

Meek (FL)	Rahall	Stupak
Meeks (NY)	Rangel	Tanner
Menendez	Rivers	Taylor (MS)
Millender-	Rodriguez	Thompson (CA)
McDonald	Roemer	Thompson (MS)
Miller, George	Rothman	Thurman
Minge	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Mink	Rush	Towns
Moakley	Sabo	Turner
Moore	Sanchez	Udall (CO)
Nadler	Sanders	Udall (NM)
Napolitano	Sandlin	Velazquez
Neal	Sawyer	Vento
Oberstar	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Obey	Scott	Waters
Olver	Serrano	Watt (NC)
Owens	Sherman	Waxman
Pallone	Shows	Weiner
Pascarell	Slaughter	Wexler
Pastor	Smith (WA)	Weygand
Payne	Snyder	Wise
Pelosi	Spratt	Woolsey
Peterson (MN)	Stabenow	Wu
Phelps	Stark	Wynn
Pomeroy	Stenholm	
Price (NC)	Strickland	

NOT VOTING—12

Barton	Everett	Kucinich
Boucher	Franks (NJ)	McIntosh
Conyers	Granger	Quinn
Crane	Klink	Salmon

1231

Ms. SANCHEZ and Ms. CARSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. REYES and Mrs. MORELLA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 450, the resolution just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 450 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3908.

1232

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3908) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORBERRY in the chair.

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

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

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

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

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring to the House today the 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill.

The Committee on Appropriations ordered this legislation reported by a nearly three to one bipartisan vote. It is reflective of a compilation of input from many sources on a large spectrum of issues. The request was thoroughly reviewed, hearings were held, input from Members outside the committee was received, and our committee painstakingly marked up the bill. The result of all of this is the bill before us.

The bill includes \$1.7 billion for counternarcotics activities in the Colombian and Andean region. By and large, the bill provides what the President requested for Colombia. In addition, the bill takes a more regional approach by providing increased help to the anti-drug efforts of Colombia's neighbors. Before any of the funds going to South America can be spent, the Secretary of State is to report on how the money will be used. The bill also funds high priority anti-drug activities in the Departments of Justice and Defense.

Also included in this bill is nearly \$5 billion for national security matters. The President's emergency request for \$2 billion for operations in Kosovo and East Timor is met. I must remind our colleagues that this money replenishes funds that have already been spent for both of these operations. In fact, the money has been spent and borrowed from the fourth quarter operations and maintenance accounts of all of the military services. So that money has to be repaid, or the training activities in the fourth quarter of the fiscal year for our Nation's military will have to stand down dramatically.

This bill also includes \$1.6 billion to help cover increasing fuel costs facing the Defense Department. As we drive up to the gas tanks and fill up our cars, we see a tremendous increase in the cost of fuel. The ships that we drive, the airplanes that we fly, the trucks and the tanks that we drive, all of these things that use fuel are experiencing the same thing. So we do provide the money to make up for the increased fuel costs.

The bill also includes \$854.5 million to the financially troubled Defense Health Program, a health program that promises medical care for members of the military, their families, and those retirees who are eligible for military medical care. There are doctors, there are nurses, there are pharmacies, and there are medical people who provide medical care who have provided their services but have not been paid. We are in arrears to at least that amount of money. So we include it in this bill. The President did not request these two items; but they are urgently needed, and we will have to provide the money sooner or later.

In the natural disaster and other emergencies areas, the bill includes \$2.2 billion. This includes \$400 million for USDA administered agriculture assistance, \$250 million for wildland fire management, \$600 million for LIHEAP, Low Income Home Energy Assistance, and \$600 million for emergency highway reimbursements to States.

Mr. Chairman, the committee tried to clean up all of the loose ends that we had relative to hurricane and flood disasters in the last year, and we believe this bill does complete all our responsibilities and obligations here.

There are many other important issues addressed in the bill. The report provides a very complete description of them. The bill is somewhat difficult and a little controversial in places, and I respect the fact that there are multiple opinions on the bill. But I think the Committee on Appropriations listened to and respected the differing positions on the various provisions in the bill, including the strong support of the President of the United States. However, as usual with an appropriations bill, we could not report a bill that included everyone's position.

Now the bill is before the entire House for consideration. It is important that we move this bill through the House today and we get it to the other body where deliberations can begin. We need to get this off of our schedules today because, Mr. Chairman, we have 13 other appropriations bills that we are trying to bring to this House in regular order and ahead of last year's schedule and certainly the year before's schedule, because this is a busy year for Members of Congress because of our national conventions, home work periods. So we need to get this bill out of here, get it into the negotiation with the other body.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert a table showing the details of this bill, as reported.

[The table follows:]

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 3908)
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
FY 2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL				
TITLE I - COUNTERNARCOTICS				
CHAPTER 1				
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
Drug Enforcement Administration				
	Salaries and expenses (emergency appropriations)		6,650	+6,650
	Contingent emergency appropriations		293,048	+293,048
Total, Chapter 1:				
	New budget (obligational) authority		299,698	+299,698
	Emergency appropriations		(6,650)	(+6,650)
	Contingent emergency appropriations		(293,048)	(+293,048)
CHAPTER 2				
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY				
Other Department of Defense Programs				
106-162	Drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, Defense (emergency appropriations)	98,400	185,800	+87,400
CHAPTER 3				
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE				
Department of State				
106-162	Assistance for Plan Colombia and for Andean regional counternarcotics (emergency appropriations)	818,000		-818,000
	Contingent emergency appropriations		1,099,000	+1,099,000
CHAPTER 4				
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY				
106-162	Military construction, Defense-wide (emergency appropriations)	38,500		-38,600
	Contingent emergency appropriations		116,523	+116,523
Total, title I:				
	New budget (obligational) authority	955,000	1,701,021	+746,021
	Emergency appropriations	(955,000)	(192,450)	(-762,550)
	Contingent emergency appropriations		(1,508,571)	(+1,508,571)
TITLE II - PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS IN KOSOVO AND OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY MATTERS				
CHAPTER 1				
DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
Administration of Foreign Affairs				
106-162	Diplomatic and consular programs (emergency appropriations)	24,000		-24,000
106-162	Educational and cultural exchange programs (emergency appropriations)	3,622		-3,622
106-162	Security and maintenance of United States missions (emergency appropriations)	239,000	104,000	-135,000
	Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs	266,622	104,000	-162,622
International Organizations and Conferences				
106-162	Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year (emergency appropriations)	107,000		-107,000
Total, Chapter 1:				
	New budget (obligational) authority	373,622	104,000	-269,622
CHAPTER 2				
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY				
Operation and Maintenance				
	Operation and maintenance, Army (emergency appropriations)		19,532	+19,532
	Operation and maintenance, Navy (emergency appropriations)		20,565	+20,565
	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps (emergency appropriations)		37,155	+37,155
	Operation and maintenance, Air Force (emergency appropriations)		30,065	+30,065
106-162	Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide (emergency appropriations)	27,400	40,000	+12,600
	Operation and maintenance, Army Reserve (emergency appropriations)		2,174	+2,174
	Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard (emergency appropriations)		2,851	+2,851
106-162	Overseas contingency operations transfer fund (emergency appropriations)	2,050,400	2,050,400	
	Total, Operation and Maintenance	2,077,800	2,202,742	+124,942
Procurement				
106-162	Aircraft procurement, Air Force (emergency appropriations)	73,000	73,000	
Other Department of Defense Programs				
	Defense health program (emergency appropriations)		3,533	+3,533

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 3908) — continued
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
General Provisions				
	Defense-wide working capital fund (emergency appropriations) (sec. 2202)		1,556,200	+ 1,556,200
	Aircraft procurement, Air Force (by transfer) (sec. 2203)		(90,000)	(+90,000)
	Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army (by transfer) (sec. 2204)		(125,000)	(+ 125,000)
	Defense health program (emergency appropriations) (sec. 2205)		854,500	+ 854,500
<hr/>				
	Total, Chapter 2:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	2,150,800	4,689,975	+2,539,175
	(By transfer)		(215,000)	(+ 215,000)
<hr/>				
CHAPTER 3				
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE				
Agency for International Development				
106-162	Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development (emergency appropriations)	22,000	13,000	-9,000
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance				
106-162	Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States (emergency appropriations)	195,000	95,825	-99,175
	Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance	217,000	108,825	-108,175
<hr/>				
MILITARY ASSISTANCE				
106-162	International military education and training (emergency appropriations)	2,875	2,875	
Foreign Military Financing Program:				
106-162	Grants (emergency appropriations)	31,000	31,000	
	Total, Military Assistance	33,875	33,875	
<hr/>				
	Total, Chapter 3:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	250,875	142,700	-108,175
<hr/>				
CHAPTER 4				
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY				
	Military construction, Army Reserve (contingent emergency appropriations)		12,348	+ 12,348
	Family housing, Army (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 2401)		2,000	+ 2,000
	Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 2401)		3,000	+ 3,000
	Family housing, Air Force (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 2401)		1,700	+ 1,700
<hr/>				
	Total, Chapter 4:			
	New budget (obligational) authority		19,048	+ 19,048
<hr/>				
	Total, title II:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	2,775,297	4,955,723	+ 2,180,426
	Emergency appropriations	(2,775,297)	(4,936,675)	(+ 2,161,378)
	Contingent emergency appropriations		(19,048)	(+ 19,048)
	(By transfer)		(215,000)	(+ 215,000)
<hr/>				
TITLE III - NATURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND OTHER EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS				
CHAPTER 1				
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	Office of the Inspector General (contingent emergency appropriations)		2,000	+ 2,000
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service				
	Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency appropriations)		7,140	+ 7,140
Farm Service Agency				
	Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency appropriations)		77,560	+ 77,560
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation				
106-198	Federal crop insurance corporation fund (emergency appropriations)	13,000	13,000	
Commodity Credit Corporation				
106-198	Marketing associations loan forgiveness (emergency appropriations)	81,000	81,000	
Rural Development				
	Rural community advancement program (contingent emergency appropriations)		43,000	+ 43,000
<hr/>				
Rural Housing Service				
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:				
Loan authorizations:				
	Single family (sec. 502)		(296,000)	(+ 296,000)
	Housing repair (sec. 504)		(13,000)	(+ 13,000)
106-198	Rental housing (sec. 515)	(40,000)	(40,000)	
	Total, loan authorizations	(40,000)	(349,000)	(+ 309,000)

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 3908) — continued
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
	Loan subsidy:			
	Single family (sec. 502) (contingent emergency appropriations)		25,000	+25,000
	Housing repair (sec. 504) (contingent emergency appropriations)		4,000	+4,000
106-198	Rental housing (sec. 515) (emergency appropriations)	15,872	15,872	
	Total, loan subsidies	15,872	44,872	+29,000
106-198	Rental assistance program (sec. 521) (emergency appropriations)	13,600	13,600	
	Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account	29,472	58,472	+29,000
	Mutual and self-help housing grants (contingent emergency appropriations)		6,000	+6,000
	Rural housing assistance grants (contingent emergency appropriations)		8,000	+8,000
	Farm labor program account (contingent emergency appropriations)		5,000	+5,000
	Total, Rural Housing Service	29,472	77,472	+48,000
	Rural Utilities Service			
	Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:			
	Direct loans: Electric 5%:			
	Loan authorization		(113,250)	(+113,250)
	Loan subsidy (emergency appropriations)		1,021	+1,021
	Foreign Assistance and Related Programs			
	Foreign Agricultural Service and General Sales Manager (contingent emergency appropriations)		2,000	+2,000
	Total, Department of Agriculture	123,472	304,193	+180,721
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
	Food and Drug Administration			
	Buildings and facilities (contingent emergency appropriations)		20,000	+20,000
	General Provisions			
	Conservation technical assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 3101)		35,000	+35,000
	Citrus canker (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 3103)		40,000	+40,000
	Total, Chapter 1:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	123,472	399,193	+275,721
	Emergency appropriations	(123,472)	(124,493)	(+1,021)
	Contingent emergency appropriations		(274,700)	(+274,700)
	(Loan authorizations)	(40,000)	(462,250)	(+422,250)
	CHAPTER 2			
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
	Economic Development Administration			
106-198	Economic development assistance programs (emergency appropriations)	30,350	25,800	-4,550
106-198	Contingent emergency appropriations	900		-900
106-198	Salaries and expenses (emergency appropriations)	1,625		-1,625
106-162	Total, Economic Development Administration	32,875	25,800	-7,075
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration			
106-198	Operations, research, and facilities (emergency appropriations)	23,900	19,400	-4,500
106-198	Contingent emergency appropriations	5,000		-5,000
106-198	Fisheries finance program account (emergency appropriations)	6,240		-6,240
106-198	Contingent emergency appropriations	15,000		-15,000
	Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	50,140	19,400	-30,740
	Total, Department of Commerce	83,015	45,200	-37,815
	RELATED AGENCY			
	Small Business Administration			
	Disaster Loans Program Account:			
106-162	Direct loans subsidy (contingent emergency appropriations)	31,000	33,300	+2,300
106-162	Administrative expenses (contingent emergency appropriations)	19,500	27,600	+8,100
	Total, Small Business Administration	50,500	60,900	+10,400
	Total, Chapter 2:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	133,515	106,100	-27,415
	Emergency appropriations	(62,115)	(45,200)	(-16,915)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(71,400)	(60,900)	(-10,500)

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 3908) — continued
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
CHAPTER 3				
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL				
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
Corps of Engineers - Civil				
106-198				
106-162	General investigations (emergency appropriations).....	8,100	1,500	-6,600
106-162	Operation and maintenance, general (emergency appropriations).....	19,175	27,925	+ 8,750
	Total, Corps of Engineers - Civil.....	27,275	29,425	+ 2,150
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY				
	Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund (emergency appropriations).....		16,000	+ 16,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activities				
	Other defense activities (emergency appropriations).....		59,000	+ 59,000
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations).....		(4,000)	(+ 4,000)
	Total, Chapter 3:			
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	27,275	104,425	+ 77,150
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations).....		(4,000)	(+ 4,000)
CHAPTER 4				
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
Bureau of Land Management				
106-162	Wildland fire management (contingent emergency appropriations).....	100,000	100,000	
United States Fish and Wildlife Service				
106-162	Construction (emergency appropriations).....	5,000	5,000	
National Park Service				
106-162	Construction (emergency appropriations).....	4,000	4,000	
United States Geological Survey				
106-162	Surveys, investigations, and research (emergency appropriations).....	1,800	1,800	
	Total, Department of the Interior.....	110,800	110,800	
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
Forest Service				
	Wildland fire management (contingent emergency appropriations).....		150,000	+ 150,000
	Total, Chapter 4:			
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	110,800	260,800	+ 150,000
	Emergency appropriations.....	(10,800)	(10,800)	
	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(100,000)	(250,000)	(+ 150,000)
CHAPTER 5				
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES				
Administration for Children and Families				
106-198	Low income home energy assistance (contingent emergency appropriations).....	600,000	600,000	
CHAPTER 6				
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Coast Guard				
	Operating expenses (emergency appropriations).....		37,000	+ 37,000
Federal Highway Administration				
	Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):			
	Emergency relief program (emergency appropriations).....		600,000	+ 600,000
	Total, Department of Transportation.....		637,000	+ 637,000
RELATED AGENCIES				
National Transportation Safety Board				
106-198				
106-162	Salaries and expenses (emergency appropriations).....	25,096	24,739	-357
	Total, Chapter 6:			
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	25,096	661,739	+ 636,643

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 3908) — continued
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
CHAPTER 7				
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT				
Public and Indian Housing				
106-198	Housing certificate fund (emergency appropriations).....	12,000		-12,000
Community Planning and Development				
	HOME investment partnerships program (contingent emergency appropriations)		36,000	+36,000
	Total, Housing and Urban Development	12,000	36,000	+24,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
National Aeronautics and Space Administration				
	Human space flight (contingent emergency appropriations).....		25,800	+25,800
	Science, aeronautics and technology (contingent emergency appropriations).....		29,000	+29,000
	Mission support (contingent emergency appropriations)		20,200	+20,200
	Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration		75,000	+75,000
Total, Chapter 7:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	12,000	111,000	+99,000
	Emergency appropriations.....	(12,000)		(-12,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations.....		(111,000)	(+111,000)
Total, title III:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,032,158	2,243,257	+1,211,099
	Emergency appropriations.....	(260,758)	(946,657)	(+685,899)
	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(771,400)	(1,296,600)	(+525,200)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)		(4,000)	(+4,000)
	(Loan authorizations)	(40,000)	(462,250)	(+422,250)
TITLE IV - SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND OFFSETS				
CHAPTER 1-A				
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
Economic Development Administration				
106-198	Assistance to Vieques, Puerto Rico	40,000		-40,000
National Institute of Standards and Technology				
106-162	Scientific and technical research and services.....	1,000		-1,000
106-162	Industrial technology services.....	4,000		-4,000
106-162	NTIS revolving fund (by transfer).....	(4,500)		(-4,500)
	Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology	5,000		-5,000
RELATED AGENCIES				
Commission on Civil Rights				
106-162	Salaries and expenses	800		-800
Federal Maritime Commission				
106-162	Salaries and expenses	490		-490
Small Business Administration				
106-198	Salaries and expenses (by transfer).....	(2,000)		(-2,000)
Business Loans Program Account:				
106-198	Guaranteed loans subsidy	1,000		-1,000
	Total, Chapter 1-A:			
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	47,290		-47,290
	(By transfer)	(6,500)		(-6,500)
CHAPTER 1				
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY				
106-162	Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	16,000		-16,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activities				
106-162	Weapons activities.....	55,000	55,000	
106-162	Other defense activities	14,000		-14,000
106-162	(By transfer)	(4,000)		(-4,000)
	Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	69,000	55,000	-14,000
Total, Chapter 1:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	85,000	55,000	-30,000
	(By transfer)	(4,000)		(-4,000)

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 3908) — continued
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
	CHAPTER 2-A BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE Department of the Treasury			
106-162	Debt restructuring.....	210,000		-210,000
	CHAPTER 2 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE Forest Service			
	State and private forestry (by transfer)		(500)	(+500)
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY			
106-198	Energy conservation.....	19,000		-19,000
	Advance appropriations		19,000	+19,000
	CHAPTER 3 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES Administration for Children and Families			
106-162	Payments to States for foster care and adoption assistance	35,000	35,000	
	CHAPTER 4 CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS JOINT ITEMS Capitol Police Board			
	Security enhancements		1,874	+1,874
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL Capitol Buildings and Grounds			
	Capitol buildings, salaries and expenses		7,039	+7,039
	House office buildings		4,213	+4,213
	Capitol power plant		3	+3
	Total, Architect of the Capitol.....		11,255	+11,255
	Total, Congressional Operations		13,129	+13,129
	OTHER AGENCIES BOTANIC GARDENS			
	Salaries and expenses		26	+26
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL Library Buildings and Grounds			
	Structural and mechanical care		3,885	+3,885
	Total, Chapter 4: New budget (obligational) authority.....		17,040	+17,040
	CHAPTER 5-A DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Coast Guard			
106-162	Operating expenses (by transfer).....	(18,000)		(-18,000)
	Federal Aviation Administration			
106-162	Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund): (Obligation limitation reduction).....	(-50,000)		(+50,000)
	CHAPTER 5 DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY Internal Revenue Service			
106-162	Processing, assistance and management.....	19,796		-19,796
106-162	Tax law enforcement	6,807		-6,807
106-162	Information systems	13,180		-13,180
	Total, Internal Revenue Service.....	39,783		-39,783
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
106-162	Committee for the Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.....	687		-687
106-162	General Services Administration: Policy and operations.....	2,000		-2,000
106-162	Office of Personnel Management: Salaries and expenses.....	1,000		-1,000
	Total, Chapter 5: New budget (obligational) authority.....	43,470		-43,470

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 3908) — continued
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
CHAPTER 6				
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT				
Federal Housing Administration				
106-162	FHA - General and special risk program account:			
	Administrative expenses.....	49,000	49,000
Management and Administration				
106-198	Office of Inspector General (reappropriation)	-6,000	-6,000
106-162				
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
National Aeronautics and Space Administration				
106-162	Mission support (by transfer).....	(20,200)	(-20,200)
National Science Foundation				
106-162	Education and human resources.....	1,000	-1,000
Total, Chapter 6:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	44,000	43,000	-1,000
	(By transfer)	(20,200)	(-20,200)
CHAPTER 7				
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
.....	Fund for Rural America (offset) (sec. 4701)		-6,000	-6,000
.....	Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems (offset) (sec. 4702).....		-100,000	-100,000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
Economic Development Administration				
106-198	Emergency oil and gas guarantee loan program account (offset) (emergency appropriations)	-20,000	+20,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY				
Atomic Energy Defense Activities				
106-194	Defense environmental restoration and waste management (rescission)	-13,000	-13,000
.....	Other defense activities (rescission of emergency appropriations).....		-40,000	-40,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
National Park Service				
106-198	Construction (rescission).....	-5,000	+5,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY				
106-194	SPR petroleum account (rescission).....	-12,000	+12,000
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
.....	Information technology systems and related expenses (offset) (emergency appropriations).....		-26,600	-26,600
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
Unanticipated Needs				
106-198	Information technology systems and related expenses (offset) (emergency appropriations).....	-235,000	-235,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT				
Public and Indian Housing				
106-198	Housing certificate fund (rescission).....	-128,000	+128,000
106-194				
Total, Chapter 7:				
	Rescissions.....	(-158,000)	(-13,000)	(+145,000)
	Offsets.....		(-106,000)	(-106,000)
	Rescission of emergency appropriations		(-40,000)	(-40,000)
	Offsets (emergency appropriations).....	(-255,000)	(-261,600)	(-6,600)
Total, title IV:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	70,760	-251,560	-322,320
	Appropriations.....	(483,760)	(150,040)	(-333,720)
	Rescissions.....	(-158,000)	(-13,000)	(+145,000)
	Offsets.....		(-106,000)	(-106,000)
	Advance appropriations		(19,000)	(+19,000)
	Rescission of emergency appropriations		(-40,000)	(-40,000)
	Offsets (emergency appropriations).....	(-255,000)	(-261,600)	(-6,600)
	(By transfer)	(48,700)	(500)	(-48,200)

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 3908) — continued
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.	Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
Grand total, all titles:			
New budget (obligational) authority.....	4,833,215	8,648,441	+3,815,226
Appropriations	(483,760)	(150,040)	(-333,720)
Rescissions.....	(-158,000)	(-13,000)	(+145,000)
Offsets.....	(-106,000)	(-106,000)
Advance appropriations	(19,000)	(+19,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	(3,991,055)	(6,075,782)	(+2,084,727)
Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(771,400)	(2,824,219)	(+2,052,819)
Rescission of emergency appropriations	(-40,000)	(-40,000)
Offsets (emergency appropriations).....	(-255,000)	(-261,600)	(-6,600)
(By transfer)	(48,700)	(215,500)	(+166,800)
(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(4,000)	(+4,000)
(Loan authorizations)	(40,000)	(462,250)	(+422,250)

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

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

Mr. Chairman, at the end of last year, the President had asked for \$568 billion in appropriated spending, and Congress had approved \$578 billion. In this supplemental as it now comes before us, the President has asked for additional funds which would take his total request for the year to \$573 billion. The supplemental has been added to by the committee so that, if this bill passes as it is now before us, we will wind up spending \$587 billion over this existing fiscal year, which is \$13 billion more than the President asked.

In addition, the amendment that will be offered today and which will be supported by the Republican leadership will add yet another \$4 billion to this package in the DoD arena. That will take total spending for this fiscal year to \$591 billion, some \$17 billion above the President's request.

That additional \$4 billion which is being asked for by the House leadership is there for a very simple reason. There is nothing wrong with what that money is actually being spent for. But the fact is it is being spent on routine items for one simple purpose, and that is to get around the very budget resolution that was passed just 5 days ago on this floor. Because by moving that \$4 billion in expenditures into this existing fiscal year, my colleagues make room in the next fiscal year for \$4 billion for Members' projects and Members' pork. Nice game if they can get away with it.

I suggest Senator MCCAIN get out his pencil. He better get ready, because a lot of stuff is going to come over there he is probably not going to like. This is one major reason to vote against this bill before us today.

But there is another, in my view, even more serious reason. We are being asked by the President and the Speaker of the House to support \$1.3 billion for Colombia. In my view, that is the camel's nose under the tent for a massive long-term commitment to a military operation in Colombia that has as much to do with the domestic situation in Colombia as it has to do with our drug problems here at home.

General Wilhelm from SouthCom has indicated that this is the first year of a 5-year commitment, in his judgment. It seems to me if a can-do Marine like General Wilhelm is predicting that this is going to be a 5-year operation, that it is likely to last a lot longer, because things have a way of getting more complicated than Congress originally expects.

As I said in the Committee on Rules, I detest Vietnam analyses under most circumstances, but I believe that, in this case, there is a very real parallel. In fact, there are two. When the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was debated in 1964, it took 2 days in the Senate. It took 40 minutes on the floor of this House. This Congress has rued the day ever

since that it did not give more time to consider that proposition.

Today, when my amendment comes before us to eliminate the most dangerous parts of that Colombian package, we will have exactly 20 minutes to discuss it, 10 minutes for those of us who are opposed to undertaking that involvement at this time.

Let me tell my colleagues what I think the unanswered questions are that we ought to be asking. In my view, this Congress has no real knowledge of what it is we are about to embark upon. I do not see any real plan by the administration. I see a plan to have a plan, but I do not see a real plan. There is no specific authorization for this proposition. Before we slide into this operation, I think we ought to ask some questions.

First of all, is this really an anti-drug campaign, or is it a political campaign, a pacification in Colombia? Will this really produce a reduction in drug availability in the United States?

The House, in the rule it just adopted, has eliminated its ability to vote on the Pelosi amendment. The Pelosi amendment was an attempt to add additional money to fight drugs here at home by expanding our drug treatment and prevention program.

I would point out that the Rand Corporation, in a study financed in part by the U.S. Army, indicated that a dollar spent to eliminate drug use here at home is 23 times more effective than a dollar spent to try to interdict or to reduce supply in some foreign land. Yet we are being prevented from voting on the most effective way to deal with drugs in this country.

I also think we need to be aware of the fact that in Colombia itself there is substantial doubt about whether that society is ready to take this issue on. If they are not, we cannot do it for them.

I do not know, for instance, how many Americans understand that if we take a look at the ruling elite in Colombia, their sons do not serve in combat. Because if one is a high school graduate, one is exempted from having to serve in combat in the Colombian armed forces.

□ 1245

Do my colleagues really think we are going to be able to sustain a 5- or 10-year military operation with that kind of divided duty in that society? I doubt it.

What happens if the battalions that we are now training do not succeed? We are training a few thousand men so they can try to root out the narcos in 40,000 square miles of jungle. Let us say we succeed, which I think is highly unlikely. What is to prevent them from simply moving into the other 150,000 square miles of jungle in that country? I do not think very much.

I think this is ill conceived and ill thought out. If this does not work, what is the next step? Will we then cut and run, or will we then deepen our involvement? I do not think, given our

past experience in Vietnam, that we are likely to just say, "Oh, well, we gave it the good old college try, so now we are going to yank the plug." I do not think whoever is the future president is going to be able to make that decision. That means a long-haul problem.

What I am going to be asking this House to do, eventually, is to allow the money for police training to flow, to allow their helicopters to go down to Colombia, but I am going to be asking my colleagues to delay until July the vote on the over \$500 million in additional funding that is meant to expand our basic military commitment in Colombia until the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on International Relations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence can hold more hearings on this so that Congress knows what it is doing before it acts. And my amendment will provide expedited procedures to assure that we would be able to vote on it in July.

We are being told that lots of very bright professional people have put this package together so we need have no fear. Well, I respect Secretary Albright, I respect General McCaffery, I respect Mr. Pickering in the State Department, I respect the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT). But with all due respect to them, every individual Member of this House has a constitutional duty to exercise his or her own judgment on an issue of this gravity, and I do not think we are able to do that under this truncated arrangement.

So I would urge, for those and other reasons, that my colleagues oppose this bill today. I have no illusions that my amendment will pass. I think it is incredible we could not even vote on the Pelosi amendment, but I would urge Members not to make the same mistake that was made on this House floor in the Gulf of Tonkin. This may not be the same as Vietnam. There are undoubtedly major differences. But there are some very disturbing similarities, and I would urge my colleagues to take those similarities into consideration and delay consideration of this crucial vote until the Congress knows a whole lot more than it does today about what the proper course of action ought to be.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his great efforts in providing us with an excellent bill. I rise today to voice my enthusiastic support for his efforts, particularly as it relates to North Carolina.

