

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, a study here in Washington by Legg-Mason recently reported that we are about to become a Nation of haves and have-nots in the worst way. That report says that as long as 3 years into the next millennium, one-half of America will still be deprived of high-speed digital Internet access.

That means that for half of America, our families, our businesses, will not have access to the Information Age, while the other half of America will have good, competitive service. Guess who is left out? Rural America, the poor, the impoverished parts of our country. It means that for half of America, they will either have a single monopoly provider or no provider at all.

Why? Because of old laws that still exist on the books to regulate long-distance and local phone companies. Those old laws restricting competition in those areas are going to hold back the deployment of high speed to half of America.

Members should try to explain to a business in their district, if they live in rural America, like I do, that has to shut down because it cannot get access to the Internet. Explain to a family that cannot get their children educated that they did not do anything about it.

It is time to change those old laws and to end this system of haves and have-nots in America.

□ 1030

#### WE HAVE REACHED THE PROMISED LAND, FOR NOW

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, we have reached the promised land for now. The Federal Government, for the first time, the first time since 1960, balanced its budget in the just-ended year without tapping Social Security. The Congressional Budget Office reported that yesterday.

Now, this is very, very important. Those people who paid their money into Social Security in the form of taxes now can realize that they are protected, they are secure. Quote, "We stopped the raid on Social Security. There is no going back," end quote. That is what our leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), said. And this is what Robert Reischauer of the Brookings Institution said, "In a sense what we have done is we have reached the promised land and it will become an issue of who lost the promised land."

Republicans are committed. Stop the raid on Social Security.

WHEN WILL H.R. 1 BE DELIVERED TO THE HOUSE?

(Mr. OSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inquire when are we going to get H.R. 1 delivered to this House? When I arrived here in January, one of the things we did out of respect for the administration was reserve H.R. 1 for the President's plan on Social Security. It is now the middle of October, and the President's plan is still absent.

When can we expect the delivery of H.R. 1 from the administration?

#### FIRST EVER CLEAN AUDIT OPINION OF U.S. HOUSE FINANCIAL RECORDS

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when we drafted the Contract with America in 1994, we promised to conduct public audits of the House books and records, but in 1995 PricewaterhouseCoopers could not even render an opinion. The records, and I should say the lack of records, were deplorable. Millions of dollars were tracked on handwritten ledgers with numbers scratched out and written in different ink colors. Supplies and equipment were purchased without competitive bidding. There was \$14 million in over-budget spending. There were problems with the post office and the House bank.

After a great deal of work to clean up the mess and start keeping records under the guidelines of general accounting principles, this fall we received a totally clean bill of financial health. For the first time ever, the House books are clean, open to the public, and follow those principles.

We are committed to the highest standards of integrity and full accountability to taxpayers, including balancing the budget without using the Social Security trust fund surplus.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2561, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 326, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 326

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2561) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from North

Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted a normal conference report rule for H.R. 2561, the Fiscal Year 2000 Department of Defense Appropriations Act. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. In addition, the rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

This should not be a controversial rule. It is a type of rule that we grant for every conference report that we consider in the House.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday's military coup in Pakistan was a reminder to all of us that we live in an unstable world. We cannot ignore national defense. This appropriations bill, as well as the defense authorization bill which the President recently signed into law, is a strong step forward as we work to take care of our military personnel and provide for our national defense.

We have a long way to go, but H.R. 2561 fully funds a 4.6 percent military pay raise so that we can get some of our enlisted men and their families off of food stamps. It provides \$1.1 billion more than the President requested for the purchase of weapons and equipment and it sets aside funding for a national missile defense system so that we can protect ourselves from terrorist nations.

This is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support the underlying conference report, because now more than ever we must improve our national security.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and this conference report; but, first and foremost, I rise in support of the men and women who serve the Nation faithfully, as well as members of our armed services. They are the ones who, when called upon, will be required to sacrifice their lives so that we may continue to live in freedom; and this conference report, Mr. Speaker, fulfills a commitment to them which I am proud to support.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report contains a package of pay and retirement improvements which keeps faith with our men and women in uniform. This conference report contains the largest military pay raise in 18 years, as well as funding for a change in pay scales and a series of pay and bonus incentives. These pay increases, bonuses, and other incentives prove our commitment to a better quality of life for our military personnel and their families.

As an editorial in the Fort Worth Star Telegram noted on Monday, when the President signed the National Defense Authorization Act last week, he said the excellence of our military is the direct product of the excellence of our men and women in uniform. This bill invests in that excellence.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the same holds true for this conference report. The conferees are to be commended for ensuring that quality of life, benefits and training for the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines, upon whom we depend for our national security, are squarely addressed. There is much left to do, but I believe the provision of the 4.8 percent pay increase is a solid beginning. Incentives to retain our most skilled military personnel are also in the bill; but, again, there is still much to do to ensure that we not continue to lose men and women who have the skills and experience that are so critical to maintaining a fighting force that can quickly and effectively respond to any emergency or who can sustain a long-term effort.

The ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), early this year called 1999 the Year of the Troops. This bill lives up to the commitments we as a body made earlier this year; but this is not the end of the story, Mr. Speaker, because there is still much to be done. In spite of the constraints on our budget, we must all make a commitment to continue to improve the quality of life for our military personnel and their families. Considering how much we ask of them, this is the least that we can do.

The conference agreement also provides for those weapons systems that our military men and women will man and operate, and in particular this bill reflects a workable compromise on the future of the F-22 stealth fighter. While I would certainly have preferred that full funding for production of the first six F-22 fighters be included in this bill, the agreement does provide \$750 million for the development of a test aircraft which will be subjected to rigorous tests prior to going forward with full scale acquisition. Also included is \$277 million for the purchase of components for advanced procurement of ten F-22s if the test aircraft meets the test thresholds established in the conference agreement and provides the \$1.2 billion requested by the President for further research and development of the aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, production of this aircraft is the number one modernization priority of the Air Force. This program has received the unqualified endorsement of the entire Joint Chiefs, as well as all 10 war fighting commanders in chief.

The Secretary of Defense has called the F-22 the cornerstone of our Nation's global air power in the 21st Century. Mr. Speaker, no other aircraft in our current arsenal will be able to fulfill the role that the F-22 is designed to

fill in the next century, and the conference agreement is a vast improvement over the zero funding that was in the House-passed bill. The conference agreement also provides for \$246 million to build ten F-16-C fighters, as well as \$283 million for F-16 modifications and upgrades. The bill also provides \$302 million for upgrades for the B-2 bomber fleet and \$856 million for the acquisition of 12 V-22 Osprey tiltrotor aircraft and \$183 million for additional research and development on the V-22.

The conference agreement provides for a total of \$267.8 billion for the Department of Defense in the first fiscal year of the new century. The conferees have done the best with the funds available to them but, Mr. Speaker, we have found ourselves in the unenviable position of making trade-offs and delaying the funding for needed modernization programs while at the same time the needs of our military continue to grow as our obligations as the world's only superpower continue to expand. This bill is a good bill as far as it goes, but I believe that in future years the Congress must make every effort to continue to fund the needed programs that will ensure our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt this rule and to adopt the conference report. This bill is good for our country and deserves our support.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, and I do this based on a provision that is in the bill, section 8160, which makes the statement, "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all military construction projects for which funds were appropriated in Public Law 106-52 are hereby authorized."

In other words, in an appropriations bill they are saying that anything we want to do is okay to do and we will assume that they were authorized. Now, this is not unusual. We do this often in bills. In fact, there are many committees who do not do an authorization bill and then an appropriations bill, but that is not the case with defense. We work very hard to do an authorization bill. We struggle with that. We have endless hours of hearings with that. We come up with a bipartisan, it is almost always a unanimous, vote. Certainly in my committee it is always a unanimous vote on the authorization process. Then we go to the full committee, and it is almost always a unanimous vote.

So we have struggled with these things, trying to authorize the things that really do make sense, that are good public policy.

Then we go through the conference process, and we struggle with the Senate, and we come out, and we have an authorization bill. Now, many times

the appropriations bill is out ahead of the authorizations bill, and so they can accept statements like this because they are out ahead, but that is not the case this year. The authorization bill is first. It has been signed by the President. The Committee on Rules, I asked in the Committee on Rules that they make these authorizations subject to a point of order so that we could at least get to these things and determine whether or not we want to do them or not. The Committee on Rules did not do that.

This is bad policy. This is a bad way to do our business here on the House Floor. It raises the question of whether or not we need an authorization committee and a Committee on Appropriations if the Committee on Appropriations is going to do it all.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would request that we would reject this rule and come back with a rule that would give us an opportunity to deal with this blanket authorization which is being done in an appropriations bill.

□ 1045

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for doing their dead-level best to bring new thinking to this bill.

They tried mightily, for instance, on the issue of the F-22, because they recognized that, if we are putting all of our money in that basket, we do not have enough money to provide other high priority needs that our defense posture very badly needs.

They have been partially successful, and I congratulate them for that. I recognize that they could not go as far as they needed to go because of constraints imposed upon them by the leadership of this House. I regret that. I think we should have gone further.

But I want to take the time of the House today to give my colleagues a more basic reason for my concern about this bill. I am not going to vote for this bill in the end because I do not believe in supporting legislation which in the end conveys a falsehood to the American people.

When we had President Reagan ram his budget through here in 1981 and beyond, I opposed those budgets in very large part because they promised something that they could not deliver. They promised that they would balance the budget in 4 years. Instead, they produced the largest deficits in the history of the country.

When we had the budget agreement in 1997, which was signed by the President and pushed through the Congress by then Speaker Gingrich, I did not support it and called it a public lie, because, in my view, it promised things that would never take place. In fact, time has demonstrated that the doubts about that bill were correct.

Now, we have a new situation. We have the Republican majority telling the country that they do not want to sit down in an omnibus negotiation with the President on all remaining bills because, if they did, they say we will wind up just like last year where we had some \$21 billion in emergency spending rammed into last year's omnibus appropriation bill.

First of all, that misreads history, because, in fact, that number was driven up substantially by then Speaker Gingrich who insisted that, whatever increases we had on the domestic side be matched on the military and intelligence side, whether we needed them or not. So they wound up spending \$21 billion on emergencies.

But, ironically, this year, this Republican House has already spent \$24.2 billion and designated them as emergencies. They spent \$8.7 billion on agriculture and declared it an emergency. They spent \$7.2 billion in this bill on defense, declared it emergency. They spent \$4.5 billion on the census. They declared it an emergency. Low-income heating assistance, which has only been around for 24 years, they declared that an emergency at \$1.1 billion. They declared \$2.5 billion in FEMA as an emergency. They declared half a billion dollars in bioterrorism as an emergency for a grand total of \$24.2 billion.

