouble.

These warning signs include isolation, depression, alienation and hostility. Recognizing these signs is the first step to ensure that troubled youngsters get the attention they need early to address their mental health needs before it is too late.

Gun control is another measure we should explore to increase the safety of our children in schools. An average of 13 children die every day from funfire in this country, and children are at a much greater risk of being the victims of a violent crime. This is Littleton, Colorado every day! This does not include close calls where guns were found inback-packs and in lunch bags.

We must pull together to protect the mental well being of our children so that they might live a healthy and productive life as citizens of our nation. I enthusiastically look forward to working with my friends to ensure a better tomorrow not only for the well being of our youth but also for the wellbeing of our nation. Again thank you for this opportunity to address this issue.

With that, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. McCARTHY) very much, and I look forward to working with her on this crisis that we have in America.

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I stand here tonight to talk about the violence in our schools. As the gentlewoman from Texas had pointed out, everyone is trying to put the blame on everybody else. I think there is enough blame to go around for everyone. But let us stop blaming and let us start looking for solutions.

Over the last year and a half, we have had three committee hearings and we have had two special hearings, and we started to look into the violence from our schools but also the violence in some of our young people. There were a lot of different factors: Mental health is something that we should be looking into, especially with our schools; our family issues that should be at home. We should be looking into those issues.

But in each and every shooting, 13 young people that die every single day, is one common factor; that is, the easy

access to guns. That is something that we can do. We can deal with all the other issues.

Today we held a hearing in the Committee on Education and the Workforce. Several students had been victims of school violence in Littleton, West Paducah, Springfield, Oregon showed great courage in coming to Congress to talk about their experiences through the shootings in their schools.

The one thing I heard from all of them was the pain, the pain that they are still suffering. That is a pain that I understand very deeply.

□ 2245

And I told one of the young men, even after the first anniversary, the pain does not get any easier. My family goes through the pain, and it will be 6 years this December. But that is why I came to Congress. I came to Congress to try to reduce gun violence in this country. I came to Congress so that hopefully other families would not have to go through what my family went through, and certainly the other members who I consider family now from the Long Island Railroad shooting.

People keep saying we cannot do something about this. I do not believe that. I believe we can do something. And I know I am hearing all the time that this is a slippery slope where I am just trying to take away guns. I have never said that. I do not care if someone owns a gun. But if they own a gun, I do believe they have a responsibility for that particular product, and I feel very deeply about that.

I have talked to many gun owners, women gun owners, men gun owners, and they are saying they realize that it is their product and they should take more responsibility for it. So I think if we take that premise and start to work on it, there are common sense solutions and I think it is something that we can work towards here.

What scares me the most about being here in Congress is sometimes they will do so many delaying techniques and, hopefully, it will go away. The sad truth is this is not going to go away. Here we are 5 weeks from the shooting in Colorado, and people are still talking about it. And I think this hit home the hardest because we have had so many school shootings and now parents are scared. Students are scared.

And when we ask our students what can we do, they come up with some really good solutions. One thing they do not want, they do not want their schools filled with metal detectors. Our schools are not meant to be prisons. It is not meant for our teachers to be under the atmosphere of possibly a young person having a gun. We know where those guns come from. A majority of them are legal. They come from home. It is up to the parents, the adults, to take responsibility that their child does not get a gun.

Our young people that are having mental health problems and have a bad day, as a lot of teenagers do, commit too many suicides every single day. That is unacceptable. We can save those kids. The accidental deaths, we can save those kids. The homicides, we can save a lot of those kids.

I know that we cannot save every child. I wish we could. But that does not mean that we should not go forward to try and save as many young people as we can. We are the adults. We have the responsibility to make a difference in our children's lives, and to the point to where again this year I am praying that the schools close without another incident. We did that a year ago. And we have done nothing. Are we going to let this summer go by? Schools open again in September, and are we going to pray that another shooting does not start?

But, again, this is about the children every single day. That is where we cannot get lost on it. Thirteen children a day. That is a Littleton every single day. But it is a young child here and there and everywhere, and it does not make the papers. Or we have become so insensitized to the violence around us. We should never do that. We should see each other as the good human beings as we are in this country, and we should try to all work together.

I wish the NRA would work with me. I wish the NRA would come and say, okay, we have a problem. Let us try to come up with solutions. I know they do not like child safety locks, but they can save lives. There is responsibility on the adults that a gun does not get into someone's hand. This is a responsibility. We should be working together. The movie industry, we should be working together. Videos, we should be working together to come up with solutions.

But I think there is one thing that we have to point out. Our young people in this country are good kids. I have the pleasure of being with them a lot, working on community projects in my district, and I see this going around in the country: Our young people caring, going into nursing homes. Our young people caring, raising money for different organizations, whether it is breast cancer or Alzheimer's. They do not like this idea that we are blaming them and that they have no morals.

I happen to think that this country has a lot of morals. And I meet those people on a daily basis. Do we have problems with some? It is a very small percentage. Do they sometimes make our lives miserable? Yes, they do. But that does not mean we should do a blanket cover and say the whole country is like that.

I think if anyone ever looks around and sees how we responded to the people of Oklahoma when they had the tornadoes, this is a caring country. We are there for each other. And that is how we can solve the problems of the gun violence in this country, by all of us coming together and coming up with common sense solutions. It is something I believe in. I certainly talk to enough people about it.

What scares me again, though, is the silence that we might hear in this Congress. We cannot have silence any longer. We have to do something. The American people are demanding that we do something. But, unfortunately, unless the American people send their message, their voices here to Congress, that is the only way we are going to get something done.

I have asked the Speaker of the House to meet with me, I have not heard from him, to talk about my proposals on how to reduce gun violence in this country. But I am very encouraged. This evening he did a press conference and started to talk about maybe we should find common sense ground to stop the gun violence in this country. That to me is encouraging. That means a door is open. That means we can try and work together.

As long as I am here in Congress, I will work as hard as I can to reduce gun violence in this country, my goal going back 5 years ago, when I promised my son that I would try to make sure that no family would go through what we went through. And my son has gotten married now and his life is going on, and he just had a son in November. That means I am a new grandmother. So I have got to work a little bit harder because I want my son to feel safe, but I want my grandson to certainly live in a safe country. And I know that if we work together, we can do it.

I know a lot of people are very shocked sometimes on the statistics, and I do not particularly care to read statistics because I think it dries over. But I do not think people realize, as I said earlier, 13 children die at the hand of a gun; 28 children die and teenagers are murdered; 1,309 children in teenage suicides; 468 children in their teens accidentally die from shootings. That is every single year, every single year.