This supplemental calls for \$94 million in unobligated balances for the emergency conservation program to be

used to repair damage done by Hurricane Floyd to buildings and farm equipment; provides \$13 million in Federal crop insurance assistance; provides \$81 million in relief for marketing loans for farmers in North Carolina; provides \$43 million in rural water projects; \$29 million for rural housing; \$5 billion for peacekeeping in Kosovo, \$2.2 billion more than the President's request. This supplemental fills in a lot of holes that have been created by this administration.

Additional funding is appropriated to stop the administration's practice of asking our soldiers to do more with less. And if the Spence amendment is accepted, and I certainly hope that it is, and support it, the supplemental will include an additional \$4 billion in emergency, badly needed defense funding. This funding includes \$750 million in military health care for active duty and veterans, \$230 million to reduce out-of-pocket housing expenses, \$600 million to address recruiting shortfalls, \$1.2 billion to meet funding requirements for our forward deployed forces, and \$1.2 billion to meet critical shortfalls in equipment maintenance.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and rise in enthusiastic support. I would respectfully urge our friends in the Senate to move forward on this bill with all dispatch.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

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

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

Just recently, Mr. Chairman, we heard our colleague from Wisconsin talking about the message that the President of the United States brought to this House of Representatives requesting that we bust the budget. I might remind the gentleman that the President was not for the balanced budget anyway, so we are not surprised he is sending us this message asking us to bust the budget.

What we did in this process, with respect to that area of jurisdiction that we on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs have, is reduce the President's request for foreign aid by \$37 million. Simply put, the President of the United States, the man that the people of this country has placed in charge of our national security, has hired one of the most professional people in this country with respect to the ability to do something about the drug problem we have, Mr. McCaffery. And Mr. McCaffery and the President of the United States have come to us and said, give us the money to implement this policy. Who are we to second-guess the Commander-in-Chief and Mr. McCaffery, the drug czar?

I am sorry that the minority Members do not have the confidence in the President of the United States to make a decision that is a responsible decision, but we must be responsible Members of the House of Representatives. The President has come to us, the Commander-in-Chief, and he tells us we have a very, very serious problem with drugs. And the President is absolutely right. He says we have a problem in Kosovo, and he is absolutely right. The President and I disagree on what the problem is in Kosovo, but, nevertheless, we have reduced his request for assistance to Kosovo for reconstruction. There is nothing in here to that effect.

So the bottom line is the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Services and the drug czar have come to us and said, after due diligent research, they have decided that this is the number one way that we can fight drug use here in the United States. I know that there appears to be an extreme lack of confidence in the ability of the President of the United States to make these decisions; but, nevertheless, he is the President of the United States and this Congress must decide whether or not we want to fight drugs based upon the suggested remedy that the President of the United States has sent to us or whether we want to play rhetoric and play demagoguery and delay this and let this drug situation develop even further.

In addition to the President's request for Colombia, we found glaring holes in it in the committee process. For example, we found that there was not a sufficient amount of money for the surrounding countries of Colombia, and we increased the President's request. We did not decrease his drug effort request; we increased it to provide for the surrounding countries of Colombia to have an ability to also fight the drug situation.

So here we are, a body that is destined to make a decision today based upon the request of the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill. I commend Chairman YOUNG for his leadership on this measure, especially his efforts to support our Armed Forces who are under so much strain in the face of repeated deployments overseas.

For Foreign Operations, this Emergency Supplemental includes a total of \$1 billion and 241.7 million including \$1 billion and 99 million for programs to fight America's international War on Drugs and \$142.7 million for Kosovo and Southeast Europe. We did not provide an additional \$210 million for debt relief at this time, but this is a subject we hope to be able to address when the proper conditions have been agreed to by the Secretary of the Treasury. In all, the Appropriations Committee recommendation reduces president's request for foreign aid by more than \$37 million.

Let me highlight the small but significant changes to the President's request made by the Committee. First, the Committee recommendation does not simply shift drug pro-

duction and trafficking away from Colombia, and into other countries in the region, we have increased the President's request for Colombia's neighbors, including: \$57 million for Bolivia; \$42 million for Peru; \$20 million for Ecuador; and \$18 million for Panama, Venezuela, Costa Rica, and Brazil.

Second, this bill will strengthen Human Rights and Judicial Reform in Colombia. The Appropriations Committee has recommended \$98.5 million—\$5 million more than the President's request—for human rights and judicial programs. As Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I expect these funds are to be subject to the existing "Leahy Law" which restricts U.S. assistance for foreign security forces involved in gross human rights abuses. In addition, the Committee adopted 2 important amendments offered by Mr. FARR that strengthen the human rights requirements of this assistance.

Mr. Chairman, for Kosovo and Southeastern Europe, the President has requested \$250.9 million in emergency funds. This bill provides \$142.7 million.

Congress made clear last year that the U.S. should not play a major role in rebuilding Kosovo. From FY 2000 funds previously appropriated, more than \$150 million is already available. Therefore, except for the Administration's request for \$12.4 million for American officers in the international police force, the Committee does not recommend additional funding for Kosovo. The exception for the police force is due to an urgent need. Ethnic violence continues, and this violence endangers civilians and U.S. troops. Police, not the U.S. military, should maintain public security.

This bill fully funds the President's request for \$34 million in assistance for Montenegro, \$35.7 million in assistance for Croatia, and \$13.7 million in assistance for democratic opposition in Serbia. Also, this bill fully funds the President's request for a modest investment of \$33.9 million to improve the military readiness of our allies in southeast Europe. The region remains volatile, and NATO needs to be in a position to operate cooperatively with these nations in case of another crisis.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill ensures continued Congressional oversight of these appropriations. None of the "Plan Colombia" funds can be spent until the Secretary of State notifies Congress regarding the exact uses of the funds. Further, all of the protections included in General Provisions from the Fiscal Year 2000 Foreign Operations bill apply to these funds, also.

Mr. Chairman, the Foreign Operations spending in this bill is truly Emergency spending that benefits Americans. I know that many Members are uncomfortable supporting Supplemental funds for foreign aid. But every penny of foreign aid in this bill is designed to benefit Americans. This assistance will help stop illegal narcotics from entering the United States and it will help American soldiers complete their work in Kosovo more rapidly. I urge Members to vote "aye".

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

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, the supplemental before us, and there has been much debate on it, really does not

address the total problem that we have.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, and we just heard the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), I want to thank him for his leadership in helping us to solve the problem in Zimbabwe; and my thanks to the full chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), for also supporting our efforts to address the crisis in Zimbabwe.

As many of my colleagues know, South Africa, Zimbabwe, as well as the tragedy in Mozambique, is of insurmountable proportions. The country has been devastated. There is money in our foreign assistance accounts today to address that problem. This supplemental, though it did not accept the amendment I had for \$60 million that would put \$20 million in child survival, \$20 million in development assistance, and \$20 million in disaster relief to replenish the account so that Mozambique today can get the assistance they need, the dollars are there; and I urge the President to request the money today to address those problems.

It is unfortunate that we have not moved yet on this tragedy. It has been over 3 weeks now. This has been in the media and some assistance has been sent. The helicopters, some food, and the personnel are on the ground in Mozambique. But over a million people are homeless today. Over 50,000 children are orphaned and cannot find their parents. We are the leaders in the world community. We have the resources and the disaster assistance account there for that purpose.

Both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) as well as the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) have agreed with me and adopted my amendment in the Committee on Appropriations, and we have report language that says when the assessment is made, and I understand it is to be made this Friday, that we will send the money forward. Let us not slow down our progress.

Mozambique is growing. It is one of the best countries on the continent. After years of struggle, they have put their house in order, but the cyclone has totally devastated them. Their housing, their hospitals, their food, their ability to grow their food has been devastated.

I urge this Congress to adopt the language in the bill and to send the financial resources to Mozambique.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, let me also thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for his hard work on this bill.

I could not help but think, as I was listening to the comments of the gen-

tleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who brought up a chart up here saying that the Republicans are busting the budget, that a few years ago he was standing here on the floor saying we were trying to starve children and put our grandmothers out on the streets. So when Republicans step forward and we fund particular programs, I am finding out that some of my colleagues enjoy the role of just playing the critic rather than being constructive and involving themselves in programs that help not only our people but our country be good neighbors in the world.

I rise in strong support of this bill. A critical element of this bill is called "Plan Colombia," which is the funding of a concerted effort aimed at reducing the supply of narcotics to the United States from this region in South America.

Illicit drugs pose a clear and present threat to the well-being of American society as well as our entire hemisphere. In 1999, drugs killed 52,000 Americans, approximately, and caused more than \$10 billion in damage to our country. The number of drug arrests and percentage of teens using drugs has steadily risen since President Clinton took office in 1993. The streets of America are literally awash in drugs, and this supplemental sends an unambiguous signal that we are finally getting serious about addressing this issue.

Unlike the Bosnia and Kosovo debates we have had on in floor, the United States has a vital national interest that is threatened by the influx of drugs across our borders. These drugs find their way on to every street corner of America. Over 80 percent of the cocaine and heroin that makes its way to the United States comes from this region in South America.

In December of 1999, I traveled to Colombia and Venezuela. I went into the jungles and Tres Esquinas where they were actually training the police battalions and, in my opinion, the democratically-elected government of Colombia is serious today about fighting the war on drugs.

Now, I will acknowledge the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) about the individuals who are drafted, young men not participating in the war, in armed combat.

□ 1300

We recognize that. But what we are training up is this narcotics police battalion. They are very serious in their efforts.

The core plan of Colombia, in training these battalions, is very serious. The transportation of the them for the helicopters is necessary. I believe that Congress needs to step up to the plate. The President has acknowledged the commitment of the president of Colombia. We need the comprehensive strategy to fight this war, and this is the initial first step.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the issue is not whether we should fight drugs. We should. The issue is what is the most effective way to do that. The issue is not whether we like the president of Colombia. I do. The question is whether his country, his society, and his military are reliable needs to lean on when we are talking about starting a 5-year or more commitment of military involvement.

I would like to once again read some of the comments made by James Hoagland, who I think everyone knows to be an objective, middle-of-the-road, and very sage reporter on international issues. This is some of what he said on March 19:

"In Colombia, the United States pursues unattainable goals largely for domestic political reasons with inappropriate tools."

Mr. Chairman, I will insert the full text in the RECORD when we are in the full House, but I am quoting portions now.

He goes on to say, "Questions not being asked, much less answered, now in the rush into quagmire include the following: What happens when it becomes clear of the considered judgment of the U.S. Air Force officers that the Colombian military will not be able to maintain the Blackhawks under the conditions in which they will be flying is shown to be correct? Will the United States replace the helicopters that crash or are shot down at 13 million a copy? Will large numbers of U.S. advisors be provided to maintain the helicopter force? If cocaine exports from South America continue unabated, will 30 more or 300 more Blackhawks be furnished to expand the war?"

"Clinton, of course, will not be around to provide the answers. Colombia's first Blackhawks will not arrive until 6 months after he leaves office. His successor will inherit an open-ended military obligation that can be trimmed back or abandoned only at domestic political cost.

"Sound familiar? Do the names Kennedy and Johnson come to mind?"

He then goes on to say, "House Republicans have championed super-sized aid to Colombia with an eye to blasting Clinton and Gore if it is not passed. They are the true catalysts for this foreign policy fiasco. The Clintonites merely show the courage of their cynicism jumping aboard a train they hope will be derailed in the Senate.

"The House Republicans blithely ignore the fact that American demand is at the root of the drug problem more than Colombian supply. They vote down efforts by Representative NANCY PELOSI to add funds for drug treatment at home in the catch-all bill that provides aid to Colombia. They slice out of that same bill \$211 million in debt relief for the world's poorest countries. They will shoot away the problems of the Third World.

"That has been tried elsewhere with similar fuzzy and contradictory thinking in Washington at the takeoff. I can

only wonder: Where is the Vietnam Syndrome when we really need it?"

I agree with those statements.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. We have already appropriated \$1.7 trillion for this year's budget. We do not need to appropriate another \$9 billion.

It is said that we need to appropriate this money to fight the drug war in Colombia. We have been fighting the drug war for 25 years. We have spent \$250 billion on the drug war. Some day we will have to wake up and decide that the way we are fighting the drug war is wrong.

As a physician, I can tell my colleagues, it is a serious problem. There are a lot of people suffering from drug usage in this country. But if something does not work, why are we so determined to pursue a process that does not work?

Quite frankly, I am not sure the real reason why we are in Colombia has anything to do with drugs. I do concede a lot of individuals will be voting for this bill because of the belief that it might help. But it will not help. So we should reconsider it and think about the real reasons why we might be there.

I had an amendment that was not approved. But what I would have done, if I had had the chance, I would have taken all the money from the overseas spending, Kosovo, Bosnia, East Timor, and the funds now for this new adventure down in Colombia, and put it into building up our military defense. That is what we need. We need better salaries, better medical care, and we need better housing for our military personnel. But here we go spreading ourselves thinly again around the world by taking on a new adventure, which will surely lead to trouble and a lot of expense.

Members have referenced the 65 helicopters that will be sent to Colombia. There is one, I guess, cynical hope about what might happen with our involvement in Colombia. Usually when we get involved its only going to be for a short period of time. We were going to go into Bosnia for 6 months. We have been there 5 years. We were going to go to Kosovo for a short period of time. It is open-ended. We are in East Timor for who knows how long. And we will soon be in Colombia.

But there was one time where we backed away, we literally surrendered and ran with our tail between our legs because we went in with helicopters, and that had to do with Somalia. We sent our Blackhawk helicopters in there. We had two of them shot down

in Mogadishu. We had two others that crash landed when they returned to the base. Within a couple weeks, we were out of there.

We did not send our Blackhawk helicopters into Kosovo because they would be shot down. Lets face it, it is not a good weapon. It will only lead to further involvement.

Who is going to fly the Blackhawk helicopters? Do my colleagues think the Colombians are going to fly them? You can bet our bottom dollar we are going to have American pilots down there very much involved in training and getting in much deeper than we ever should be.

So I think that, unfortunately, this could end up in a real mess. Maybe then we would have enough sense to leave. But we, in the Congress, ought to have enough sense not to go down there. This money can be better spent on national defense. We should be concerned about national security.

When we get ourselves involved, whether it is the Persian Gulf or Bosnia or wherever, all we do is build up our enemies and expose ourselves more to terrorist attacks because we are not doing it in the name of security and resentment toward America builds.

Under the Constitution, we should have a strong national defense, and we should provide for national security. Going into Colombia has nothing to do with national security and serves to undermine national defense.

Even those who build helicopters are pretty blunt. One lobbyist said, "It is business for us, and we are as aggressive as anybody. I am just trying to sell helicopters."

What about the oil companies who support this war; which several oil companies do? Yes, they want investment security, so they want the military industrial complex to come down there and protect their oil interests. The oil interests are very supportive of this war, as well as the helicopter companies.

But the American people, if they were asked, they would decline. A recent poll by Zogby showed that, essentially, 70 percent of the American people answered no to this particular question: "Should the U.S. help defend militarily such-and-such country even though it could cost American soldiers their lives?" It varied depending on which country. But, basically, 65 to 75 percent of the American people said no. The American people want us to mind our own business and not be the policeman of the world.

Can any Member come to this floor and absolutely assure us that we are not going to lose American lives in Colombia? We are certainly committing ourselves to huge numbers of dollars, dollars that we do not have, dollars that if we wanted to could come out of the current \$1.7 trillion budget we already have.

So I would suggest to my colleagues, let us reassess this. It is not really a war on drugs.

The war on drugs, by trying to reduce interdiction does not work. It has not worked. It is not going to work. It is only an excuse. It is an excuse for promoting military intervention in Colombia to satisfy those who are anxious to drill for oil there and for the military industrial complex to sell weapons.

It's amazing to me to see an administration who strongly opposes law abiding American citizens from owning guns for self defense to be such a promoter of the big guns of war throughout the world.

I ask for a "no" vote.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to change the focus of the debate a little bit.

Last year the President, in 1999, sent to the Congress his State of the Union message and budget in which he said we were going to save 60 percent of Social Security. The Congress, led by the Republicans of Congress, said, no, Mr. President we are going to save 100 percent of Social Security. And we did just that. We stopped the raid on Social Security. It is time it look at the other program under which we are stealing money, and that is Medicare.

The CBO announced in March that the estimated budget surplus of this country for fiscal 2000 will be \$27 billion. It is interesting if we look to see where that money comes from. \$23 billion of that made up of excess, Medicare, Part A Trust Fund payments and the interest thereon, is from Medicare.

So what we are really saying is this surplus that we have, the vast majority of it, is Medicare Part A Trust Fund, and we are about to spend most of it. Let me outline for my colleagues for a minute where it is going to go: \$26 billion surplus, \$6.9 billion we have already spent by reversing through the budget that was passed by this House. There is going to be \$2.2 billion in new supplemental outlays from this bill. There will be another \$6 billion that we are going to use for agricultural emergency support payments. There is \$4.2 billion in gimmicks in the budget from 601 to 596. And then there is \$4 billion that I suspect we are going to pass on the House floor today to retire debt.

That leaves us with \$2.7 billion left. What that really says is we are going to spend \$20 billion this year of Medicare Part A Trust Fund money.

How should we do it? The only things that are emergencies are the things that should be in an emergency supplemental. That is number one. Number two is, it should be accompanied by a rescission bill that finds the excesses or trims other areas of government if, in fact, these are true emergencies.

I would ask my colleagues to consider if they really want to take money from a program that is going to be bankrupt in 2014 and fund the vast array of items that are in this bill? I think not, on further reflection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for yielding me the time. He is a true gentleman. And so I sadly rise in opposition to this emergency supplemental appropriations bill because it funds too many nonemergency programs.

For example, this bill includes \$20 million for a new FDA laboratory in Los Angeles. Did somebody just all of a sudden find out that the current lab is in dangerous disrepair? We should take care of this in the HHS appropriations bill.

This so-called emergency supplemental also includes \$96 million in economic assistance for countries in Eastern Europe and the Balkans, \$104 million for an embassy in Sarajevo, \$49 million for our weapons labs, \$75 million for staffing at NASA; \$55 million for atomic energy plant personnel and infrastructure improvements; \$35 million for foster care and adoption assistance; \$20 million for abstinence programs; \$19 million for weatherization grants.

Mr. Chairman, many of these programs are valuable and I think should be funded, but they should be funded through a normal appropriations process, not an emergency bill.

And let us not forget the really big ticket items. This bill includes \$2.1 billion for operations in Kosovo and East Timor. How long will we continue to support the extended deployment of our troops? An amendment is to be offered today to add \$4 billion to address our military readiness problems. The reason our military is stretched is because we have sent too many of our soldiers on too many missions to too many countries.

And that leads us to Colombia. Should we send more than \$1.7 billion to Colombia in the form of emergency funding? I do not think so. We do have a serious drug problem. We should spend that money on drug treatment and increased border patrol. Our involvement in Colombia is just too important a decision to be made in limited debate in a supplemental spending bill.

I support provisions in this bill to help victims of natural disasters, but we should not fund normal programs in an emergency bill.

And so, Mr. Chairman, let us clean up this bill and help get those true emergency funds to those who need it. I urge a "no" vote on this supplemental.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me the time and for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I wish that we could have the time to have a full debate on the military assistance package to Co-

lombia. I commend the gentleman for his attempt with his amendment to have a reasonable, as I said, full debate on that subject. But that will not be allowed under these rules.

□ 1315

I want to focus my attention on two areas in the bill. First let us stipulate that there are many fine projects in this bill. We all agree to that. That is why many people will be voting for it, because of issues that are of concern to their regions, and I respect that.

I just want to say why, and even in light of the fact that I would normally support some of the provisions in the bill, that I find it impossible to do so because of the manner in which this bill has been brought to the floor. Are the American people not entitled to something better than a debate on military assistance to Colombia than having it as one provision in a multifaceted emergency supplemental bill?

Why can we not have a debate on a very important foreign policy issue, and a vote that stands on its own? Is the Republican majority afraid of a debate in the House of Representatives? Are they afraid that their arguments are too weak, that they could not stand the scrutiny of the American people in a full debate on this issue?

Let us stipulate that the President of Colombia is a brave and courageous man. President Pastrana has a very, very difficult task ahead of him. He deserves our support. What form that support should take is a matter that this House should debate, hear comment on, hold hearings on, in other words, the regular order. But the regular order is being cast aside for 20 minutes of debate, 10 minutes on each side, to debate whether we are going to commit all of this military assistance and all that goes with it, including putting our young people in harm's way, which we have already done, without a vote of this Congress.

I am also very concerned that this military approach does not really get to the heart of the matter. This bill, this assistance to Colombia, is called an emergency because we have an emergency drug problem in our country and indeed we do. As we heard on this floor earlier today, 5½ million Americans need substance abuse treatment. Two million of them are getting it. We have a 3.5-million-person treatment gap in our country.

If we want to reduce substance abuse in the United States, we must do that by reducing demand in the United States. Cutting off supply in Colombia is more costly and less certain. Let me tell my colleagues how much more costly. According to the Rand Corporation report, for every dollar spent to reduce demand in the U.S., you would have to spend \$23 in the country of origin in coca leaf eradication. That means if you spend \$34 million in the U.S. to reduce dependence on drugs by 1 percent, that same effect of reduction of 1 percent costs \$723 million by tak-

ing the approach of the eradication of the coca leaf in the country of origin, in this case Colombia.

But say that has to be part of a comprehensive drug problem. How can we bring an emergency supplemental bill to the floor of the House of Representatives whose emergency status in this area in terms of reducing substance abuse in the United States is dependent on reducing demand in the United States without one dollar in the bill, without one dollar in the bill being used for reduction in demand in the U.S., a formula that is 23 times more effective, according to the Rand Report which was done in conjunction with the Department of Defense and the Office of Drug Control Policy? So do not take my word for it. Twenty-three times more effective.

On the subject of again Plan Colombia, of which this is a part, we were told that Plan Colombia was an over \$7 billion proposal. Colombia would put up \$4 billion, we would put up \$1.7 billion, the EU would put up \$900 million, and then IMF and the Multilateral Development Bank would put up money. This is the only money on the table, the military money. So when we are told this is the military part but there is a big humanitarian part, we have not seen that yet. That is why I am voting no on this bill and respectful of my colleagues' decision for their own part.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. I would do anything, Mr. Chairman, but to tell the gentlewoman from California that she is all wet on some of her assumptions, but I rise primarily, Mr. Chairman, to inform the House that the gentlewoman from California's birthday is being celebrated this week, and we take this opportunity to wish the gentlewoman from California a very happy birthday.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman. If the gentleman will yield, I am pleased on my birthday to present the gentleman with the Rand Report which documents the assumptions that I presented.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I hope they wrapped it nicely.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and all those who worked so hard to bring this emergency antidrug aid package to the floor today. Passage of this bill affects every school, hospital, courtroom, neighborhood, all of our communities throughout America.

This bill will provide sorely needed assistance to our allies in Colombia who are all on the front lines in the war against illegal drugs. The numbers have been shocking. Eighty percent of the cocaine, 75 percent of the heroin consumed in our Nation comes from Colombia. Illegal drugs have been costing our society more than \$100 billion per year, costing also 15,000 young American lives each year.

As a result of inattention from the administration, the civil war in Colombia is going badly for that government. This weekend alone, 26 antidrug police were killed by the narcoterrorists in Colombia. The specter of a consolidated narcostate only 3 hours by plane from Miami has made it patently clear that our Nation's vital security interests are at stake.

As the sun begins to set on his administration, President Clinton is finally facing the reality of the Colombian drug-fueled crisis with this emergency supplemental request. As former Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter eloquently noted, and I quote, "wisdom too often never comes, and so one ought not to reject it merely because it comes late."

Heroes like Colombia's antidrug leader General Jose Serrano want our Nation to stand with them in their fight against the drug lords, including the right-wing paramilitaries. This legislation provides more assistance where it can do the most good with the Colombian antidrug police. Colombia is not asking for nor should we offer American troops in that war. Investing American aid dollars now in Colombia to stem the hundredfold cost to our society only makes common sense. It is a proper role for our government. We at the Federal level have the responsibility to help eradicate those drugs at their source.

Accordingly, I am urging our colleagues to support this package. Colombia's survival as a democracy and our own national security interests are at stake here. The stakes could not be more clear and more critical.

With regard to the comments of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), demand reduction composes 32.7 percent of the government's total spending on antidrug efforts while the amount spent on reducing overseas supply currently consists of only 3 percent of those expenditures. I again urge our Members to fully support this very important antidrug measure.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

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

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am really troubled about what we are doing here today, and I cannot believe we are doing it without much more debate. This looks to me very much like something from

my younger years when we got involved in Vietnam.

Let us understand this Colombia situation is a civil war. It is a civil war that has been going on for a long time. We have decided all of a sudden that it is a war on drugs. That is our excuse or it is some folks in our administration's excuse for getting involved in a civil war.

And then the mistake we are making here which I brought out in committee and in subcommittee and other places is the fact that we are referring to the insurgent group in Colombia as narcoterrorists. The minute in this country you call somebody a terrorist, you close the door, and rightfully so, on ever negotiating with them. So by saying that we are going into Colombia to help the military, number one, which is wrong, fight the narcoterrorists, we just said that we are never going to negotiate with one side in a civil war.

Now, I suspect that people in Washington are beginning to look at Latin America and beginning to get this feeling which was a bad feeling and a wrong feeling in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. They see a progressive President in Venezuela, Chavez; they see a new so-called socialist President in Chile and they say, "Oh, my God, we've got to do something," so where do we set our anchor? In Colombia.

And then to suggest that in Colombia only one side may be involved with drug money is to suggest we are reinventing that country. There is a major problem with drugs in Colombia, and it plays a role in everything that is done in that country. I wish that today we had the courage to look at this issue for what it is. We are getting involved in a civil war which we are going to pay for a price, a big price in the future.

Secondly, we are closing off any opportunity to speak to one side. How do you bring peace to a country if that is what you want to do by shutting the door on one side?

And, thirdly, we are thinking about Colombia as we thought about South America in the 1960s. We are looking at it in the year 2000 in the same way. We made mistakes then; we are going to make them again, and for what? So that some helicopter company somewhere can sell a few helicopters? It is not worth it. I wish we would reconsider this and vote as I will against this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the supplemental and in strong support of the Lewis-Spence-Murtha-Skelton amendment to the bill which would provide an additional \$4 billion for our severely underfunded Defense Department.

In addition, later today, I will offer an amendment with the gentleman

from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) regarding the \$40 million contained in this bill to implement the President's directive on the Navy's training range on the Puerto Rican island of Vieques. The bill would provide these funds to Puerto Rico as part of a deal to resume Navy and Marine Corps training on Vieques which has been suspended because of trespassers seeking to end our training operations there.

The money would be used for economic development and to hold a binding referendum on Vieques on whether live-fire training should be resumed. The Fowler-Hansen amendment would essentially do two things: First, it would strike language that would permit any of the \$40 million to be used for the referendum. It does not stop the referendum. As the San Juan Star accurately reported today, the referendum can still be held, just not underwritten by the U.S. government.

Operations on a vital military training range should not be subjected to a public referendum. This is terrible public policy and will set a very dangerous precedent for other critical military activities.

Second, it would require that before the \$40 million is released to Puerto Rico, the President must certify to the Congress that live-fire training operations have been resumed. The amendment would also allow part of this \$40 million to be spent on a health study on the island of Vieques immediately upon enactment without condition. I want to quote specifically referring to the live-fire training on Vieques from the Secretary of the Navy Richard Danzig.

He has stated, and I quote,

This training wins wars. Many Americans in uniform owe their lives to this crucial training. Many would perish without it.

This is critical to the well-being of our young Marines and sailors. I urge my colleagues to support the Fowler-Hansen amendment which will be on the floor later this afternoon.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

□ 1330

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, if this bill were not so serious, I would think it is a joke. Once again, the United States is proposing a huge military alliance with the foreign military known for its human rights abuses.

Now, you think we would have learned our lesson by now. How long ago was it that Bill Clinton went to Guatemala and apologized for fueling that country's generation-long slide into chaos? But just a year later you can say here we go again.

No one seriously denies the link of paramilitary groups to the Colombian government, and here we are going to turn over to known human rights abusers the means by which they can perfect their trade.

As we stand here on the floor today, 3,000 union leaders, students, parents,

shopkeepers and others are standing before 3,000 armed Colombian soldiers, forming a human shield to protect the peaceful U'wa people that the Colombian government wants to move off their ancestral land to make way for Occidental Petroleum's oil rigs. We should be standing with the people, not giving aid and encouragement to Colombia's brutal military.