So they have already spent more in emergencies than we spent last year. Yet, they claim the reason they do not want to negotiate with the President is to avoid that which they have already done. That strange logic makes sense only, I guess, on this floor.

I would also point out that, in this bill, this bill pretends to spend \$249 billion in outlays. In fact, when we take into account all of the gimmicks, it spends \$271 billion in outlays. They have \$21 billion worth of gimmicks in order to pretend that the bill is spending less than it actually spends.

It has an emergency designation of \$7.2 billion in budget authority and \$5.5 billion in outlays. It pretends we are going to make \$2.6 billion through spectrum sales. We know that is not going to happen. It has an advance appropriation of \$1.8 billion.

Then it simply directs the Congressional Budget Office to pretend that the spend-out rate for this bill is going to be \$10.5 billion less than it will actually be, and they simply tell the Congressional Budget Office to ignore reality. That hides another \$10.5 billion. Then they delay payments to contractors for a few days to save \$1.25 billion.

So we have overall total gimmicks of \$21.6 billion. That is not a good recommendation for passing this bill.

One thing we ought to do, no matter what our political differences are, no matter what our philosophical differences are, we at least ought to level with people about what we are doing. Yet, we are engaged in this ridiculous fiction that we are not above the caps and that this Congress has not already spent Social Security money for the

coming year, by engaging in all of these phony accounting gimmicks.

That is happening, no question about it, at the direct direction of the leadership of this House. I think it brings discredit to the entire process. It brings discredit to this institution.

Whatever we pass ought to be on the level. This bill is as far from being on the level in terms of being honest with budget numbers as any I have seen in a long time. This and the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies appropriations bill, which has all kinds of similar gimmicks, are two reasons which demonstrate that, when it comes to telling the truth, this House gets a flunking grade.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do intend to support the rule and the conference report, but I wanted to express my concerns about some particular provisions concerning U.S. policy in South Asia.

The conference report language that would give the President authority to waive certain sanctions against India and Pakistan, including the prohibition on U.S. military assistance to Pakistan mandated by the Pressler Amendment, as well as other arms transfer controls.

While I have long supported lifting the economic sanctions against India and Pakistan, which the conference report also addresses, I am concerned the provisions in the conference report would result in a renewal of U.S. arms transfers to Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we were reminded in a stunning and very disturbing way about the potential problems associated with renewing our military ties with Pakistan. The Pakistani Army Chief of Staff, in a nationally televised address, confirmed that a military coup has taken place.

Prime Minister Sharif has been dismissed and placed under house arrest. Troops took over state-run TV and radio stations and closed the major airports. Pakistan's army has ruled the country for 25 of its 52-year history, so Army takeovers have been a relatively common occurrence. But this time, the subversion of civilian government means that Pakistan's nuclear arsenal is under direct control of the military leaders, the same hard-line forces who precipitated Pakistan's incursion into India or onto India's side of the Line of Control in Kashmir earlier this year, greatly heightened tensions in that region.

I believe the provision in the Defense authorization conference report to grant waiver authority for the Pressler amendment essentially on a permanent basis is a grave mistake. Combined with expanded waiver authority on other provisions of the Arms Export Control Act, this opens the door for the

administration to renew the U.S. Pakistan military relationship.

Although the Arms Export Control Act waivers would theoretically apply both to India and Pakistan, with congressional notification, I am concerned that that goal is to renew military assistance to Pakistan. I hope that the administration would not help Pakistan militarily thereby putting India at risk. Likewise, I hope that any steps against Pakistan would not be matched by corresponding actions against India.

The conference report also provides for extended waiver authority of the Glenn Amendment economic sanctions. I have lobbied for a suspension, if not an outright appeal, of the Glenn amendment.

I am glad that the conference took action on the Glenn sanctions. Extending the waiver is a positive step, but I just think we could have gone a little further.

I also want to thank the conferees for another positive provision, a sense of the Congress resolution that the broad application of export controls to nearly 300 Indian and Pakistani entities listed on the so-called Entities List, which is adopted by the Bureau of Export Administration, is inconsistent with the specific national security interest of the U.S., and that this list requires refinement.

There is also language that these export controls should be applied only to those entities that make direct and material contributions to weapons of mass destruction and missile programs and only to those items that so contribute.

The BXA went way too far in blacklisting entities with little or no connection to nuclear or missile programs.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, I urge that we adopt the conference report and the rule, but I am very concerned about the repeal, essentially, of the Pressler Amendment.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule, and I yield back the balance of the time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 326, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2561) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 8, 1999, at page H9651).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and

the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS. 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. 2561, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I first rise to ask the membership for their support for this very important bill. It involves the national defense of our country. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my personal appreciation to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have been, not just cooperative, but who have been truly professional in the best possible sense in presenting their viewpoints regarding a number of items that are very important, which we will consider as we go forward with this debate today.

In particular, I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the full committee. He has been essentially my trainer since I assumed this job, for he chaired the committee before I did. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is not just a great leader of the full Committee on Appropriations, but, for his entire career, he has provided the kind of leadership that has allowed us to make certain that America is the strongest country in the world, as we play a role in leadership for peace in that world.

Mr. Speaker, speaking just for a moment about the bill, this legislation does provide for \$267.7 billion in discretionary spending authority for fiscal year 2000. It meets all budget authority and outlay limits set in the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation.

This bill provides for \$17.3 billion more than was appropriated in fiscal year 1999 and is \$4.5 billion above the administration's 2000 budget request.

Let me take just a moment to outline some of the highlights of the bill. This legislation provides \$73.9 billion to meet the most critical personnel needs of our military. One of our top priorities has been to improve the training, benefits, and quality of life, to ensure that the armed services retain their most valuable asset, that asset being the men and women who serve the country in uniform.

There are essentially 2.25 million men and women serving in the Armed Forces, the reserves, and the National Guard. These personnel, as well as our colleagues, will be pleased to know that this bill fully funds the 4.8 percent pay raise that we have discussed previously.

Mr. Speaker, with those brief comments outlining the highlights of the bill, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the time.

Mr. Speaker, a minute ago, I talked about the gimmicks that were in this bill that hide its true spending levels. I would like to continue on that theme and put it in context by walking the House through what the gimmicks are in all of the appropriations bills that we are expected to try to pass.

First of all, with respect to this bill itself, one of the gimmicks in this bill, I guess I would call it the Government Deadbeat Amendment for the year. It simply says that the government is going to delay payment to defense contractors on the bills that we owe from 12 days to 17 days, thereby saving \$1.2 billion by squeezing that money into the next fiscal year.

□ 1100

I would like to point out when we do that, we are not only affecting the cash flow of the United States Government, we are affecting the cash flow of thousands of U.S. businesses, and we are affecting their balance sheets for the quarter in question and for the entire fiscal year. And I think that what that really does is to increase the cost of doing business with Uncle Sam.

So what is the response of these contractors likely to be? The response is likely to be that they will factor in that problem the next time they write a contract with Uncle Sam. The net effect is it will raise the cost of those contracts down the line and, in the end, the taxpayers will pay for this foolishness.

This is just one example of one of the problems in the bill. And as I say, I make no criticisms to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) or the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) when I cite this, because they had no choice but to include gimmicks like this because everybody in this House is under orders from the leadership to hide the true levels of spending. And it is not just happening on this bill. It is happening on all of them.

On agriculture we had just in directed scoring alone, not counting the emergency designation, just in directed scoring alone, which means that they pretend that they are going to spend less than they are actually going to spend, they hide \$163 million that way.

In the Commerce-Justice bill, they hide \$5.4 billion through a series of budgetary gimmicks. In this bill, as I said earlier, they hide \$21.5 billion in spending that way. In the Energy and Water bill that passed, they hide \$103 million. In the Foreign Operations bill, they hide \$159 million. Interior, the House-passed bill, hides \$159 million, as well.

Then in the Labor Health bill, which was reported by the committee, we will

have \$12.1 billion in assorted gimmicks, some of which their own leading presidential contender has denounced as being unfair because they balanced the budget on the backs of the poor.

In Transportation we have \$1.4 billion worth of these gimmicks that hide the true nature of congressional spending. In Treasury-Post Office they hide \$151 million. In the VA-HUD bill, which is going to come to the floor yet this week, they hide \$1.5 billion through what I would call these hidden card tricks in a magic show.

The problem is that it is not just a few suckers paying a quarter who are fooled, the entire American public is deceived in the process. That means that government-wide, in all of the appropriations bills that we are supposed to consider this year, we have over \$43 billion in gimmicks. When we subtract \$14 billion from that, which represents the amount of the non-Social Security surplus that we have for the coming year on that we are expected to have, that means we have bills \$29 billion over the spending caps in real terms when we do not count the gimmicks.

Now, I want to make clear some of this has happened before. This is not unprecedented. But what is unprecedented is the huge amount of game playing that is going on.

I would just suggest, in the end, both parties would be better off if we level with the American people and if we simply tell them what the true effects are. I know the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) tried to avoid this. He tried to bring a series of bills out of committee which were bipartisan in nature and which were a whole lot more honest than the bills that we are running to the floor today, but he was cut off at the pass by people in his caucus who thought they knew better.

The result is that the level of consumer fraud in this House has reached record levels, and I think that is unfortunate for the country and the institution.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of our full committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I rise in support of this conference report on our appropriations bill for our national security and our intelligence programs.

The gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) deserves a tremendous amount of credit for the hard work that he has done in getting this bill to the floor.

Having had many years of experience as a member of this subcommittee, this was probably the most difficult year to go to conference on this bill that any of us have seen. The gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) has done a really outstanding job and especially since this was his first year in that important position as Subcommittee Chairman, and I cannot say enough

good words about the outstanding work that he has done.

Also, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), who is the ranking member and the former chairman of this subcommittee, as usual has worked with the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) to keep this bill and any matters relating to national defense or intelligence totally non-political, nonpartisan, which is as it should be. Our defense issues and our intelligence issues should not be political in any way.

One of the problems that they faced as they produced this bill this year and went to conference with the Senate was a 13-year reduction in our investment in our national defense. However, at the same time we were making these reductions, we were sending our troops to excessive deployments in all parts of the world. Many of them, as all of our Members know, are still deployed today in places like Bosnia and Kosovo and plus the permanent deployments in Europe, Korea, and other places like that.

We have tried to reduce the pressure of these excessive deployments, without much success, because the administration believes that anyplace in the world that there is an opportunity to send American troops they ought to do it. And they do it, and then they send us the bill after they spend the money.