One of our recent congressional testimonies demonstrates the need for Federal legislation on kids and guns. An angry child who has access to a gun will use it because it is there and it is in that child's hands. ''I realize that gun control is a complex issue in our country, but I also know that guns represent the single greatest threat to educators and to schoolchildren.'' That was by Scott Polland, National Association of School Psychologists.

This is a testimony before the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families, United States House of Representatives, on my Committee on Education and the Workforce on March 11, 1999:

''An international comparison of 26 industrial countries found that the firearm death rate for U.S. children younger than 15 years old was nearly 12 times higher than any of the children in any of the other 25 countries combined.'' That came from the Centers for Disease Control.

''We need better information on how our children get guns. That is why the Children's Gun Violence Prevention

Act expands our Federal program for tracing guns used in juvenile crime. Research should be expanded on gun markets to educate the flow of firearms from the legitimate sector to the hands of minors and criminals and how this flow might effectively be reduced.''

A few years ago up in Boston in what they called the ''Boston Project,'' they started tracing guns that were used in juvenile homicides and juvenile crimes. Once they started tracing these guns to the illegal gun dealers, they were able to have for 40 months, 40 months, not one child died because we got rid of the illegal guns and we educated our adults.

Now, if we can do that in Boston, why can we not do that across this country? Where I come from in New York, it is very hard to get a gun legally. They have to go through a background check, but eventually they will get it. The problem with New York is all the guns that come into our State are illegal guns, they are guns that we have no control over. What are we supposed to do? Put up a barbed wire fence around New York because we decide that we are going to try to make it safer? And it has made a difference and it has made a big difference, but there is more that we can do.

As a nurse, we hear that homicide rates are down, and thank God they are. What no one is talking about is what it is costing our health care system for those that are surviving. I know the medical care that my son received and still continues to receive and will have to receive for the rest of his life is costing this government a lot of money.

We have four young people in Littleton, Colorado, still in the hospital with spinal cord injuries because of the shootings. The health care that they are going to need. The estimates of health care due to gun violence in this country is almost up to $20 billion a year. $20 billion a year. Could we not take that money and put it back into our health care system? Could we not put that towards our educational system? It would help so many of us.

We have an obligation here in Congress. It should not be a battle between Republicans and Democrats. It should be something that we should be working out together and to do the right thing as far as our children and the safety of our children. This is not a slippery road. This is not somewhere we are trying to take away the right of someone to own a gun, but we are asking for responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I plan on being here as much as I can to talk about this subject. There is one more thing that I will ask. The American people have to get involved in this debate and they have to, if they want to change, their voices have to be heard here, and our Congressmen and certainly our Senators need to hear from all Americans.

CONSTITUENT CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for half of the remaining time until midnight tonight, approximately 32 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to let the Chamber know and all of my colleagues that this special order is one that I secure every week on behalf of the majority, and so I would invite other Members who would like to run down to the floor here for the last 32 minutes to come join us on the floor.

But I want to also mention and refer to a constituent of mine. Her name is Jessika, Jessika Fretwell. She introduced me to Flat Stanley. I got a picture of Flat Stanley here. She faxed the photo, a drawing of Flat Stanley. There is a letter that comes with it, and I would like to read that briefly. She wrote to me.

She said, ''In school we read a book about a boy who got mashed by a bulletin board. His name is Flat Stanley. He wanted to go on a trip, so his family folded him up and mailed him to California. I am mailing Flat Stanley to you. Please take him somewhere and write me back telling me where he went. If you have pictures or postcards, please send them too. I will take Flat Stanley back to school and share his adventure with my class. Thank you for helping me with this project. I wish I could fold myself up and visit you. Love, Jessika.'' And Jessika spells her name with a ''K.''

So there is Flat Stanley for Jessika. He is on the floor of the United States House of Representatives tonight, and we are proud to have him join us.

□ 2300

I am also pleased to be joined by my good friend and colleague from the great State of Arizona who is here to speak with us tonight. Many of our constituents write to us, not just Jessika but several others. We are here on the floor this evening to refer to some of the comments that have been raised by many of our constituents. We have received so many phone calls and letters in the last few days on the matters of taxes, on Kosovo, on environmental-related topics. I am just curious what kind of things the gentleman from Arizona is hearing about over the weekend and today from his constituents.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding. I am pleased that Flat Stanley joins us on the floor tonight. Usually people leave out the ''L'' when they describe me, although I am working on the diet.

In all sincerity and seriousness, echoing the comments, though not in complete agreement with my friend from New York who spoke on the floor here earlier, even tonight as we speak, Mr. Speaker, a group of concerned citizens making up a citizens committee on juvenile violence meets in the Sixth Congressional District of Arizona. The committee includes clergymen, school administrators and former school administrators, current educators, teachers in the classroom, students in the classroom and parents together as they take a look at the Sixth District of Arizona.

If there is one difference that typifies the two schools of thought here in the House of Representatives, it is that our friends on the left tend to look to Washington for solutions and put a trust in the Washington bureaucracy. I believe if given a choice between Washington bureaucrats and the people at home, I would choose the people at home. It is in that spirit that our friends meet, not as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans concerned looking for practical solutions to the problems they face.

I think we would all concur that one thing we learn in our time here, whether it is through letters that we receive, and I have a few tonight, or through town hall meetings or just in our everyday lives when we return home to our district, I think we are all impressed and reimpressed with the fact that the people whom we serve in our respective districts have a lot of good ideas, and so it is the intent of our citizens committee on juvenile violence to take a look at the vexing problems that have plagued us and the recent tragedies at hand.

I might also point out that I continue to receive e-mail, phone calls, faxes and letters concerning the extraordinary and disturbing transfer of technology and nuclear espionage carried on by the Red Chinese in this country. Indeed, there are those in my district who have said that it is as if we are living in a real-life Allen Drury novel, that there are those in this city and on the editorial boards or in the assignment editor chairs of various television networks who steadfastly refuse to take a look at the serious problems we have. Yet through investigative reports, such as those by Bill Gertz of the Washington Times and the new book that has been produced, the partial title being ''Betrayal'' which details what sadly has transpired and, according to the author, how some in the current administration have undermined our national security, that continues to be a main concern. And, of course, again the topic to which we always return is the notion of this government serving the people rather than the people serving the government. We have seen a disturbing reversal, if you will, in this century in terms of the fact that this government, it would seem, both in attitude and in the action of reaching into the pockets of hardworking Americans seems to ask for more and more and ask working Americans to get by with less and less.

I received a letter from my friend Ryan in Apache Junction, Arizona, just on the border of Maricopa and Pinal Counties there at the foot of the beautiful Superstition Mountains.