We should have learned our lessons well about going in with the military where only diplomacy should be allowed to tread. Unfortunately, it appears that we have not. Because in addition to Plan Colombia, this bill also provides an additional \$5 billion to keep us in Kosovo, another failed military blunder that diplomacy should have resolved.

After our military gambit in Kosovo, we have left 31,000 rounds of depleted uranium rounds and 50 percent unemployment, in some areas rising to 85 percent. The crumbling infrastructure is yet to be rebuilt, and our European allies have not lived up to the commitments they made at the beginning of that adventure.

Time and time again, this Congress commits our troops to military adventures without a plan to bring them home. Last year, U.S. aircraft flew over 1,000 sorties in Iraq, nearly a decade after that war was supposedly over. In Kosovo, our limited military engagement has turned into a permanent occupation. Now we are being asked to fund the Vietnamization of Barry McCaffrey's war without an exit strategy or end game.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this so-called emergency amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have only one speaker to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, on October 24, 1999, more than 10 million Colombians took to the streets of every major city in Colombia to rally for peace. These 10 million Colombians wanted to send a message that they were sick of war. They were terrorized by the kidnappings. They were exhausted with paramilitary violence and disgusted with drug trade. No mas, they said. No more.

Peace is what Colombia needs. Peace will allow democracy to flourish. Peace will permit law enforcement officials to combat the flow of illicit drugs, and peace will create the conditions to address the income inequalities, the problems of displaced persons and economic development issues that will truly improve the lives of the Colombian people.

Unfortunately, the aid package we are considering today will not help the peace process. In fact, it fails to address the underlying issues that are needed to promote peace in Colombia.

I traveled to Colombia in 1993 to see the situation first hand. It was clear, then, that U.S. military aid and equipment that was intended to be used to stem the flow of illegal drugs was being misused, misused to suppress citizens in Colombia, including labor activists, community leaders, peace activists, human rights activists and collective farmers.

The United States is properly concerned about the abuse of illegal drugs by our citizens. Interdiction and source reductions should be a part of a comprehensive drug control policy. This proposal does not reflect such a policy. The proposal we have before us today will do little or nothing to address the fundamental problems in Colombia; namely, economic inequality, civil war, lack of economic development, and judicial impunity. Unfortunately, we seem to be playing a game of public relations when we should be pursuing peace in the region.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, last week, the majority party in this House posed for political holy pictures and promised spending discipline and bragged about how much spending they were going to cut.

This week they have brought to the floor this bill which adds \$4 billion to the spending requests that the President has made for a supplemental. And then on top of that, it intends in an amendment that they will shortly offer to add yet another \$4 billion in spending. And the reason they are going to do that in the DOD account is simply so they move \$4 billion in spending from next year to this year, because that frees up \$4 billion for them to add for Members' projects in the coming year.

It is very simply a \$4 billion end run around the spending ceilings which they bragged about imposing just 5 days ago. They must think that people are not watching. Well, I suspect they are.

The net result is that they come in for this entire fiscal year spending \$17 billion more than the President asks for. That to me is an indication of just how false those promises have been that we would see straight book-keeping and fiscal discipline under their budget. That alone, I think, is a reason to defeat this proposition.

I have already indicated my concern about the Colombian war effort, but I think this is yet another reason to vote against this budget hocus pocus.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment all of our colleagues for the very high level and professional approach to this debate. There have been

strong differences, and I indicated in my opening comments that there would be, because this bill covers a lot of issues. But when this bill was presented to us from the administration, the Plan Colombia presentation to the Committee on Appropriations dealt with drug abuse and eliminating the source of those drugs.

No one suggested that we were talking about getting involved in a civil war, and no one suggested that this was going to be a major military operation. They were talking to us strictly about eliminating drugs at their source.

This is important. We have great law enforcement. Our Customs agents, our law enforcement officers, the United States Coast Guard do a really great job of interdicting the flow of these drugs from Colombia and other countries before they reach the United States. The problem is they are overwhelmed. They do not have the assets that are necessary to stop all of the narcotraffic. The drug people have unlimited sums of money. They have high technology. They have fast boats. They have unlimited numbers of airplanes, and they do not have to go by any rules.

Mr. Chairman, we have good assets, but we are limited in how many assets we have; and we have to go by a lot of rules. So it is very difficult. How great it would be to eliminate these drugs at their source, and that is what Plan Colombia is all about. It is to help the Colombian government elected by the people to eliminate the source of these drugs.

Now, we spend billions and billions of dollars here at home in programs trying to get people to stop using the drugs. But as long as the drugs are available, people still continue to use those drugs.

Mr. Chairman, how many more hundreds or thousands of our kids are going to get hooked on drugs or die from overdoses, or get shot up in a raid or a drug bust that went bad before we eliminate this terrible, terrible problem? It is essential to the future of this Nation that we eliminate the scourge that is illegal drugs and the trafficking of illegal drugs in the United States. We need to wipe out the source of these terrible drugs and we need to eliminate those killing fields where the drugs are grown.

Now about Kosovo. A previous speaker mentioned that this bill would include \$5 billion to keep our troops in Kosovo. That is not accurate. The money that we provide in this bill for Kosovo has already been spent. When this administration sent American military to Kosovo, the money was committed; and the longer they are there, the more money is spent. Now, where that money came from was not from an appropriations for Kosovo, but it was money that was appropriated for operations and maintenance of our own military. So in order to pay for the Kosovo deployments, they reached into

the fourth quarter O&M accounts of all of the services.

Now, if we do not replace that money, and I join with those who believe that the Kosovo experience is not going to be a positive one for the United States, and I wish we were not there; but if we do not replace this money, what happens is that our own military will have to stand down its operations, much of its training operations during the last quarter of this fiscal year, and that is rapidly approaching.

So it is important that we move this legislation through the House today and that we get it to the other body so that we can begin the negotiations in finalizing what this supplemental is really going to be. We have tried to work with and be cooperative with the administration, with the President, and with the leadership in the Congress; and I think the bill that we deliver today has done that.

Mr. Chairman, this is important. The fiscal year is running out. Half the fiscal year is basically gone. We have 13 regular appropriations bills to get to. We need to complete this bill, get it to the other body, get to conference and clear the way so that we can get about our business of the 13 regular appropriations bills.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I expect we will have some lively debate on the amendments that will be offered here very shortly. I hope that the Members will pay close attention because some of the debate will be rather critical.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on an important provision contained in the supplemental appropriations bill—the emergency funding for at-risk disabled, mentally ill, veterans, and other vulnerable families who would otherwise face the very real risk of eviction if we don't act to provide one-year renewals for expiring Shelter Plus Care and SHP permanent housing grants.

In this regard, I would like to thank VA, HUD Appropriations Chairman WALSH and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for agreeing to add this provision to the bill. I would also like to acknowledge the original co-sponsors of H.R. 3613, Representatives WELLER, QUINN, and VENTO, for their hard work in getting this provision inserted into the bill. I also appreciate the support of Catholic Charities, the National Alliance to End Homelessness, and the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, all of which have written in support of this bill.

The issue here is simple. Through a combination of policy inaction, limited homeless prevention funding, and vigorous competition for homeless funds, forty requests for renewal of homeless rental assistance grants were not approved as part of last December's McKinney Act homeless awards. The result is that communities that run these contracts will run out of money this year—and will be faced with the option of either evicting families or robbing funds from other critical programs.

To address this looming crisis, we recently introduced H.R. 3613 to authorize HUD to use existing Section 8 reserves to renew all of these expiring but unfunded grants for a period of one year. This would not require any additional budget authority, but would merely

shift \$6 million in already approved Section 8 funds for this purpose. In committee, that bill was added to the supplemental.

This approach, of renewing expiring homeless rental assistance grants through the Section 8 account, is consistent with the fiscal year 2001 budget recently submitted by HUD. Moreover, it just makes sense. All other HUD rental assistance contracts are routinely renewed through Section 8 funds; only homeless program rental assistance contracts for the very poorest Americans are subject to a funding competition, with the all too real possibility of non-renewal.

I believe there is bi-partisan support for permanent authorization of renewal of all expiring Shelter Plus Care and SHP permanent housing grants through the Section 8 account, and I hope Congress will do this later this year.

But, I would point out that the action we are taking today does not pre-judge that policy decision, but merely protects vulnerable families in the interim, for a one-year period. This gives Congress time to debate permanent authorization, and gives grantees a chance to apply for renewal in the next round of funding.

So, I applaud inclusion of this measure in the bill, and urge the Senate to do likewise.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong dismay that the Stupak-Stabenow-Camp amendment offered to H.R. 3908, the 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, was not made in order under the modified rule for consideration of the bill. The amendment authored by Congressmen BART STUPAK and DAVE CAMP and myself would have provided critical, emergency funding to address Bovine Tuberculosis (Bovine TB) in the State of Michigan.

At my request, report language is included in H.R. 3908 that urges the Department of Agriculture to address the problem of Bovine TB immediately. The report language urges the Secretary of Agriculture to "promptly notify the [Appropriations] Committee of any additional funding requirement, accompanied by official requests for additional funds. The Secretary is directed to report to the [Appropriations] Committee by May 1, 2000 on his plan of action." Clearly, by including this language in the committee report, the Appropriations Committee has recognized the urgency of the Bovine TB problem in Michigan.

Until recently, Bovine TB has only been identified in cattle. For the first time, this threatening disease has been identified in a non-captive deer herd in Michigan. Michigan is the only State in the Nation that has found Bovine TB in a wild animal population. With the presence of this disease in Michigan's free-roaming deer population, Bovine TB is quickly being transferred to captive cattle herds throughout the State and the disease is spreading southward, endangering cattle herds in other States.

The State of Michigan is on the verge of losing its "TB-free" (Accredited-free) status, granted by the Department of Agriculture. For a period of time, the presence of Bovine TB in both deer and cattle was isolated to the northeast portion of Michigan's lower peninsula. To date, Michigan has had an unusual split status, in which the unaffected regions are deemed "TB-free." Expanded testing, however, has identified the presence of the disease outside the northeast quadrant and USDA officials are now seriously considering granting the entire State a "Non-modified ac-

credited" status, the lowest possible Bovine TB status. This reduced status will severely impact Michigan's dairy and cattle industry, require increased testing, and merits increased federal investment in research and support to eradicate the disease.

The Stupak-Stabenow-Camp amendment would have appropriated \$7.5 million in emergency funding to conduct a cooperative program with the State of Michigan to combat Bovine TB. It is very disappointing that the Rules Committee did not make this amendment in order, resulting in a delay in bringing critical federal dollars to Michigan to eradicate this agricultural and public health crisis. I will continue to work with my colleagues, Representatives STUPAK and CAMP and the members of the Appropriations Committee, to ensure that adequate federal resources are directed toward combating Bovine TB.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, this is the first major appropriations action of the year, and already we're starting off on the wrong foot. This bill spends too much on the wrong things and does not devote enough attention to priorities that we desperately need to focus on.

I have major concerns about the money being spent on additional defense projects in this bill. Billions of dollars are provided for such spending, including military construction projects, new jet engines and tanks, a demonstration project for an air force base in Texas, and a military training range in Puerto Rico. Other members have offered amendments to add billions more in defense spending. I do not believe the supplemental appropriations bill should be a vehicle to ratchet up military spending.

I also have concerns about the money being put forward to help combat drug trafficking in Colombia. Although I am very interested in seeing the drug problem confronted throughout the hemisphere, I am skeptical that sending more military equipment into an already unstable region will be successful. Rather, the problem will most likely be pushed into other regions as a result.

This bill should be limited to true emergency spending, not for additional pork projects in places that don't need it. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, the Administration, as part of its fiscal year 2001 budget request, submitted a supplemental request for \$6.6 million to begin planning, engineering, and design as well as an environmental review of an emergency outlet for Devils Lake, North Dakota. I am deeply disappointed that the bill before us today fails to provide this critical funding.

During consideration of the supplemental by the House Appropriations Committee on March 9, 2000, Congressman VISLOSKEY offered an amendment to include \$6.6 million for the Devils Lake emergency outlet. Unfortunately, the amendment failed on a straight party line vote of 24–30.

To date, the federal government has spent \$300 million in the Devils Lake region, including \$80 million to raise roads and \$21 million to relocate 505 homes. Currently, eight miles of threatened roads in the basin are in need of significant structural reinforcement so that they can serve as dikes to hold back the encroaching lake from homes and other property. The Corps' preliminary estimate is that approximately \$30–50 million will be needed to address just these 8 miles of road.

If the lake continues to rise as projected, federal, state and local governments can expect to spend over \$500 million more on flood response in the absence of an outlet and other mitigation measures. It is clear that the amount that has been invested in the lake region, combined with the potential costs to reduce damage as this lake rises, make the case that the benefits of an outlet far outweigh the cost. However, what the numbers cannot show is the suffering and personal loss this disaster has brought upon the people of the lake region. It is often said that while the Grand Forks flood of 1997 was a heart attack, the Devils Lake flood is more of a cancer that grows year after year.

An outlet is a critical part of the overall strategy to respond to the continuous flooding that has plagued this region for far too long. Further, it is an approach supported by North Dakota's congressional delegation, Governor Ed Schafer and the state elected leadership of North Dakota. Without an outlet, Devils Lake will overflow naturally causing a devastating impact to communities downstream. Action must be taken now to provide relief to this region, and the outlet is the best means to address this crisis.

Even though the bill fails to provide funding for this project, the bill does meet our commitment to peace operations in Kosovo and provides critical funding to address the current backlog at the Federal Highway Administration for highway repair funds. For these reasons, I will be supporting the measure.

I am hopeful that funding for the Devils Lake outlet will be included in the Senate and I look forward to working with my colleagues to insure this funding will be provided in the final version of this supplemental appropriations bill. We simply cannot wait any longer.

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak on behalf of the young people in this Nation and more specifically those living in the First Congressional District of Connecticut. While this bill addresses many important issues, I am disappointed that this measure does not contain \$500 million for the Workforce Investment Act in H.R. 3908, the 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill. I am also disappointed that the rule did not make in order the Blagojevich Amendment that would have provided this funding.

I understand that the President has submitted a separate supplemental appropriations request for \$40 million for this program. However, this request is far too small and may never be acted upon by Congress. Therefore, I believe that it is imperative that we should include this critical \$500 million in the bill we are acting on today.

The Summer Youth Employment Program, under the Workforce Investment Act, is critical to our Nation's youth. For the City of Hartford, a City plagued with job loss and in dire need of revitalization, this program gives those at-risk youths a chance to thrive and make a contribution to their community. Now, without this funding, we have to deny these children this chance.

Last year in Hartford, approximately 2,000 young people were employed through the Summer Youth Employment Program, with a waiting list of approximately 600 young people who requested services. Without additional funding for Summer 2000, Hartford may only be able to serve 1,000 young people, with more than 1,000 needing services. In fact, in-

terested youth have been calling the Mayor's office about summer employment opportunities and have not been able to obtain an answer. We need to provide a positive answer to the inquiries.

On the National level, according to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, average reductions of almost 50 percent in the number of youth that will be served this summer as compared to last are expected. Some cities are even facing up to 80 percent of reductions in the number of youth they will be able to serve.

For a program that has worked so well in the past, why then should we halt its growth and the good it provides not only for our communities but also most importantly for the children? If we are in fact dedicated to making a difference in the lives of our young people, we must make our investment today. I urge my colleagues to address this important issue in Conference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant favor of this bill, which makes emergency appropriations for fiscal year 2000. Notwithstanding my support for the \$2 billion package for the costs of the U.S. peacekeepers in Kosovo or the paltry, yet sorely needed \$854 million for the Pentagon's embattled health-insurance system, I have serious concerns over the Colombia supplemental package.

The \$1.7 billion package of counter-narcotics and development assistance for the Andean region, principally Colombia may be spending too much money in the wrong places. Let's briefly list what this package includes:

Assistance for Colombian Army Counter-narcotics Battalions ["Push into Southern Colombia" program]. This includes 33 Huey helicopters and 28 UH-60 (Blackhawk) helicopters, along with training, operations and maintenance and related equipment.

Assistance for Colombian National Police—2 UH-60 helicopters; a spray aircraft; base construction; upgrade of existing aircraft; and provision of intelligence.

Narcotic interdiction assistance for Colombia and neighbors in the region.

Some economic development including crop substitution, employment, and resettlement.

A modicum of human rights protection, democratic governance, judicial reform and the peace process.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have been privy to many briefings regarding the grave situation in Colombia. And while I believe the U.S. has a responsibility to assist the Colombian government there needs to be a full and unfettered debate on the extent of American assistance.

For example, we have been told by U.S. military chiefs and Pentagon officials that U.S. forces which currently number around 250 personnel, do not and will not engage in combat operations with the Colombian military against the leftist guerrillas. We are told that U.S. personnel are there in Colombia solely to "advise and train." This sound bite is what has many members and security analysts making comparisons to Vietnam. Looking at this bill, we see vast portions of the funding slated for counter-narcotics interdiction efforts. Yet no one can explain to me (or any member for that matter)—operationally, where does narcotics-interdiction end, and counter-insurgency begin?

Another potential pitfall that troubles me is the right-wing paramilitary groups that have sprung up in Colombia. These armed militias, which are tacitly accepted by the Colombian military, are reticent of the Central-American "Death Squads" that killed thousands there in the 1980s. I don't believe this bill contains enough protections to condition this military aid on a "human rights" certification basis.

Finally, I am deeply disappointed that Congresswoman PELOSI's amendment to mandate funds for domestic treatment programs aimed at reducing demand. Representative PELOSI's proposed amendment would have added \$1.3 billion for this purpose. If you are going to effectively attack a problem, you need to do so on every front. With the Republican's shutting off this wise proposal, I can not take seriously their claims to be "doing this for the children of America."

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that there were not significant funds in this bill for a more comprehensive aid package on alternative economic development; increased protection of human rights workers; humanitarian aid to the internally displaced; and the peace process between the Colombian government and the leftist insurgents.

As I noted at the outset, I do support this measure but reluctantly. Whereas I have briefly outlined my personal reservations, I recognize that there are many aspects of this bill that will do a lot of good. In any case, I hope that this body will have a future opportunity to fully examine the U.S. military's involvement in Colombia. Our military experts are setting us up for at least a 5 year commitment. My greatest fear is that years from now our troops will have become embroiled in this civil quagmire in Colombia—a war that has been on going for 40 years. True, the civil/political/military situation in Colombia is very different from Vietnam, but I ask, does it not also look very much the same?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 3908. With this bill, we are today embarking on a new course in our involvement in the counter-narcotics effort in Colombia. I support the bill because I believe we have an obligation to support democracies when they are threatened. Colombia is the oldest democracy in Latin America and is clearly under siege.

But Colombia is not fighting a traditional insurgency whose followers claim some ideological justification for violence. It was once that way, but it isn't anymore. The guerrilla movements in Colombia have abandoned their ideology and instead provide protection to the narcotics traffickers who poison our children. The guerrillas also resort to kidnaping and extortion. From both these activities, the guerrillas generate substantial income making them the best funded insurgency probably in the history of the world. So the first point I would make to my colleagues is that we should be clear about the real purpose of this bill. It is not only to support a counter-narcotics strategy, it also supports a counter-insurgency strategy. It is designed to punish the guerrillas and their drug-trafficking allies in order to drive the guerrillas to the negotiating table and, with luck, arrest the traffickers.

We also need to consider who we are providing our assistance to. The Colombia national police have an outstanding human rights record. They are an organization we should be proud to assist. But the bulk of this package

will go to the Colombian military, which has one of the worst human rights records in the hemisphere. On top of that, there are credible allegations of ongoing cooperation between elements of the Colombian military and the paramilitary organizations. The good news is that our assistance will be provided to battalions that have been vetted and trained by us. In addition, it appears to me that the leadership of the Colombian military genuinely wants to address human rights issues. We should demand that our assistance be contingent on genuine efforts to arrest and prosecute abusers of human rights.

Lastly, I am concerned about the direction of our counter-narcotics strategy. As we have seen in Bolivia and Peru, when there is success with eradication and interdiction in one area the traffic merely moves to another area. In a very real sense, much of the turmoil in Colombia is our fault. Our citizens consume the drugs grown and produced in Colombia, and unless we intensify our efforts to reduce demand here, a supply-side strategy is doomed to failure.

In a larger sense, we are faced with a choice all of us would prefer not to make. None of us wants to become more deeply involved in another civil conflict in Latin America, yet doing nothing imperils not only Colombia but her immediate neighbors as well.

On balance, I believe we should support the assistance package to Colombia as the best of the options available but we should understand the obligations this policy places on us and we should be aware that we will be involved in Colombia for a very long time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this Emergency Supplemental Appropriation bill. While I support the necessary emergency funding needs in this supplemental request, I have found numerous reasons to vote against it.

H.R. 3908 provides over \$9 billion in so called emergency funds for this year. In fact, \$3.8 billion, or 73% more than originally requested by the President. This bill provides \$5 billion for ongoing operations in Kosovo, \$2.2 billion for natural disaster assistance, \$2 billion additional funds for the Defense Department, \$1.7 billion in Colombian assistance and various other initiatives.

This funding runs the risk of repeating past mistakes in Latin America. The supplemental funds will not achieve our objectives of combating drug trafficking and political violence or enhancing peace efforts in Colombia. \$1.1 billion or 65% of the total request for Colombia will go to their abusive military regime. Training Colombian army battalions for counter narcotics efforts and to strengthen democratic institutions is contradictory. In fact, aid to the Colombian army will without doubt worsen the human rights situation and will drag the United States further into a long-term counterinsurgency commitment.

The Colombian military continues to maintain close regional and local links with the primary agents of violence and disorder in this region—paramilitary groups. According to the Washington Office on Latin America, the paramilitary groups are well known to be involved in the drug trade and responsible for over 70% of human rights violations. The paramilitaries continues to thwart and attack government investigators, reformist politicians and human rights monitors. Punctuating this, the Washington Post reports today that paramilitary

rebels killed at least 24 policeman and soldiers in a small village outside of Bogota in a series of attacks since this past weekend.

With such a relationship documented it makes no sense to factor in U.S. dollars into this equation. Rather, we must focus upon alternatives to military aid such as economic assistance, micro-credit loans, social services programs, judicial reform, drug prevention education and humanitarian relief for the approximately one million Colombians displaced by violence in the last five years.

The roughly \$1.6 billion allotted for the military to pay for rising fuel costs, \$855 million for military health care and the \$134 million for repairing damages to military facilities caused by recent hurricanes, floods and other natural disasters is understandable. These are truly unforeseen costs for the most part. However, an amendment being proposed by Chairman YOUNG and Chairman SPENCE, would give the Pentagon an additional \$4 billion for special interest projects. This is not only bad policy, but drains resources away from human needs and people programs. Such initiatives and decisions should be part of the regular 2000 appropriation process rather than trying to slip under the past and current year DOD spending agreements. This bill would already reduce the non-Social Security budget surplus for this year by about 35%. So much for the Congressional pledges to pay down the debt.

Too often under this GOP leadership, the term "emergency" is misunderstood and misused. This Emergency Supplemental request is not an opportunity to beef up the Pentagon with rancid pork projects for special interests. Nor is it the vehicle to load down with extraneous riders in effort to avoid the regular appropriation cycle. H.R. 3908 could have provided real help to those in need. Sadly, the Majority is failing this simple task.

I urge all Members to join me in voting no against this measure. As much as we need the fuel and energy assistance and other emergency help, the Congress and the American people should not be forced fed and blackmailed into spending billions on lousy policy and unneeded, unreviewed policy from the Administration or the congressional power brokers. Let's say no.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, today, we have before us the very important Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act. I say it is important because it would provide desperately needed disaster relief funds for those in my home state of North Carolina and others who have suffered the ravages of Hurricane Floyd. It also contains the Colombian aid package which will serve as a critical component in winning the war on drugs.

As you may recall, Mr. Chairman, Congress approved some disaster relief funding last fall to help eastern North Carolina recover from the disaster left by Hurricane Floyd. But, if you also remember, that funding did not cover all of the outstanding needs. The FY 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act addresses some of the shortfalls by providing over \$1 billion in emergency disaster assistance to areas ravaged by Hurricane Floyd, especially eastern North Carolina. For example, the emergency supplemental contains \$81 million for the Commodity Credit Corporation, funding which was removed from last year's disaster bill despite the efforts of the North Carolina delegation to include it. The measure also would provide \$77 million for the Farm

Service Agency, \$13 million for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, \$37 million for the Coast Guard and \$600 million for the Administration for Children and Families. While the measure will not cover all of the disaster relief needs, it will address some of the most pressing ones. So, I urge its passage.

H.R. 3908 also contains \$1.1 billion in aid to Colombia and other Andean countries, to stem the tide of illegal narcotics coming into this country. These funds would be used, among other things, purchase utility helicopters for the Colombian Army and the Colombian National Police and to help train two more anti-narcotic battalions for the Colombian Army. Other funds contained in the package will be used to establish alternative crops programs and other non-military drug reduction programs.

Since Colombia is a hemispheric neighbor, what happens there can profoundly affect the way we live here. Let me share some statistics. Each year an estimated 14 metric tons of heroin and 357 metric tons of cocaine enter the United States. Of these amounts, 90% of the cocaine and 75% of the heroin originate in Colombia.

Let's face it, illegal drugs are killing our kids at an alarming rate. Every year, we lose 52,000 young lives to drugs, nearly equal to the number of Americans killed in Vietnam over ten years. That means every day 143 of our young people will die from drug-related causes. In the time it takes us to debate this bill, 12 or more children will perish due to drug addiction. According to the U.S. Drug Czar, one of every two Americans kids will try illegal drugs by the time they reach the 12th grade. Many will become habitual users, leading to a life of crime or worse, a miserable, lonely death. This problem, Mr. Chairman, is staggering.

In 1998, five million young people in this country required treatment for drug addiction, and nearly 600,000 required an emergency room visit. In the United States, there are 1.6 million drug-related arrests annually, and over half of our prison population committed drug-related crimes. Even more disturbing, while the average age for marijuana users is increasing, heroin abusers are getting younger. The cost of drug abuse to our society is estimated to be \$110 billion per year, but it is much higher if measured in countless lives lost and young dreams broken.

With our strong support and the financial assistance contained in this bill, Colombia can be successful in slowing the flow of drugs from their country to our school and communities. Failing to provide this important aid now may result in the loss of Colombia to the drug cartels, leaving them free to turn the once prosperous and democratic nation into a large narcotics nursery, laboratory and distribution center. Without this help, we will leave generations of Americans vulnerable to the hopelessness of drug addiction.

We have worked hard to stop genocide in other countries Mr. Chairman, we now must stop this senseless slaughter of a generation of Americans. If we love our children, we must ensure that Colombia receives the help it needs. This bill will provide that help, and I strongly its passage.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

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

Before consideration of any other amendment, it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in Part A of House Report 106-549. Each amendment printed in Part A may be considered only in the order printed in the report.

Amendments printed in Part B of the report may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill.

Amendments printed in the report may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 1 printed in Part A of House report 106-549.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part A Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. Sanford:

Page 2, strike lines 3 through 21 (and redesignate the subsequent chapters and sections accordingly).

Page 3, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$87,400,000)".

Page 5, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$281,000,000)".

Page 8, lines 18 and 25, after each dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$77,923,000)".

Page 11, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 13, line 21.

Page 44, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 46, line 3.

Page 46, strike lines 5 through 22 (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly).

Page 49, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$8,100,000)".

Page 52, strike lines 7 through 17.

Page 52, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$59,000,000)".

Page 56, strike line 14 and all that follows through page 57, line 15.

Page 62, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 64, line 6.

Page 79, strike lines 9 through 14 and insert the following:

SEC. 5104. (a) INAPPLICABILITY OF EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.—A proviso in this Act shall not have effect if the proviso—

(1) designates an amount as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; or

(2) makes the availability of an amount contingent on such a designation by the President.

(b) EXEMPTION OF DEFENSE FUNDS FROM SEQUESTRATION.—Accounts for which amounts are made available in title III of this Act, and accounts previously within the defense category of discretionary appropriations under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, shall be exempt from any sequestration that is required under section 251(a)(6) of such Act to eliminate any fiscal year 2000 breach caused by the appropriations or other provisions of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) seek to control the time in opposition?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will control 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

I offer this amendment along with the gentlewoman from Charlotte, North Carolina. I think it is a very simple amendment. All it does is it trims and focuses what this supplemental is all about. I think that given my experience here in Congress, what typically happens with emergency supplementals is that they grow like weeds. That has certainly been the case with this bill. So what this does is attempts to bring it back to basically closer to the size and scope of what was originally proposed.