The air war in Kosovo, for example, was a very expensive air war. That air war was basically an American air war. We provided the airplanes. We provided the pilots. We provided the fuel. We provided the munitions. And despite the fact it was a NATO decision to go into that war, it was a U.S. war, and we basically paid for it.

With this bill we are replacing a lot of the munitions, we are fixing a lot of the worn out equipment, we are trying to get a decent quality of life for those men and women who serve in our military by providing them a pay raise. And it is not really enough, but at least it is a significant step towards a commitment that some of us have made to get our men and women in the military up to a livable wage.

It is really a shame when we still have to report that there are still several thousand Americans in uniform who have to rely on food stamps to feed their family.

So we have to give some recognition to those people, and we have done that in this bill in addition to changing the retirement system. This is a good bill. And again I say, in my many years of experience on this subcommittee, this was the toughest conference meeting; and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) deserve just a tremendous amount of credit in what they have been able to do to bring this conference report to the floor today.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in great reluctance to oppose the conference report to accompany H.R. 2561, the Department of Defense appropriations act for the year 2000. I oppose the legislation because it contains numerous provisions which taken together represent an erosion of the prerogatives of the authorization process and actually raise the question of do we need an appropriations process and an authorization process if the Committee on Appropriations is going to do both in their bill.

I am not usually down here opposing a defense appropriations bill. I always have been and I continue to support a strong national defense.

Let me tell my colleagues, there is a lot of good in this bill. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) pointed out many of the items. There is a lot of good in this bill. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) should be commended on the bill that they have produced and for getting this out of the conference report.

But since I have become chairman of the subcommittee on military installations and facilities over 4 years ago, I have worked closely with Members of both sides of the aisle to find additional resources needed to improve and enhance our military housing and infrastructure. I have always done so in cooperation with the Committee on Appropriations.

In fact, the military authorization bill on military facilities and construction and the appropriations bill on military construction in these last 4-plus years have been mirrors of each other because we worked so closely together. That is the way it should be. That is not the way it is this year.

That is why it is especially troubling to me to review the conference report and see that there are so many provisions that violate the necessary and reasonable boundaries between the authorizations and the appropriations process.

First, section 8160 provides a blanket authorization for all military construction projects for which funds are appropriated pursuant to the Military Construction Appropriation Act, 2000. The legislation contained funding or additional funding for 18 military construction projects amounting to \$110.5 million for which no authorization of appropriations was provided in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I will include a list of these military construction projects at issue following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes the appropriations bill is out ahead of the authorization bill; and when that happens, a provision like this may need to be done, but it is usually done with the idea that we are appropriating this subject to the authorization of these

projects, which we then look at the next year and we get done.

That is not the case this year. The authorization bill did not provide authority for these military construction projects because there was a consensus among House and Senate conferees on that bill to not break scope to add large number of new projects, given the limited resources available to us.

While these projects may have legitimate military utility, none, in my judgment, represent an urgent requirement that could not be evaluated during next year's authorization review. It is not unusual for an occasional construction project to be appropriated without authorization. But, as I said, we do that the following year.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding.

Let me say this: the questions that he is raising in his statement are very legitimate questions, and I must say that the gentleman has been more than professional in his dealings with me. I, too, feel that we need to work very hard to make sure that we eliminate conflicts between the authorizing process where they may exist and the appropriations process.

In this case, I guess the gentleman and I working together would probably agree regarding most of the projects that may have been authorized. Sometimes elements at a different level than that of the gentleman and mine and the House get involved between us. So, in connection with that, let me say to the gentleman that I commit to him that he and I will work very closely to try to eliminate this kind of problem in the future dealing with our leadership and otherwise.

And with that, while the gentleman is expressing very well his concern about this matter, recognizing the broad base of values in this bill, I would hope in the final analysis even with this protest I would have the vote of this gentleman.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and I have worked together; but we have been friends and colleagues and worked well together for darn near 15 years, and that is not going to change because of this bill this year. And we have talked about next year and future years and how this ought to be done, and we intend to do it differently. I appreciate his comments.

Second, section 8167 provide new appropriations and authorization for an Army Aviation Support facility to support the Army National Guard at West Bend, Wisconsin. This MILCON project was not included in either the House or the Senate version of the defense authorization bill or in the House or Senate version of the military construction appropriations bill. It is an entirely new \$10 million project that is

not even included in the Future Years Defense Plan, what is called the FYDP, meaning that it is not part of the current Army National Guard planning until well after the year 2005.

That is not the way we do business. The urgency of this project escapes me. Its inclusion in the general appropriations bill to support the Department of Defense is simply wrong and compounds the troubling precedent presented by section 8160.

Third, section 8163 provides authority for the Secretary of the Air Force to accept up to \$13 million in contributions from the State of New York for the purpose of combining those funds with \$12.8 million in appropriated funds to consolidate and expand facilities at Rome Research Site at New York.

□ 1115

It sounds like a good deal for the Air Force. The trouble is that the Air Force does not support it.

The President's budget request for the coming fiscal year contained a requirement for a \$12.8 million facility at

the Rome Research Site. The conference agreements on the defense authorization bill and the military construction appropriations bill both provided the funding necessary for the validated MILCON requirement. However, the proposal for broader authority to permit the State of New York to contribute funding for additional facility improvements was rejected by the conferees on the defense authorization bill. While the Department of the Air Force fully supported the requirement contained in the President's budget, the Secretary of the Air Force declined to support the broader facility improvement plan. In a letter dated August 6, 1999, the Secretary stated that "The Air Force currently has no additional phased consolidation projects for the Rome Research Site in the Future Years Defense Plan and does not have options for funding any future phases."

Finally, section 8168 contains extensive new authorities for the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a "pilot project" at Brooks Air Force Base,

Texas. These authorities fundamentally change the nature of installation management. Although the provision was slightly modified for the version contained in the Senate-passed defense appropriations bill, this is a matter which deserves review by the authorization committee, even if it is just a "pilot project."

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I know the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and other members resisted the inclusion of many of these provisions and I appreciate their efforts. Regretfully, the conferees on H.R. 2561 could not withstand the significant pressures to depart from the well-established pattern of comity that has governed the authorization and appropriations process for military construction in recent years. I simply cannot support legislation that in the end significantly undermines the authority of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY SECTION 8160 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

State	Service	Location	Project	Amount in thousands
Arizona	Army	Fort Huachuca	Wastewater Treatment Plant, Phase 1	6,000
California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Gymnasium	16,000
District of Columbia	Navy	8th & I Barracks	Site Improvements	4,000
Florida	Navy	Blount Island (Jacksonville)	Land Acquisition, Phase 1	5,000
Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Mission Planning Center, Phase 1	10,000
Massachusetts	Army National Guard	Barnes ANGB	Army Aviation Support Facility	3,933
Michigan	Air National Guard	Selfridge ANGB	Replace Fire Crash/Rescue Station	7,400
Minnesota	Air Force Reserve	Minneapolis/St. Paul ARS	Consolidated Lodging Facility, Phase 2	8,140
Montana	Army National Guard	Great Falls	Readiness Center	4,700
New Jersey	Army	Picatinny Arsenal	Armament Software Engineering Center, Phase 1	9,900
New Jersey	Navy	NWS Earle	Security Improvements	1,250
Ohio	Air National Guard	Mansfield Lahm Airport	Replace Security Forces Complex	2,700
Ohio	Air National Guard	Toledo Express Airport	Upgrade Maintenance Complex	8,400
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Youngstown ARS	Apron Runoff/Storm Water/Deicing Collection System	3,400
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Connellsville	Readiness Center	1,700
South Carolina	Navy	NWS Charleston	Child Development Center	3,614
Washington	Army	Yakima Training Center	Tank Trail Erosion Mitigation, Phase 5	12,000
Korea	Army	Camp Kyle	Physical Fitness Center	4,350
Subtotal				112,487
Offset for Authorization of Appropriations (P.L. 106-65)				(2,000)
Total				110,487

Note: Public Law 106-65, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 provided authorization of appropriations for Military Construction, Army in the amount of \$2,000,000 for tank trail erosion mitigation at Yakima Training Center, Washington.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I want to commend the gentleman from California, the chairman, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking member, for putting together what I think is a good quality bill.

As the gentlemen know, I was not particularly pleased with the direction at which we started out with respect to the F-22, but I want to say to each of the gentlemen, they have been very straightforward in the debate, the dialogue we have had, they have been honest in their beliefs and honest with me. I appreciate them working hard to make sure that we came up with a fair resolution for the continued research and ultimate procurement of a very valued weapons system. It is going to be necessary for this system to be purchased if we are going to maintain air superiority in the future, and we have

seen just most recently in the Balkans how critical that is.

I also want to commend them on the direction in which we are continuing to go with respect to the C-17. The C-17 is a very valuable airlift mobility asset. I think that we ought to continue to look at what we are doing with the C-17 as a model for the purchase of future weapons systems. A multiyear buy not only provides our armed forces with the best weapons systems available but it also saves the taxpayers money, and that is what we are ultimately here and all about. We are operating in an entirely different era now from what we have operated in in past years because we simply do not have the money to buy anything we want in the quantities that we want to buy them.

I am a little disappointed in where we are going, the direction, with the 130s. The Marine Corps asked for a total of four and we were not able to provide those. But I know that the gentlemen are going to work hard to see if we cannot improve that next year. We

are going to put the burden back on the Air Force, that if they want these weapons systems, they are not going to be able to depend on add-ons in future years. They have got to come ask for them. That is the way it ought to be.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement, particularly on his comments regarding the C-17. I am very pleased and I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for putting in the multiyear language for the C-17. Frankly, I do not think 120 of these planes is enough. I think we are going to need more than that, simply because we do not have enough aircraft for the airlift and deployability issue.

Just yesterday, General Shinseki has come up with this new program for the

Army which is basically heavily reliant on deployability and having all this new equipment be able to fit into those C-130s that the gentleman mentioned. I look forward to working with him in the days ahead, and I appreciate his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. This year's defense appropriations bill provides funding for many critical military needs. Chairman LEWIS and Ranking Member MURTHA have ensured that the Congress is addressing problems with recruiting and retention and the readiness of our Armed Forces. I thank them for their leadership on this bill.

H.R. 2561 includes the final portion of a 4.8 percent pay raise for military and defense civilian personnel. This pay raise will address the pay gap between those at the Defense Department and comparable jobs in the private sector. The bill includes critical funding for Navy ship maintenance, an area where increasing backlogs have built up. This year's bill includes over \$360 million more for ship maintenance activities than the appropriations bill for FY 99. And this bill has found a critical balance for the modernization priorities of all the services. In particular, I am pleased that the conferees were able to restore much of the funding in the President's Request for the F-22, air dominance fighter. Funding included in the bill will allow work to move forward on the F-22 while also providing for additional testing.