Ryan writes, movingly and with conviction:

Every corner an American turns today has a tax waiting for him or her. It's ridiculous and it's time that it was stopped. I'm tired of paying income tax, property tax, license plate taxes, sales tax, inheritance tax, Social Security tax and capital gains tax. I find all of these taxes unfair, oppressive and un-American. Does anyone remember why we left our oppressors in England? Because of high taxes and religious constraints. Where do we go now? When is enough enough? Forty percent of one's wages taken out in taxes? Fifty percent of someone's check taken out in taxes? Make me proud and allow my family and I to live a better life through tax relief.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Your constituent has a good friend in one of mine from Fort COLLINS, Colorado, Robert Seymour, who wrote to me just last week:

The administration's budget plan for next year was presented to Congress on February 1. It imposes new taxes that will make it harder for millions of American families to save for their own retirement needs and will seriously jeopardize the financial protection of families and businesses. Providing for retirement and securing your family's financial security should not be a taxing experience. Americans are taking more responsibility for their own financial futures and they have made it clear that they oppose both direct and indirect tax bites that jeopardize their retirement security and their ability to protect their families. Congress on a bipartisan basis soundly rejected a similar approach last year and I strongly urge you to do the same this time around. Please oppose any new direct or indirect taxes like those commonly referred to as DAC, COLI and PSAs, the typical alphabet soup of Washington, DC, all of these new taxes on annuities and life insurance products.

This is an individual who obviously is saving for his future and his retirement and is getting fed up, as many constituents are around the country, with the new proposals that we are seeing coming out of the White House this very day, to increase the level of taxation on the American people.

My letters are similar to yours. We receive thousands of them on a week-by-week basis. I am glad to be a part of a Republican majority that is here to put the voice of the people ahead of the voice of the special interests that exist right outside these halls in Washington, DC and in Congress.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Colorado, Mr. Speaker. As I hear him speak, I think about another tax that I continue to hear about, the death tax, what has been called by the Washington bureaucracy, the estate tax. That really seems to suggest something rather placid and pastoral when, in fact, it is the death tax where this government taxes you literally upon your death. My good friend from Colorado summed it up very succinctly with echoes of history, not unlike when Ryan pointed out the genesis of our Nation in opposition to our English cousins imposing taxation, my friend from Colorado, and I will quote him again because many an audience enjoys this statement, I am pleased to offer him the proper and full credit, unlike some others in American politics who take lines from time to time, Mr. Speaker, but according to my good friend from Colorado, ''There should be no taxation without respiration.'' I think that is especially appropriate.

I think I have related the story in times past, recently in Winslow, Arizona, we were not standing on the corner but we were on the corner where the police station and the city hall is located and we were having a town hall meeting. It was in the middle of the day and a couple of young men from the high school who aspired to attend one of our Nation's military academies came to that town hall meeting. A few more honored citizens, senior citizens, if you will, were there and they were talking about the egregious nature of the death tax, how it affected their small businesses, how it affected their family farms and ranches, how it was driving families out of business. One of the young men heard us talking about this and then, with almost a military bearing, I mean the very flower of American youth, he stood there, ''Congressman, sir, do you mean to tell me the Federal Government taxes you when you die?'' And the assembled citizenry there started to chuckle, knowingly, almost like our good friend Art Linkletter and now Bill Cosby with the television segment ''Kids Say the Darnedest Things,'' but, Mr. Speaker, that laughter soon faded, because there was nothing funny about the question. The sad fact about the death tax is this. For all the rigmarole, for all the hunting down and contacting heirs and business partners, the Federal Government procures roughly 1 percent of its revenue from the death tax. Yet almost three-quarters of that 1 percent goes to tracking down the people who apparently owe the taxes through the convoluted structure that we have here.

I have remarked in the past, Mr. Speaker, and I think it bears repeating, this country has been blessed with an outstanding group of individuals at its birth, Catherine Drinker Bowen made mention in her great work in 1966, ''The Miracle at Philadelphia,'' the assemblage of so many great thinkers and true patriots. One of those patriots, Dr. Benjamin Franklin, incredibly well-versed in a variety of different subjects, a man of letters, a printer, a diplomat, a scientist.

Yet even Dr. Franklin, with all his prescience, I believe would be shocked to realize today that the republic which he helped to found would literally tax people upon their death, even with his saying in Poor Richard's Almanac, ''There are only two certainties in life, death and taxes.''

□ 2310

Understand that Dr. Franklin did not say there was a certainty that one would be taxed on their death, and this is one of the absurdities we see in our tax structure that my friend Ryan points out, that others point out, whether it is the death tax, or the marriage penalty, or other tax policies that seem to do their best to disrupt the family unit and continue to ask Americans to sacrifice more and more so Washington can allegedly do more.

Those of us in the new majority and people in the Sixth District of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, say the opposite should be true. Washington bureaucrats should sacrifice so that individuals and families can do more with their hard-earned money in terms of saving, investing and building for the future.

Mr. SCHAFFER. It is interesting that my colleague mentions Dr. Franklin, because when Ben Franklin and Thomas Jefferson were working together over the drafting of the Declaration of Independence, there is a story that I have heard from a number of historians about how the two of them disagreed on one key point, a key phrase, and that was the word ''unalienable,'' whether to use ''unalienable,'' which was Franklin's preference, or ''inalienable'' which was Jefferson's preference. And it is a key distinction.

Ultimately Franklin won the debate, and the difference between ''unalienable'' and ''inalienable'' is a matter of taxation in many ways. Historians suggest that they pronounce ''unalienable'' the following way: un-a-lien-able which means that one cannot place a lien, they cannot place some kind of claim from the government on any of the rights to life, liberty or the pursuit of happiness.

But we see this Federal Government and the people here in Washington, D.C. have found a way to abridge the desires of Dr. Franklin, to make it so that life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are no longer un-a-lien-able. There are, in fact, liens placed against life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and I will bring up another example written by a constituent of mine, this time in Ft. Morgan, Colorado. Kathleen Tarver wrote, and she is very frustrated. You can just hear the frustration in the tone of this letter. It says:

''This January I resigned my job and retired early at the age of 50 to cut our taxes,'' she says. ''We are penalized for being married, and we have no children so you guys really sock it to us. Higher fees on everything we buy or use are higher taxes.''

Says: ''We have been putting almost the maximum allowed into our 401(k) to help cut our taxes. But I may not live long enough to spend the money because you look at my retirement dollars as your money,'' she is speaking about Washington in general, ''determining for me how I can spend it.'' She says that the era of big government seems to be back. Here at the end she says:

''I don't want to hear you guys in Washington say one more time, 'We have to save Social Security.' Do it now, and do it right. We have saved Social Security five times now because you continue to steal from it. Give us

our money. Stop stealing it.'' Cut our taxes.

