(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;