The conferees also approved multiyear procurement authority for the FA-18 E&F and the C-17. This will allow us to purchase 222 F-18s for the price of 200, a significant savings. And it will allow us to take advantage of an unsolicited proposal by Boeing to provide 60 more C-17s at an average price that is 25 percent lower than the current model. These planes will address critical airlift needs revealed in Kosovo.

The committee has also ensured that the weaponization of our bomber force will continue. Earlier this year, the Air Force provided Congress with a bomber road map laying out their plan to weaponize the bomber force. It was totally inadequate. Congress has provided an additional \$100 million for weaponization of the B-2 bomber. These funds will allow for the purchase of deployable shelters for the B-2 so that when necessary it can deploy closer to the theater of combat. We further integrate the B-2 into the larger air campaign by adding Link 16 connectivity to the B-2 along with the most advanced displays for situational awareness. We improve the in-flight replanning capability of the B-2's on-board computer systems. At the Air Force's request, we pay for the integration of the EGBU 28 bomb in the B-2's bomb bay. And we start the process of developing further improvements to the B-2's stealth.

The conferees also provided funding for improvements to B-52's situational awareness systems, and for additional conventional bomb modules for the B-1B. These investments will ensure that our bomber force can continue to be as effective in the future as it was during the recent Kosovo conflict.

Again, I would like to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member, and urge support of the conference report.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I thank the gentleman for those comments.

Lastly, just let me say that I appreciate the efforts that we have made on the quality of life issues. As I go around and talk to enlisted personnel all across the world, I am very impressed with the quality of those folks, and the provisions that the gentlemen have made with respect to quality of life are going to help those young men and women out there.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Department of Defense conference report, legislation that deserves overwhelming support in this House.

I want to begin by acknowledging the budgetary challenges that the gentleman from California and the Subcommittee on Defense faced in assembling this conference report. Yet I also want to thank this Congress and acknowledge that the Federal Government has no more important responsibility than national defense. This bill is a step in the right direction. I commend the gentleman from California for his leadership.

I have been an advocate for a stronger military for many years, but it was not until I arrived in Congress that I realized how hollow our military has become and how important high-tech weapons are to the future of our national security.

I want to commend the gentleman for his scrutiny of the F-22 Raptor program. This is an honorable compromise that does not compromise our national security. The F-22 will continue to be developed. That is bad news for America's enemies, but it is good news for America's security.

This conference report also funds other programs critical to our national defense, including the V-22 Osprey, the F-16 Falcon, and the 4BW-4BN, H-1 upgrade programs. I thank the gentleman for his work on these priorities.

In closing, I would like to remind my colleagues that our national security

can be preserved only when we match our greatest asset, which is our troops, with the greatest weapons possible. This bill acknowledges that when it comes to national security, it is better to be safe than sorry. For that reason, I am proud to support this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill speaks for itself. All the members have done a marvelous job: the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) have been in the trenches; the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) did a tremendous job; the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) in a very difficult situation. This bill is carefully crafted, articulately done.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, a very brief comment in closing. I would be remiss if I did not just take a moment to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) who is not just a pro at this business but who has been a great leader on behalf of national defense for a long, long time. Within our subcommittee, he has been the driving force that has allowed us to create an environment that is literally non-partisan as it relates to national defense. No bill is more important to the national government, to America and indeed to the world than this one. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has played a key role in making this year's effort such a success.

Beyond that, I would also like to express my appreciation to Greg Dahlberg, his fine staff assistant who has worked so closely with us this year, Kevin Roper, my staff director, and I must say my own personal staff as well as our Appropriations Committee staff. Mr. Speaker, I do not know where or how we find such fabulous young people who are willing to work endless hours, endless days. They do not know weekends. They have done a fantastic job this year to create an extraordinary bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE I</b>						
<b>MILITARY PERSONNEL</b>						
Military Personnel, Army.....	20,841,687	22,006,632	21,475,732	22,041,094	22,006,361	+ 1,164,674
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31.....			(559,533)			
Military Personnel, Navy.....	16,570,754	17,207,481	16,737,072	17,236,001	17,258,823	+ 688,069
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31.....			(436,773)			
Military Personnel, Marine Corps 2/.....	6,263,387	6,544,682	6,353,622	6,562,336	6,555,403	+ 292,016
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31.....			(177,980)			
Military Personnel, Air Force.....	17,211,987	17,899,685	17,565,811	17,873,759	17,861,803	+ 649,816
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31.....			(471,892)			
Reserve Personnel, Army.....	2,167,052	2,270,964	2,235,055	2,278,696	2,289,996	+ 122,944
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31.....			(40,574)			
Reserve Personnel, Navy.....	1,426,663	1,446,339	1,425,210	1,450,788	1,473,388	+ 46,725
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31.....			(29,833)			
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps.....	406,616	409,189	403,822	410,650	412,650	+ 6,034
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31.....			(7,820)			
Reserve Personnel, Air Force.....	852,324	881,170	872,978	884,794	892,594	+ 40,270
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31.....			(13,143)			
National Guard Personnel, Army.....	3,489,987	3,570,639	3,486,427	3,622,479	3,610,479	+ 120,492
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31.....			(70,416)			
National Guard Personnel, Air Force.....	1,377,109	1,486,512	1,456,248	1,494,496	1,533,196	+ 156,087
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31.....			(30,462)			
<b>Total, title I, Military Personnel 4/.....</b>	<b>70,607,566</b>	<b>73,723,293</b>	<b>72,011,977</b>	<b>73,855,093</b>	<b>73,894,693</b>	<b>+ 3,287,127</b>
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31.....			(1,838,426)			
<b>Total funding available.....</b>	<b>70,607,566</b>	<b>73,723,293</b>	<b>73,850,403</b>	<b>73,855,093</b>	<b>73,894,693</b>	<b>+ 3,287,127</b>
<b>TITLE II</b>						
<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</b>						
Operation and Maintenance, Army.....	17,185,623	18,610,994	19,629,019	19,161,852	19,256,152	+ 2,070,529
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile).....	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund).....	(-96,000)					(+ 96,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Navy.....	21,872,399	22,188,715	23,029,584	22,841,510	22,958,784	+ 1,086,385
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile).....	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund).....	(-32,087)					(+ 32,087)
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps.....	2,578,718	2,558,929	2,822,004	2,758,139	2,808,354	+ 229,636
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund).....	(-9,513)					(+ 9,513)
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.....	19,021,045	20,313,203	21,641,099	20,760,429	20,896,959	+ 1,875,914
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile).....	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund).....	(-52,200)					(+ 52,200)
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide.....	10,914,076	11,419,233	11,402,733	11,537,333	11,489,483	+ 575,407
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund).....	(-90,020)					(+ 90,020)
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve.....	1,202,622	1,369,213	1,513,076	1,438,776	1,469,176	+ 266,554
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	957,239	917,647	969,478	946,478	958,978	+ 1,739
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve.....	117,893	123,266	143,911	126,711	138,911	+ 21,018
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	1,747,696	1,728,437	1,788,091	1,760,591	1,782,591	+ 34,895
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.....	2,678,015	2,903,549	3,103,642	3,156,378	3,161,378	+ 483,363
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard.....	3,106,933	3,099,618	3,239,438	3,229,638	3,241,138	+ 134,205
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund.....	439,400	2,387,600	1,812,600	2,087,600	1,722,600	+ 1,283,200
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.....	7,324	7,621	7,621	7,621	7,621	+ 297
Environmental Restoration, Army.....	370,640	378,170	378,170	378,170	378,170	+ 7,530
Environmental Restoration, Navy.....	274,600	284,000	284,000	284,000	284,000	+ 9,400
Environmental Restoration, Air Force.....	372,100	376,800	376,800	376,800	376,800	+ 4,700
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide.....	26,091	25,370	25,370	25,370	25,370	-721
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites.....	225,000	199,214	209,214	239,214	239,214	+ 14,214
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid.....	50,000	55,800	55,800	55,800	55,800	+ 5,800
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction.....	440,400	475,500	456,100	475,500	460,500	+ 20,100
Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund.....				246,439	222,800	+ 222,800
(By transfer).....	(279,820)					(-279,820)
Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense 3/.....	455,000	1,845,370	800,000		300,000	-155,000
<b>Total, title II, Operation and maintenance.....</b>	<b>84,042,814</b>	<b>91,268,249</b>	<b>93,687,750</b>	<b>91,894,349</b>	<b>92,234,779</b>	<b>+ 8,191,965</b>
(By transfer).....	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	