Very frustrated constituent, and I can tell my colleague I am on Kathleen's side, and I know the gentleman from Arizona is as well. We receive letters like that routinely, but it really speaks to the 223 year origins of our great country, when these very noble gentlemen were meeting in Philadelphia at this miraculous time that you described and trying to chart a new course for our country, one that is based on the realization that our rights come from God. They do not come from the crown, they do not come from the king, they do not come from some document, they do not come from people in the capital city.

These rights come to us from God himself, and they are un-a-lien-able rights. They should be treated that way. Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness should come as real liberties, as real rights. There should be no tax upon them. There should be no burden that one is saddled with if they want to enjoy living in complete freedom and liberty as America proposes to make possible for all Americans.

Here is one more letter, another one from Ft. Collins. Russell Beers wrote to me. Says Republicans have a majority. Pass a tax proposal, and put it on Clinton's desk, and let him veto it. He says he would prefer a flat tax, but he underlines: Just do it. It has cost him $700 just to have someone figure his taxes for him this year.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague, and I can certainly sympathize with his constituent. And I receive many letters, and they are not confined to April 15, by the way, because some folks get their extension to try and work out their taxes on through October 15, and it has become a particularly vexing problem for a lot of Americans.

But let us address my colleague's constituents' concern because, Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know that these comments are not falling on deaf ears. Indeed, as the first Arizonan in history honored to serve on the House Committee on Ways and Means, the committee with primary jurisdiction over the Tax Code and ultimately over tax relief, I am pleased to point out that it is our intention in July to sit down and write a massive bill of tax cuts, because again we believe this is very true, as the preceding letter my friend read from Colorado. We understand that in most American families both parents work not out of choice, but out of necessity, one parent working essentially to pay the incredible tax obligations that befall many families. Essentially for one salary in essence to be almost free and clear, the other spouse, the other parent, must work quite simply to pay the taxes.

My colleague's constituent pointed that out in her letter. The subsequent letter that he read from the gentleman is a call to action, and it is our intent to move forward with a tax bill that is expansive because we believe over 10 years time we need to reaffirm the fact that this money does not belong to the Federal Government, that the tax burden and bite should not be so excessive as to force parents out of the home and into the workplace not because of career aspirations, but because of the necessity of paying the tax bill and dealing with the tax burden. And our notion is over 10 years time to return almost $800 billion to the American people because it is their money to begin with. It does not belong to the bureaucrats here in Washington.

Mr. SCHAFFER. It absolutely is. It is dollars that the American people work hard for, and in order to maintain a truly free and liberated Republic we have to do everything we can here in Washington to insist that those dollars are left in the pockets and in the hands of those people who work hard to earn them in the first place.

Let me just reemphasize the point again with another letter from our constituent who lives in Loveland, Colorado, Toni Colson.

''Dear Representative SCHAFFER, I am your constituent from Loveland. As a business owner and grandparent, I'm very concerned about the serious economic problems facing our country. I feel our current income tax structure is having a very negative impact by taxing production, savings and investment, the very things which can make our economy strong.''

Well, Ms. Colson has hit the nail right on the head. If you look at our tax policy, the graduated income tax structure that we have today, the harder you work and the more productive you are, the higher the percentage of taxation on your income. We actually punish hard work with the current Tax Code. As it stands today, we punish those who put money aside and try to save it, we punish people who make the right kinds of investment decisions that are not only in their own personal best interests as families, but provide the capital and the availability of capital on the market to create more jobs, to create more businesses and to expand the economy.

As my colleagues know, I think often about the trillions of dollars in private capital that is locked up today. Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, estimates that there is $11 trillion in private capital that is locked up somewhere in America today because the owners of that cash are afraid to take it out and use it productively, and why? Because the Federal Government punishes those who act responsibly and help to move toward promoting a more vibrant and stronger economy.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Colorado is right. I would just amend this.

We are looking, and I think we should reemphasize this, not at billions but trillions of dollars, and it is amazing to see what is locked up because of the disincentive to inject those funds into the economy, the disincentive to invest in businesses because of the excessive taxation.

☐ 2320

In fairness, Mr. Speaker, we should be prepared and indeed, Mr. Speaker, there may be many within the sound of my voice or within this television signal who ask the question, but wait a minute; do not your friends on the left always offer the rejoinder, tax cuts for the wealthy?

I would say to them, yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the tired rejoinder we hear. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it is all in how one defines who is wealthy, because the rhetoric has become so incendiary and so predictable that if there is a tax cut at all it must go to the wealthy.

I would invite my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to take a look at an estimate that was prepared for all of us by the Joint Committee on Taxation. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means asked for this and, Mr. Speaker, this is not something that deals with the trillions of dollars, as my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, pointed out earlier. This is something that deals with the very human equation of average families in America.

We should also point out that this process does not occur in a vacuum. Indeed, I was glad my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado, joined me in his first term here in the 105th Congress, my second term but the first term on the Committee on Ways and Means, as we actually offered tax relief to families with first a $400 per child tax credit that increases to $500 and indeed we have found that a family of four earning $30,000 a year, in essence, pays really no income tax if they take advantage of the different deductions and tax credits available to them, an average family of four.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, just raise that income by $10,000 again a family trying to succeed, trying to get ahead, in raising that income to $40,000 for a family of four the tax bill is in excess of $2,000 for that family.

So, again, Mr. Speaker, it is curious to hear the tired rhetoric of tax breaks for the wealthy because the sad fact is, apparently our friends on the left define wealthy as a middle income earner and a middle income taxpayer earning $40,000 a year.

So that is one of the ironies and that is real life, the very human equation, not lost with mind-boggling figures of billions and trillions but just the simple challenge of an annual income for a middle income family. That is what we reiterate here, that this money belongs to the people, not to the Washington bureaucrats.

The first three words of our Constitution are very instructive and they are as instructive as they are poetic. We, the people; not, they, the government, but we the people; all of us, Mr. Speaker.

It is that responsibility which we find uppermost in our minds.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Listening to the people is something that we are certainly all about and want to do as often as we can.

Here is a personal letter from Weston, Colorado, from someone who wrote on this very point, and again he is very critical of government and the Federal system. This is a paragraph I am reading from the middle of the letter from Dr. Owens, and he says, as you can tell, I favor smaller government and less interference with State and local governments who are in a better position to make decisions on most issues. You people in Washington have very distorted concepts of what really goes on out in the real world. Do not believe all you read in the polls. I have taught research and statistics and we have a saying in research: Statistics do not lie but liars often use statistics, he says.