It trims the supplemental by \$1.6 billion, and it does so in two ways. First of all, it takes out nonemergency spending. I have a long list here which I will not bore my colleagues with but, for instance: \$20 million to replace an FDA building in Los Angeles, California, is probably not an emergency, and \$8.1 million to put SBA funding back into the Small Business Administration is probably not an emergency.

□ 1345

I could continue with the list, but there is a simple point here. That is that we have gotten into this dangerous habit of classifying things that are not emergency as emergency. This

strips a number of those out. What it does as well is it keeps 2000 spending in 2000 and 2001 spending in 2001.

What had happened with this bill was that some 2001 spending basically came into calendar year 2000. We keep those two years separate.

What this bill does as well, in addition to trimming and focusing, is that it simply asks that what we spend, we pay for. It strikes all references to emergency designation, making this spending subject to budget caps, and making it recorded as spending. There is a certain lunacy that goes with the notion that emergency spending is not spending as it relates to the budget.

It also enacts cuts in other areas of government to pay for what we propose spending here. I think that this is really important because, in essence, this is preventive medicine. If we do not prescribe to ourselves preventive medicine, I think we will be performing emergency surgery come September in adhering to budgets.

In fact, if we look at the budget that we passed just last Thursday, if we do not pass this amendment, we will end up \$4 billion above what we call for in our own budget.

So I think it is a simple step toward fiscal sanity. I think it helps us to hold the line on what Greenspan himself had urged, and that is, extra money going toward debt reduction, as opposed to other things.

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

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

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have to oppose this amendment, as well-intended as I know it is, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, because he is trying to get at budget constraints. I understand that.

But two provisions in this bill that he cuts out by this amendment are very specific. One of them is \$282 million for the Communications Assistance Law Enforcement Act. This is a critical provision in order to fund that which we have debated for a long time in the criminal law area, and in helping protect us from terrorism and so forth; to allow an understanding and agreement between the Justice Department and a lot of the private industry groups to allow us to have the technical know-how to go in with certain electronic surveillance abroad, as well as here, and be able to do the type of wire-tapping and surveillance for criminal behavior that we are now accustomed to being able to do.

In the modern age of technology, there are all kinds of impediments to that that have come about because of what has occurred in the developments in that industry. This is a purely technical arena, but we do not have the funding for it anywhere else, and it is very critical to what we are doing in Latin America, as well.

Plus there is \$10 million for DEA intelligence programs in Colombia and seven more in Bolivia and Peru that are cut out. I think that is really wrong.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, every year when we do these emergency supplemental bills I have the same concerns. They are grave concerns, because we really do not deal with true emergencies. Emergencies happen all over the country, they do not just happen in North Carolina.

Right now we are referring to one that is in North Carolina, Hurricane Floyd, which tremendously devastated our State. There are still thousands and thousands of people who are not in their homes or do not have homes because of this hurricane. It is really disturbing to me, because when we do emergency supplemental bills, we end up with a lot put in there that is not emergency. This bill is no different.

Disasters happen all over the country. There was a tornado yesterday in downtown Fort Worth. It is another example of it does not matter what State one is from, one is probably going to face the same situation. It is time we set up some type of emergency rainy day fund or insurance fund, or something that is going to get us out of this box of continually coming to the floor with emergency spending bills, with three-fourths of the spending in the bill not being emergency.

I am very disturbed by this one, as well. I will end up voting for the bill because I do not have any choice. I cannot vote against the money for the people who do not even have a home to live in. That is not a choice in my situation. But I am very disturbed by the fact that there are a lot of other things in here that are not emergencies.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) also does not touch defense spending. It is not cutting defense spending. I believe that is very important, and we have some dramatic needs there, too, that are critical right now.

My concern is that the monies that come forward for emergency bills do go toward emergencies. In this case, of course, the emergency is the Hurricane Floyd money. I would hope my colleagues would join me in that, and really look toward a positive solution to this so we can come up with a way that we do not end up in this box all the time, and come back and say, well, everything is in there but the kitchen sink.

I really do not like it. There are a lot of people here who do not like being put in that position. I would hope my colleagues would support this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO).

(Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, the Sanford-Myrick amendment, which eliminates some of the spending authorized in this bill, including the \$40 million downpayment for Puerto Rico in exchange for the resumption of the military maneuvers in Vieques.

One of the things in the arguments that have been before this forum has been that the Navy will not be able to carry out its training for the personnel that go into harm's way.

That is not correct. The Navy itself has written a letter to the chairman of the committee where they say that the fulfillment of the agreement entered into by the President of the United States, the Governor of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Navy, is essential to the resumption of the military exercises; that without fulfilling this agreement, they will have no hope of having the cooperation necessary for resumption of these maneuvers.

So all of the arguments that have been brought here to do away with this \$40 million appropriation for Puerto Rico in lieu of payments of taxes for many, many, many years are not correct.

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

I just want to again remind folks that this is simply an amendment that does not touch defense, it does not touch emergency spending, for instance, in North Carolina, but it does get at fiscal restraint that is needed, because the budget we passed last week would be broken to the tune of \$4 billion if we do not pass this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in opposition to the Sanford amendment. I must rise in opposition to it. The comment has been made now twice by two speakers that it does not touch defense. That is not accurate.

Part of this amendment strikes the emergency designations in the bill. That means that we would have to find at least \$2 billion in offsets to provide, just to replace the money for Kosovo. We would have to provide another \$1.6 billion in offsets just to make up the additional fuel costs that this bill provides for for our national defense.

So Mr. Chairman, this amendment does touch national defense. That is a major reason why we ought not to support this amendment.

It also cuts a large amount from the counter-narcotics program. I was wondering, how much is a life worth? If we can eliminate just one acre of a terrible drug, how much is that worth to a kid that might or might not have the opportunity to get on that drug and to possibly get addicted, possibly die from an overdose?

It does cut money from the emergency appropriations related to Hurri-

canes Floyd, Dennis, and other natural disasters. It cuts money from the United States Coast Guard, that is already so far behind in its operating expenses that I am amazed that they can do anything in search and rescue, let alone drug interdiction.

This amendment would actually knock out money for aircraft spare parts that are so much in demand for the United States Coast Guard. The drug pushers, those who ship drugs from Colombia to the United States, they do not have any spare parts problem. They have plenty of money, plenty of spare parts. If the boat does not work, they throw it away and get a different one. If the airplanes do not work, they throw them away and get a different one. They do not have the limitations that we have.

Yes, this amendment knocks out the money for the Coast Guard's operating expenses, aircraft, spare parts.

Mr. Chairman, as much as I understand the importance of this amendment to its sponsors, I just do not believe this House can accept this amendment. We might just as well strike the enacting clause, or take a vote on the bill now and send it back to committee, because that is what the effect of this amendment is. It kills the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 315, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

AYES—108

Archer	Gutknecht	Paul
Barr	Hall (TX)	Pease
Bartlett	Hayworth	Peterson (MN)
Bereuter	Hefley	Peterson (PA)
Berry	Herger	Petri
Bilbray	Hill (IN)	Pickering
Blunt	Hill (MT)	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Pombo
Campbell	Horn	Portman
Cannon	Hostettler	Pryce (OH)
Castle	Hulshof	Radanovich
Chabot	Inslee	Ramstad
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Rivers
Chenoweth-Hage	Kasich	Roemer
Coburn	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Collins	LaHood	Roukema
Cook	Largent	Royce
Cox	Lazio	Ryan (WI)
Cubin	LoBiondo	Ryun (KS)
Deal	Luther	Sanford
DeMint	Manzullo	Scarborough
Deutsch	McInnis	Schaffer
Doggett	McIntosh	Sensenbrenner
Duncan	McKinney	Sessions
Ehrlich	Meehan	Shadegg
Ewing	Metcalfe	Shays
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Sherman
Fossella	Miller, George	Shimkus
Ganske	Minge	Shows
Gibbons	Moran (KS)	Smith (MI)
Goode	Myrick	Stearns
Goodlatte	Nethercutt	Stenholm
Graham	Norwood	Sununu
Green (WI)	Nussle	Tancredo

Tanner	Terry	Toomey	Traficant	Waters	Whitfield
Taylor (MS)	Thurman	Upton	Turner	Watkins	Wicker
			Udall (CO)	Watt (NC)	Wilson
	NOES—315		Udall (NM)	Watts (OK)	Wise
Abercrombie	Fattah	McIntyre	Velazquez	Waxman	Wolf
Ackerman	Filner	McKeon	Vento	Weiner	Woolsey
Aderholt	Fletcher	McNulty	Visclosky	Weldon (FL)	Wu
Allen	Foley	Meek (FL)	Vitter	Weldon (PA)	Wynn
Andrews	Ford	Meeks (NY)	Walden	Weller	Young (AK)
Army	Fowler	Menendez	Walsh	Wexler	Young (FL)
Baca	Frank (MA)	Mica	Wamp	Weygand	
Bachus	Frelinghuysen	Millender-			
Baird	Frost	McDonald		NOT VOTING—11	
Baker	Gallegly	Miller (FL)	Barton	Granger	Larson
Baldacci	Gejdenson	Mink	Crane	Jones (OH)	Quinn
Baldwin	Gekas	Moakley	Everett	Klink	Salmon
Ballenger	Gephardt	Mollohan	Franks (NJ)	Kucinich	
Barcia	Gilchrest	Moore		□ 1417	
Barrett (NE)	Gillmor	Moran (VA)			
Barrett (WI)	Gilman	Morella			
Bass	Gonzalez	Murtha			
Bateman	Goodling	Nadler			
Becerra	Gordon	Napolitano			
Bentsen	Goss	Neal			
Berkley	Green (TX)	Ney			
Berman	Greenwood	Northup			
Biggert	Gutierrez	Oberstar			
Billirakis	Hall (OH)	Obey			
Bishop	Hansen	Olver			
Blagojevich	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz			
Bliley	Hastings (WA)	Ose			
Blumenauer	Hayes	Owens			
Boehlert	Hilleary	Oxley			
Boehner	Hilliard	Packard			
Bonilla	Hinchee	Pallone			
Bonior	Hinojosa	Pascrell			
Bono	Hobson	Pastor			
Borski	Hoeffel	Payne			
Boswell	Holden	Pelosi			
Boucher	Holt	Phelps			
Boyd	Hookey	Pickett			
Brady (PA)	Houghton	Pomeroy			
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Porter			
Brown (OH)	Hunter	Price (NC)			
Bryant	Hutchinson	Rahall			
Burr	Hyde	Rangel			
Burton	Isakson	Regula			
Buyer	Istook	Reyes			
Callahan	Jackson (IL)	Reynolds			
Calvert	Jackson-Lee	Riley			
Camp	(TX)	Rodriguez			
Canady	Jefferson	Rogan			
Capps	Jenkins	Rogers			
Capuano	John	Ros-Lehtinen			
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Rothman			
Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard			
Clay	Jones (NC)	Rush			
Clayton	Kanjorski	Sabo			
Clement	Kaptur	Sanchez			
Clyburn	Kelly	Sanders			
Coble	Kennedy	Sandlin			
Combest	Kildee	Sawyer			
Condit	Kilpatrick	Saxton			
Conyers	Kind (WI)	Schakowsky			
Cooksey	King (NY)	Scott			
Costello	Kleczka	Serrano			
Coyne	Knollenberg	Shaw			
Cramer	Kolbe	Sherwood			
Crowley	Kuykendall	Shuster			
Cummings	LaFalce	Simpson			
Cunningham	Lampson	Sisisky			
Danner	Lantos	Skeen			
Davis (FL)	Latham	Skelton			
Davis (IL)	LaTourette	Slaughter			
Davis (VA)	Leach	Smith (NJ)			
DeFazio	Lee	Smith (TX)			
DeGette	Levin	Smith (WA)			
Delahunt	Lewis (CA)	Snyder			
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Souder			
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Spence			
Diaz-Balart	Linder	Spratt			
Dickey	Lipinski	Stabenow			
Dicks	Lofgren	Stark			
Dingell	Lowey	Strickland			
Dixon	Lucas (KY)	Stump			
Dooley	Lucas (OK)	Stupak			
Doolittle	Maloney (CT)	Sweeney			
Doyle	Maloney (NY)	Talent			
Dreier	Markey	Tauscher			
Dunn	Martinez	Tauzin			
Edwards	Mascara	Taylor (NC)			
Ehlers	Matsui	Thomas			
Emerson	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)			
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)			
English	McCollum	Thornberry			
Eshoo	McCrery	Thune			
Etheridge	McDermott	Tiahrt			
Evans	McGovern	Tierney			
Farr	McHugh	Towns			

Security surpluses, and that was a terrific step.

This year, after saving and setting aside the entire Social Security surplus, the Federal Government is still taking in more tax revenue than it is spending for the rest of its programs. We call this the on-budget surplus or sometimes the non-Social Security surplus.

Now, despite increasing discretionary spending in fiscal year 2000 by about 5 percent over fiscal year 1999's levels last fall through the regular appropriations bills, the economy is so strong, and tax revenues were so high that this on-budget surplus that we are talking about is about \$26 billion for fiscal year 2000. Let us keep in mind that this fiscal year is about half over, so this amount is quite certain at this point. So today's debate is really over what to do with this \$26 billion on-budget surplus.

This is a historic debate. We have not had a surplus like this in over 30 years, and even then only briefly and very small. But today we have a real live, honest-to-goodness, not-just-projected, but already-here non-Social Security surplus.

More importantly, we stand at the threshold of an era in which we could be debating surpluses for many years to come, provided that we do one thing, Mr. Chairman, provided we do not spend it all.

Mr. Chairman, prior to the amendments that we are voting on and considering today, this emergency supplemental appropriations bill already spends roughly \$9 billion of the \$26 billion surplus. Now, we will likely add to that price tag today, and some are already working on future later bills which eventually, if we do not do something about it today, will surely spend all of this real live surplus, the first one in 30 years.

I think it will be a terrible mistake to spend all of that money. Let me cite four reasons. First of all, I think the American people want to see less government and more freedom, surely not expanding Federal spending at a breathtaking pace.

Second, this is not just about fiscal year 2000 spending because, as we all know, each year we spend more money than we did in the previous year. That is what we do in Washington.

My point is that this debate is not about just the fiscal year 2000 surplus, because if we spend all this money, it will find its way into the baseline, and all future budgets will end up spending more money as a result if we spend all of this fiscal year 2000 surplus.

If we do that, we diminish future surpluses, and that means there is less money available in the future for tax relief, to make the changes we need in Medicare, to make structural reform for Social Security, a number of very important priorities.

Thirdly, it would be a terrible precedent. This again, as I said, is our first

NOT VOTING—11

Barton	Granger	Larson
Crane	Jones (OH)	Quinn
Everett	Klink	Salmon
Franks (NJ)	Kucinich	

□ 1417

Mrs. KELLY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Messrs. DREIER, PASTOR, and CAPUANO changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Messrs. FORBES, SMITH of Michigan, PICKERING, GOODLATTE, and INSLEE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote is announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 106-549.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. TOOMEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment:

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part A Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. TOOMEY:

Page 58, after line 17, insert the following new chapter:

CHAPTER 7

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

GIFTS TO THE UNITED STATES FOR REDUCTION OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

For deposit of an additional amount into the account established under section 3113(d) of title 31, United States Code, to reduce the public debt, \$4,000,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

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

Mr. Chairman, today we are debating a supplemental appropriations bill, but this debate is really all about what Congress should do with the on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2000.

Let me explain what this surplus is because there is, understandably, a lot of confusion about budget surpluses. Last year, Congress, for the first time in 30 years, stopped the raid on Social

real live, honest-to-goodness Social Security surplus in 30 years. Do we really want to tell the American people that, for Congress, the purpose of the surplus is to spend it as fast as it arrives?

Finally, let us remember that every dollar the Federal Government spends is a dollar being spent by politicians through a political process rather than by free men and women who have earned that money and could be spending it as they see fit.

That is why I am offering this amendment, to prevent us from spending all of this money by taking some of it off the spending table.

What my amendment does is very simple. It specifically appropriates \$4 billion of the \$26 billion fiscal year 2000 on-budget surplus to reduce the publicly held debt. If we pass this amendment, first of all, we will pay down some more debt. I think that is a worthwhile goal.

But, in addition, it would be the first time in the history of the modern Congress that we will have an explicit appropriation for debt reduction and an explicit voluntary act of this body to take some of that money and pay down debt. It will show that we have got the discipline to resist spending some of this money.

I want to thank the Republican leadership for their support on this. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for his support on this amendment.

I want to remind my colleagues this first surplus is a unique opportunity. I want to urge my colleagues to do the right thing and set the right precedent. Vote yes on my amendment and make this a better bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the former governor of Texas, Ann Richards, observed once that you can dress up a pig, and you can put lipstick on a pig, but it is still a pig. I think that is sort of the case that we are faced with here this afternoon. This amendment is a transparent attempt to put lipstick on a pretty sad bill that underlies this whole debate.

Let me simply explain what this amendment really does. This amendment is Washington at its "finest", pretending to do something when, in fact, it does nothing.

Now, what this bill does or what this amendment does is to take \$4 billion, which right now sits in the Treasury and is scheduled for deficit reduction, and it diverts it for, guess what, deficit reduction. Here is the way it works. Under normal budget processes, dollars that are not appropriated at the end of the year stay in the Treasury, and they are used to reduce the national debt. That is what happened to many billions of dollars last year when the majority party gave up on its misguided efforts to pass huge tax cuts rather than using those dollars for debt reduction.

This amendment, in my view, pretends to add to deficit reduction by appropriating \$4 billion, which is right now sitting in the Treasury, and it pretends that it appropriates it for a purpose for which it is already scheduled to be used, debt reduction.

It then further requires that that amount, in order to be considered for debt reduction, has to be designated as an emergency pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(a) of the Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

So, in other words, there is an emergency to make certain that this money is going to be used for the purpose for which it is going to be used. Only in Washington would that be considered a major event. Only in Washington would this transaction be considered real.

Then this provision goes further, and it says that the amount of money in this bill for deficit reduction shall be available for that purpose only to the extent that an official budget request that includes designation of an entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is submitted by the President to the Congress. So we are requiring three steps to do what we would normally do in one step.

It does not matter, Mr. Chairman, whether my colleagues vote for this amendment or not. If this amendment was never born, the \$4 billion under discussion would be used for debt reduction. With the amendment being passed, we have two more steps that we have to go through in order to accomplish debt reduction. If it makes the gentleman happy to substitute motion for movement, be my guest, but it does not do anything real.

I find it ironic that we are being given 30 minutes to debate this nonissue when we have only been given 20 minutes to debate whether or not we are going to get sucked into a 5-year war in Colombia. That says something, I guess, about this House. What it says I cannot quite figure out.

So let me congratulate the gentleman for making something out of nothing.

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

□ 1430

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond.

First of all, as my colleague, I would think, would be aware, the budget rules of this House simply require the emergency designation in order for this to take place. There is no avoiding that, given those rules.

And I am really amazed at the suggestion that if it were not for this suggestion this money would be used to retire debt, because the best I can see, for the last 30 years anyway, there has never been any money that has been allowed to sit in the Treasury account for the purpose of retiring the debt. It always gets spent. That is why this amendment is very necessary to prevent that from happening.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to rise in support of the Toomey amendment. I agree with some of the things the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said; that we are transferring from the Treasury to the Treasury. But as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) points out, if we do not do something like that, that \$4 billion is liable to be spent somewhere. When there is money on the table, it is easy to try to find a way to spend it.

The problem that we have is not so much the discretionary spending, in order to balance these budgets, in order to bring down the debt. For 1998 we had a \$51 billion paydown in the debt; in 1999 we had an \$88.6 billion paydown; and in the year 2000 we estimate to have \$157 billion paydown of the public debt. That is good. And that all happened without a lot of fanfare. But what the Toomey amendment says is that we are going to do it. It is a symbolic statement. It tells the American taxpayer that we intend to continue to pay down the debt.

As I said, balancing the budget, having a surplus, is what makes it possible for us to pay down the debt. But let me tell my colleagues where the problem comes from in spending. It is not discretionary. Since 1995, mandatory spending, something that the Committee on Appropriations has no jurisdiction over whatsoever, mandatory spending has increased nearly \$214 billion; Social Security increased \$70 billion. That is a mandatory entitlement. Medicare increased \$42.6 billion. Medicaid increased \$27 billion. Agriculture programs increased \$21 billion. Deposit insurance increased \$16.5 billion. Federal employment retirement programs increased \$11.8 billion. Supplemental security income increased \$7 billion. Veterans benefits and services increased by \$6.4 billion. Since enactment of TEA-21, funding for highways and transit programs will increase by \$37.1 billion through fiscal year 2002. Aviation programs will increase \$10 billion over the next three years. These last two are now, in effect, treated as mandatory programs.

These are mandatory programs. And every time that Congress creates an additional mandatory spending program, we take away the ability of the Appropriations Committee to get a handle on the spending. Our committee has a very small part of the government spending programs. We have only the discretionary programs, but we need to pay a lot more attention to mandatory spending.

So I want to compliment my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY). If it does not do anything else, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has suggested, this says to the American taxpayer that we intend

to pay down the national debt in a time of prosperity.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Let me observe that the gentleman says that if this money is not appropriated it will be used somewhere else. Well, I do not know who is going to use it. Maybe this chart again gives us a good guideline, because it shows that when we are done with this bill today that the majority will have voted to spend \$591 billion for this existing fiscal year as opposed to the \$573 billion requested by the President.

I am not voting for this turkey. They may be planning to.

I would also say that what I really think this amendment is about is this. There is an amendment coming later today which will take \$4 billion in regular appropriations for the Department of Defense for routine items that normally would be handled next year. Instead, that money is going to be moved into this existing fiscal year. That is \$4 billion more that will be spent this year that the President is not asking for.

The effect of that is to give us a \$4 billion hole in next year's budget which can then be filled up with congressional pork projects in the Defense Department. That is the intent. The result: \$4 billion in added spending.

So now this amendment conveniently comes along and gives people a political fig leaf. The rhetoric over there is made quite clear. This amendment is not real. It is symbolic. It is not substantive. All this amendment does is take \$4 billion, which is in the Treasury, and appropriate it back to the Treasury. Now, my colleagues on the other side may be impressed with that. I am sorry, I am not.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

I am in total agreement with this legislation and somewhat in disagreement with what the gentleman from Wisconsin is saying. I, first of all, applaud the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) for what he has done here. He has made us focus on this, not as something which happens if we do not appropriate the money but as an overt action by which we are segregating that money and saying we are now going to retire debt of the United States of America. My judgment is this is something that should have happened a long time ago.

Unfortunately, I am not as enthusiastic about the underlying bill, which I think has some problems with it, including the President not making his case to the Congress on parts of it, and parts of it, in my judgment, not being an emergency process and probably better going through the normal appropriations process. But be that as it

may, the Toomey effort is perhaps the most important aspect of this overall legislation.

By reducing debt we limit our expenditures. Because that money cannot be brought back in some later supplemental appropriations bill to be spent if we reduce that debt now. That is why I think it is important to actually do this, and disagree with the gentleman from Wisconsin with respect to that. And that is what it does.

Let us just remember that we are still spending. I think it is about 15 cents per dollar on the interest of the debt of the United States of America. Every time we reduce this debt, we slowly start to reduce that amount of our budget which is spent on interest each year because we had to borrow money. That is a very significant impact in being able to do the spending that we need to do later to help our military, to help those in need, and to help with other programs across the United States of America.

For all these reasons the step we are taking here, which I consider to be a precedent, is an extraordinarily important precedent for steps that we can take in the future. And perhaps in the future, when we budget, when we appropriate, when we deal with issues involving finances of the United States of America, we can start by saying how much of the debt can we retire, and then figure out what it is that we have to expend.

So for all these reasons I think this is a very beneficial, very precedent-setting piece of legislation. Again, I congratulate the sponsor of it, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), and I hope he is the sponsor of 20 more of these in the next few years so we can continue to retire the debt of the country.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I understand that I have the right to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves 8½ minutes.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of this amendment, and I would encourage not only all of my colleagues on my side of the aisle to vote for it but as well my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

If we oppose this amendment and believe that if we just leave the money there in the Treasury that the debt will still be reduced, we are assuming that as we go through the whole process of negotiating within the House and then with the Senate on conferences, and then as we sit down and negotiate

with the President and go through all 13 appropriations bills, that this money will somehow still be there in the end and, therefore, we do not need to pass this amendment. I really question that.

And I have to respectfully disagree with the gentleman on the other side of the aisle. I think this is an extremely important amendment. We had \$26 billion extra come into the Treasury, and the debate before us today is, yes, we are going to be spending quite a bit of it shoring up our national defenses, something I consider to be extremely important; and, yes, we have other very important priorities; but, yes, when we vote for this amendment and approve this amendment in the House, we are saying that we recognize the tax burden to pay the interest on the debt is too high; that the responsibility of saddling our kids with ever-increasing amounts of debt is wrong, and that we are going to take some of this money and retire some of the public debt with it.

My only regret is that we are not giving another \$4 billion back to the hard-working taxpayers, who essentially have been overcharged and that is why we have this money. But I think this amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is an extremely important amendment. I agree with the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that we need to be doing this some more as we go through the appropriations process and setting more of the money aside for debt reduction.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I would just close by pointing out that this Congress has never taken on-budget funds, money in this case that is coming from the overcharged taxpayers, and allowed that to sit around and to be used to retire debt. The Congress has never done that. And I think to think that that would happen this year is naive at best.

By explicitly appropriating this money for debt reduction, we assure that will happen, we pay down more of the publicly held debt, and we eliminate the possibility that next week or next month or sometime in the near future there will be another bill that will attempt to spend it. So I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment and make this supplemental a better bill.

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

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

I do not care how Members vote on this amendment. This amendment is a big nothing. It does not do anything for anybody, does not do anything to anybody. It simply takes money which is in the Treasury and puts it in the Treasury. That is all it does. So Members should vote however they want.

I would simply observe that last year \$124 billion was devoted to debt reduction without benefit of this amendment, and this year we will see a lot

more than that devoted to deficit reduction, with or without the benefit of this amendment.

I think the problem is that debate has been so trivialized in this House on budget issues, and the budget process itself has become so trivialized that we see immense amounts of time spent by many people in this chamber simply trying to invent procedural gimmicks so that they have a rollcall to take home to taxpayers who are too busy to make a living to understand the intricacies of the budget process. I think that does not serve this institution well. It certainly does not serve our own taxpayers well.

I would simply say this. If colleagues want to take a real action as opposed to an ethereal action, if colleagues want to take a real action that will save money today, they should vote against this entire bill and have it come back in a stripped-down version, the way it ought to come back.

I would also urge Members to vote against the amendment that will be coming up shortly, which, as I said five times earlier, will simply move \$4 billion in defense spending out of next year's budget into this year's budget so that we free up \$4 billion more spending room for next year. If we want to save the same \$4 billion that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) alleges to save in his amendment, we will take that action and we will save it for real.

I would also urge Members to again consider voting against this bill because the net result of this bill, as it stands here before us today, with the amendment that is going to be added on the DOD side, will mean that this bill has raised the amount of spending above what the President has asked for by about \$8 billion, and it will mean that for the entire fiscal year this Congress will be spending \$17 billion more, as represented by this red bar, than the President asked for, as represented by the blue bar.

Now, if Members want to save real money as opposed to monopoly money, they will vote against the bill and vote against that amendment. It does not mean bean bag how we vote on this amendment.