**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued**  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE III</b>						
<b>PROCUREMENT</b>						
Aircraft Procurement, Army .....	1,388,268	1,229,888	1,590,488	1,440,788	1,451,688	+ 63,420
Missile Procurement, Army .....	1,226,335	1,358,104	1,272,798	1,267,698	1,322,305	+ 95,970
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army .....	1,548,340	1,416,765	1,556,665	1,526,265	1,586,490	+ 38,150
Procurement of Ammunition, Army .....	1,065,955	1,140,816	1,228,770	1,145,566	1,204,120	+ 138,165
Other Procurement, Army .....	3,339,486	3,423,870	3,604,751	3,658,070	3,738,934	+ 399,448
Aircraft Procurement, Navy .....	7,541,709	8,228,655	9,168,405	8,558,684	8,662,655	+ 1,120,946
Weapons Procurement, Navy .....	1,211,419	1,357,400	1,334,800	1,423,713	1,383,413	+ 171,994
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps .....	484,203	484,900	537,600	510,300	525,200	+ 40,997
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy .....	6,035,752	6,678,454	6,656,554	7,178,454	7,053,454	+ 1,017,702
Other Procurement, Navy .....	4,072,662	4,100,091	4,252,191	4,184,891	4,320,238	+ 247,576
Procurement, Marine Corps .....	874,216	1,137,220	1,333,120	1,236,620	1,300,920	+ 426,704
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force .....	8,095,507	9,302,086	8,298,313	9,918,333	8,228,630	+ 133,123
Missile Procurement, Air Force .....	2,069,827	2,359,608	2,329,510	2,338,505	2,211,407	+ 141,580
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force .....	379,425	419,537	481,837	427,537	442,537	+ 63,112
Other Procurement, Air Force .....	6,960,483	7,085,177	6,958,227	7,198,627	7,146,157	+ 185,674
Procurement, Defense-Wide .....	1,944,833	2,128,967	2,286,368	2,327,965	2,249,566	+ 304,733
National Guard and Reserve Equipment .....	352,000		130,000	250,000	150,000	-202,000
Defense Production Act Purchases .....			5,000		3,000	+ 3,000
<b>Total, title III, Procurement .....</b>	<b>48,590,420</b>	<b>51,851,538</b>	<b>53,025,397</b>	<b>54,592,016</b>	<b>52,980,714</b>	<b>+ 4,390,294</b>
<b>TITLE IV</b>						
<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION</b>						
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army .....	5,031,788	4,426,194	5,148,093	4,914,294	5,266,601	+ 234,813
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy .....	8,636,649	7,984,016	9,080,580	8,421,976	9,110,326	+ 473,677
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force .....	13,758,811	13,077,829	13,709,233	13,489,909	13,674,537	- 84,274
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide .....	9,036,551	8,609,289	8,935,149	9,327,155	9,256,705	+ 220,154
Developmental Test and Evaluation, Defense .....	258,606	253,457	271,957	251,957	265,957	+ 7,351
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense .....	34,245	24,434	29,434	34,434	31,434	- 2,811
<b>Total, title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation .....</b>	<b>36,756,650</b>	<b>34,375,219</b>	<b>37,174,446</b>	<b>36,439,725</b>	<b>37,605,560</b>	<b>+ 848,910</b>
<b>TITLE V</b>						
<b>REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS</b>						
Defense Working Capital Funds .....	94,500	90,344	90,344	90,344	90,344	- 4,156
Transfer stockpile balances to working capital fund .....		67,000				
National Defense Sealift Fund:						
Ready Reserve Force .....	311,266	257,000	257,000	257,000	257,000	- 54,266
Acquisition .....	397,100	97,700	472,700	97,700	460,200	+ 63,100
(Transfer out) .....	(-28,800)					(+ 28,800)
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>708,366</b>	<b>354,700</b>	<b>729,700</b>	<b>354,700</b>	<b>717,200</b>	<b>+ 8,834</b>
<b>Total, title V, Revolving and Management Funds .....</b>	<b>802,866</b>	<b>512,044</b>	<b>820,044</b>	<b>445,044</b>	<b>807,544</b>	<b>+ 4,678</b>
<b>TITLE VI</b>						
<b>OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS</b>						
Defense Health Program:						
Operation and maintenance .....	9,727,985	10,477,687	10,471,447	10,527,887	10,522,647	+ 794,662
Procurement .....	402,387	356,970	356,970	356,970	356,970	- 45,417
Research and development .....	19,500		250,000	300,000	275,000	+ 255,500
<b>Total, Defense Health Program .....</b>	<b>10,149,872</b>	<b>10,834,657</b>	<b>11,078,417</b>	<b>11,184,857</b>	<b>11,154,617</b>	<b>+ 1,004,745</b>
Armed Forces Retirement Homes .....				68,295		
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction, Army: 1/						
Operation and maintenance .....	491,700	593,500	492,000	543,500	543,500	+ 51,800
Procurement .....	115,670	241,500	116,000	191,500	191,500	+ 75,830
Research, development, test, and evaluation .....	172,780	334,000	173,000	294,000	294,000	+ 121,220
<b>Total, Chemical Agents .....</b>	<b>780,150</b>	<b>1,169,000</b>	<b>781,000</b>	<b>1,029,000</b>	<b>1,029,000</b>	<b>+ 248,850</b>
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense .....	735,582	788,100	883,700	842,300	847,800	+ 112,218
Office of the Inspector General .....	132,064	140,844	140,844	137,544	137,544	+ 5,480
<b>Total, title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs .....</b>	<b>11,797,668</b>	<b>12,932,601</b>	<b>12,883,961</b>	<b>13,261,996</b>	<b>13,168,961</b>	<b>+ 1,371,293</b>

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE VII						
RELATED AGENCIES						
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund .....	201,500	209,100	209,100	209,100	209,100	+ 7,600
Intelligence Community Management Account .....	129,123	149,415	144,415	149,415	158,015	+ 28,892
Transfer to Dept of Justice.....	(27,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)	.....
Payment to Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund.....	25,000	15,000	15,000	35,000	35,000	+ 10,000
National Security Education Trust Fund.....	3,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	+ 5,000
<b>Total, title VII, Related agencies .....</b>	<b>358,623</b>	<b>381,515</b>	<b>376,515</b>	<b>401,515</b>	<b>410,115</b>	<b>+ 51,492</b>
TITLE VIII						
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Ship Transfers (FY99 with FY2000 carryover) .....	-636,850	-170,000	-170,000	-170,000	-170,000	+ 466,850
FFRDC's/consultants .....	-62,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+ 62,000
Defense reform initiative (DRI) Title II savings .....	-70,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+ 70,000
National Defense stockpile transaction fund asset sale credit .....	-100,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+ 100,000
Ellsworth AFB claims sup general provision .....	8,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	- 8,000
Fisher Houses.....	1,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	- 1,000
Division B - omnibus general provision (sec. 104).....	2,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	- 2,000
Procurement reductions.....	-142,100	.....	.....	.....	.....	+ 142,100
FY 1999 Procurement inflation Savings.....	-400,600	.....	.....	-285,600	.....	+ 400,600
FY 1999 RDT&E inflation savings.....	.....	.....	.....	-166,500	.....	.....
FY 1999 Appropriations General Reduction .....	.....	.....	.....	-3,100,000	.....	.....
Information Assurance.....	.....	.....	150,000	.....	.....	.....
Guard Disaster Response.....	.....	.....	20,000	.....	.....	.....
Fuel Repricing .....	-502,000	.....	.....	-250,307	.....	+ 502,000
Division B - omnibus general provision (sec. 105).....	-67,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+ 67,000
Additional transfer authority (sec. 8005) .....	(1,650,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(1,600,000)	(-50,000)
Indian Financing Act incentives (sec. 8024).....	8,000	.....	8,000	8,000	8,000	.....
Disposal & lease of DOD real property (sec. 8040).....	25,000	32,200	32,200	32,200	32,200	+ 7,200
Overseas Military Fac Investment Recovery (sec. 8044) .....	38,000	4,300	4,300	4,300	4,300	-33,700
Rescissions (sec. 8058) .....	-415,909	.....	-612,987	-53,405	-350,180	+ 65,729
Lapsed rescission.....	67,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-67,000
FY 1999 Economic Adjustment (rescission) (sec. 8090).....	.....	.....	-452,100	.....	-452,100	-452,100
Women in Service for America Memorial (sec. 8097) .....	.....	.....	5,000	.....	5,000	+ 5,000
Civilian personnel under execution (sec. 8100).....	.....	.....	.....	-209,300	-123,200	-123,200
Foreign Currency Fluctuations (sec. 8101).....	-193,600	.....	-171,000	-206,600	-171,000	+ 22,600
A-76 Studies (sec. 8108).....	.....	.....	-100,000	.....	-100,000	-100,000
WMD consequence management (sec. 8111).....	.....	.....	50,000	.....	35,000	+ 35,000
Travel Cards (sec. 8119) .....	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	.....
Recovery of DoD admin expenses from FMS (sec. 8123) .....	.....	.....	-87,000	.....	-87,000	-87,000
Advance pay appropriation (sec. 8129) .....	.....	.....	.....	-1,838,426	-1,838,426	-1,838,426
Transfer to Department of Transportation (sec. 8131) .....	.....	.....	.....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(+ 5,000)
Aircraft leasing (sec. 8133) .....	.....	.....	.....	11,000	19,000	+ 19,000
Munitions/Readiness (sec. 8134) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	-100,000	-100,000
Red Cross (sec. 8137) .....	.....	.....	.....	23,000	5,000	+ 5,000
United Service Organizations (sec. 8143) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,000	+ 5,000
F-22 Program Transfer Account (sec. 8146) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000,000	+ 1,000,000
F-22 Program Termination Liability (sec. 8147) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	300,000	+ 300,000
Performance Based Academic Model (sec. 8148).....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,500	+ 5,500
Seattle Conveyance (sec. 8153).....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000	+ 1,000
Eisenhower Memorial Commission (sec. 8162).....	.....	.....	.....	.....	300	+ 300
Rome Labs (sec. 8163) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	13,000	+ 13,000
Aviation Support Facility (sec. 8167) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,000	+ 10,000
Depot Maintenance (sec. 8169) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	-400,000	-400,000
Spares (sec. 8170) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	-550,000	-550,000
Base Operations (sec. 8171) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	-100,000	-100,000
Munitions (sec. 8172) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	-356,400	-356,400
O&M general reduction (sec. 8173) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	-7,200,000	-7,200,000
O&M contingent emergency (sec. 8173) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,200,000	+ 7,200,000
<b>Total, title VIII.....</b>	<b>-2,436,059</b>	<b>-128,500</b>	<b>-1,318,587</b>	<b>-6,196,638</b>	<b>-3,350,006</b>	<b>-913,947</b>
<b>DOD-WIDE SAVINGS.....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>-1,650,000</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued**  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE IX</b>						
Waiver of certain sanctions against India and Pakistan.....					43,000	+ 43,000
<b>Grand total (before emergency funding for FY99).....</b>	<b>250,520,548</b>	<b>263,265,959</b>	<b>268,661,503</b>	<b>264,693,100</b>	<b>267,795,360</b>	<b>+ 17,274,812</b>
<b>EMERGENCY FUNDING FY99</b>						
Emergency funding (P.L. 105-277):						
Title I - Readiness .....	5,893,053					-5,893,053
Title II - Antiterrorism .....	528,927					-528,927
Title III - Y2K conversion .....	1,100,000					-1,100,000
Supplemental (H.R. 1141) .....	8,573,969					-8,573,969
<b>Total, Emergency funding for FY99 .....</b>	<b>16,095,949</b>					<b>-16,095,949</b>
<b>Adjusted total (including emergency funding for FY99).....</b>	<b>266,616,497</b>	<b>263,265,959</b>	<b>268,661,503</b>	<b>264,693,100</b>	<b>267,795,360</b>	<b>+ 1,178,863</b>
<b>CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP</b>						
Scorekeeping adjustments:						
Adjustment for unapprop'd balance transfer (Stockpile) .....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Stockpile collections (unappropriated) .....	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000	
Emergency funding .....	-7,521,980					+ 7,521,980
Emergency funding .....	-8,573,969					+ 8,573,969
Spectrum auction (sec. 8124) .....			-2,600,000	-2,600,000	-2,600,000	-2,600,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>-16,095,949</b>		<b>-2,600,000</b>	<b>-2,600,000</b>	<b>-2,600,000</b>	<b>+ 13,495,949</b>
Advance pay appropriation (P.L. 106-31).....			1,838,426	1,838,426	1,838,426	+ 1,838,426
<b>Total adjustments .....</b>	<b>-16,095,949</b>		<b>-761,574</b>	<b>-761,574</b>	<b>-761,574</b>	<b>+ 15,334,375</b>
<b>Adjusted total (including scorekeeping adjustments).....</b>	<b>250,520,548</b>	<b>263,265,959</b>	<b>267,899,929</b>	<b>263,931,526</b>	<b>267,033,786</b>	<b>+ 16,513,238</b>
Appropriations .....	(250,869,457)	(263,265,959)	(268,965,016)	(263,984,931)	(267,836,066)	(+ 16,966,609)
Rescissions .....	(-348,909)		(-1,065,087)	(-53,405)	(-802,280)	(-453,371)
<b>RECAPITULATION</b>						
Title I - Military Personnel .....	70,607,566	73,723,293	72,011,977	73,855,093	73,894,693	+ 3,287,127
Title II - Operation and Maintenance .....	84,042,814	91,268,249	93,687,750	91,894,349	92,234,779	+ 8,191,965
(By transfer) .....	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	
Title III - Procurement.....	48,590,420	51,851,538	53,025,397	54,592,016	52,980,714	+ 4,390,294
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation .....	36,756,650	34,375,219	37,174,446	36,439,725	37,605,560	+ 848,910
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds .....	802,866	512,044	820,044	445,044	807,544	+ 4,678
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs.....	11,797,668	12,932,601	12,883,961	13,261,996	13,168,961	+ 1,371,293
Title VII - Related agencies .....	358,623	381,515	376,515	401,515	410,115	+ 51,492
Title VIII - General provisions .....	-2,436,059	-128,500	-1,318,587	-6,196,638	-3,350,006	-913,947
DoD-wide savings .....		-1,650,000				
<b>Total, Department of Defense (in this bill).....</b>	<b>250,520,548</b>	<b>263,265,959</b>	<b>268,661,503</b>	<b>264,693,100</b>	<b>267,752,360</b>	<b>+ 17,231,812</b>
Funds provided in Supplemental Acts .....	16,095,949		1,838,426	1,838,426	1,838,426	-14,257,523
<b>Total DoD funding available .....</b>	<b>266,616,497</b>	<b>263,265,959</b>	<b>270,499,929</b>	<b>266,531,526</b>	<b>269,590,786</b>	<b>+ 2,974,289</b>
Title IX - India and Pakistan waiver of sanctions.....					43,000	+ 43,000
Other scorekeeping adjustments .....	-16,095,949		-2,600,000	-2,600,000	-2,600,000	+ 13,495,949
<b>Total mandatory and discretionary .....</b>	<b>250,520,548</b>	<b>263,265,959</b>	<b>267,899,929</b>	<b>263,931,526</b>	<b>267,033,786</b>	<b>+ 16,513,238</b>
<b>RECAP BY FUNCTION</b>						
Mandatory.....	201,500	209,100	209,100	209,100	209,100	+ 7,600
Discretionary.....	250,319,048	263,056,859	267,690,829	263,722,426	266,824,686	+ 16,505,638