He is absolutely right. He says polls can show almost anything pollsters want them to, just as anyone can find a passage in the Bible to support almost any belief. These are both possible if one takes things out of context and ignores parts that do not suit them.

He talks about the occupant of the building at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue as proof of the above and he says the people we know do not believe the approval ratings that we see with the things going on, again down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

I have to amend the gentleman's letter a little bit to fit within the House rules about referring to the individual at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue directly, but again this is an individual from Weston, Colorado, who understands full well that it is the voice of the people that needs to be heard over and above those of special interests.

Unfortunately, these average, regular, ordinary, every day citizens, they are counting on their Members of Congress to voice their opinions, to voice their concerns and be the ones who are the guardians of the public trust and a legitimate public trust.

What they are up against, though, and the gentleman knows this as well as I do, is when we walk right outside the House chamber in these lobbies right outside the Capitol, there are legions of lobbyists who are paid by various special interests to come here and give us another viewpoint on what America looks like from the perspective of the banks of the Potomac. Fortunately we have the loud voices of people like Dr. Owens in Weston, Colorado, who take the time to write us letters and help us keep the Congress on an even center.

I know the gentleman hears from many constituents who help the gentleman in that regard.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I do, indeed. I would also make the point that one of the ironies of serving here in Washington is that especially sadly on the left, a number of the special interest lobbyists are subsidized with taxpayer funds, which is one of the incredible ironies, something we have tried to change but the institutional inertia here, it is an uphill battle dealing with that. It is one of the curiosities.

The gentleman mentioned the voice of the people and in addition to letters, and I brought a couple down tonight, but I just think about a variety of radio townhall meetings we have held lately and the subject that comes up time and again, Mr. Speaker, is our national security; for even as our Founders in that wonderfully practical and poetic preamble to our Constitution delineated that one of our constitutional responsibilities was to provide for the common defense.

Again, we have serious problems here. Almost everyone I speak with during these radio townhalls in a district in square mileage almost the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, say the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) has been working to prepare a bipartisan report. It was prepared in January or February. When will the House move to release that because the White House is reticent?

We must move quickly to release that report.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Before the gentleman goes on to the point about the comment, let me just ask about these town meetings. I hold a town meeting in my district every week and hold several others on top of that when we are not in Washington, and it is a great opportunity to listen to thousands of constituents who show up and voice these same kind of concerns that I have read from some of the letters.

I am curious about what the gentleman called a radio townhall meeting. Tell me how that works.

Mr. HAYWORTH. The challenge in representing a district, really in square mileage almost the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, is trying to get everywhere all the time.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The gentleman's district is that size?

Mr. HAYWORTH. The district is that size. Although a rancher in Show Low said, here is a perfect slogan, a big man for a big district, I do not exactly think that is the case. Even I cannot get all the way around all the time.

So several broadcasters in the area are willing to set up programs and quite often on a Monday or Tuesday will set them up where constituents from the comfort of their home or at work or via mobile phone, if they are out on the streets and byways, can call in and we can discuss issues and it actually invites everyone into the townhall.

The past several townhalls I have had, Mr. Speaker, again and again and again and again, the question of national security comes up. It evokes evidence that we have heard from Dr. Owens that people are concerned. They believe that our national security has been frittered away. Indeed, we have read in the press that the technology transfers and the espionage carried out by the communist Chinese rivals that of the Rosenbergs in the 1950s.

While we see the drips and drabs and the old spin game going on at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, we must move as a House, if there is reticence in the executive branch, to release this report.

I would point out for the record, Mr. Speaker, that President Clinton, following receipt of the report from the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), in a bipartisan fashion, could have released the report immediately. While there are legitimate national security concerns in terms of not exposing our sources and means of procuring our own information through counterintelligence, there are still serious concerns that the American people need to know about.

Again Mr. Speaker, I would renew the call that this House, if the reticence, if the stonewalling, if the dribs and drabs and endless spin continue from the administration, that this House should take every action necessary, including meeting in a closed session, if that is necessary, to vote out this report so the American people can understand the extent of the problem we confront.

□ 2330

Because whether we worry about security in the home, security in the school, Social Security for our seniors in generations yet to come, undergirding all of that is our very existence as a constitutional republic and our national security. This House took steps tonight to bolster our national security, not bullet-for-bullet or bomb-for-bomb in the Balkan theater, but to try and avert the danger of returning to the days of the hollow force, and it is in that spirit we continue to work in this House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SERRANO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for Tuesday, May 17, and today, on account of a death in the family.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HILL of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

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. WHITFIELD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EHRLICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes each day, today and on May 19.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, on May 25.

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, on May 19.

Mr. HILL of Montana, for 5 minutes, on May 19.

Mr. PORTMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CARDIN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 669. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 to carry out that Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 19, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2173. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Office's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Electronic Funds Transfer [DFARS Case 98–D012] received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2174. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting Final Funding Priorities for Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2175. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2176. 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; California State Implementation Plan Revision, South Coast Air Quality Management District [CA 038–100a; FRL–6333–4] received April 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2177. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Missouri: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision for Corrective Action [FRL–6333–2] received April 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2178. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Consolidated Guidance about Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance about Self-Shielded Irradiator Licenses, dated October 1998—received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2179. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 1998 Annual Report on the National Institutes of Health AIDS Research Loan Repayment Program; to the Committee on Commerce.