□ 1445

It just does not do anything to anybody.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and will undoubtedly be amused by the results.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0,

answered "present" 3, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

AYES—420

Abercrombie	DeLay	Jefferson
Ackerman	DeMint	Jenkins
Aderholt	Deutsch	John
Allen	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (CT)
Andrews	Dickey	Johnson, E. B.
Archer	Dicks	Johnson, Sam
Armey	Dingell	Jones (NC)
Baca	Dixon	Jones (OH)
Bachus	Doggett	Kanjorski
Baird	Dooley	Kaptur
Baker	Doolittle	Kasich
Baldacci	Doyle	Kelly
Baldwin	Dreier	Kennedy
Ballenger	Duncan	Kildee
Barcia	Dunn	Kilpatrick
Barr	Edwards	Kind (WI)
Barrett (NE)	Ehlers	King (NY)
Barrett (WI)	Ehrlich	Kingston
Bartlett	Emerson	Kleczka
Bass	Engel	Knollenberg
Bateman	English	Kolbe
Beceerra	Eshoo	Kuykendall
Bentsen	Etheridge	LaFalce
Bereuter	Evans	LaHood
Berkley	Ewing	Lampson
Berman	Farr	Lantos
Berry	Fattah	Largent
Biggart	Fliter	Larson
Bilbray	Fletcher	Latham
Bilirakis	Foley	LaTourette
Bishop	Forbes	Lazio
Blagojevich	Ford	Leach
Bliley	Fossella	Lee
Blumenauer	Fowler	Levin
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)
Boehkert	Frost	Lewis (GA)
Boehner	Galleghy	Lewis (KY)
Bonilla	Ganske	Linder
Bonior	Gejdenson	Lipinski
Borski	Gekas	LoBiondo
Boswell	Gephardt	Lofgren
Boucher	Gibbons	Lowe
Boyd	Gilchrest	Lucas (KY)
Brady (PA)	Gillmor	Lucas (OK)
Brady (TX)	Gilman	Luther
Brown (FL)	Gonzalez	Maloney (CT)
Brown (OH)	Goode	Maloney (NY)
Bryant	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Burr	Goodling	Markey
Burton	Gordon	Mascara
Buyer	Goss	Matsui
Callahan	Graham	McCarthy (MO)
Calvert	Green (TX)	McCarthy (NY)
Camp	Green (WI)	McColum
Campbell	Greenwood	McCrery
Canady	Gutierrez	McDermott
Cannon	Gutknecht	McGovern
Capps	Hall (OH)	McHugh
Capuano	Hall (TX)	McInnis
Cardin	Hansen	McIntosh
Carson	Hastert	McIntyre
Castle	Hastings (FL)	McKeon
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	McKinney
Chambliss	Hayes	McNulty
Chenoweth-Hage	Hayworth	Meehan
Clay	Hefley	Meek (FL)
Clayton	Herger	Meeks (NY)
Clement	Hill (IN)	Menendez
Coble	Hill (MT)	Metcalf
Coburn	Hillery	Mica
Collins	Hilliard	Millender-
Combest	Hinche	McDonald
Condit	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)
Conyers	Hobson	Miller, Gary
Cook	Hoefel	Miller, George
Cooksey	Hoekstra	Minge
Costello	Holden	Mink
Cox	Holt	Moakley
Coyne	Hooley	Mollohan
Cramer	Horn	Moore
Crowley	Hostettler	Moran (KS)
Cubin	Houghton	Moran (VA)
Cummings	Hoyer	Morella
Cunningham	Hulshof	Murtha
Danner	Hunter	Myrick
Davis (FL)	Hutchinson	Nadler
Davis (IL)	Hyde	Napolitano
Davis (VA)	Inslee	Neal
Deal	Isakson	Nethercatt
DeFazio	Istook	Ney
DeGette	Jackson (IL)	Northup
DeLaunt	Jackson-Lee	Norwood
DeLauro	(TX)	Nussle

Oberstar	Ryun (KS)	Tauzin
Olver	Sabo	Taylor (MS)
Ortiz	Sanchez	Taylor (NC)
Ose	Sanders	Terry
Owens	Sandlin	Thomas
Oxley	Sanford	Thompson (CA)
Packard	Sawyer	Thompson (MS)
Pallone	Saxton	Thornberry
Pascrell	Scarborough	Thune
Pastor	Schaffer	Thurman
Paul	Scott	Tiahrt
Payne	Sensenbrenner	Tierney
Pease	Serrano	Toomey
Pelosi	Sessions	Towns
Peterson (MN)	Shadegg	Trafficant
Peterson (PA)	Shaw	Turner
Petri	Shays	Udall (CO)
Phelps	Sherman	Udall (NM)
Pickering	Sherwood	Upton
Pickett	Shimkus	Velazquez
Pitts	Shows	Vento
Pombo	Shuster	Visclosky
Pomeroy	Simpson	Vitter
Porter	Sisisky	Walden
Portman	Skeen	Walsh
Price (NC)	Skelton	Wamp
Pryce (OH)	Slaughter	Waters
Radanovich	Smith (MI)	Watkins
Rahall	Smith (NJ)	Watt (NC)
Ramstad	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Regula	Snyder	Weiner
Reyes	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Reynolds	Spence	Weldon (PA)
Riley	Spratt	Weller
Rivers	Stabenow	Wexler
Rodriguez	Stark	Weygand
Roemer	Stearns	Whitfield
Rogan	Stenholm	Wicker
Rogers	Strickland	Wilson
Rohrabacher	Stump	Wise
Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak	Wolf
Rothman	Sununu	Woolsey
Roukema	Sweeney	Wu
Roybal-Allard	Talent	Wynn
Royce	Tancredo	Young (AK)
Rush	Tanner	Young (FL)
Ryan (WI)	Tauscher	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Frank (MA)	Obey	Schakowsky
------------	------	------------

NOT VOTING—12

Barton	Everett	Kucinich
Bono	Franks (NJ)	Martinez
Clyburn	Granger	Quinn
Crane	Klink	Salmon

□ 1507

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

COUNTERNARCOTICS

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$299,698,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$282,500,000 shall be deposited in the Telecommunications Carrier Compliance Fund: *Provided*, That of such amount, \$293,048,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
PROGRAMSDRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG
ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense", \$185,800,000, to remain available for obligation until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer the funds provided herein only to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; the Defense Health Program; and working capital funds: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 1201. (a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE SUPPORT.—Of the amount appropriated in this Act for the Department of Defense, not to exceed \$50,000,000 shall be available for the provision of support for counter-drug activities of the Government of Colombia. The support provided under this section shall be in addition to support provided for counter-drug activities of the Government of Colombia under any other provision of law.

(b) TYPES OF SUPPORT.—The support that may be provided using this section shall be limited to the types of support specified in section 1033(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85; 111 Stat. 1882). In addition, using unobligated balances from the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 106-79), the Secretary of Defense may transfer one light observation aircraft to Colombia for counter-drug activities.

(c) CONDITIONS ON PROVISION OF SUPPORT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may not obligate or expend funds appropriated in this Act to provide support under this section for counter-drug activities of the Government of Colombia until the end of the 15-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits the written certification for fiscal year 2000 pursuant to section 1033(f)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85; 111 Stat. 1882).

(2) The elements of the written certification submitted for fiscal year 2000 described in section 1033(g) of that Act shall apply to, and the written certification shall address, the support provided under this section for counter-drug activities of the Government of Colombia.

CHAPTER 3

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ASSISTANCE FOR PLAN COLOMBIA AND FOR ANDEAN
REGIONAL COUNTERNARCOTICS
ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses to carry out section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to support Plan Colombia and for Andean regional counternarcotics activities, \$1,099,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds appro-

riated under this heading, not less than \$57,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for Bolivia, of which not less than \$49,000,000 shall be made available for alternative economic development activities: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$20,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for Ecuador, of which not less than \$8,000,000 shall be made available for alternative economic development and similar activities: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, up to \$42,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for other countries in South and Central America and the Caribbean which are cooperating with United States counternarcotics objectives: *Provided further*, That funds under this heading shall be in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes: *Provided further*, That section 482(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That for purposes of supporting Plan Colombia and for Andean regional counternarcotics activities, any agency of the United States Government to which funds are transferred or allocated under any authority of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may utilize, in addition to any authorities available for carrying out section 481, any authorities available to that agency for carrying out related activities, including utilization of such funds for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be utilized for the procurement of and support for two UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters for use by the Colombian National Police which shall be utilized only for counternarcotics operations in southern Colombia: *Provided further*, That procurement of UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters from funds made available under this heading shall be managed by the United States Defense Security Cooperation Agency: *Provided further*, That the President shall ensure that if any helicopter procured with funds under this heading is used to aid or abet the operations of an illegal self-defense group or security cooperative, then such helicopter shall be immediately returned to the United States: *Provided further*, That funds obligated after February 6, 2000, and prior to the date of enactment of this Act for administrative expenses in support of Plan Colombia and for Andean regional counternarcotics activities may be finally charged to funds made available for such purposes by this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, shall provide to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act and prior to the initial obligation of any funds appropriated under this heading, a report on the proposed uses of all funds under this heading on a country-by-country basis for each proposed program, project or activity: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount provided shall be available only to the extent an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit

Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

CHAPTER 4

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-
WIDE

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for an additional amount for "Military Construction, Defense-Wide," \$116,523,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$116,523,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 9, line 4, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. OBEY:

Page 3, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$51,000,000)".

Page 5, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$501,000,000)".

Page 8, after line 13, insert the following:

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 1301. (a) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES FOR HOUSE CONSIDERATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PUSH INTO SOUTHERN COLOMBIA.—If, by July 15, 2000, the House of Representatives has not considered an appropriation bill that includes funds to support the Push into Southern Colombia, then it shall be in order at any time after such date (but before July 31) to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of such a bill.

(b) EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWER OF HOUSE.—This section is enacted—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of the House, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in the House in the case of a bill described in this section, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House to change the rules at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of this amendment. No one will take a back seat to me when it comes to drug eradication or no one can take a back seat to me in fighting drugs. I use this opportunity to explain that there is a better alternative, a better way of doing things in fighting drugs in the country of Colombia. As the strategy is now explained to us, it is called "Push Into Southern Colombia." It is a 6-year plan. It is one that is aimed at the guerillas and not one that is aimed primarily at eradicating the drug traffic.

For example, this package appears to be focused on guerilla-controlled coca-growing areas to the exclusion of areas controlled by the paramilitaries and other narcotraffickers. The paramilitary groups linked to the drug trade will continue to operate with impunity until the last 2 years of this 6-year plan.

This cannot be the case. We must do a better job in strategic thought on how to fight these drugs and the drug trafficking. What we must do is to follow the strategy that was successful in the country of Peru. There is an alternative to the so-called Push Into Southern Colombia strategy that needs to be considered and it is the experience of reducing the coca cultivation by the country of Peru by doing three things.

Number one, an aggressive air interdiction of drug traffickers. In other words, if you fly, you die. Number two, a comprehensive AID alternative crop development program. And, number three, crop eradication.

The Colombian government has not yet matched the Peruvian government's demonstrated willingness to interdict the drug traffickers' aircraft. The Colombian government should be encouraged to match that commitment. When combined with a successful effort to interdict the air bridge, a strong ground interdiction strategy at the three main points that drugs must have to cross the Andes Mountains, the road to Pasto, the road through Florencia and the road through Villavicencio, ground interdiction focus must be kept on those three areas. We cannot do this by piecemeal.

I think that those military thinkers, whether they be Colombian or whether they be American who make suggestions can do a much better job. We must interdict the drugs in the air, force them through the three Andes passes, and stop them and eradicate them there. That is the only sound way of getting at the drug trafficking.

This other way, the strategy that I think is an erroneous one, is one that will last some 6 years and might cause us well to find ourselves involved in a guerilla warfare; and the last thing in the world we want to do is to have

American young men and young women involved in that. I doubt the American people would support a counterinsurgency campaign, and yet that is where we are headed.

The administration's continued insistence that the package is entirely counternarcotic, however, has made impossible any debate on the merits of counterinsurgency. Let us get this strategy right; let us think it out; let us interdict it by air and through the three passes as opposed to the manner in which they suggest. I therefore will vote for and urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

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

□ 1515

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Obey amendment would strike from this bill the U.S. aid to the Colombian army while still allowing the Human Rights, Justice and Alternative Development System to go forward. In return, he proposes that the House be allowed expedited consideration of the appropriations for the money later this year.

But let me tell my colleagues the fallacy. While I am sure that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is sincere in his belief that we should delay this, and certainly he comes forth with some good justification, let us put the scenario where it is.

President Pastrana has gone to the international community, as well as his own country, and developed collectively a package of about \$7.5 billion to participate in this Colombia plan. Our share, according to the President's request, will be \$1.3 billion. If, indeed, we today indicate to the guerillas in Colombia that we are not sufficiently interested to vote on this issue today and to send the message that we are going to participate, it is going to disable the ability of President Pastrana to go to the European Community and to the Japanese community and the others who have also pledged assistance. It is also going to cause him consternation in his own country, because it is going to be a political defeat for his plan.

Here we have a President in Colombia who has said he wants to cooperate with the United States of America to assist us in our efforts to stop the importation of drugs that originate in his country.

Mr. Chairman, if we delay this today, it is a wrong message; and the gentleman from Wisconsin I think would agree with that. If, indeed, the President is wrong and we do not have the confidence in our President to go along with what he considers the number one priority in this country today and thus, he says, is the reason for this emergency declaration.

So if one disagrees with the President, that is certainly one's prerogative. I disagree with him on a lot of things. I disagreed with him when he ran for the presidency of the United States and voted for Bob Dole and before that, for George Bush. That is not the issue. The issue is the commander in chief has said this is what we should do today, not in July, not in August, not in September, not get it involved in the appropriations process, which is probably going to be October or November before we finish.

So I urge my colleagues today to vote against the Obey amendment. Let us make the declaration. Do we support the President of the United States? Do we want to fight drugs in this manner, or do we want to procrastinate and send a message to the guerillas in Colombia that we are really not as concerned as the president of Colombia is and send the message to the European Community and the other communities that have agreed to supplement our \$1.3 billion with an additional \$1.7 billion, plus the \$4 billion that Colombia itself is contributing?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Obey amendment which cuts out all of the military aid to Colombia.

There is an explosion of coca cultivation taking place in southern Colombia, a region where the Colombian National Police does not have the ability to conduct eradication and interdiction operations without the support of the Colombian military. The Colombian National Narcotics Police requires Colombian military support to establish an acceptable level of security around their counterdrug objectives, prior to initiating eradication and interdiction operations. Colombian military participation is essential, essential for successful counterdrug efforts in Colombia; and Defense Department programs are the primary means to ensure the successful integration into ongoing counterdrug efforts.

The counterdrug support that our government supplies to the Colombian military is part of a balanced and a comprehensive plan to provide security, stability, and ongoing government control over southern Colombia. Without effective government control or stability in that part of the country, social programs such as alternative development have no chance of any long-term success. The support of the Colombian armed forces is needed to provide the kind of security for law enforcement operations of the Colombian National Police and to allow the Colombian government to provide basic services to the Colombian people in southern Colombia.

The counternarcotics police, the CNP, does the eradication, but they need military support to eradicate the drug crops in guerrilla-controlled territories. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Obey amendment which guts the antidrug strategy that we have in Colombia.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Obey amendment which would gut the effort we are making here today to fight the drug war in Colombia. I have been to Colombia, and I have seen the crisis that exists there today.

To the extent that Congress determines that emergency funding is necessary to stem this crisis, military assistance must be a part of that effort. The Obey amendment would strike all military assistance from the emergency funding. Should his amendment pass, there would be no funding for the 45 helicopters needed to ferret out the narcoguerrillas that enforce the state of lawlessness there, and there would be no funding for training, equipping and deploying the Colombian army's counternarcotics battalions.

The Obey amendment would retain the funding for economic and agricultural assistance, but would take away the military aid that is needed to create an environment in which such assistance could function. This is the equivalent of sending social workers into a crack house unarmed and without police accompaniment.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Obey amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire as to the time remaining for both sides.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 4 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and I reserve the right to close.

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

I start by reminding the House that there is no authorization for the action that we are about to take. This bill contains \$1.3 billion as a downpayment on what will be at least a 5-year war in Colombia. Some say it is a drug war; some say it is a civil war. I think it is both.

I hate drugs. They destroy lives, and they destroy communities. But this amendment does not in any way limit funds to help the Colombian police, it does not limit funds for their helicopters, it does not limit funds for their intelligence operations or for the radar that we are supplying. I favor air interdiction.

All this amendment does is delay until after July 15 the \$522 million downpayment on what will be at least a 5-year expanded military commit-

ment which will involve ourselves unquestionably in a civil war. This delay simply gives the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on International Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence time to ask questions that this institution has an obligation to ask before we vote these funds.

Now, I understand our Speaker will close debate. I would ask him and I would ask my colleagues the following questions: Do we know what the 5-year full cost will be? We are told \$1.3 billion for the first year. Do we know what we are going to have to spend over the entire 5 or 6 years?

Second, if U.S. advisors are kidnapped, what are our plans then? My colleagues ought to ask the administration, do they have a plan? If these few troops that we will train cannot control the 150,000 square miles of jungle in Colombia, what will we do next? Will we just quit? I doubt it. I do not know if the administration has an answer to that, and I do not know if the Speaker does. What can we do to make certain that we know what we are doing?

I would suggest one thing we ought to ask is why is it that we have not been allowed, through an amendment today, to offer drug treatment to more than 37 percent of Americans who need it? We have been denied that opportunity today. This may or may not be similar to Vietnam, but I do see one difference. The Gulf of Tonkin was debated for all of 40 minutes on this floor. This amendment will be debated for all of 20 minutes. That is the major distinction, I fear.

Mr. Chairman, there has been no real debate. We have not had a chance to get into it.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) said this bill cuts money for Colombia. It does not cut one dime. It simply delays \$522 million until his committee and the gentleman from Missouri's (Mr. SKELTON) committee can hold the hearings that ought to be held. We ought to have this authorized before we move ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I know the President of the United States is for this, and I know the Speaker of this House is for this, and I have had so many of my colleagues say to me, "Oh, I think you are right, we probably ought to delay this; but after all, you know the Speaker wants it." I respect that. I would just remind my colleagues of one thing. On this issue, on all issues affecting our involvement in war, we are not to be the agents of the President; we are not to be the agents of the Speaker. We owe it to ourselves and our constituents in this body to exercise our own judgment on a crucial, crucial matter; and I beg my colleagues to do that this afternoon.

All my amendment does is to delay our decision until we know more about it than we know today. I do not think, given our history, that that is too much to ask.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 4 minutes of our time to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTER), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. HASTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in respectful opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I want to speak in favor of U.S. assistance to the government of Colombia to fight the war on drugs.

I do not take this well in a frivolous way. First of all, the supplemental that we are considering today is about our children and whether we want our children to grow up in a society free from the scourge of drugs. Now, does that mean that we can do this just by doing something in Colombia? No, and I want to pursue that.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), my good friend, talked about Peru. I have been to Peru several times, more times than I want to count. But when President Fujimori came in there on the Shining Path and controlled the drug trade in the Upper Huallaga Valley, and they did bring the shoot-down policies because they were moving drugs from Peru to Colombia, he was successful. He was successful because he was able to address the problem of the narcoguerrillas in Peru and the transportation of drugs from where it was grown to where it was being remanufactured in Colombia.

Then the new president of Bolivia came in, and I have been to Bolivia more times than I want to count, and he was able to do the drug suppression there where drugs were going into Brazil and Argentina by crop substitution, but also by being able to stop the drug trade from moving from Bolivia to Colombia. I say to my colleagues, the problem is, all of the drugs that we stopped from Peru and Bolivia are now grown in Colombia. How do we address that?

□ 1530

The Colombian police officers have been fairly successful. They have a great human rights record. They have been able to do a credible job. But the police force in Colombia does not have the manpower, it does not have the ability to get into southern Colombia, an area the size of Switzerland, to be able to stop drug trade and drug growing and drug transportation and drug manufacturing.

The Colombians need help. But I want to focus for a few minutes about why. Colombia is the source of 90 percent of the cocaine that comes into this country. Colombia is the source of 65 percent of the heroin that reaches our neighborhoods, our schools, and our children.

Over 52,000 Americans die every year, every year from illegal drug use, and others from gang- and drug-related violence, thousands, and tens of thousands of lives are ruined. I could tell Members stories from my own experience.

Thousands of families are destroyed because of what Colombian drugs and others, but mainly Colombian drugs, are doing in this country.

They are our real casualties of a quiet, deadly battle that is waged on the streets of our cities, our towns, our rural areas, our neighborhoods, and our schools.

Some of my colleagues have said that this package is not the answer. They are correct, stopping drugs in Colombia is not the only answer. We have a responsibility to stop drugs in Colombia, to stop them in transit, to stop them at our border, to stop them in our streets and in our schools.

We also have a responsibility to teach our children to say no, and to educate them as to the dangers of drugs, and keep them from trying drugs in the first place.

Finally, we have the responsibility to provide meaningful and effective treatment to those who are addicted to drugs. I know the gentleman before me talked about that. This year alone we will spend close to \$6 billion, or one-third of our drug control budget, on treatment and prevention.

I am personally committed to working with this Congress, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the President of the United States, to implement an effective and balanced strategy to win the war on drugs.

My friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, asked, he said, have we ever had this debate? Since I have been in this Congress, especially the last 6 years, we have debated this every year. We have had hearings. We know what the problems in Colombia are. We know of the ineffectiveness of the previous administration in Colombia fighting drugs.

We were somewhat askance when the President opened up the territory in southern Colombia, but now our administration and the administration of Colombia are in concert. Our administration has listened to what this Congress has said for 5 or 6 years: that we need to do something about it, that we cannot put our head in the sand; that we cannot say, well, we cannot do anything about it, so we ignore it.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, and I speak to Members today as my colleagues, we cannot ignore this issue. We cannot ignore it in this Congress, we cannot ignore it on our street corners, and we cannot ignore it from the place that this stuff comes from.

I ask Members today, and again, respectfully, because I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I understand that we do not want to get in a prolonged war. But we helped Peru and we did not get in a prolonged war because we did not have our troops down there. We are not going to do this here. We helped Colombia, and they were able to stop it. We did things, and if we are constant and vigilant in this Congress, we can do a great deal. We can do a great deal together.

I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin, I am willing to reach out my hand and work with the gentleman. I do not want to see us escalate. A lot of this is for the beginning helicopters, so they can get into the territories, they can get into the places where they grow the drugs; that they can stop the transit, the riverine problems that they have.

But Mr. Chairman, we have to solve this problem. We cannot solve the problem by ignoring it.

I ask Members again respectfully to reject this amendment. Let us get on with this job, and let us do it right.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 239, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

AYES—186

Abercrombie	Frost	Millender-
Ackerman	Ganske	McDonald
Allen	Gephardt	Miller, George
Andrews	Gutierrez	Minge
Archer	Gutknecht	Mink
Bachus	Hall (OH)	Moakley
Baird	Hall (TX)	Moran (KS)
Baldacci	Hastings (FL)	Morella
Baldwin	Hefley	Nadler
Barrett (WI)	Hill (MT)	Neal
Becerra	Hilleary	Nethercutt
Bentsen	Hilliard	Oberstar
Bereuter	Hinchev	Obey
Berry	Hoekstra	Olver
Blagojevich	Holt	Owens
Blumenauer	Hooley	Pastor
Bonior	Horn	Paul
Boucher	Hoyer	Payne
Boyd	Hulshof	Pelosi
Brady (TX)	Inslee	Petri
Brown (OH)	Istook	Phelps
Camp	Jackson (IL)	Pitts
Campbell	Jackson-Lee	Porter
Capps	(TX)	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jenkins	Ramstad
Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Castle	Jones (OH)	Rodriguez
Chabot	Kaptur	Roemer
Clayton	Kennedy	Rohrabacher
Coburn	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Collins	Kilpatrick	Royce
Combest	Kind (WI)	Rush
Conyers	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Cook	Klecza	Sabo
Costello	LaFalce	Sanchez
Cox	Largent	Sanders
Coyne	Leach	Sanford
Crowley	Lee	Schaffer
Davis (IL)	Levin	Schakowsky
Deal	Lewis (GA)	Scott
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sensenbrenner
DeGette	Lofgren	Serrano
Delahunt	Lowe	Shadegg
Deutsch	Luther	Sherman
Dickey	Manzullo	Skelton
Dicks	Markey	Slaughter
Dingell	Matsui	Smith (MI)
Dixon	McCarthy (MO)	Spratt
Doggett	McDermott	Stark
Duncan	McGovern	Stearns
Ehlers	McInnis	Stenholm
Engel	McKinney	Stupak
Eshoo	McNulty	Tancredo
Evans	Meehan	Taylor (MS)
Farr	Meek (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Filner	Metcalf	Thornberry
Fossella		Tiahrt

Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton

Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner

Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wicker
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—239

Aderholt	Gonzalez	Oxley
Armey	Goode	Packard
Baca	Goodlatte	Pallone
Baker	Goodling	Pascarell
Ballenger	Gordon	Pease
Barcia	Goss	Peterson (MN)
Barr	Graham	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (NE)	Green (TX)	Pickering
Bartlett	Green (WI)	Pickett
Bass	Greenwood	Pombo
Bateman	Hansen	Pomeroy
Berkley	Hastert	Portman
Berman	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Biggert	Hayes	Radanovich
Billbray	Hayworth	Rahall
Bilirakis	Herger	Rangel
Bishop	Hill (IN)	Regula
Bliley	Hinojosa	Reyes
Blunt	Hobson	Reynolds
Boehler	Hoeffel	Riley
Boehner	Holden	Rogan
Bonilla	Hostettler	Rogers
Bono	Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen
Borski	Hunter	Rothman
Boswell	Hutchinson	Roukema
Brady (PA)	Hyde	Ryun (KS)
Brown (FL)	Isakson	Sandlin
Bryant	Jefferson	Sawyer
Burr	John	Saxton
Burton	Johnson (CT)	Scarborough
Buyer	Johnson, Sam	Sessions
Callahan	Jones (NC)	Shaw
Calvert	Kanjorski	Shays
Canady	Kasich	Sherwood
Cannon	Kelly	Shimkus
Cardin	King (NY)	Shows
Chambliss	Knollenberg	Shuster
Chenoweth-Hage	Kolbe	Simpson
Clay	Kuykendall	Sisisky
Clement	LaHood	Skeen
Coble	Lampson	Smith (NJ)
Condit	Lantos	Smith (TX)
Cooksey	Larson	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Latham	Snyder
Cubin	LaTourette	Souder
Cummings	Lazio	Spence
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Stabenow
Danner	Lewis (KY)	Strickland
Davis (FL)	Linder	Stump
Davis (VA)	LoBiondo	Sununu
DeLauro	Lucas (KY)	Sweeney
DeLay	Lucas (OK)	Talent
DeMint	Maloney (CT)	Tanner
Diaz-Balart	Maloney (NY)	Tauscher
Dooley	Martinez	Tauzin
Doolittle	Mascara	Taylor (NC)
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Terry
Dreier	McCollum	Thomas
Dunn	McCrary	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	McHugh	Thune
Ehrlich	McIntosh	Thurman
Emerson	McIntyre	Traficant
English	McKeon	Turner
Etheridge	Meeks (NY)	Vitter
Ewing	Menendez	Walden
Fattah	Mica	Walsh
Fletcher	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Foley	Miller, Gary	Waters
Forbes	Mollohan	Watkins
Ford	Moore	Watts (OK)
Fowler	Moran (VA)	Weldon (FL)
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Weller
Frelinghuysen	Myrick	Weygand
Gallely	Napolitano	Whitfield
Gejdenson	Ney	Wilson
Gekas	Northup	Wise
Gibbons	Norwood	Wolf
Gilchrest	Nussle	Young (AK)
Gillmor	Ortiz	Young (FL)
Gilman	Ose	

NOT VOTING—10

Barton	Franks (NJ)	Quinn
Clyburn	Granger	Salmon
Crane	Klink	
Everett	Kucinich	

□ 1557

Mr. LAZIO and Mr. LAMPSON changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. BACHUS, RYAN of Wisconsin, ROYCE, and METCALF and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Ms. PELOSI:

Page 3, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: (reduced by \$51,000,000)".

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, the amendment at the desk that I have cuts \$51 million of the \$185 million in the funds in the DOD account in this supplemental bill. The \$51 million cut represents all the money provided for the push into Southern Colombia.

Primarily these funds were to pay for training, equipping and deploying the counternarcotics battalions into Southern Colombia. I offer this amendment, once again, to emphasize that our emphasis is wrong.

We have an emergency supplemental before us today, because we have an emergency in our country; and that is the issue of substance abuse.

As I said earlier and earlier today in the debate on the rule and in general debate, we have an emergency supplemental bill before us today, because, indeed, there is an emergency in our country, and that is the dependence on substance abuse by so many people; indeed, 5½ million people in the United States.

I introduced the amendment to emphasize that in this bill with that emergency in our country, we do not have \$1 of emergency spending for reducing substance abuse in our country for treatment on demand and for prevention.

In the Rand report, which I quoted earlier, it says that for every dollar spent on treatment or demand in the U.S., we get 23 times more value than on money spent in the country of origin in the coca leaf eradication program, 23 times more effective.