1/ Included in Budget under Procurement title.

2/ FY 2000 budget request was increased by \$3,000,000 for a mistake in the budget appendix.

3/ FY 2000 budget amendment added \$1,845,370,000.

4/ The total recommended for Title I was reduced by \$1,838,426,000, the amount provided in the FY 1999 Supplemental for advance funding of pay and retirement reform initiatives.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement to H.R. 2561, making FY 2000 appropriations to the Department of Defense.

As a Member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the strong bipartisan leadership exhibited by Chairman LEWIS and Congressman MURTHA in developing this conference report.

Confronted with the difficult task of negotiating an agreement between two vastly different bills, their bipartisan approach should serve as a model of how this entire body should work.

We have produced a strong bill that makes a number of critical investments in our nation's military, most especially the people who serve our country.

This bill funds a 4.8 percent pay increase for our military personnel and an additional \$399 million to support DOD's recruiting and retention efforts such as elimination of the so-called REDUX policy.

After many long hours of negotiation, we reached a compromise on the F-22 program that will require further testing of the F-22 aircraft and make procurement of the aircraft contingent on the F-22 passing certain performance tests.

This action sends a signal to the entire defense establishment that, given the demands on today's military forces, we cannot back away from some difficult choices concerning our weapons modernization programs.

This bill carefully balances all facets of our military budget in order to sufficiently invest in hardware without shortchanging our military personnel.

For this reason, we should exercise every opportunity to demand excellence and efficiency from the money we appropriate.

I am optimistic that the outcome of this conference will set a precedent for how our subcommittees must balance our nation's defense spending priorities in today's post-Cold War era.

We have undertaken a serious debate on how to develop and procure the best weapons technology and military equipment available today without shortchanging readiness and quality-of-life issues that are equally critical to the men and women who serve in our military.

I would also like to commend the staff from both subcommittees for their assistance to my office and, most especially, their tireless work in developing this conference agreement. Their professionalism throughout this process is to be highly commended.

I have benefitted from the tremendous expertise and institutional knowledge my esteemed colleagues who sit on this Subcommittee and am proud to support this conference report.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this agreement and promptly send it to the President for this signature which I trust it will secure.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this Defense bill. I am concerned that this bill does not fit within existing priorities and will make it extraordinarily difficult to address budget reality. This measure appropriates \$267 billion—\$4.5 billion over the Administration request and \$8 billion when all aspects of 2000 spending are calculated. Moreover, \$5 billion has been added to advance previous 1999 emergency bills. Overall, this bill easily represents a \$20 billion increase in

defense spending for 2000—a year when the overall category is supposed to decrease under the caps by some \$25–30 billion and collectively translates into a \$50 billion reduction from other programs in the budget!

H.R. 2561 relies heavily upon budget gimmicks. The GOP uses over \$10 billion in budget slight of hand, suggesting that spending is reduced by \$1 billion by simply delaying defense contracts, declaring \$7.2 billion in emergency spending to beat the budget caps and claiming over \$2 billion credit for sale of the electromagnetic spectrum. These actions defy common sense and the net effect will result clearly in higher spending and this House ought to acknowledge the impact rather than invest in scapegoats.

Surprisingly, the Republicans opted to undermine peacekeeping efforts in the Balkans by not providing any funds for the ongoing operations in Kosovo. By such action, the GOP has turned their backs on the U.S. role in NATO and our involvement within the Balkans. It is imperative that this Congress continue to maintain our commitment in this troubled region by supporting the important peacekeeping mission in Kosovo. No doubt a supplemental spending bill will appear in the near future to fund this and other short changed commitments.

How can we justify appropriating a whopping \$4 billion to a national missile defense system that is out of line with the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and which on technical grounds has failed to perform? This flawed policy at its worst will invite a new arms race, thus trashing a treaty for a missile defense system of dubious performance. Nonetheless, the Republican led House has found a way to waste federal resources on a budget busting and ineffective missile defense when reports suggest that soldiers are living in substandard housing and quitting in droves.

This Conference Agreement provides over billions for aircraft not requested. Specifically, the funding for the KC 130J Hercules alone is \$600 million and the National Defense Sealift is \$717 million, representing \$320 million over the Administrations request. Others collectively include bombers, fighters and helicopters which well exceed \$1.1 billion beyond the Presidents request and numerous other procurement programs that go off the deep end.

The most controversial aircraft in this bill is the F-22. This Air Force modernization project was constructed to counter the soviet Union and is estimated to cost well over \$40 billion, or \$14–\$18 billion a year, greater than the cumulative budget of several Federal Departments combined a year, when in full production for one aircraft program. Fortunately, common sense and reality limited funding for such in this bill. However, this measure does provide \$1 billion to research and develop "test" aircraft. No doubt the advocates of the F-22 will live to fight another day and will be well fed during the interim.

Congress should keep in mind that we just don't need smart weapons, but smart soldiers and sailors. Our priorities should concentrate on investing in the men and women in the Armed Forces. Such paramount investment constitutes health care and education opportunities for our soldiers and future generations long before they put on a uniform. Unfortunately, this bill and its distorted priorities precludes possible investment in people in other parts of the budget. This represents the clas-

sic slogan—"guns vs. butter". We can't have both. This measure takes us down the path of investment in hardware, not personnel.

I agree with the important and much needed military pay and pension increases and health care for our military personal, but not the pension changes. This increased military spending brings big budget problems for tomorrow and years ahead. It is my hope that this Republican led Congress will face up to the inflated costs inherent in the policy blueprint of this measure and get their heads out of clouds and feet back on the ground of the real world.

This measure set us on a policy path where expensive weapon systems and hardware costs soak up all the available funds committing us to a faulty military policy and short changing key people programs. Such people programs are essential to our nation's security both economic and militarily.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2561, the Defense Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2000. Spending on the F-22 is only a small portion of an already bloated Defense Appropriations bill. The House of Representatives will vote today on spending \$267.8 billion for the Department of Defense. The GOP is unable to come up with adequate funding for Labor-HHS, yet they have mysteriously come up with \$267.8 billion for defense spending. I have a suggestion for the leadership—cut wasteful defense programs.

The Air Force can expect to receive approximately \$1 billion to develop "test" F-22 aircraft and \$1.2 billion for research and development on the plane. Lockheed Martin's K Street lobbyists are certain to get a bonus in their stocking at Christmas. Thanks to Lockheed's relentless lobbying efforts and shrewd production prowess, the company was able to convince House and Senate conferees that the program really is worthwhile.

The Department of Defense has spent \$18 billion on the F-22 since the mid-1980's. The project is too expensive and simply not needed. The program was initiated in 1981 to meet the threat of next generation Soviet aircraft. However, that threat no longer exists. The war in Kosovo is the perfect example of why the U.S. does not need the F-22. The current fleet of F-15s and F-16s demonstrated U.S. dominance in the air in Kosovo. Proponents of the F-22 claim that the aircraft is far superior than the F-15 in air to air combat. This may be true, but we never had air to air combat in Kosovo and we don't need anything superior. The Yugoslav Air Force never engaged the U.S. in air to air combat because they would have faced defeat much sooner. No nation in the world comes close to challenging U.S. air dominance. But there are many nations whose children's elementary and secondary school aptitude tests far exceed those of the U.S.