2180. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Market Regulation, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Broker-Dealer Registration and Reporting [Release No. 34–41356; File No. S7–17–96] (RIN: 3235–AG69) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2181. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List Additions and Deletions—received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2182. A letter from the President, James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation, transmitting the 1998 annual report of the Foundation, pursuant to Public Law 99–591, section 814(b) (100 Stat. 3341–81); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2183. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Central Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 990304063–9063–01; I.D. 040599A] received April 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2184. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for Winter I Period [Docket No. 981014259–8312–02; I.D. 032699B] received April 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2185. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Shallow-water Species Fisheries by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 990304062–9062–01; I.D. 033199F] received April 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2186. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Additional Authorization to Issue Certificates for Foreign Health Care Workers [INS 1979–99] (RIN: 1115–AF43) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2187. A letter from the Chairman, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting the 1997 annual report of the activities of the Commission, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2188. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29544; Amdt. No. 1927] received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2189. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Alexander Schleicher Segelflugzeugbau Model ASK 21 Gliders [Docket No. 91–CE–25–AD; Amendment 39–11149; AD 95–11–15 R1] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2190. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; S.N. CENTRAIR 101 Series Gliders [Docket No. 98–CE–50–AD; Amendment 39–11140; AD 99–09–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2191. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Avions Pierre Robin Model R2160 Airplanes [Docket No. 98–CE–80–AD; Amendment 39–11141; AD 99–09–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2192. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Models C90A, B200, B200C, B200T, B200CT, 300, B300, B300C, and A200CT Airplanes [Docket No. 98–CE–104–AD; Amendment 39–11143; AD 99–09–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2193. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes [Docket No. 96–NM–214–AD; Amendment 39–11145; AD 99–09–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2194. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757–200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–37–AD; Amendment 39–11146; AD 99–09–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2195. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Management Information System (MIS) Requirements [USCG–1998–4469] (RIN: 2115–AF67) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2196. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Model L–1011–385 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–199–AD; Amendment 39–11147; AD 99–09–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2197. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS–350B, B1, B2, B3, BA, and D Helicopters, and Model AS 355E, F, F1, F2 and N Helicopters [Docket No. 98–SW–44–AD; Amendment 39–11139; AD 99–09–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2198. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes Equipped With General Electric Model CF6–45 or –50 Series Engines; or Pratt & Whitney Model JT9D–3, –7, or –70 Series Engines; and 747–E4B (Military) Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–49–AD; Amendment 39–11144; AD 99–09–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2199. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–100, –200, –200C, –300, –400, and –500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–337–AD; Amendment 39–11132; AD 99–08–23] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2200. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–59–AD; Amendment 39–11136; AD 99–09–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2201. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–44–AD; Amendment 39–11135; AD 99–09–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2202. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–43–AD; Amendment 39–11134; AD 99–09–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2203. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–42–AD; Amendment 39–11133; AD 99–09–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2204. A letter from the Acting Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) Training—received April 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

2205. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Technical Corrections Regarding Customs Organization (T.D. 99–27) (RIN: 1515–AB84) received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on Science. H.R. 1654. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on Science. H.R. 1553. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 for the National Weather Service, Atmospheric Research, and National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 174. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–147). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 175. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1553) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 for the National Weather Service, Atmospheric Research, and National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; (Rept. 106–148). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1400. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to improve collection and dissemination of information concerning bond prices and to improve price competition in bond markets, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 1833. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the United States Customs Service for drug interdiction and other operations, for the Office of the United States Trade Representative, for the United States International Trade Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1834. A bill to promote the growth of free enterprise and economic opportunity in the Caribbean Basin region, to increase trade between the region and the United States, and to encourage the adoption by Caribbean Basin countries of trade and investment policies necessary for participation in the Free Trade Area of the Americas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. COX, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. MCINTOSH):

H.R. 1835. A bill to impose conditions on assistance authorized for North Korea, to impose restrictions on nuclear cooperation and other transactions with North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 1836. A bill to properly balance the wind and water erosion criteria and the wildlife suitability criteria to be used in the 18th signup of land in the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURR of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 1837. 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 for other purposes; 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. DELAY (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WU, Mr. COX, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COOK, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 1838. A bill to assist in the enhancement of the security of Taiwan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. FRANKS of New Jersey:

H.R. 1839. A bill to authorize the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to make grants to fire departments for the acquisition of thermal imaging cameras; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 1840. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the maximum taxable income for the 15 percent rate bracket, to provide a partial exclusion from gross income for dividends and interest received by individuals, to provide a long-term capital gains deduction for individuals, to increase the traditional IRA contribution limit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 1841. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to restore eligibility for adjustment of status under section 245(i) of that Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 1842. A bill to provide matching grants for the construction, renovation and repair of school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. HYDE (for himself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 1843. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to permit States to use funds under the State Children's Health Insurance Program for coverage of uninsured pregnant women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. FROST, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 1844. A bill to provide for adjustment of status for certain aliens granted temporary protected status in the United States because of conditions in Lebanon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1845. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for congressional review of civil aviation agreements; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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 Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1846. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the Attorney General to deem that an applicant for naturalization has taken an oath of renunciation and allegiance in certain cases where the applicant is medically unable to take the oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. KELLY, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1847. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations to protect the confidentiality of communications between dependents of members of the Armed Forces and professionals providing therapeutic or related services regarding sexual or domestic abuse; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. DOOLEY of California):

H.R. 1848. A bill to ensure a woman's right to breastfeed her child on any portion of Federal property where the woman and her child are otherwise authorized to be; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1849. A bill to require the Attorney General to promulgate regulations relating to gender-related persecution, including female genital mutilation, for use in determining an alien's eligibility for asylum or withholding of deportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GOSS, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. STARK, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. BASS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. COOK, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. PORTER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. HORN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 1850. A bill to amend the Agricultural Market Transition Act to convert the price support program for sugarcane and sugar beets into a system of solely recourse loans and to provide for the gradual elimination of the program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1851. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to enhance protections for employees reporting workplace hazards to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 1852. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow a judge to whom a case is transferred to retain jurisdiction over certain multidistrict litigation cases for trial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 1853. A bill to provide for each American the opportunity to provide for his or her retirement through a S.A.F.E. account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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. SHAYS (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KOLBE, Ms. LEE, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SCHAFFER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 1854. A bill to temporarily increase the number of visas available for backlogged spouses and children of lawful permanent resident aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 1855. A bill to exempt agreements relating to voluntary guidelines governing telecast material, movies, video games, Internet content, and music lyrics from the applicability of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 1856. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish a panel to study the issue of Federal benefits received by persons convicted of drug offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. THURMAN (for herself, Mr. STARK, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon):

H.R. 1857. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to allow leave for individuals who give living organ donations, to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to paying travel and subsistence expenses that are incurred by individuals in donating or receiving of organs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, Government Reform, House Administration, and 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 Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. OSE, Mr. FROST, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DIXON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. MINGE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HORN, Ms. LEE, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. REYES, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. KING, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. ROTHman):

H. Con. Res. 109. A concurrent resolution commending the people of Israel for reaffirming, in its elections, its dedication to democratic ideals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OWENS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FORD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FROST, Ms. CARSON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina):

H. Res. 176. A resolution recognizing the historical significance of the Supreme Court's unanimous decision in Brown v. Board of Education, repudiating segregation,

and reaffirming the fundamental belief that we are all ''one Nation under God, indivisible''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDACCI:

H. Res. 177. A resolution relating to the treatment of veterans with Alzheimer's disease; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. COX, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WU, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HORN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CLAY):

H. Res. 178. A resolution concerning the tenth anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre of June 4, 1989, in the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 8: Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 49: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 65: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 111: Mr. TALENT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MOORE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 157: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 170: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 194: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 220: Mr. SUNUNU.

H.R. 248: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 303: Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 315: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 351: Mr. QUINN and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 353: Mr. UPTON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SHAYS, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 357: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 380: Mr. WEINER and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 383: Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 390: Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 407: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 417: Mr. BOYD.