This report says that if we want to reduce demand in the United States by 1 percent, if 1 percent would cost \$34 million if we spent it on treatment on demand programs. To get that same 1 percent reduction, by the approach taken in the chamber today, coca leaf eradication, you would have to spend 23 times that, or \$723 million.

We can spend \$34 million on treatment in demand in the U.S., or we can spend \$723 million in the country of origin, that being Colombia what the discussion is about today.

Every indicator in this Rand report that was done in conjunction with the Department of Defense and the office of National Drug Control Policy points to the value of treatment on demand. Even in an OPED in 1998 General

McCaffrey wrote, it is a sad time when the number of incarcerated Americans exceeds the active duty strength of the Armed Forces.

□ 1600

"A Rand Corporation," this is still General McCaffrey's quote, "a Rand Corporation study in 1994 found that increasing drug treatment was the single most effective way to reduce domestic drug consumption."

So how can we have a bill that addresses an emergency in our country where we have 23 times more effectiveness by addressing demand in our country has all of its emphasis on eradication of the coca leaf in another country. Maybe it is important for us to go that route, too.

But we have so much uncertainty about the success of the \$1.7 billion that we are allocating to Plan Colombia, and so much certainty about the effectiveness of treatment on demand that it is hard to understand this legislation.

Let me say that we have a treatment gap in this country, and that is part of the emergency. There are 5½ million substance abusers in the United States. Of that, 2 million receive treatment; 3½ million do not.

In an amendment that I wanted to offer that I offered in committee for \$1.3 billion to be used for prevention, for treatment on demand, for prevention program geared to our youth, we would have been able to meet the needs of 303 substance abusers in this country, 303, only one-tenth of the problem. I was defeated in committee.

Trying a more modest approach in the Committee on Rules, I put forth a \$600 million treatment-on-demand amendment and was not given the opportunity to bring that amendment to the floor.

So I offer this modest cut of \$51 million from the funding for the push into southern Colombia and to emphasize, as I say, the improper emphasis of this bill.

We all agree that President Pastrana is a great and courageous person and deserves our help. I want to make that point. But I think this is the wrong way to go.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), which will come later, about some other issues in the bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly to oppose the amendment to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is the ranking member of the subcommittee.

It is my privilege to serve on the subcommittee with the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and I very much admire their work and the total responsibility we have for foreign operations.

Unfortunately, I could not disagree more with the position that the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has on this specific item that her amendment addresses itself to. I could not disagree more strongly.

She would strike that money that allows us to provide for the training of those Colombian troops who will be putting forth the effort to cut off this flow of coca leaves to the United States. I cannot really understand why she would even consider such an action.

In the final analysis, this amendment is little more than a mini-amendment of the Obey amendment that was before us a short time ago. The gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), as well as the Speaker, expressed themselves eloquently and touched every point that needs to be made here.

The government of Colombia is doing their very best to put together a package that essentially would stop the production of coca leaves in Colombia that eventually comes into the United States. That flow provides 90 percent of the coca available in the United States. To not be willing to cooperate with that effort on the part of the government of Colombia is sort of a bit of insanity.

I cannot understand why the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) in this case, for some reason, chooses to eliminate the money for the training itself. It is a fundamental pillar of that effort. It is the essence of the American effort. Because of that, I would ask that the House consider this last vote and repeat it on the final question regarding the Pelosi amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not need any reminders from anyone about what illicit drugs do to people in this country. My wife has been a speech therapist. She has been a social worker. She has dealt with people in Saint Elizabeth's and at Georgetown Hospital. She has seen crack babies close up. Once one has seen that, one does not need any lectures about what stupid use of drugs will do in this society. The issue is how we deal with that problem.

What I think the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is simply saying to my colleagues is that we think that they are putting all of their eggs in one basket and that the evidence shows it is the wrong basket.

We have 3½ million people in this country who are in severe need of drug treatment and yet cannot get it because of inadequate programs to provide that treatment. We are currently able to provide only 37 percent of the estimated 5.7 million Americans who need treatment with the treatment that they need.

Yet, if we look at an evaluation done by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration, and it is cited on page 97 of the committee report, we see "A five-year evaluation of SAMHSA substance abuse treatment

services found treatment has significant and lasting benefits. Patients receiving treatment reported 50 percent decrease in drug and alcohol use 1 year after completing treatment, 53 percent decrease in alcohol/drug related medical visits, 43 percent decrease in criminal activity, 56 percent decrease in sexual encounters for money or drugs, 51 percent decrease in sexual encounters with an injection drug user, 43 percent decrease in homelessness, and a 19 percent increase in employment."

That is what the evidence shows one can get if one puts money in drug treatment. Yet the leadership of this House and the Committee on Rules, which is its agent, denied the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) the opportunity to offer an amendment to put one dime of additional money into drug treatment and drug prevention.

Then my colleagues have got the gall to come here and ask her why she offers this amendment. I will tell them why she offers this amendment. It is the only way she can get a discussion of the issue on the floor. We tried not to eliminate a dime for Colombia.

All we asked our colleagues to do is to delay \$522 million that we thought was going to get us in a war that we did not know how to get out of, and recognize the Rand study, which says that we get 34 more times bang for the buck if we put the money where she wanted to put it as opposed to where the House decided to put it.

So if my colleagues want to know why this amendment is here, it is because it is the only way that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) can get an opportunity to ask them again and again why, if they are willing to fight the drug war a thousand miles from here, why are they not willing to fight it in their own backyard by increasing drug treatment. That is where the money ought to go.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me start off by explaining the amendment cuts a heart off the entire push, in my opinion, into Colombia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will suspend. The gentleman's microphone has not been working.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, maybe I will try the other one on the Democratic side.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentlewoman's amendment. Seriously, this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Point of order, Mr. Chairman. The microphone of the gentleman from Alabama is on.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment really cuts the heart out of the entire program of Plan Colombia because it would prohibit the money to train the counternarcotics pavilion. I think the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) recognizes that. Without this training money, there is no reason

for the rest of the package. I think the gentlewoman recognizes that.

But the primary reason I rise, other than in nonsupport of the gentlewoman's amendment, is to correct some perception that may have come from her remarks and the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) about our concern about drug prevention and abuse programs in this country.

Let me remind my colleagues that we have appropriated more than \$10 billion towards this program. The President of the United States has come to us and said, in addition to that money, there is an emergency problem in interdiction. He has said, in effect, that we have appropriated a sufficient amount of money for drug prevention and abuse programs in this country.

So let us not create a perception that this Congress, both sides of the aisle included, is ignoring the internal problem that we have, the domestic problem we have here in the United States.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is absolutely correct in her assessment that the real problem of all of this lies in our own solving of our own programs here in the United States. But let me remind her and all of my colleagues that it is not because of a lack of financial resources, because since 1996, we have increased the programs by 35 percent. The President of the United States also runs our domestic programs. If he needs more money, all he has to do is ask, and we will fulfill his request for additional domestic concerns here in this country.

So let us do not get this thing construed to the point that there is an indication that this Congress has not been willing to support our own domestic programs, because the fact remains we have increased it in the last 4 years more than 35 percent. It now exceeds more than \$10 billion per year.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, with great respect to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), our distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, and with appreciation that we were able to work together to get the \$10 billion into this account; however, I would just like to remind my colleagues that, although we have made progress in investing in this account, 37 percent, only 37 percent of the estimated 5.7 million Americans in severe need of substance abuse treatment are taken care of, 37 percent.

□ 1615

Thirty-seven percent. So I just want to commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for bringing attention to this critical need in our country.

It is very disappointing that she was not allowed to offer her amendment as she offered it into the committee, because I do believe that we need an ag-

gressive drug control strategy. We all know that substance abuse is a critical and persistent problem facing every community in our Nation. It has an incredibly difficult impact, as we know, on our families, public safety, employment, productivity. And while we know treatment works, let us remember again that there are 3.6 million people in severe need of substance abuse treatment that cannot get access to it. I see it all over the district. We must have better systems if we are to help those who need help today and as we reach out to millions of today's youth reaching a vulnerable age.

I want to repeat it again, although the gentlewoman from California referred to the Rand Corporation study, which found that funds spent on domestic drug treatment were 23 times, 23 times, more effective than source country control, 11 times more effective than interdiction, and 7 times more effective than law enforcement in reducing cocaine consumption. So the strategy that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is talking about works. It is common sense and it is long overdue.

I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting the \$10 billion, but we have not done nearly enough, and I would hope that we can support the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and direct these additional dollars to substance abuse control.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think we need to focus on what we are talking about right now. We have heard a lot of good speeches, most of which we can all agree on, and that is the need for treatment, the need for rehabilitation, the need to do these sorts of things in the community. That is not what this amendment is about. This amendment is a straight cut.

My friend from Wisconsin spoke about the problem not being taken care of in our back yard. We are talking about what is going on in the streets in front of the homes of thousands of Americans, millions of Americans, where these drug deals are going down. The supply needs to be cut. We need to go with both the supply side and the demand side.

And now we have ourselves in a situation where a country is in trouble, the country is reaching out to the United States, Colombia is the oldest democracy, I think, in South America; and they are reaching out to the United States for assistance. They are going to accept our training; they are going to accept our resources and our assets; and this is very important.

We go over and we bomb these other countries, Libya and all these places, because they are making weapons of mass destruction that might some day hurt Americans; they may some day be used on our friends. At the same time, we are turning our heads and our backs on what is really going on, and that is

this poison that is being created in Colombia and other countries in our hemisphere which is coming in and poisoning our kids and destroying their future.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said that everyone agreed with us on the need for more drug treatment. Then I would ask why did the gentleman vote for a rule that prevented us from being able to provide this drug treatment?

Mr. SHAW. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would say that I did not say that we agreed for the need for more. We agree that the arguments that have been made is that we do need to concentrate in this area. That is very important. And perhaps when we get to the regular type of appropriation bills, this would come about.

But what we have right now is an emergency in Colombia that we need to address. This qualifies for an emergency in every way possible. And I can tell the gentleman, this particular bill came in with an open rule that opens it up to all of the areas that are before the House today, and I think that the minority was certainly handled very fairly in this regard.

But now, let us get serious on the war against drugs in this country. Let us get serious. And this is a wonderful first step. Let us not show a diminution of our resolve by starting to cut in with all these amendments that are going to be put before the House this afternoon and tonight. Let us not fall into that trap. Let us examine each one exactly the way they are. If it is a cutting amendment, that cuts down on our war against drugs, let us just call it that. It is not moving this money someplace else.

Whether my colleagues like the rule or they do not like the rule, the question is right before us very squarely, and that is are we going to cut the aid that we desperately need in order to continue the war against drugs as an ally of the Colombian government? It is as simple as that. Vote down this amendment.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is about the drugs in America that have devastated America, its families, its children, and its communities. If we have a supplemental before us, the first of the 21st century, and we do, that is funded by \$1.7 billion tax dollars to give to Colombia, the country that sends 90 percent of the cocaine to this country, that sends over 60 percent of the heroin to this country, we are all saying, yes, we must do something with that supply, we must decrease that supply, but what we are also saying is that all those tons of cocaine and heroin that are in the American communities now, that we must in this supplemental, the

first of the 21st century, allow money for treatment. Treatment on demand.

Everyone who is addicted to drugs is not ready for treatment; but those who are ready for treatment on demand, we must make it available to them. In my district there is a 6-month waiting list for an addicted person who wants treatment today, not 6 months from now, when their families are more deteriorated, when the community is more deteriorated. Today, on demand.

So what we asked in committee with the Pelosi amendment, and what we are asking today, a small drop in the bucket, \$57 million out of a \$1.7 billion appropriation to Colombia, is to allow money for treatment so that those Americans can take care of their families and become citizens again of this society and pay taxes and raise their children. Is that too much to ask? I think not, Mr. Chairman.

How can the gentleman on one hand we talk about a "Plan Colombia" that talks about supply and not do anything to eradicate the demand? It is not fair. It is not right. As leaders of this country, of the free world, the greatest country in the world, we need to stand up to what we believe in. Many of our constituents across this country, across all ethnic, racial, and gender lines are addicted. Does the gentleman not want them treated on demand when they finally decide in their life they have had enough?

The Pelosi amendment is a small piece of what we need. We ought to be putting \$1.7 billion into treatment, but the amendment before us only asks for \$57 million. How can the gentleman be against \$57 million. My colleagues have heard the figures already. I am not going to repeat them again. We all know people who are addicted, we know families and children that have been devastated by the drugs from Colombia. Let us do the right thing, Mr. Chairman.

I strongly support the Pelosi amendment. We need to begin to provide funding for treatment for those people who have finally decided in their life that they have had enough.

It was said earlier that we will have to attack drugs on all bases, and we do. On the supply side, I agree totally, let us give them that money, but it is unconscionable that we will not at the same time in this bill, when we have a surplus in our government, supply money for treatment. It is the right thing to do, and I hope my colleagues will stand up and do the right thing.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is about the drugs in America that have devastated this country, its families, its children, and its communities. We have a supplemental before us, the first of the 21st century, and we propose to fund \$1.7 billion in tax dollars in economic aid to Colombia. Colombia sends 90 percent of the cocaine to this country; it sends over 60 percent of the heroin to this country. We all agree, we must do something to decrease that supply. It is imperative that we decrease that supply, but we

must also agree, as we consider this supplemental appropriation bill, the first in the 21st century, to reinforce our commitment to drug treatment and prevention. We exist in a culture that makes drugs available on demand. We must provide the funds to give treatment on demand.

Everyone who is addicted to drugs is not ready for treatment; but those who are ready for treatment on demand must have access to treatment programs. In my district there is a 6-month waiting list for an addicted person who wants treatment today—not 6 months from now—when their families have deteriorated, when their community has deteriorated. They need access now, today, on demand.

What we asked in committee with the Pelosi amendment, and what we are asking today, is a small drop in the bucket, \$57 million out of a \$1.7 billion appropriation to Colombia, to allow money for treatment so troubled Americans can take care of their families and become citizens again of this society, pay taxes and raise their children. Is that too much to ask? I think not, Mr. Chairman.

How can the gentleman talk about a "Plan Colombia" that talks about supply and not do anything to eradicate the demand? It is not fair. It is not right. As leaders of this country, of the free world, the greatest country in the world, we need to stand up for what we believe in. Many of our constituents across this country, across all ethnic, racial, and gender lines are addicted. Does the gentleman not want them treated on demand when they finally decide in their life they have had enough?

The Pelosi amendment is a small piece of what we need. We ought to be putting \$1.7 billion into treatment, but the amendment before us only asks for \$57 million. How can the gentleman be against \$57 million? My colleagues have heard the figures already. I am not going to repeat them again. We all know people who are addicted. We know families and children that have been devastated by the drugs from Colombia. Let us do the right thing, Mr. Chairman.

I strongly support the Pelosi amendment. We need to begin to provide funding for treatment for those people who have finally decided in their life that they are sick and tired of being sick and tired.

It was said earlier that we will have to attack drugs on all bases, and we must. On the supply side, I agree totally. Let us give them that money, but it is unconscionable that we will not at the same time in this bill, when we have a budget surplus in our government, provide more money for treatment. It is the right thing to do, and I hope my colleagues will stand up and do the right thing.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my colleagues on a personal note. Drugs have hurt many of us, our own families, including my own, including my own son.

I have two beautiful daughters. My youngest scored 1600 on her SATs. She is a National Merit Scholar. And my oldest one helped to start a club of some 35 high school kids that do not drink; they do not smoke; they do not do drugs, and it is a marvelous group to watch. But it is called family. I have

a son who is 30 years old who got involved using drugs in his early years, and he went through drug treatment. On a lieutenant's pay, it was not easy to put him through that treatment, so I understand where the gentlewoman is coming from.

But then later on in life, when he was 30, he got caught selling marijuana that came across from Mexico. So we individually have a lot of pain with drugs. It has been devastating to our family having my son in the situation he is in, knowing that he could have had much better in life.

So to my colleague I would say, is there enough money in drug treatment? No. I do not disagree with the gentlewoman. But it is a series of a war. We have not really had a war on drugs in this country, with Republicans or Democrats, because if we did, we would stop them at the border. The Noriegas of the world, we would not only throw in jail but we would stand them up in exhibition to the world to let the world know we are not going to stand for those drugs coming in. Our border patrols would stop the money that is coming in from China on our cargo ships. And then on the streets, if someone gets caught selling drugs, that person needs to know they are going to go to jail, and they are going to go to jail for a long time, including my own son, who I love very much.

And then if someone does get hooked on drugs, and thousands of our children have, and we heard the Speaker say that 52,000 people die every year in our country from drugs, then, yes, we treat that. I think we do not have an adequate amount, but we do have it, and we need to spread out the money on all of these endeavors. I would rather have my son or my daughters, if I knew they were going to get the mumps or the measles, I would rather prevent them from getting the mumps or the measles in the first place, as I would like to stop our children from getting drugs. So we need to spread out the money across the gambit. I think it is difficult to do that when we say, well, we need more money here, we need more money there. I agree we need more money everywhere on this to really have a war on drugs.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is not wrong. I had a very difficult time voting against his amendment. Actually, in the committee, I voted for it, because I do not know in my own mind, having not supported Haiti, and I know that we put \$2.4 billion in there and I look at Haiti today, and I look at Somalia, so I do not know if Colombia has the infrastructure to handle the money that we give them or if it will end up in Las Vegas, and so I struggle with that very much.

But I would ask my colleagues not to berate saying, well, one side or the other does not want to give money for treatment. I think when we lay out the whole plan and the whole war, it is very, very important for us to come together on this.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise on this occasion to oppose the amendment introduced by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), which calls for the resumption of live fire at the range in Vieques. The earlier amendment by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) aimed to eliminate the \$40 million appropriation for economic initiatives.

The Fowler amendment is an attempt to derail the agreement reached by the Secretary of the Navy, the administration, and the Governor of Puerto Rico this past January 31 that was approved by the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations and the National Security Council, among others. The agreement has also been endorsed by the Puerto Rico legislature, the Mayor of Vieques and by myself, the only elected representative of the nearly 4 million disenfranchised American citizens in Puerto Rico.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this shortsighted amendment that aims to undo the agreement and will actually prevent the use of the range, thus undermining military readiness. Both the Navy and the Marine Corps have indicated that the resumption of bombing with inert ordnance for the next 3 years is an acceptable solution to their training needs.

□ 1630

They also assert that this process provides the best opportunity to correct past inequities in their relations with the 9,300 citizens in the island municipality.

There is a letter from the Department of Navy dated March 29 directed to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the committee, where the Department of the Navy says, "We have been engaged in a multi-agency effort to resolve the Vieques situation since April 18, 1999. The proposed amendment makes two significant changes to the Administration's proposed statutory language, either one of which will likely worsen the situation on Vieques."

The Secretary of the Navy goes further on to say, "To eliminate either of them would seriously undercut the essence of the agreement. In that event, the Governor and the citizens of Puerto Rico could consider this to be an abrogation of the President's agreement. The cooperation of the Government of Puerto Rico is crucial to resuming the safe operational use of the range. Without safe access to the range, the Navy and Marine Corps will have to continue to conduct training, which falls short of the Navy's needs, at other sites, a requirement that the President intended to remedy with his Directives."

As we meet in this Chamber today, I am reminded of the powerlessness of Puerto Rico's political situation and my lack of vote in matters and deci-

sions that impacts our daily lives. I will not be able to vote on this amendment today.

I am firmly convinced that the situation that we faced on April 19, 1999, was underscored by the tragic death of David Sanes Rodriguez that would not have happened anywhere else in the United States.

The agreement that was reached by the President, the Department of Defense, and the government of Puerto Rico is the best opportunity to achieve peace and justice for the American citizens in Vieques. The presidential directive calls for a referendum, a process that enables the people who are directly impacted by the bombing and who are disenfranchised American citizens the only opportunity to express their opinion through the democratic process.

I believe that the controversy over Vieques has been a test of our Nation's resolve to assure democratic rights for all Americans. The agreement ensures the national security and the military readiness requirements are balanced with the rights, the health, the safety, and welfare of American citizens, while taking into account their substantial contributions to the defense.

I want to highlight the fact that both candidates for President support the agreement. Governor Bush of Texas has made it clear that he will implement this agreement if elected. I have a copy of his statement which he made in Virginia. Vice President GORE has also announced that he will also enforce the President's directives.

I urge all of my colleagues to reject any effort to bar a fair solution that is in the best interest of the American citizens in Vieques and in the best interest of the naval defense and the national defense of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the above-mentioned letter:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, 29 March 2000.

Hon. C.W. BILL YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express the grave concern of the Department of the Navy with the proposed amendment to H.R. 3908 concerning the economic assistance program on the Island of Vieques, Puerto Rico.

We have been engaged in a multi agency effort to resolve the Vieques situation since April 19, 1999. The proposed amendment makes two significant changes to the Administration's proposed statutory language, either one of which will likely worsen the situation on Vieques. Those changes are (1) deletion of the ability to spend any of the funds for support of the proposed referendum on Vieques; and (2) a prohibition on expenditure of any of the funds for purposes enumerated in the bill until the President certifies to the Congress, among other things, that live fire training has resumed on the Vieques range.

Both the referendum and training with inert ordnance are key components of the agreement reached by the President with the Governor of Puerto Rico that was memorialized in two Directives issued by the President on January 25, 2000. To eliminate either

of them would seriously undercut the essence of the agreement. In that event, the Governor and the citizens of Puerto Rico could consider this to be an abrogation of the President's agreement. The cooperation of the Government of Puerto Rico is crucial to resuming the safe operational use of the range. Without safe access to the range, the Navy and Marine Corps will have to continue to conduct training, which falls short of the Navy's needs, at other sites, a requirement that the President intended to remedy with his Directives.

While the President's agreement with the Governor does not guarantee the resumption of training with live ordnance, it does present the most substantive possibility that we can achieve that end. The agreement allows us to address positively and in a constructive way both the legitimate concerns of the citizens of Vieques and the critical national security/national defense mission of the Navy and the Marine Corps. This includes a multiplicity of training opportunities on the Vieques range and the use of live ordnance.

The Department of the Navy strongly believes that the negotiated agreement represents the best opportunity for the Navy to resume crucial training on the Vieques range.

We strongly oppose this amendment to H.R. 3908.

A similar letter has been sent to Congressman Obey. As always, if I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

JERRY MACARTHUR HULTIN,

Acting.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). I know it is a protest amendment with regard to what she wanted to offer. But it does beg the question a little bit that has not been discussed a lot out here today, and that is where we are in this so-called "war on drugs" in terms of trying to limit the damage that is there.

I am for drug treatment. I do not know anybody here who is not. But in the war, the treating the wounded does not win the war. It is something my colleagues want to do and I want to do.

I also know that many of the drug treatment programs that I have supported over the years have not been shown to be as effective as we would like, and there are a lot of people who are on drugs who do not come forward and seek treatment. So it is a very difficult area, one we need to take a lot of time and energy with and I hope this Congress will try to sort out those programs that work from those that do not and then provide the right amount of funding for them.

On the other hand, what we are dealing with in this bill is really critical to what is going on in the streets. And what I find to be very difficult for a lot of Americans today to understand because we do not hear as much about it, our other leadership nationally has not talked much about it lately, is the fact that even though we may show statistics showing drug use in the country generally trending down, teen drug use

is up, particularly heroin and cocaine and even marijuana.

From 1992 to 1998, the last full statistics that I have, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, we show use among 12- to 17-year-olds up 120 percent in that period of time, and that is for all drugs, 27 percent in 1998 alone.

But I think the most startling statistic of all is that with heroin. I want to bring that up particularly because heroin is produced in Colombia. In fact, in the eastern half of the United States, almost the entire heroin supply coming into this country is from Colombia; and a lot of the resources we have and the efforts being made in this legislation today are to try to stop that from happening, from Colombia producing it and from it coming our way.

There has been among 12- to 17-year-olds, and I want my colleagues to hear this number now, from 1992 to 1998, an increase in drug use, heroin use, specific heroin use, among 12- to 17-year-olds of 875 percent, an absolutely astounding number.

It strikes me that when we are talking about trying to do what we want to do to solve the problem of drug use in this country, we do not do it by simple treatment; and we have to go to the source country. The most efficient use of our dollars in any kind of effort on the supply side which gets at winning a war is in the country where it is being produced.

We have been extraordinarily effective with our work with Bolivia. They now have a program under way down there that many of us believe will virtually stop the growth of coca plants, which has been a very big crop-producing country for us down there. They have gone to alternative crops. We have got a lot of cooperation with them. It has been a very positive program.

In Peru, we had a couple years where we did really well there. We are not doing as well now. But that was when we had an aggressive program, cooperating with the president of that country, to shoot down drug planes flying raw coca to Colombia from Peru. There has now not been as much support from the United States available, and that program has not done as well.

In Colombia, where the problem is the greatest, is where the FARC and the revolutionaries are right now controlling about a third of the country, protecting the drug lords, and getting money in return for that to allow their operations to continue.

This legislation we have before us today that the gentlewoman wants to cut money from is designed to allow us to stop this activity from going on so that we can, the Colombians in particular themselves, can go in and destroy the coca crops, destroy the drug lords' operations, and be able to destroy the heroin produce and poppy plants that are growing up in the mountains with the helicopters and the other equipment in this legislation.

If we do not do that, we are going to continue to see an enormously greater supply of heroin, in particular, and cocaine coming out of Colombia to this country, particularly the eastern half. We are going to have more teenagers getting onto these drugs than we do today, and we are going to see the numbers go up.

We cannot win the war by treatment alone, and we cannot win by education alone. It is not one thing alone. But our police officers, our schools, our professionals in the drug counseling area are swamped in many of our cities and communities today with the sheer quantity that is coming in and very little discussion about it.

We have not gained the kind of support in this Congress or from this administration over the last couple of years that this effort deserves or requires.

Today we have a chance to do something about that with regard to Colombia. We need to do that. We need to help them in their efforts to overcome the revolutionaries that are supporting the drug lords and being supported by them, and the only way to do that is to pass this bill today.

This amendment should be defeated because it cuts a vital amount of money out of that portion of this bill which goes toward that effort. I urge its defeat.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pelosi amendment. It is unfortunate that this House is not being given the opportunity to have a full debate about the very important aspects of drug treatment and drug prevention. I believe that it was a sorry mistake when her amendment was not allowed to come before this body.

The only reason this issue is pending before the House is because we have in this emergency supplemental a \$1.7 billion appropriation for intervention in Colombia. That would lead us to believe that this Congress, at least, understands that the drug problem that we face here in America is very serious. But what is wrong is that we have undertaken to look at this problem as though it is only a problem from the source and the supply.

We have a serious problem here with respect to a control of the demand. And we know that all the literature tells us that if we have adequate treatment programs for people who even want treatment that they can be helped.

If we have truly the authority of this House to take full account of emergency supplemental appropriations, there is no justification for our not including in this emergency, if we are going to include the supply end of a Colombia appropriation, by not taking into account also the needed funds that we could use for an enhanced drug treatment program. It goes together. Supply and demand cannot be separated.

We look at the appropriations that are going to Colombia, \$1.7 billion is going to purchase 60-some-odd helicopters. I serve on the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources as the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform. We had hearings on this matter and we were told that, from the viewpoint of the production of these helicopters, it is going to take years before they are in supply actually to Colombia and years more after that before the people there are going to be trained in order to use this equipment.

The engagement of our military in this kind of activity, which is going to put them in harm's way, get us messed up into a civil strife within that country, I think is a terrible mistake.

But aside from that, this body is now considering an important issue, and that is drugs, drug abuse in our country; and we are pretending as though this is only a supply issue and that, if we spend a billion dollars in Colombia, it will correct the problem. It will not.

I had the opportunity with my subcommittee to travel to Colombia about a year ago. It is a country that has enormous problems of poverty, corruption, lack of control of its own territory. Forty percent of Colombia is under the control of the rebels.

There is no possibility that our intervention of 60-plus helicopters is going to be able to control that situation. If we had alternate crops for the farmers there to produce to get into the market, the biggest problem is infrastructure, how would they get it from their farms into the market. There is none out in the countryside.

The lack of control by Mr. Pastrana over his country is absolutely sad. I have the greatest admiration for Mr. Pastrana. I met him and talked with him. I understand his problem. But there is no way that \$1 billion of our taxpayers' money is going to solve this problem for him.

However, if we are going to do it, at the very minimum we ought to be looking at this as a balanced issue. And the issue is, if it is going to take 5 years for those helicopters to actually be delivered, if we appropriated today \$600 million or a billion dollars for drug treatment tomorrow, those addicts and victims out there of heroin and cocaine addiction will have treatment. They are waiting in line now. We are told that only 50 percent of those that actually come to a center wanting treatment are actually provided any sort of help.