We must ask ourselves, where are our priorities? When is classroom size reduction, providing health insurance to 11 million children and full prescription drug coverage to 40 million elderly going to be a priority for this Congress? It is deplorable and shameful that the wealthiest industrial nation cannot afford quality health care or adequate education. Yet at the same time, our nation is able to boast of its air dominance and insist on more.

I urge my colleagues to join me in saying, "enough is enough." I urge a no vote on H.R. 2561.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2561, the defense appropriations conference report, but with reservations. I voted for this conference report because I believe in a strong national defense and I support the men and women who risk their lives to defend our nation. I am, however, strongly opposed to the manner in which this conference report funds these important functions. I believe in a strong defense, not the budget gimmicks that the majority uses to hide the actual amount of spending in the bill.

I voted in favor of a 4.8 percent pay increase for military personnel who risk their lives for this country, not an agreement that shifts spending of an estimated \$10.5 billion out of fiscal year 2000 and pushes personnel payments into the next fiscal year. I voted in favor of our commitment to providing the strongest defense in the world, not delaying over \$1.3 billion in payments to defense contractors. I voted in favor of new defense technologies that will save lives, not for projects like the F-22 that my colleague from California, the Chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee says, "has become a burden on the rest of the military."

Mr. Speaker, I am offended by the manner in which this Congress is proceeding with its fiscal duties. Shifting \$10.5 billion of FY 2000 dollars to FY 2001, delaying contractor payments into the next fiscal year and declaring a \$7.2 billion in "emergency" is not being fiscally responsible and it is not being honest with the American people about adherence to budget caps.

On September 29th, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office released a letter stating that Congress has already broken the budget caps and has already consumed over \$18 billion of the Social Security surplus. Mr. Speaker, as we move forward in the appropriations process, I hope both parties will work together to preserve and protect Social Security and Medicare, while providing for our country's basic needs. I hope the leadership will choose to keep faith with Americans and stop resorting to these kinds of budget gimmicks, which only seek to deceive people about the federal budget.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2561, the Fiscal Year 2000 Department of Defense Appropriations bill. This bill will provide \$267 billion for defense programs which is sufficient to meet the needs of today's military. However, I am concerned that \$18 billion of this bill has been designated as "emergency spending" and would therefore not be subject to the budgetary caps included in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. I support providing additional resources to the Department of Defense, but I believe that we must be honest with the American people in reconciling our need for additional defense spending with our ability to do so under the existing budget caps.

I would like to highlight an important project included in this bill that would provide \$10 million for the Disaster Relief and Emergency Medical Services (DREAMS) program. This is the third installment on funding for DREAMS that would help to save lives and reduce health care costs. In 1997, Congress provided \$8 million for DREAMS and in 1999, \$10 million for DREAMS. These federal funds have been leveraged with State of Texas funding, financial support from the National Institutes of Health and the ANA and philanthropic sources.

DREAMS is a joint Army research project with the University of Texas Houston Health Science Center and Texas A&M University System. The DREAMS project will demonstrate in both civilian and military terms how to attend to wounded soldiers from remote locations during emergency situations. The project will fund three different research projects, including Emergency Medical Services (EMS), diagnostic methods and therapies for shock injuries, and chemical as well as biological warfare defense.

The EMS program will use emergency helicopters to fly directly to injured persons and treat these individuals after a trauma injury. Using the fiber-optic traffic monitoring system already being used in Houston, the DREAMS project will help helicopters to reach their victims faster. The second part of this EMS program is to collect real-time patient data and relate this information back to trauma physicians to make immediate diagnosis and recommended treatments.

The chemical and biological warfare program will help to develop chemical sensor tests to treat victims on toxic substances. In addition, DREAMS in developing mechanisms for the biological decontamination and detoxification of these chemical agents. The City of Houston is an ideal location for these tests because of that large number of petrochemical and industrial facilities located in our area.

The diagnostic methods and therapies program will determine possible applications to treat patients during the "golden hour" following a traumatic injury. These methods will include mechanisms to treat the decreased blood flow that is common in many trauma patients. This project is also exploring how to prevent cell death as a result of traumatic injury. The DREAMS project will yield new results and procedures to help patients become stabilized before sending them to trauma centers.

I am pleased that Congress has included this vitally important research funding and urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report for Defense Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2000. This bill is replete with budget gimmicks that seek to mask the true cost of funding the Department of Defense, such as declaring billions of spending to be an arbitrary "emergency" and delaying payments to defense contractors. Unfortunately, those gimmicks cannot hide the fact that this bill exceeds the Pentagon's request by \$8 billion, with much of that money spent on unnecessary and even unrequested projects such as \$264.3 million for the C-130 airplane and \$375 million to build the LHD-8 ship in Mississippi. This bill also does not meet our commitments to fund current peacekeeping operations or reconstruction in Kosovo. This sends a disturbing message to the rest of the world that we are not willing to keep our promises to our allies in times of crisis. For these reasons, among others, I am voting against this conference report.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2561, the FY 2000 Defense Appropriations Bill.

There are a number of good things in the bill and I applaud the Members of the Subcommittee for their efforts. I applaud the inclusion of \$165 million to boost the military pay raise to 4.8 percent, increasing the 4.4 percent

raise that was funded in the FY 1999 emergency supplemental.

While I intend to vote for the package today, I remain extremely concerned about the manner in which this bill fits into the overall budget picture and about the number of budgetary gimmicks included in the legislation.

The bill is \$3.8 billion over the President's request. The bill provides \$267.1 billion for various defense programs in FY2000, \$269.7 billion if spectrum asset sales are excluded. Of this amount, \$7.2 billion of routine Operation and Maintenance appropriations are designated as "emergency" for budget scoring purposes, and an additional \$10.5 billion in outlays are not counted under the budget caps due to "directed scoring" to the CBO by House leadership.

While it is not clear if the President will sign this bill, I am hopeful that he will examine this legislation in the context of the important needs our government has left to fund for the next fiscal year.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, when combined with defense appropriations in the Military Construction and Energy and Water bills, the Defense Appropriations Conference Report for FY 2000 brings total defense funding to \$289 billion, \$7.4 billion more than the President requested. This level of spending is above the ceiling imposed by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; and since the on-budget surplus of \$14.4 billion in FY 2000 has been committed already by other appropriations bills, this spending level could lead to borrowing from the Social Security surplus in FY 2000.

To avoid the appearance of being over the caps and into Social Security, the conference report resorts to a number of "gimmicks." It classifies \$9 billion in new budget authority as "emergency spending." It directs that outlays in FY 2000 be scored at \$10.5 billion less than CBO estimates. As an offset to extra spending, it includes non-germane provisions that direct spectrum sales in FY 2000, although CBO deems them improbable, and it scores the proceeds of the spectrum sales at \$2.6 billion, although CBO disputes any proceeds in FY 2000.

I support most of the defense spending in this agreement, but not the "gimmicks." This is no way to budget. This report allows "spending caps" and "emergency spending" to mean whatever the majority says they mean. It disregards CBO's scorekeeping, despite its track record for accuracy, and by fiat inserts outlay estimates of its own. These rules, disciplines, and procedures have helped us achieve the first budget surpluses in thirty years. If we treat these rules in the cavalier way this report treats them, our on-budget surpluses are not destined to last long, and we may soon find ourselves borrowing again from Social Security.

This conference agreement provides \$269.4 billion in discretionary budget authority (BA) for defense in FY 2000. This includes \$9.0 billion in emergency funding and \$2.6 billion in funding that is "offset" by spectrum sales (more details below). Of the \$9.0 billion in emergency funding, \$1.8 billion was previously appropriated in the Kosovo Emergency Supplemental bill for military pay raises. In conference, \$7.2 billion in Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funding already included in the House bill was designated as an emergency. The purpose of this increase was not to increase the total amount of defense funding

(the conferees actually cut the House bill). Rather, it was to raise the caps and create room for an increase to the allocations of other subcommittees, such as Labor-HHS-Education.

According to the Appropriations Committee's press release, the gross total of the bill (including emergencies) is almost \$900 million less in BA (and \$3.3 billion less in outlays) than the House-passed version of the bill, but \$17.3 billion more in BA than the 1999 appropriated level excluding emergencies. According to the press release, the following accounts were increased. (Figures are dollar increases compared to President's request except Military Personnel.):

- O&M—\$1.0 billion.
- Procurement—\$1.1 billion.
- R&D—\$3.2 billion.
- Military Personnel—4.8% pay raise vs. 4.4% pay raise.

BUDGET GIMMICKS IN THE BILL

**Emergency Declaration:** Besides the \$1.8 billion for "emergency pay" contained in the Kosovo Supplemental, the conference report declares \$7.2 billion BA for routine O&M activities to be an emergency even though these activities were not declared emergencies in either the original House or Senate bills. This gimmick is intended to help other subcommittees, not the defense subcommittee, because the emergency will increase the total caps, and money is fungible. To facilitate this kind of chicanery, the Senate has adopted a new rule, which requires 60 votes to declare a non-defense emergency, but only a simple majority to declare a defense emergency.

**Delaying Contractor Payments:** The conference report included two provisions, sections 8175 and 8176, not found in either the original House or Senate bills, that relax the time table for Pentagon payments to defense contractors by an extra amount of time ranging from five to seven days longer than current practice, depending on the type of payment. This will result in slipping about \$1.250 billion in outlays from FY 2000 into FY 2001.

**Scoring Adjustments:** Several adjustments have been made to CBO's scoring of appropriations bills that contain defense funding:

- (1) Outlay "plugs" or "directed scorekeeping" total \$10.533 billion. As explained below, this consists of \$9.7 billion in general scorekeeping of outlays and \$833 million related to contingent emergencies.
- (2) \$2.6 billion has been added as a "credit" for provisions that direct the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a spectrum auction.

CBO does not believe that the spectrum auction of television frequencies can be completed in 2000, and scores its revenue potential at zero for FY 2000. If the spectrum sales were to occur on a more reasonable schedule, CBO believes they would only raise \$1.9 billion, not \$2.6 billion. The \$9.7 billion plug is supposed to represent the difference between OMB and CBO scoring of the President's budget, but that figure includes the difference in contingent emergencies between OMB and CBO. Nevertheless, CBO is ordered to count contingent emergencies twice for a total of \$10.533 billion in "plugged outlays," \$833 million more than the discrepancy between CBO and OMB.