H.R. 430: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 456: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 483: Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 488: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 516: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 518: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 531: Mr. LARSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HOEFFEL, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 541: Mr. WU and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 576: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 584: Mr. KING and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 648: Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 670: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 716: Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 719: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 732: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 750: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 783: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 784: Mr. STENHOLM and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 796: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 827: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 845: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 876: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 895: Mr. DIXON, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. LEE, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 924: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. JENKINS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 976: Ms. CARSON, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 997: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1000: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 1002: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 1008: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1029: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FROST, Mr. FARR of California, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 1044: Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 1070: Mr. BORSKI and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1071: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 1080: Mr. WEINER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1083: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 1095: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1102: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. COOK, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1106: Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 1111: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 1123: Mr. GEJDENSON and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 1146: Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 1168: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. HILLEARY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 1180: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TAUZIN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1190: Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1196: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. WU.

H.R. 1218: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 1221: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1222: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1237: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 1248: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1256: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1267: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 1285: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BONIOR, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1288: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1292: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1301: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. KIND, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CAMP, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 1317: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1334: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 1337: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 1342: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1349: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1355: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 1366: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1443: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1452: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 1465: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 1496: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1513: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1592: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 1602: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 1614: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 1616: Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 1649: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1650: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1659: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. CARSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1706: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 1710: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1750: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. RODRIQUEZ, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1763: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1768: Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 1775: Mr. HOYER and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1777: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 1791: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1798: Mr. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1812: Mr. BALDWIN.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. EWING.

H.J. Res. 41: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. DEGETTE.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. LEACH, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. SUNUNU.

H. Con. Res. 73: Mr. LAFALCE.

H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. ENGLISH

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. DEMINT, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RILEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. BLILEY and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H. Res. 45: Mr. PACKARD.

H. Res. 115: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 161: Mr. LAMPSON and Ms. BALDWIN.

H. Res. 164: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. FROST.

DELETION 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. 692: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 987: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1553

OFFERED BY: MR. HUTCHINSON

AMENDMENT NO. 1: In section 3, insert at the end the following new subsection:

(d) CLOSING OF LOCAL WEATHER SERVICE OFFICES.—It is the sense of the Congress that the National Weather Service should not close any local weather service offices within Wind Zone IV, otherwise known as tornado alley.

H.R. 1553

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of the bill, add the following new sections:

SEC. 9. COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.

No funds authorized pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 11. PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

H.R. 1654

OFFERED BY MR. BATEMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 1: In section 101(1), strike ''$2,482,700,000'' and insert ''$2,382,700,000''.

In section 101(2), strike ''$2,328,000,000'' and insert ''$2,228,000,000''.

In section 101(3), strike ''$2,091,000,000'' and insert ''$1,991,000,000''.

In section 103(4)—

(1) in subparagraph (A), strike ''$999,300,000'' and insert ''$1,099,300,000'';

(2) in subparagraph (A)(i), strike ''$532,800,000'' and insert ''$632,800,000'';

(3) in subparagraph (A)(i), strike ''$412,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base'' and insert ''$512,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including—

''(I) $20,000,000 for the Innovative Aviation Technologies Research program;

''(II) $30,000,000 for the Aging Aircraft Sustainment program;

''(III) $10,000,000 for the Aircraft Development Support program;

''(IV) $20,000,000 for the Unmanned Air Vehicles program; and

''(V) $20,000,000 for the Long-Range Precision Hypersonic Strike program'';

(4) in subparagraph (B), strike ''$908,400,000'' and insert ''$1,008,400,000'';

(5) in subparagraph (B)(i), strike ''$524,000,000'' and insert ''$624,000,000'';

(6) in subparagraph (B)(i), strike ''$399,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, and with $54,200,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity'' and insert ''$54,200,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity, and with $499,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including—

''(I) $20,000,000 for the Innovative Aviation Technologies Research program;

''(II) $30,000,000 for the Aging Aircraft Sustainment program;

''(III) $10,000,000 for the Aircraft Development Support program;

''(IV) $20,000,000 for the Unmanned Air Vehicles program; and

''(V) $20,000,000 for the Long-Range Precision Hypersonic Strike program'';

(7) in subparagraph (C), strike ''$994,800,000'' and insert ''$1,094,800,000'';

(8) in subparagraph (C)(i), strike ''$519,200,000'' and insert ''$619,200,000''; and

(9) in subparagraph (C)(i), strike ''$381,600,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, and with $67,600,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity'' and insert ''$67,600,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity, and with $481,600,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including—

''(I) $20,000,000 for the Innovative Aviation Technologies Research program;

''(II) $30,000,000 for the Aging Aircraft Sustainment program;

''(III) $10,000,000 for the Aircraft Development Support program;

''(IV) $20,000,000 for the Unmanned Air Vehicles program; and

''(V) $20,000,000 for the Long-Range Precision Hypersonic Strike program''.

H.R. 1654

OFFERED BY: MR. COOK

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. SPACE STATION COMMERCIALIZATION.

In order to promote commercialization of the International Space Station, the Administrator shall—

(1) allocate sufficient resources as appropriate to accelerate the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's initiatives promoting commercial participation in the International Space Station;

(2) instruct all National Aeronautics and Space Administration staff that they should consider the potential impact on commercial participation in the International Space Station in developing policies or program priorities not directly related to crew safety; and

(3) publish a list, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter with the annual budget request of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, of the opportunities for commercial participation in the International Space Station consistent with safety and mission assurance.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Space Station commercialization.

H.R. 1654

OFFERED BY: MR. ROEMER

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Amend section 101 to read as follows:

SEC. 101. INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the International Space Station, for expenses necessary to terminate the program, for fiscal year 2000, $500,000,000.

In section 106(1), strike ''$13,625,600,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$11,642,900,000''.

In section 106(2), strike ''$13,747,100,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$11,919,100,000''.

In section 106(3), strike ''$13,839,400,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$12,248,490,000''.

In section 121(a), strike ''sections 101,'' and insert in lieu thereof ''sections''.

H.R. 1654

OFFERED BY: MR. ROEMER

AMENDMENT NO. 4: After section 130, insert the following new section:

SEC. 131. COST LIMITATION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.

(a) LIMITATION OF COSTS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the total amount appropriated for—

(1) costs of the International Space Station through completion of assembly may not exceed $21,900,000,000; and

(2) space shuttle launch costs in connection with the assembly of the International Space Station through completion of assembly may not exceed $17,700,000,000 (determined at the rate of $380,000,000 per space shuttle flight).