So this country is in real distress. And so I counter with the argument that, if we are truly dealing with emergency and if we are going to attack the supply issue as an emergency subject matter, there is no justification for our not including as part of that emergency an augmented treatment program to help the people in this country get rid of this addiction and cut down on the demand. I think that is the legitimate way to go.

I hope that the Pelosi amendment will be approved.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, for several years now the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Operations and Human Rights, and I, as chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, and the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman MICA) and a number of others have been working trying to get helicopters and other equipment down to the Colombian National Police and the military in Colombia so they can adequately defend that country against the FARC guerrillas, who are, and I hope my colleagues will get this, are getting as much as \$100 million a month from the drug cartel. That is a billion dollars a year.

Now, what happens if we do not do anything? What happens if we do not do what the President has suggested? And the President is a late-comer to this fight. I am very happy that he is on board with this \$1.3 billion, but it is coming rather late. What happens if that money does not get down there?

The FARC guerrillas who have been trained by the Cubans, who are Marxist oriented, they may very well take over that country. We may have a narcoguerrilla government running Colombia. There will be no impediment to the heroin and the cocaine coming out of that country into the United States.

Ninety percent of the cocaine coming into America comes from Colombia. Sixty-five percent of the heroin coming into the United States comes from Colombia. One out of seven people, according to officials in Baltimore, are heroin addicts.

□ 1645

We have an absolute epidemic. Yes, we need to deal with education and rehabilitation and a lot of other things. But we have got to go to the source and take on these guerrillas who are being supported by the drug dealers down there, the drug cartels, because if we do not, they are going to have a sanctuary from which we will not be able to do anything to them.

Now, my feeling is that the problem may get so big if we do not deal with it right now that we will be forced to send American troops in there to deal with it. I do not want that to happen. I do not want American young men and women fighting in the jungles of Colombia with the drug cartel and the drug guerrillas. That could very well happen. They now have 20 to 30,000 people in that army. Many of those people, those combatants have been forced into being involved, and they are going to have more because of the tremendous amounts of money that they are getting from the drug cartel.

Let me just tell my colleagues what they are doing. The day before yester-

day, there was a police outpost in Vigia del Fuerte. I hope my colleagues on the minority side will get this. For 36 hours they held off the FARC guerrillas who attacked them. After 36 hours, after the Colombian National Police ran out of ammunition, they came in and they hacked them to death, 26 people, with machetes; they castrated the men; they chopped off the heads of the mayor and the head of the Colombian National Police there; they put them on spikes in the middle of the town as a warning to anybody that gets in the way of the FARC guerrillas down there.

The people are terrified of the FARC guerrillas. As a result, a lot of people, including people in the Colombian National Police and the military, are scared to death of them. They know if they are captured, they are going to be chopped into pieces. They took one man who was in the Colombian National Police, they hacked his wife and child to death in front of him and then they tortured him to death. These are the kind of people we are dealing with.

Either we give the Colombian government and the Colombian National Police and the Colombian military the wherewithal to fight these people or they are going to take over that country in all probability. If that happens, what do we do? Do we let them flood this country with heroin and cocaine with impunity because we know how porous our borders are? No, I think what will happen then is we will have to get directly involved militarily, and that is something none of us wants.

There is an old commercial in Indianapolis that shows a guy with a Fram oil filter saying, "You can pay me now or you can pay me later." The implication is that if you do not use a Fram oil filter, and this is not a commercial, that the engine is going to go bad on you and you are going to have to buy a whole new engine.

I am saying to my colleagues today, we can either deal with the problem today as the President has now seen fit to do and give them this \$1.3 billion or we can wait around another 4 or 5 years until the matter gets so bad that we have to send our lifeblood down there to fight these guerrillas. I think it is better to do it now. It is the prudent thing to do.

I urge my colleagues, not because the gentlewoman from California does not have a good heart and not because she is not making some sense but this is the time to send the money to Colombia to fight the guerrillas and also to do the other things that need to be done as the time goes by, but fight the guerrillas now, defeat them as they have in Peru and Bolivia and to make absolutely sure that we do not have to send our young people down there in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following material for the RECORD:

U.S. CONGRESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 28, 2000.

Re Support Assistance to Colombia

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am writing to urge your support for the Administration's proposed assistance package for Colombia in the Supplemental Appropriations bill. Colombia's President Pastrana has taken bold action in his effort to deal with the country's drug production and its civil conflict. He has requested the assistance and the Administration has proposed that we provide it. President Pastrana is a friend of the U.S., he is taking action to our country's benefit, and we should provide that aid.

Helping Colombia is in our fundamental national interest. The scourge of drugs is tearing at the fabric of our society, and Colombia is ground zero in the fight against drugs: More than 80% of the cocaine and much of the heroin that arrives on our shores comes from or through Colombia. Colombia is also a key regional state. It borders five other South and Central American countries, whose 40 million citizens face serious social, economic, and national security challenges.

With Plan Colombia, President Pastrana has proposed a bold agenda for addressing his country's inter-related challenges of drug-trafficking, weak state institutions and a faltering economy. The Government of Colombia estimates that \$7.8 billion will be needed over the next three years to reverse the country's role as the hemisphere hub for drugs, rebuild its economy, and strengthen its democratic institutions. The government had committed \$4.5 billion to the Plan—including \$900 million in credits from international financial institutions—and President Pastrana is asking the international community for \$3.3 billion in foreign assistance, of which the Administration has proposed that we provide \$1.6 billion.

The Administration's initiative is a balanced and integrated approach that will help Colombia fight the drug trade, foster peace, institute judicial reform, promote the rule of law, improve human rights, assist the internally displaced, and expand economic development.

I know that some Members have reservations about human rights conditions in Colombia, and I have been critical of Colombia's human rights record. But this package is geared to improve the conditions that have led to poor human rights. For example, all assistance that is provided to Colombia's forces will go to fully-vetted units. The military units trained by the United States will not clash with insurgents or para-militaries, unless these elements directly support illicit drug cultivation and production. Indeed, the cornerstone of President Pastrana's administration is the search for a negotiated peace with Colombia's various insurgent groups. I welcome the Administration's statements that Colombia's insurgency problem must ultimately be resolved through negotiation, and not military action, and this view will guide the United States approach to implementing this assistance package.

To help stanch the flow of drugs to the U.S., to help a key neighbor and to help preserve stability in our hemisphere, I urge you to join me in supporting the Colombia assistance package.

Most Cordially,

TOM LANTOS,
Member of Congress.

[From the Los Angeles Times, March 27, 2000]

CONGRESS MUST ACT ON COLOMBIA

Last September Colombian President Andres Pastrana presented the White House a

comprehensive plan intended to rescue his country from the violence of drug lords, guerrillas and paramilitary forces. Included were programs for economic development, democratic institution-building, judicial reform, human rights protections and peace negotiations.

Pastrana's approach has been well received in the White House and, for the most part, in Congress. There is a consensus in Washington that Colombia and its problems are an important issue for the United States. There is also a sense that the United States can work with Pastrana, though the White House must assure that no U.S. military personnel are drawn into combat.

Yet despite the emergent consensus, the urgency of Pastrana's plan has not, so far, moved Congress to act decisively. The negotiations on when and how to deliver a \$1.3-billion military aid package proposed by the White House have been bouncing from door to door in Congress, never reaching the House or Senate floors, and the delays are dangerous.

A major South American power, Colombia faces the often indistinguishable problems of drugs and insurrection that demand prompt action. Cocaine coming from the highlands has flooded the United States for years despite past U.S.-supported eradication efforts. Coca cultivation is estimated to have increased 140% in the past five years.

In Colombia, drugs beget violence. About 35,000 people have been killed in drug-related violence in the past decade, and more than a million people have been driven from their homes. Under these circumstances, the White House and Congress should be justifiably concerned.

The U.S. proposal anticipates a two-year program of support, and the problems of Colombia cannot be resolved in that short period. The White House's benchmarks of success—diminution of violence and coca production and a strengthened government in Bogota—over the period should be closely monitored by Congress.

What Colombia needs is decisive and prompt action. Congress should move now to deliver the arms, equipment and other elements of the program to suppress lawlessness in the countryside. At stake is proliferation of the cocaine plague and potential collapse of one of Latin America's proudest countries.

[From the New York Times, March 28, 2000]

REBEL ATTACKS ON 2 COLOMBIAN VILLAGES
KILL 30

BOGOTA, Colombia, March 27, (AP).—Fierce guerrilla attacks on two northern fishing towns killed at least 30 people during the weekend, including 24 police officers, a mayor, and two children, officials said.

At least seven police officers were taken prisoner by the rebel Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, Colombia's largest leftist insurgency, officials said. Four other officers were missing.

Troops regained control on Sunday night of Vigia del Fuerte—site of the worst clash—and found the riverfront town of 1,200 in ruins.

Rebel machine-gun fire and homemade missiles destroyed a church, the mayor's office, the police barracks, the telephone company and 10 houses near the main plaza in the town, near the border with Panama.

Twenty-one police officers died trying to repel the 36-hour barrage, which began on Saturday. Six civilians also died, including the mayor, Pastor Perea, and two children, the Antioquia state government reported.

"It was a merciless attack," Fernando Aristizabal, a top state official told Colombia's Caracol Radio.

The rebels also hit Bojaya, a nearby town in neighboring Choco State, where, Mr. Aristizabal reported, three police officers were killed.

Rebel attacks on rural towns and remote military installations are continuing despite peace talks with the government of President Andres Pastrana. The two are negotiating without a cease-fire.

The rebels are also suspected of setting off a car bomb on Sunday that killed a police cadet and injured 16 civilians in a crowded market in Girardot, a popular tourist spot 60 miles south of Bogota.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the Pelosi amendment. I also want to thank her for offering this amendment so we would have an opportunity to discuss the entire drug problem in our country.

I am very disturbed that we have seen fit that we would address this problem by sending \$1.7 billion to Colombia along with the helicopters and along with the advisers in a country the size almost of California and believe that we are going to have an impact.

We have been on this interdiction bandwagon now for over 20 years. We have spent \$250 billion. We have spent it in Panama. We have spent it spraying paraquat on drugs in Mexico. We had the Florida interdiction program. We had the Andean strategy program. We had the invasion of Panama. We got rid of Noriega, but we did not get rid of the drug dealers or the drug problem. We had the Peruvian shutdown policy, and now we have President Clinton's eradication program which is the largest herbicide spraying program in the world.

What is the result? The heroin and cocaine on the streets of America is purer and in more plentiful supply, and the price continues to drop. What does that tell us? That these programs have not been effective. And the price has continued to drop in spite of the fact that they now have to avoid being shot down, in spite of the fact that they have to buy bigger and faster boats, in spite of the fact that they buy disposable airplanes and disposable boats. The cost keeps dropping.

It says something about the effectiveness of people trying to drive up the cost of doing business. What the drug lords understand is this is simply the cost of doing business. Whether you are corrupting a border guard, whether you are corrupting a Colombian police member, whether you are throwing in with the Colombian police to create a paramilitary to fight the guerillas, or you are throwing in with the guerillas that is just the cost of doing business.

If you really want to stick it to the guerillas, if you really want to stick it to the drug lords, what you do is you dry up their market. You take away

the market. You take away the market by treatment and education. We have conquered some of the most serious problems in this country, intractable problems we thought, with education. But on this one, we fall faint, because we do not think we are being strong if we deal with education.

We know that when women come into the women, infants, and children program if they are smoking or they are taking drugs, after they talk to a doctor about their pregnancy and they get the connection between their body and the fetus's body and the birth of a healthy baby, we know that we have a tremendous success in getting women to stop smoking, to stop taking drugs.

What the gentlewoman from California is talking about is treatment on demand. You know how hard it is to get somebody to ask for treatment when they are addicted, those of us who have worked with addicts, those of us who have friends who have become addicts, those of us who have had family members? You know how hard it is to get them to turn around their life? You think you say, "Come on, I want to take you to treatment," it does not work. You can take them over and over.

But very often, fortunately, thank God, every now and then, somebody says, "I'm ready for treatment." You know what happens in most cities when you say I am ready for treatment? You do not get treatment, you get a waiting list. You get a waiting list. Now we are telling a very sick person, who is deeply addicted, come back in 6 months, hang in there but come back in 6 months.

Addiction. Do you know what addiction means? We see it played out every day. We used to see it played out in the criminal reporters because addicts died in the streets. But now we can read about it in the sports page. Athletes who have brilliant careers, millions of dollars, lose it because of addiction. We see a brilliant ballplayer like Darryl Strawberry who goes to treatment, works hard at it and for some reason has a moment of weakness that he cannot even explain, and he may have now finished out his baseball career.

We see CEOs of companies who lose their companies because of addiction. They have beautiful families. They have a beautiful career, a beautiful future; they lose it. This is about addiction. This is about a terrible, terrible problem that confronts our entire society. We see people, performers, brilliant people, stage, music, pictures, great careers gone, die, overdose, take their lives. That is addiction.

You are not going to solve that problem of addiction by going down into the Andean jungle and believe that by spending another \$1.7 billion, \$250 billion, and no results. In fact, all of the evidence is that it is getting worse. It is getting worse. The market is better for them. They have shifted to where they go to do business. They go from one country to another. They shift the mode of transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, as the gentlewoman from California pointed out, if you really want to effectively deal with this problem, you would go the treatment route. It is not because we say it. It is not because she says it. It is because the Rand Corporation who has spent a lot of our government money studying this to try to help us find a path to treat this says this is where you would go if you really want a bang for your dollar.

It is not about giving up on the drug lords. It is not about prosecuting, but it is about once and for all deciding what is effective and is not. We now have 20 years of experience and \$250 billion of effort that tell us this does not work. Yet this is our approach.

We can also scrutinize some of the drug treatment programs because some of them do not work, but we are so addicted to those because they look good when you are standing there with the school children and the police but we are not getting the results so maybe we can score that one. So if we really want to deal with this, we have got to think about whether or not we have got the commitment and the courage to deal with the demand and whether we can stay with it and start to offer people treatment instead of a waiting list, start to offer people hope that treatment will be there should they make that decision.

There are others who will not make that decision. That is almost something that is almost impossible to deal with. But for those who are willing and have the courage to walk in and say I need help, I need treatment, what the gentlewoman from California was saying is we are here to help you and we can start to reduce that. We can start to reduce the market.

We are throwing thousands and tens of thousands of people in jail for minor drug infractions and even when they are in jail we will not give them treatment. Where we have them 24 hours a day, we cannot find to give them treatment.

We talk about triangulation. We are in between the left and the right, both of which are fostering the drug trade in Colombia, between the military and the guerrillas, between the paramilitary and the police. We are going to insert ourselves for \$1.7 billion. Do we think we are going to bring home a solution for America? I do not think so.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I really appreciate the passion of my friend from California. Even when he is incomplete in his arguments, he certainly is moving. There is no question that we have to have a multifront war. It is a war and a cancer.

I would have voted for a treatment amendment had that amendment been allowed. I am a cosponsor of the gentleman from Minnesota's bill to cover drug treatment. I am working in the Committee on Education and the Work Force on prevention programs.

But let us not overstate the data on treatment and prevention programs, either. The data is mixed. The Rand study itself is mixed, 88 percent recidivism. People get partially better, but treatment is a struggle. Drug courts are a struggle. Prevention programs are a struggle.

We should be treating, and we have a massive problem in this country as we have locked up more kids and adults in our prisons and do not focus on making sure they get educated and they get in treatment programs. We absolutely have to deal with that. But the plain truth of the matter is our local police department, our local schools, our local treatment centers cannot handle the amount of new people coming in to drug addiction if we do not get it at the source and at the border as well.

We have to have a comprehensive program. What we are dealing with today is a Colombian amendment. The reason we have not put in all these dollars into Colombia over the years is because we had a legitimate human rights objection to how their military was being handled and because drug money had gotten into the previous government of Colombia.

We have been putting roughly \$300 million into just the Colombian National Police and not into the rest of Colombia while we were putting \$3.2 billion into treatment. We are behind in Colombia.

Where we were putting the effort in Peru and Bolivia, we have had progress. The facts are real simple. In 1992, which may just be a happenstance date, 1992, 1993, two things happened in this country. One, we relaxed our attitudes on Just Say No but the other thing is we cut our interdiction budgets. We had made progress steadily on drug abuse, on addiction, on treatment, on prevention. But when the drugs soared into this country, the prices on the street dropped again. We saw a direct correlation between price, demand, purity, and usage. In that period when we cut back, to get back to 1993 where we were, would take a 50 percent reduction right now. Interdiction is only part of this effort. But we have to work at the source.

Let us go to some of the particulars in Colombia. First off, what is the clear, compelling national interest in Colombia versus other parts? We put \$8 billion into Kosovo, and we did not have a clear compelling national interest.

In Colombia, it is the longest standing democracy under siege, under siege not because there is a civil war, only 4 percent of the people support the FARC, there are that many drug dealers in our home States. It is under

because of money from this country fomenting a civil war in that country where people are dying.

Drugs are the leading cause, drugs and alcohol, of every crime in my hometown and in every town in this country. Every police chief will tell you 70 to 85 percent of all crime, child abuse, domestic violence, everything is drug- and alcohol-related. It is our number one problem in this country.

Thirdly, Colombia is our eighth largest supplier of oil. They are going to be a net importer in 3 years as their oil fields have come under pressure. Furthermore it is right now up against the Venezuelan border, our number one supplier of oil.

□ 1700

That is another compelling national interest.

Furthermore, on top of that, they have moved into the Darien Peninsula in Panama, threatening potentially the Panama Canal, a vital trade link. Compelling national interests means drug crises on our streets; trade, energy, these are compelling national interests in our own hemisphere.

In Colombia, it is not Vietnam. Mr. Chairman, 71 percent of the people say they trust most of the Catholic church, 69 percent the Colombian National Police, 68 percent the military, 4 percent the FARC. There is not a division of opinion. We have a stable democracy that even goes through transition of power. We have a national police and a military that is willing to fight. What we have been unwilling to do is give them the weapons and training with which to do that. It is only a part of the drug war, but it is a part.

We have patriotic Colombians who are sacrificing their lives because of our abuse, and what they are asking is for us, for the first time since the Leahy rule no longer applies to their military, as they have cleaned house and as this President has relaxed with the new President. President Pastrana has reached out for peace with the FARC and been slapped on one cheek, turned his other cheek, slapped on the other cheek; turned his cheek and was slapped again.

What we have are people who are saying, we will fight your drug war, part of it, in our country if you will at least provide some training and some dollars for helicopters, for our soldiers. We will clean up our human rights problems. We will reach out with peace overtures. But what we say is no, we are not going to help you unless you do it in exactly our way all the time.

We know we need more money for drug treatment. We know we need more money for prevention. We know we need more money for interdiction at the borders, for our prisons, for education systems. But we also need more for interdiction, because we have not even given a drop compared to other things in the battle in Colombia where our cocaine in every one of our hometowns and States is coming from,

where our heroin in every one of our hometowns and where our potent marijuana is coming from. And the least we can do, and I am particularly disappointed in some of my conservative friends who are being penny wise and pound foolish, this problem is not going to go away if we defeat the funding so necessary for this push in southern Colombia.

Mr. Chairman, we must take action and defeat the Pelosi amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pelosi amendment, and I rise to express serious questions about this aid package.

First, this is not the way to win the drug war at home. Over and over today it has been emphasized, every dollar spent here at home on drug treatment and prevention is 23 times more effective than a dollar spent on cutting production at the source.

Second, this aid will not stop coca targeted for the United States. Coca is profitable and easy to grow. In Colombia it is grown by thousands of peasant farmers who have no other viable economic crop. Even if we were able to eradicate their coca crops, cultivation will only move to other regions in Colombia or in the Andean region.

As long as Americans demand cocaine and heroin, the supply will be there. Drug-dealing is market-driven capitalism in its purist form.

Third, Colombians do not support fumigation and crop eradication. It has been tried before in Colombia and failed. I am sure my colleagues know that in February, the governors and mayors of two provinces where the U.S. plans to target its crop eradication efforts asked the national government to suspend all aerial spraying. I am sure my colleagues also know that on March 12, the general director himself of the regional office of Colombian Ministry of the Environment for the Amazon suspended all aerial spraying of illicit crops in the southern departments of Putamayo and Caqueta, exactly where U.S. action is focused.

Fumigation was suspended because small farms growing food crops are being poisoned, the water is being poisoned, the Amazon headwaters are being polluted, and the Amazon rain forest itself is being degraded. Yet, in this package today, the U.S. is proposing a significant escalation of crop eradication.

Fourth, Colombian civil society has raised serious questions about the U.S. aid proposal. Every single Member of this House received several letters signed by scores of Colombian churches, women's organizations, human rights organizations, academics, trade unions, indigenous groups, farmers' unions, jurists, community organizations, members of the government-appointed National Peace Council, and humanitarian groups. They sent us these letters at great personal risk to

themselves. We should show some respect to the concerns that they have raised.

Fifth, millions of Colombians have taken to the streets demanding an end to the violence. The only result this aid package could guarantee is to increase the violence and dislocation in Colombia.

Sixth, this plan offers a U.S. embrace to a brutal antidemocratic and corrupt military that often works hand in hand with right-wing paramilitary groups who are themselves deeply implicated in the drug trade, according to the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency. According to a February report by Human Rights Watch, half of Colombia's 18 brigade-level army units are linked to paramilitary activity. Military support for paramilitary activity remains national in scope and includes the areas where Colombian units are receiving or will receive U.S. military aid.

There are dozens more reasons for opposing this package, but I would like to conclude with one other observation.

Many of my colleagues insist that Colombia is not El Salvador, and as someone intimately familiar with the Salvadoran war and its peace process, I could not agree more; the two countries are different. However, what other Members have been stressing is that the response and justifications voiced by supporters of this policy, both in the administration and in the Congress, are hauntingly familiar. If my colleagues do not think so, go back and read the record of the debate during the 1980s.

On top of all of this is the overlay of the drug trade in which all sectors in Colombia are involved. The FARC and the ELN guerillas are involved, the paramilitaries are involved, the Colombian military is involved, and key financial government officials must be involved, or the drug trade would not be able to flourish.

Then there are the criminal drug dealers and the traffickers themselves. This is the situation into which we want to throw our military resources? Give me a break.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Pelosi amendment and to reject this ill-conceived aid package.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to participate in this debate. I think it is a good one because it focuses our energies and our Nation's energies on a very important subject which is what we need to do to save the lives of young people, to save our communities from this scourge of drugs.

Now, I just want to remind my colleagues on this side of the aisle that this supplemental appropriation bill started with this President. President Clinton submitted a request to this Congress, and in that request he asked for \$1.2 billion in counternarcotics funding. It is on an emergency basis. So this is not something that was just

created by this side of the aisle saying that we need to do this. It was this administration, it was this President that said there is an extraordinary emergency in Colombia that affects the national security interests of this Nation, and this Congress needs to address it.

So this is not something that is just being pulled out of thin air. It is this administration who has also supported demand reduction, that has supported more treatment. Certainly, this administration illustrates that one can ask for and support treatment facilities and demand reduction, but at the same time recognize the need and the impact that the drugs coming in from Colombia has on this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I would just remind my colleagues of that particular point.

Now, I would also refer back to balancing the need as we have to approach the drug war. If my colleagues will look at this chart that I have that talks about the demand reduction money that is being spent as well as comparing it with what we are spending on interdiction, it goes back to 1987 with the demand reduction in red. And each year since 1987, the red line goes up, which is the money that is being spent for demand reduction. Demand reduction is that which is for drug education and treatment programs, substance abuse programs. That has increased 63 percent since 1985. Yet, if my colleagues will look at the interdiction funding, it is the green that goes up at a very, very slow rate. What is remarkable about this that really is not shown on this chart, but that in-between 1987 and 1994 it went up, the interdiction spending, and then it actually went down and it went down in 1992 when we diverted some resources over to the Gulf War.

So the point of this is that since 1992 our demand reduction expenditures have continued to go up. Yet even though we are spending more and more money on demand reduction, in 1992 the teenage use and experimentation with illegal drugs went up.

Mr. Chairman, I think the point of the story is that history tells us that we cannot win this war; we cannot win the lives of our teenagers simply by putting money in demand reduction. It takes that balanced approach. I come back to my original point, which is that it was this administration that initiated, that joined this battle to aid Colombia in fighting the war on drugs. They asked for over \$1 billion. It was General McCaffrey that last year initiated this. In every war, we have to have somebody who starts pointing and assigning the troops and where we need to go and where we need to spend our money. That is the responsibility of General McCaffrey. He recommended last year, after a trip to Colombia, that we invest \$1 billion.

Now, what we have done in this Congress is say that it is not just Colombia, but we also have to have Ecuador and Peru and Bolivia be involved, so we

have targeted some money to there as well. But the counternarcotics initiative started with this administration, supported by this Congress, supported by the Speaker, as he testified to.

So this debate today is what we can do in terms of aiding Colombia to fight our war against drugs, to save our children's lives. Yes, we need demand reduction; yes, we need treatment facilities; yes, we need to do more in those areas. But this debate is about what we need to do this day in the battle that Colombia faces that impacts our Nation.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague yielding because he makes a very, very important set of points. I would only point out and add to what he has said, the Pelosi amendment addresses really none of these things. The amendment specifically cuts out funding, the bulk of which would take out the ability to train the Colombian troops that we are dealing with in the first place.

But the gentleman's original point was the real point, and that is that the Pelosi amendment in this debate would express concern about what we are doing on the demand side and suggests that we are not doing anything. But indeed, there is a comprehensive effort in any number of other committees where it is appropriate to deal with that side of the question. Indeed, if the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) would present an amendment sometime that actually put money into education, for example, I would be glad to help her.

But the gentleman is making the point very well, and I appreciate his yielding.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have proceeded in this conversation as if it is an either/or proposition. I would argue that it really is not.

The purpose for this complaint and the protest is that we wanted an amendment made in order for the gentlewoman from California so that we could put it into the supplemental appropriation to increase resources for drug treatment.

Now, it is true that a large amount of cocaine and heroin travels from Colombia to this country, but it is also true that those are not the only drugs that are causing problems for us here in America. There are domestically generated drugs, like methamphetamines. There are all kinds of other drugs. We have a serious problem of marijuana being grown here domestically. There are household inhalants that our children are using and, in some cases, killing themselves and destroying their potential.

So it is not just a matter of cocaine or heroin, number one, when we talk about drugs.

The question of treatment is a question of common sense and cost-effectiveness. We know that treatment works. We know that there are millions of Americans, 3 million in the latest study, that do not have access to treatment. We know that in most cities and in rural areas, not only do families not have access to the person in the family who needs help, but they do not have any opportunity for the counseling and the support that they need.

We know that drug addiction causes divorce, home foreclosures, lack of productivity in the workplace. We know that this problem of drugs is a serious problem throughout our society, and that we should not be here today talking about on the one hand, we only want to deal with the problem in Colombia, and on the other hand, we will wait for another day to deal with the questions and the challenges of drug treatment here in this country.

Mr. Chairman, all of our law enforcement officials tell us that even those people incarcerated do not have access in the majority to treatment programs for drug and alcohol abuse. We know that the National Institute of Justice did a study that shows that in our major cities more than 80 percent of the crime is drug driven.

So the question for us has to be, as a Congress why can we not in a supplemental appropriation that is wide ranging, it is not just dealing with the question of Colombia, it is dealing with emergencies in North Carolina, it is dealing with a whole range of questions, why was it not fitting in the sense of the majority to make an amendment made in order so that we could talk about increased resources in an area in which so many people on both sides of the aisle see the need.

□ 1715

If it was someone in our family, someone in our community, someone that we have come in contact with that needed treatment, we want to make sure that they have access to it. We should feel the same for those 3 million Americans out there today, and make sure that they have access to real treatment opportunities.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) that stresses prevention, that stresses education, that stresses us putting more of a priority on our domestic concerns right here at home, in our neighborhood, and in our back yards.

I also rise to show and express my deep reservations and concerns about, one, the process in spending contained

in this supplemental; secondly, the goals and the mission and whether or not they can be achieved for trying to address the problem in Colombia.

I think we are all concerned about it. We all want to do something about it. It is whether or not this program will achieve the mission and the objectives outlined by the administration. I do not think we can.

Thirdly, I object to this supplemental because it contains a particular classified intelligence funding program, and I will address that at the end.