SUMMARY OF GIMMICKS  
[In billions of dollars]

	BA	Outlays
Directed scorekeeping or plugs .....	0.000	10.533
Spectrum sales .....	2.600	2.600
New "emergencies" .....	9.038	6.591
Delayed contractor payments .....	0.000	1.250
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>11.638</b>	<b>20.974</b>

BUDGET VARIANCE REPORT

The following table compares current defense spending levels with levels specified in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997:

COMPARING DEFENSE PLANS: BBA VS. PRESIDENT'S CURRENT PLAN VS. REPUBLICAN RESOLUTION

	2000	2001	2002	2000-2002 total
Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997 (BBA):				
Budget authority .....	277.3	281.9	289.7	848.8
Outlays .....	275.7	272.8	273.9	822.4
President's current plan:				
Budget authority .....	283.4	301.3	303.2	888.0
Outlays .....	280.3	284.4	293.3	858.0
Republican FY 2000 budget resolution:				
Budget authority .....	291.8	304.8	309.3	905.9
Outlays .....	283.4	288.9	293.4	865.7
President above/below BBA (squeeze on NDD):				
Budget authority .....	6.2	19.4	13.5	39.1
Outlays .....	4.6	11.6	19.4	35.6
Republican above/below BBA (squeeze on NDD):				
Budget authority .....	14.6	22.9	19.6	57.1
Outlays .....	7.7	16.1	19.5	43.3
Republican above/below President (squeeze on NDD):				
Budget authority .....	8.4	3.5	6.1	18.0
Outlays .....	3.1	4.5	0.1	7.7

Notes: (1) The BBA has been adjusted for emergencies, both released and anticipated to be released. (2) The President's plan is from the June Mid-Session Review and includes emergencies, both released and anticipated to be released. (3) The Republican Budget Resolution has been adjusted for emergencies, both released and anticipated to be released. (4) The 1998 and 1999 levels in both the President's plan and the Republican plan are per OMB, actual for 1998 and estimated for 1999. (5) All emergencies are per OMB estimates.

This bill departs from the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, and leaves in its wake a lot of budget problems. For instance, in August 2000, when CBO and OMB do their reviews of the budget, outlays could easily be tracking CBO's projections, in which case outlays would be \$11.6 billion greater than the estimates plugged into this report. Or consider the next fiscal year, FY 2001. The discretionary spending cap will be coming down in FY 2001 while defense spending will be going up, up by \$22.9 billion in BA and \$16.1 billion in outlays above the Balanced Budget Act ceilings. Gimmicks may get this bill over the threshold, but they may not last the full fiscal year, and may make budgeting in the next fiscal year far more difficult. This is the wrong way to run a budget.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 372, nays 55, not voting 7, as follows:

Abercrombie	Ehrlich	Largent
Aderholt	Emerson	Larson
Allen	Engel	Latham
Andrews	English	LaTourette
Archer	Etheridge	Lazio
Army	Evans	Leach
Bachus	Everett	Levin
Baird	Ewing	Lewis (CA)
Baker	Farr	Lewis (GA)
Baldacci	Fletcher	Lewis (KY)
Ballenger	Foley	Linder
Barcia	Forbes	Lipinski
Barr	Ford	LoBiondo
Barrett (NE)	Fossella	Lowe
Bartlett	Fowler	Lucas (KY)
Barton	Frank (MA)	Lucas (OK)
Bass	Franks (NJ)	Maloney (CT)
Bateman	Frelinghuysen	Maloney (NY)
Becerra	Frost	Manzullo
Bentsen	Gallegly	Martinez
Bereuter	Gejdenson	Masara
Berkley	Gekas	Matsui
Berman	Gephardt	McCollum
Berry	Gibbons	McCrery
Biggett	Gilchrest	McHugh
Bilbray	Gillmor	McInnis
Bilirakis	Gilman	McIntosh
Bishop	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Blagojevich	Goode	McKeon
Bliley	Goodlatte	McNulty
Blunt	Gooding	Meehan
Boehler	Gordon	Meek (FL)
Boehner	Goss	Meeks (NY)
Bonilla	Graham	Menendez
Bonior	Granger	Metcalf
Bono	Green (TX)	Mica
Borski	Greenwood	Millender-
Boucher	Gutierrez	McDonald
Boyd	Gutknecht	Miller (FL)
Brady (PA)	Hall (OH)	Miller, Gary
Brady (TX)	Hall (TX)	Mink
Brown (FL)	Hansen	Moakley
Bryant	Hastert	Mollohan
Burr	Hastings (FL)	Moore
Burton	Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)
Buyer	Hayes	Moran (VA)
Callahan	Hayworth	Morella
Calvert	Herger	Murtha
Camp	Hill (IN)	Myrick
Campbell	Hill (MT)	Napolitano
Canady	Hilleary	Neal
Cannon	Hilliard	Nethercutt
Capps	Hinchee	Ney
Cardin	Hinojosa	Northup
Castle	Hobson	Norwood
Chabot	Hoeffel	Nussle
Chambliss	Hoekstra	Ortiz
Chenoweth-Hage	Holden	Ose
Clay	Holt	Oxley
Clayton	Horn	Packard
Clement	Hostettler	Pallone
Clyburn	Houghton	Pascarell
Coble	Hoyer	Pastor
Coburn	Hulshof	Pease
Collins	Hunter	Pelosi
Combest	Hutchinson	Peterson (PA)
Condit	Hyde	Petri
Cook	Inslee	Phelps
Cooksey	Isakson	Pickering
Costello	Istook	Pickett
Cox	Jackson-Lee	Pitts
Coyne	(TX)	Pombo
Cramer	Jenkins	Pomeroy
Crane	John	Porter
Crowley	Johnson (CT)	Portman
Cubin	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Cummings	Johnson, Sam	Pryce (OH)
Cunningham	Jones (NC)	Quinn
Davis (FL)	Jones (OH)	Radanovich
Davis (VA)	Kanjorski	Rahall
Deal	Kaptur	Ramstad
DeLauro	Kasich	Regula
DeLay	Kelly	Reyes
DeMint	Kildee	Reynolds
Diaz-Balart	Kilpatrick	Riley
Dickey	King (NY)	Rodriguez
Dicks	Kingston	Roemer
Dingell	Kleczka	Rogan
Dixon	Klink	Rogers
Dooley	Knollenberg	Rohrabacher
Doolittle	Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen
Doyle	Kuykendall	Rothman
Dreier	LaFalce	Roukema
Duncan	LaHood	Roybal-Allard
Dunn	Lampson	Royce
Edwards	Lantos	Rush

[Roll No. 494]  
YEAS—372

Ryan (WI)	Smith (WA)	Toomey
Ryun (KS)	Snyder	Towns
Sabo	Souder	Trafficant
Salmon	Spence	Turner
Sanchez	Spratt	Udall (CO)
Sandlin	Stabenow	Udall (NM)
Sanford	Stearns	Vislosky
Sawyer	Stenholm	Vitter
Saxton	Strickland	Walden
Schaffer	Stump	Walsh
Scott	Stupak	Wamp
Sensenbrenner	Sununu	Watkins
Serrano	Sweeney	Watts (OK)
Sessions	Talent	Weiner
Shadegg	Tancredo	Weldon (FL)
Shaw	Tanner	Weldon (PA)
Sherman	Tauscher	Weller
Sherwood	Tauzin	Wexler
Shimkus	Taylor (MS)	Weygand
Shows	Taylor (NC)	Whitfield
Shuster	Terry	Wicker
Simpson	Thomas	Wilson
Sisisky	Thompson (CA)	Wolf
Skeen	Thompson (MS)	Woolsey
Skelton	Thornberry	Wu
Slaughter	Thune	Wynn
Smith (MI)	Thurman	Young (AK)
Smith (NJ)	Tiahrt	Young (FL)
Smith (TX)	Tierney	

NAYS—55

Ackerman	Green (WI)	Olver
Baldwin	Hefley	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Hoooley	Paul
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Boswell	Kind (WI)	Peterson (MN)
Brown (OH)	Kucinich	Rangel
Capuano	Lee	Rivers
Conyers	Lofgren	Sanders
Davis (IL)	Luther	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Markey	Shays
DeGette	McCarthy (MO)	Stark
Delahunt	McDermott	Upton
Deutsch	McGovern	Velazquez
Doggett	McKinney	Vento
Ehlers	Miller, George	Waters
Eshoo	Minge	Watt (NC)
Fattah	Nadler	Waxman
Filner	Oberstar	
Ganske	Obey	

NOT VOTING—7

Carson	Kennedy	Wise
Danner	McCarthy (NY)	
Jefferson	Scarborough	

□ 1146

Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, RANGEL, and OLVER, and Ms. MCKINNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Mr. UDALL of Colorado changed their 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.

Stated for:

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 494, the conference report on H.R. 2561, the Defense Appropriation Act of FY 2000, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, due to circumstances beyond my control, I was unable to vote on the Defense Appropriations Conference Report. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote No. 494.

EXPORT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 327 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 327

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1993) to reauthorize the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Trade and Development Agency, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the bill modified by the amendments recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill. Each section of that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 327 is a modified, open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1993, the Export Enhancement Act of 1999. The rule provides for one hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

The rule makes in order the Committee on International Relations

amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Further, the rule provides for the consideration of only pro forma amendments and those amendments preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration, which may be offered only by the Member who preprinted it or by his designee, and shall be considered as read.

As has become standard practice, the rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on postponed questions if the vote follows a 15 minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an appropriate rule for the consideration of this legislation. It is legislation to reauthorize several very important United States investment trade promotion programs, including the Overseas Private Investment Corporation known as OPIC, the Trade and Development Agency and the export functions of the International Trade Administration of the Department of Commerce.

OPIC's authority to operate lapsed on September 30, but it was extended by the continuing resolution on an emergency basis for only a few days more. This bill must pass the House and the Senate, as you know, in identical forms and be signed by the President in a very short time frame if these programs are to be able to continue uninterrupted. Therefore, I think that the preprinting requirement in this rule is an appropriate manner to allow interested Members to offer amendments while expediting the bill's consideration.

H.R. 1993, the underlying legislation, reauthorizes most commercial export promotion programs that involve the United States Government. OPIC is authorized for 4 years and continuing under this bill will be able to continue its self-sustaining operations without raising its liability ceiling, which is an improvement and a significant change over the bill that was considered in the 104th Congress.

In addition, H.R. 1993, the underlying legislation, codifies the cost-sharing and success fees of the Trade and Development Agency and provides the Agency with \$48 million, the amount requested by the President. It also provides funding for all and reauthorizes three programs of the International Trade Administration in the Commerce Department, \$202 million for the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service, \$68 million for the Trade Development Program, and \$4 million for the Market Access and Compliance Program.

I am encouraged that the bill directs the Department of Commerce to create a special initiative to promote trade opportunities and remove market barriers in sub-Saharan Africa and in Latin America. Obviously, Latin America is a tremendous export market for