(b) COSTS TO WHICH LIMITATION APPLIES.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT COSTS.—The limitation imposed by subsection (a)(1) does not apply to funding for operations, research, and crew return activities subsequent to substantial completion of the International Space Station.

(2) LAUNCH COSTS.—The limitation imposed by subsection (a)(2) does not apply to space shuttle launch costs in connection with operations, research, and crew return activities subsequent to substantial completion of the International Space Station.

(3) SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION.—For purposes of this subsection, the International Space Station is considered to be substantially completed when the development costs comprise 5 percent or less of the total International Space Station costs for the fiscal year.

(c) AUTOMATIC INCREASE OF LIMITATION AMOUNT.—The amounts set forth in subsection (a) shall each be increased to reflect any increase in costs attributable to—

(1) economic inflation;

(2) compliance with changes in Federal, State, or local laws enacted after the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) the lack of performance or the termination of participation of any of the International countries participating in the International Space Station; and

(4) new technologies to improve safety, reliability, maintainability, availability, or utilization of the International Space Station, or to reduce costs after completion of assembly, including increases in costs for on-orbit assembly sequence problems, increased ground testing, verification and integration activities, contingency responses to on-orbit failures, and design improvements to reduce the risk of on-orbit failures.

(d) NOTICE OF CHANGES.—The Administrator shall provide with each annual budget request a written notice and analysis of any changes under subsection (c) to the amounts set forth in subsection (a) to the Senate Committees on Appropriations and on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and to the House of Representatives Committees on Appropriations and on Science. The written notice shall include—

(1) an explanation of the basis for the change, including the costs associated with the change and the expected benefit to the program to be derived from the change; and

(2) an analysis of the impact on the assembly schedule and annual funding estimates of not receiving the requested increases.

(e) REPORTING AND REVIEW.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION OF COSTS.—

(A) SPACE SHUTTLE.—As part of the overall space shuttle program budget request for each fiscal year, the Administrator shall identify separately the amounts of the requested funding that are to be used for completion of the assembly of the International Space Station.

(B) INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.—As part of the overall International Space Station budget request for each fiscal year, the Administrator shall identify the amount to be used for development of the International Space Station.

(2) ACCOUNTING FOR COST LIMITATIONS.—As part of the annual budget request to the Congress, the Administrator shall account for the cost limitations imposed by subsection (a).

(3) VERIFICATION OF ACCOUNTING.—The Administrator shall arrange for a verification, by the General Accounting Office, of the accounting submitted to the Congress within 60 days after the date on which the budget request is transmitted to the Congress.

(4) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Within 60 days after the Administrator provides a notice and analysis to the Congress under subsection (d), the Inspector General of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall review the notice and analysis and report the results of the review to the committees to which the notice and analysis was provided.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 130, insert the following new item:

Sec. 131. Cost limitation for the International Space Station.

H.R. 1654

OFFERED BY: MR. ROEMER

AMENDMENT NO. 5: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. CANCELLATION OF RUSSIAN PARTNERSHIP.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall terminate all contracts and other agreements with the Russian Government necessary to remove the Russian Government as a partner in the International Space Station program. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall not enter into a new partnership with the Russian Government relating to the International Space Station. Nothing in this section shall prevent the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from accepting participation by the Russian Government or Russian entities on a commercial basis. Nothing in this section shall prevent the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from purchasing elements of the International Space Station directly from Russian contractors.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following:

Sec. 221. Cancellation of Russian partnership.

H.R. 1654

OFFERED BY: MR. ROHRABACHER

AMENDMENT NO. 6: In section 103(2)—

(1) in subparagraph (A), insert ", and of which $77,400,000 may be used for activities associated with International Space Station research" after "rocket vouchers";

(2) in subparagraph (B), insert ", and of which $70,000,000 may be used for activities associated with International Space Station research" after "health issues"; and

(3) in subparagraph (C), insert ", and of which $80,800,000 may be used for activities associated with International Space Station research" after "health issues".

In section 103(4)(A)(i), insert "focused program" after "Ultra-Efficient Engine".

In section 103(4)(A)(ii)(I), insert ", including $30,000,000 for Pathfinder Operability Demonstrations" after "Demonstration Program".

In section 103(4)(B)(i), insert "focused program" after "Ultra-Efficient Engine".

In section 103(4)(C)(i), insert "focused program" after "Ultra-Efficient Engine".

In section 209(1), insert "encouraging" after "process of".

In section 219—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) strike "EDUCATION CURRICULUM.—" and insert "EDUCATIONAL INITIATIVE.—";

(B) strike "an age-appropriate educational curriculum" and insert "age-appropriate educational materials";

(C) insert "related" after "and any other"; and

(D) strike "the educational curriculum plans" and insert "the educational materials plans"; and

(2) in subsection (b), strike "Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate" and insert "Congress".

H.R. 1654

OFFERED BY: MR. SALMON

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. ANTI-DRUG MESSAGE ON INTERNET SITES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, shall place anti-drug messages on Internet sites controlled by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Anti-drug message on Internet sites.

H.R. 1654

OFFERED BY: MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 8: In section 217—

(1) insert "(a) INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT.—" before "The Administrator shall"; and

(2) add at the end the following new subsections:

(b) PLAN.—After performing the activities described in subsection (a) the Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture shall develop a plan to inform farmers and other prospective users about the use and availability of remote sensing products that may assist with agricultural and forestry applications identified in subsection (a). The Administrator shall transmit such plan to the Congress not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 90 days after the plan has been transmitted under subsection (b), the Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture shall implement the plan.

H.R. 1654

OFFERED BY: MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 9: In section 217—

(1) insert "(a) INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT.—" before "The Administrator shall"; and

(2) add at the end the following new subsections:

(b) PLAN.—After performing the activities described in subsection (a) the Administrator shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, develop a plan to inform farmers and other prospective users about the use and availability of remote sensing products that may assist with agricultural and forestry applications identified in subsection (a). The Administrator shall transmit such plan to the Congress not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 90 days after the plan has been transmitted under subsection (b), the Administrator shall implement the plan.

H.R. 1654

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Administrator shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Sense of Congress; requirement regarding notice.

H.R. 1654

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 11: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. USE OF ABANDONED AND UNDERUTILIZED BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, AND FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In meeting the needs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for additional facilities, the Administrator shall select abandoned and underutilized buildings, grounds, and facilities in depressed communities that can be converted to National Aeronautics and Space Administration facilities at a reasonable cost, as determined by the Administrator.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the term "depressed communities" means rural and urban communities that are relatively depressed, in terms of age of housing, extent of poverty, growth per capita income, extent of unemployment, job lag, or surplus labor.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Use of abandoned and underutilized buildings, grounds, and facilities.