First of all, on the size, the spending level, and the process of this supplemental. This is an emergency supplemental which, by its function here in Congress, I do not necessarily object to emergency supplementals. The gentleman from Arkansas said that it started with the President. It started at \$5.2 billion. Now it is before us, the entire House, at \$9.2 billion. We will have amendments that might be attached to it that might take it to \$13 or \$14 billion. Then it will be sent over to the Senate, where it might come back to the House at \$15 or \$16 billion.

Maybe I am more of a conservative in the House. Maybe I am to the right of the majority. But we have made so much progress on balancing the budget. We have made a priority of getting surpluses. We have tried to tell Congress to keep their hands off of social security. Now, in the third month of the year, before we have done any appropriations bills, we are looking at a presidential request of \$5.2 billion to \$15 billion. I do not think that is appropriate or fair to the appropriations process and to the priorities that we are going to outline.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) might bring a defense bill in the appropriations process forward that I will support an increase in, or the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) might bring an appropriations bill for education with new ideas and more accountability that I will support.

But this is an emergency supplemental that may spend, that may spend, one-third to one-half of the non-social security surplus in one shot. We have a \$26 billion surplus. This may take \$13 billion of that surplus in one vote.

Finally, on Colombia, Colombia has had a 40-year civil war, an ongoing drug problem, and an army and a police force that have not worked together. As a matter of fact, institutionally and culturally and law enforcement training-wise, they do not work together well at all.

And we think \$1.9 billion, 30 Blackhawks, and 15 Hueys is going to cure that? I do not think this is going to address the civil war or further the peace process. I think it is going to exacerbate both.

Finally, on the intelligence front, as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I take an oath of secrecy. To abide by that oath, this statement has been approved by

the committee to confirm and conform to that oath.

This bill contains some classified funding requested by the administration for intelligence programs and activities. As a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I generally support most of this funding. There is a particular intelligence activity funded by this bill, however, which I cannot support.

I try to judge spending on intelligence programs by the same standard I use on other Federal spending: Is the program in the national interest, and likely to achieve its goals?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROEMER was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the intelligence activity which I have reservations on fails on both these counts, on both achieving its goals and supporting the national interest.

I have advised senior officials in the administration of my concerns. I hope that this decision to continue this particular activity will be reconsidered.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, during committee hearings on the Colombia aid package, I raised serious questions about what has been posed as mostly a counter-narcotics effort. Unfortunately, those questions have not been answered. That is why I am going to raise them again here today.

Why are we taking action to invest in a militaristic drug war that has the potential for escalating regional conflict in the name of fighting drugs instead of doing what we need to do, putting more money here at home, and attack the problem here with at least as much vigor?

Considering the demonstrated failure of militarized eradication efforts to date, why should we believe that investing more money in this type of plan will achieve a different result?

According to the General Accounting Office, despite U.S. expenditures of \$625 million in counter-narcotics efforts in Colombia between 1990 and 1998, Colombia surpassed Peru and Bolivia to become the world's largest coca producer. Colombia is already the third largest recipient of our foreign aid in the whole world, and there has been no net reduction in coca production in Colombia or cocaine availability in the United States.

All of the heroin the United States consumes can be grown on just 50 square miles. An entire year's supply can fit into one cargo plane. Yet, the rebels in Colombia and the paramilitaries already control an area the size of my home State of Illinois.

What makes us think that this amount of money, this effort, is going to do anything to seriously reduce the supply?

According to the United Nations, profits from illicit drugs are so high that three-fourths of all drug shipments would have to be intercepted to seriously reduce the profitability of the business.

Why are we focusing exclusively on the rebels when we know that the paramilitaries in Colombia are involved in the drug traffic, and that they are the ones who are responsible for 70 percent of the human rights abuses and civilian murders in that country? Why are we ignoring the proven drug control strategies that focus on prevention, treatment, and education?

I know that my colleagues have pointed out that we are spending money on that, but we also know that that is the effective way to address the problem. We should be doing more. If we are so serious about reducing drug use, then why is 63 percent of the need for drug treatment unmet in the United States, according to the substance abuse and mental health services administration?

I think we need to question if this really is a counter-narcotics operation, or is it a counterinsurgency operation? Could it be more about purchasing helicopters than protecting our children? What exactly is our mission? What will it take to achieve total victory in Colombia? Are we prepared to make that type of investment in dollars and in lives? How many lives? If not, what is the purpose of this aid?

It seems to me if we really want to address the drug problem, we should be here today discussing the original Pelosi amendment, which was not able to be considered, which was an aggressive, ambitious approach to increased domestic spending on drug prevention, treatment, and education, not a massive, militaristic care package for a military with the worst record of human rights abuses in this hemisphere.

I believe that this aid package for Colombia is a misguided, dangerous, and irresponsible approach. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Pelosi amendment, and I would also urge support for the Ramstad and Campbell amendment and against this bill.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to the \$1.7 billion military package for Colombia, and in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and thank her for giving us the opportunity to engage in this debate.

This military package will spell disaster for peace and human rights in Colombia, and will do nothing for reducing drug use in our country. What is

missing from this shortsighted, expensive approach are the resources for a more comprehensive Federal drug prevention and treatment policy here in our own country.

How much are we willing to invest in mentoring programs, after-school programs, job training, and drug treatment? This is how we reduce drug use, as the Rand Corporation study cited by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) indicates. Why are we not pushing for an emergency bill to address the drug emergency that is right here in our own country?

Drugs are destroying our communities. For example, in California, as a result of the horrendous three strikes law, nearly 40 percent of California's prison population are African-American men who have been incarcerated for nonviolent drug offenses.

In the African-American community, one out of every three African-American young men in their twenties are either in prison, on probation, or on parole due to nonviolent drug offenses. The majority of these young men would not be in jail had there been treatment on demand, job training, and a job.

Drugs are having a devastating impact on our Nation, especially in the African-American community. Providing \$1.7 billion in military assistance to Colombia does not begin to provide us with the funding to wage a real war on drugs. Now is the time to consider a comprehensive Federal drug prevention and treatment policy here at home.

We should stop misleading the American public by arguing that sending military hardware and helicopters to Colombia will reduce drug use in America. It will not. This is outrageous, to perpetuate that notion on our people, on our constituents, and on the country.

This military package also ignores the human rights crisis in Colombia, nor does it deal with the extreme poverty in Colombia. Guns and helicopters will not solve the problems of hunger in Colombia, nor will it help our young people in America break the cycle of drug addiction.

We need to go back to the drawing board, support the Pelosi amendment, and just say no to this counterproductive military package.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I join all of my other colleagues who have stood here today, rising in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). This debate has become a long debate because we have a growing number of legislators who are concerned about this wrongheaded policy that we are pursuing.

Mr. Chairman, this supplemental appropriations provides over \$1.1 billion in aid to the government of Colombia. Most of this money will go to the Colombian military and be used in the

Colombian civil war. This civil war has been going on for 40 years, and both sides, both sides have profited from the drug trade.

Furthermore, the Colombian military has been known to cooperate with drug traffickers. Colombian military officers also provide support to right-wing paramilitary organizations that traffic in illegal drugs, and carry out extrajudicial killings and other gross violations of human rights.

□ 1730

This bill gives money to drug traffickers who kill other drug traffickers and murder innocent civilians. This bill is unwise and immoral, and we should not support it.

We are focused today on what is happening domestically. We are rising in opposition to this funding and supporting the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) because we are very concerned about what is not being done in America. We are just growing our prison system.

The number of inmates in State and Federal prisons has increased more than fivefold from less than 200,000 in 1970 to 1,232,900 by 1998. An additional 592,000 are held in local jails. As of July 1999, 131,112 offenders were incarcerated in approximately 100 Federal facilities. There are 115,363 inmates housed in Federal facilities rated to hold 89,696.

At the end of 1998, State prisons held 1,178,978 inmates. In June of 1998, 592,462 offenders were held in local jails.

The number of persons on probation and parole has been growing dramatically along with institutional populations. There are now 507 million Americans incarcerated, on parole, or probation, an increase of 209 percent since 1980.

A few more statistics. Mr. Chairman, 71 percent of those sentenced to State prisons way back in 1995 were convicted of nonviolent crimes, including 31 percent for drug offenses and 29 percent for property offenses. Fifty-seven percent of jail inmates in 1989 reported they were under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time they committed their offense. One in four inmates way back in 1989 was in jail for a drug offense compared to one in ten in 1983.

Drug offenders constituted 21 percent of 1997 State prison inmates and 60 percent of 1996 Federal prison inmates. I could go on and on with these statistics.

Mr. Chairman, I am sick and tired of this wrong-headed policy. I am just overcome by the fact that we cannot get it right here in our own country. We are talking about throwing away money down in Colombia; and nothing is going to happen but drug dealers are going to fight drug dealers, both in and out of the government. And here we have mandatory minimum sentencing that is locking up young folks, young folks in rural and inner cities, at an alarming rate. Mandatory minimum sentences.

Many of these young people, 19 and 20 years old, first-time offenders. The judge has no discretion. He must send someone in possession of 5 grams of crack cocaine to prison for 5 years on a first-time offense, as opposed to those with powder cocaine, 100 times more. Some of these young people may be stupid, but they do not deserve to have their lives taken away from them. And this is not black. Black, white, green, rural, inner city. Prisons just filling up.

And, oh, let me tell about the conspiracy charges that they are now arresting the mothers and the women and the girlfriends and the mates on. We are spending millions of dollars, and our country is going down the drain.

Mr. Chairman, it was unwise for them not to make the Pelosi amendment in order, and it is unwise for us to support this appropriation to Colombia.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for bringing this to our attention here today and also the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his efforts to make sure that this House would spend ample amount of time debating all the particulars of the path in which we seem to be headed.

This is, in fact, a situation where we are taking the wrong action and taking it with too little thought. What is before us would improve the bill and strike an appropriate balance between the supply and demand aspects of the problem that confronts us. The bill, as currently constructed, strikes us with a false assertion. It asserts that the United States involvement in this 40-year-old conflict would somehow correct the situation and stop drug dealing and drug use in this country. That somehow getting involved by training armed forces and providing helicopters is going to stop or reduce consumption in this country.

It tries to leave with us the impression that this has been well thought out and debated, but that is absolutely questionable when we think that General McCaffrey came before the subcommittee on which I sit and left with us the clear impression that there is much work to be done here. He acknowledged that it will take years to deploy the proposed helicopters out there to train the troops for the proposed task. He tells us that there are currently insufficiently trained and insufficient numbers of pilots to even get into those helicopters. They do not have the hangars to house those helicopters. And that we should know that some 5 years out we definitely will still be involved in this enterprise in a best situation.

The fact of the matter is we have to know that there are already 300,000 people that have been displaced in Colombia. If we go in on the current path,

we are likely to see scores of thousands of others being displaced, and we are not taking proper precautions to resolve the situation that those people will find themselves in.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, things have gotten better in Bolivia and Peru; but things have gotten worse in Colombia as a result of that. And the action that we are embarking on today simply forces people in Colombia to grow these crops somewhere else, most likely Ecuador, maybe Panama or Mexico or somewhere beyond there. And we are not talking about what we might do to stop that from happening.

The statement of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is one of the reasons that people on this side are very concerned about where we are going here. He talks about if things do not resolve quickly there, then we will need more United States troops. This is Nicaragua all over again. We do not seem to learn from our past mistakes. We should take the time to debate all the ramifications of this proposal and talk about it in depth and see if we cannot find a more balanced way to attack this problem.

Mr. Chairman, wealthier Colombians are leaving that country in droves. Apparently, they are more than willing to fight to the last drop of American blood. We can be helpful in this situation and we should, Mr. Chairman. We can support President Pastrana by providing resources to build infrastructure so crops can get to market profitably, to build confidence of the people there in the government by helping him to strike an even-handed effort against paramilitary as well as guerrilla forces, to build a court system to the point that it is effective, fair, and respected, to build schools and roads and community support, to build a competent, efficient respected police force and a military that does not favor the paramilitaries or ignore paramilitary atrocities.

Mr. Chairman, we can be balanced in our efforts. We can increase efforts for prevention and treatment here at home. And the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is exactly right in that regard. We do not have anywhere near the proper attention being spent on treatment and prevention in this country. It does bear repeating the fact that we have way too many people in our jails with alcohol and drug abuse problems and a problem that they cannot get a job when they are out, even if they do deal with drugs and alcohol, because we are not spending enough of our attention on making sure that they are educated and trained and capable of returning as productive citizens.

We do not start putting money in early enough for early childhood programs and Head Start and after-school programs, for community building and community programs to make sure that every one of our children has the ability to be productive and be happy citizens with hope. And we certainly are not providing enough attention and

enough resources to make sure that those that are addicted, that have a drug or alcohol problem, get the kind of treatment that they need.

That is what this debate is about, Mr. Chairman, and I am so glad that the gentlewoman from California brought that up and the gentleman from Wisconsin made it clear that we are not spending the time that we need to debate all of these issues and the ramifications that will come from them.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pelosi amendment and in opposition to the underlying provisions in the bill dealing with funding of the military in Colombia to address a serious problem that cannot be really addressed by the military.

Let me start by stipulating that we have a serious drug problem in this country. I do not think anybody would debate that issue. Part of the reason we have a serious drug problem in the country is that we do not have any kind of rational plan to deal with drug prevention or drug treatment or the consequences of drug use.

Instead of coming up with a plan, we come up with reactionary approaches. We come up with emergency responses. And there is no ongoing plan to deal with this. And that is exactly what we are doing again in this emergency appropriation bill. Instead of coming up with a plan, as the Pelosi amendment has suggested that we need to do, we are funding this on an emergency basis.

Let me be clear that I do not support having the United States military involved in our drug prevention efforts. And we have had a debate many times on this floor, and we have had a policy of not having the United States military involved in drug prevention in this country.

So why in God's name would we, not supporting our own military being involved in drug prevention in our own country, allocate \$1.7 billion to a corrupt military in Colombia to deal with drug interdiction? A military that is part and parcel of the drug problem itself because they have been involved with drug dealing and selling and shipment over and over again in addition to being involved with some of the worst human rights abuses that have taken place in that country.

Why would we as part of a plan, other than as a reactionary approach, where we are just going to throw money after something and send in the military so we can go home and tell folks we have done something? Why would we give money to a corrupt military in another country to do a job that we would not even have the military do in our own country?

This is symptomatic of our approach to issues that are difficult issues. We put some money out there. We say we are sending in the military to solve a problem that is not a military problem, and then we go home and tell our con-

stituents, well, we have done something to solve this problem.

This is exactly the approach we should not be pursuing, and I hope my colleagues will support the Pelosi amendment and reject the underlying provisions in this bill, and support the Ramstad and Campbell amendment that strikes out all of this provision, because it has no place in our policy, no place in a plan, a rational plan to deal with drug abuse in this country.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if our goal is to reduce drug abuse, the \$1.7 billion could be used better on juvenile crime prevention and early intervention programs and drug rehabilitation under the Pelosi amendment than spending that money in Colombia under the bill.

Now, we know how to reduce drug abuse. The drug programs are not perfect, but they are effective. A study of the rehabilitation program in California has shown it to be so effective that it reduced costs in health care, welfare, and crime so much that the State saves \$7 for every dollar it puts into the drug abuse program.

Drug courts have been studied. They send prisoners to drug rehabilitation rather than simply to jail. That program is shown to reduce recidivism more than just sending them to jail and is a little cheaper.

□ 1745

So we know that drug rehabilitation works, and it is cost-effective. We also know that spending \$1.7 billion in Colombia will not make a measurable difference on the amount of drugs consumed in the United States.

Late last year, Mr. Chairman, the Speaker of the House and the minority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, appointed a bipartisan Juvenile Justice Task Force to figure out what we can do to reduce juvenile crime. We invited experts across the country to help us in this process.

And all the testimony that we heard pointed to prevention and early intervention as the appropriate strategies to deal with juvenile crime. We did not hear anyone suggest that spending billions of dollars on interdiction would be an effective strategy for dealing with juvenile crime. We heard about early childhood programs and improved education and afterschool programs.

If we look at \$1.7 billion, we could build four \$1 million boys and girls clubs in every congressional district in this country for that same amount of money, and that is \$1.7 billion. A lot of it we could spend over and over again so we can build more and more boys and girls clubs with that same appropriation.

We have heard stories of the tragedies involving drug use, and we have a choice in this amendment. We can do what works, what is cost-effective, the drug rehabilitation and the prevention and early intervention programs, or we can spend a lot more on a program

which, at best, will have a negligible effect on the amount of crime, on the crime and drugs in the United States.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will have the courage to vote for the choice which will actually reduce crime and drug abuse by adopting the Pelosi amendment.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I, too, rise in strong support of the Pelosi amendment, which would add vital drug prevention and treatment dollars to the emergency supplemental budget.

I cannot remember how long this war against drugs has been going on, but it has been a long, long time. And despite some reports to the contrary, in too many places in this country, we are losing.

I do not necessarily have a problem with appropriations to fight drugs in Colombia or anywhere else and to address the need for increased interdiction. But to do this alone is to employ the same one-sided, near- and short-sighted approach that has not worked through all the plans and in all the years that we have been trying to stem the tide of drugs and stop the scourge of drugs in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to meet and speak with leaders in my part of the world, the Caribbean, on many occasions, and in almost every instance, the issue of drug transshipment and urgings for them to keep their commitment strong in addressing it is always an important part of the conversation.

Do you know what they say to us?

They assure us of their commitment. They do not want what the transshipment does to their countries, and they do not want the risks it presents to their people. They want to stop the flow of drugs in and through their countries.

But they also say to us that the greatest obstacle to stopping the flow is the ready and the large market for the product. It is simple economics, supply being developed to meet a sustained and increasing demand. And I support the Pelosi amendment, because it is only through addressing demand, as well as interdiction, that we will ever win this ongoing war.

I support this amendment for an even more important reason, because we have not adequately addressed poverty, failing schools, poor or no housing and other critical issues facing communities around this country, especially communities of color, drugs; and because of them, HIV and AIDS have taken hold of these communities and threaten to drain the very life blood from our neighborhoods.

In those communities, people want to rid themselves of the illness of addiction. They want treatment, and parents want to help to keep their growing children from being consumed by drugs and AIDS, but they cannot get into treatment.

And the programs to help our kids and divert our children's energies into

positive ways are just not available. The Pelosi amendment would change that, and that is why I support it.

We need to provide funding not just to rid our communities and the country of drug-related crime, but we need it to heal those who have fallen prey to addiction to illicit drugs. And we need it to heal our communities and to make them whole.

I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for her leadership. And I thank all of the others who have spoken in favor of this amendment and in favor of the many in this country who need our voices to speak out on their behalf.

I urge the rest of my colleagues to support the Pelosi amendment and to vote yes.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Let me, first of all, congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her amendment. I think it is important that we highlight the importance in terms of treatment. I think we all recognize from both sides of the aisle the importance of looking at both the supply and the demand. And as we do that, I think it is also critical for us to realize, at least from my perspective, I think I am the only one who is here who has ever had a caseload of 60 heroin addicts and I worked as a case worker.

And when I was working as a case worker, I just want to share with you the frustrations. It seemed like every election, whether it was a Republican or a Democrat, the DA would pick up a case load of heroin addicts that were selling probably enough to just fix themselves.

The reality is that we are not going after the ones that are really selling the items, and we are going after the little guy. If we look at our prisons, we find 70 percent of them are drug-related, a lot of them are black, Hispanic and poor white, but we look in terms of our professionals that are using the drugs out there, we are not doing enough to go after that professional, that individual, that is related to a Congressman, that individual that is an attorney, that individual that is out there, and we are not doing enough there.

What frustrates me is that we have even come up with now a report card on other nations, on how they rank. When are we going to come up with a report card on our own district attorneys, on our own communities? When are we going to hold them accountable?

If we ask the military to come up with a plan, they have come up with a plan, and this is a military plan; but when are we going to ask our own communities to come up with a plan? I think it is important that we recognize that this is a societal problem. It is a problem that America has.

And I can attest, unless we deal with it as a problem that exists within our society, we are not going to be able to make it happen.

Let me just share with my colleagues we have 6 million youngsters right now, 6 million kids on prescription drugs. When I practiced as a social worker, one of the things that we were told, and we used what we call the DSM for diagnostic assessments, that we should use the least restrictive diagnosis in dealing with youngsters.

That was that we do not give a serious diagnosis unless we had to. We used to have what we called adjustment reaction. That was, if any kid got into difficulties, we used "adjustment reaction" and worked on it.

But when we first started to tie in the funding in mental health, when we tied funding to whether the person was going to get reimbursed, then we started giving more serious diagnosis to a lot our youngsters in this country, and we really need to watch that real closely.

We really need to investigate what we are doing in the area of mental health. A lot of our individuals that suffer from mental illness are some of the ones that are self-medicating themselves and getting involved in prescriptions and drugs, both the legal and illegal. I think we really need to go out there and try to do something in those areas.

In addition, if one looks at our media in terms of how it stresses a prescription coverage for any illness that one has, they will have a pill for it. So we really need to kind of look at it and really approach it in a comprehensive manner.

If we ask the military again to come up with a plan, we are going to get a military plan. I am going to be supportive of that. But I think that we also need to look at our backyards. We have to stop scapegoating other countries. We have an obligation in our backyards. We need to hold our own people accountable. We need to hold ourselves accountable. Part of that is treatment.

I want to share with my colleagues that, when I worked in the area of mental health in the city of San Antonio for what we call the major center, which was the community mental health center, now it is referred to by another name, we had two case workers that worked with adolescents. I was one of them. Two for a population of over a million. That, I can attest to my colleagues, has not increased.

We also need, not only in terms of those treatment approaches that vary, some will work with others, some will not, we need, yes, in some cases religious approaches that work with some addicts, others in terms of the methadone program; but we need a combination of all of those approaches.

One of the things that frustrate me is that people, especially adolescents, if they suffer from drug addiction, they are not going to come to see you. I can attest to that. You have to go out there and reach out. We need both a medical model and an outreach model or a social work model that goes out

there after those youngsters and reaches out to them.

The other frustrating thing that we have, and I think that we are definitely not doing enough, is when it comes to our veterans, our veterans are suffering tremendously and a lot of them are abusing alcohol and substance abuse. We need to do more in that area.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to respond to a few of the comments made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) just spoke about the fact to focus on our own backyard and not just focus on interdiction and blaming other countries. He also indicated he would be supportive of interdiction, but we needed to do more than that.

The previous speaker talked about the importance of interdiction but also said, while interdiction may make sense, it is not the only thing we should be doing.

I guess what I am here this evening to talk about is the fact that that is not all we are doing in this Congress, and we need to draw attention to that.

Yes, the President has a plan to try to save Colombia, which is a national security issue as well as a substance abuse or drug issue, and it is a crisis. It is appropriate, I think, to deal with that in a supplemental appropriations bill.

But this Congress, Mr. Chairman, over the last several years has made progress on doing exactly what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is talking about, what the previous speaker is talking about, looking at this issue in a more comprehensive way. Despite what I have heard on the floor today, I think we need to recognize that and look at the track record of this Congress.

First, on a bipartisan basis, we have passed some good legislation from the Drug Free Communities Act, for instance, we passed in 1997. It supports community-based solutions. It focuses on prevention, education, and treatment. It brings all segments of the community together and forces them to deal with the problem in a comprehensive way. It is working.

There are about 3,000 community coalitions now around the country. We hope to double that in the next several years. Incidentally, we are looking for \$40 million for that program this year in the appropriations process. Those who have spoken today and who care about this issue might want to focus on that. The administration requested only \$35 million, under the authorized amount.

The National Youth Antidrug Media Campaign this Congress passed a few years ago, the funding started 2 years ago, an unprecedented amount of Federal support from this Congress to support, yes, an antidrug media campaign that focuses on prevention. It is working. The ads are being tested. \$185 mil-

lion was appropriated by this Congress last year for that program. Over the 5-year period for which it is authorized by this Congress, we will spend, when we conclude the private match over \$2 billion, the largest media campaign in history on drugs or any other issue.

This is something this Congress has done, and we need to do more of it. We need to continue to support that. I have not heard much about that today.

The Drug Demand Reduction Act we passed in 1998 increases the effectiveness of the Safe and Drug Free Schools Act. It authorizes the media campaign I just talked about. It streamlines the antidrug bureaucracy we have of 54 different departments and agencies, to reduce the duplication.

If my colleagues want to be supportive of what is going on here in our backyard, there are lots of ways to do it. There is the Drug Free Workplace Act, which again has been a bipartisan effort of this Congress. We got about \$4 million provided in last year's budget. We are going for more this year. For those who care about issue, through the normal appropriations process, my colleagues will have an opportunity to support the Drug Free Workplace Act. It establishes a new grant program for nonprofits to expand on drug-free workplaces. It also has the Small Business Administration involved directly in efforts to promote drug-free workplaces.

We are asking to do even more in the area of prevention, education, and treatment this year in the appropriations process. I am delighted we have had this debate today, because I have found there is a lot more support for it than I thought there was.

I am not sure the supplemental appropriations bill is the right place to do it. Let us take it through the normal process. Let us support what we have already done. Let us build on that.

This year, let us have a teen drivers' act, where when teens go to get their driver's license, they are asked to be tested. There is a monitoring of that. There is an incentive through insurance discounts if they do it, a voluntary program with real discounts and real incentives.

Let us put enhanced treatment in our jails, in our prisons. If we talk to folks who are involved in this, the only way, we believe, to stop the revolving door to cut that link between addiction and crime is to get more treatment in our jails and prisons. Only 9 percent of prisoners today at those levels are getting that kind of treatment.

□ 1800

We do not have a Federal program to do that now. We need one. The money we would dump into SAMSHA would not help in that regard. That is something this Congress can work on in a bipartisan basis, and there will be proposals to do that later this year. This is something that we can do and we can do through the regular order.

My only point is not that we should not be focused on the comprehensive picture, it is that we have been. And this Congress, over the last few years, has a lot to be proud of in terms of focus and in terms of resources, putting unprecedented amounts of money into prevention, education, and treatment. We need now to build on that. We need not, though, at the same time, to say that there is not an issue with regard to interdiction.

I have tended to focus more on the demand side. But if we take our eye off the ball on the supply side, what will happen? We will get increased supplies from foreign countries and what we will have is also reduced cost and cost is a factor in this. So we need to do both. It needs to be a balanced approach. We need to reduce demand for drugs, and we need to help move this country toward a drug free America.

The Speaker spoke earlier today about his willingness to do that. He spoke about his willingness through the regular process, not through the crisis in Colombia, but through the regular process to enhance our efforts on prevention, education and treatment, and I think this Congress ought to take him up on that.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this has really been quite an interesting discussion we have had, and I want to thank the gentleman from California for being so creative and providing us a way for this discussion to go on.

Mr. Chairman, we have been dealing with a war on drugs all the years of this past decade that I have served in the Congress, and quite a few years before that. And I doubt that any single one of us, reading the evidence, could say that we are winning that war on drugs. Generally, I think we do understand that if the war on drugs is to be won, then it is going to have to be a combination of efforts, where demand reduction here at home is going to have to go hand-in-hand with the supply interdiction that occurs at the source. But surely it ought to be a balance that uses most of the most effective effort.

In fact, research by the Rand Corporation has shown that in order to get the same benefit that \$1 spent on treatment in education-on-demand reduction here at home we would have to spend about \$20 in interdiction at the source in order to get the same benefit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, because the full amendment that had been offered and debated in the full Committee on Appropriations, the full amendment that was to be proposed and had been proposed before the Committee on Rules by the gentleman from California, was not made in order, the gentleman had no choice, had no way of entering this debate except to make an amendment that would cut \$50 million out of a program that has never been authorized by this Congress. It was her only way to focus on this utter folly of

misexpenditure where that \$50 million would do 20 times the benefit, at least 20 times the benefit, if that same \$50 million that she has proposed to cut were to be used here at home on drug treatment and demand reduction here at home.

Mr. Chairman, it is more than an hour ago that the distinguished gentleman, also from California, who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, said that he would be happy to join with the gentlewoman from California, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, in doing an effective demand reduction program, expansion of a demand reduction program. Well, he had that opportunity within the full Committee on Appropriations; and if that amendment had been made in order today, he would have had that opportunity again today.

It is more than 2 hours ago that the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, had said, in justifying why the amendment that was offered by the gentlewoman from California was not made in order, to be debated in proper order, in general order here, he said that the President had not asked for dollars to fight domestic drugs; and if he had asked for money to fight the domestic drug program, that we would have appropriated it.

Well, I have never before noticed any reluctance by the majority to go beyond what this President has requested, if it was appropriate to do so. And I simply do not understand why we would not go after drug demand here at home, drug-demand reduction here at home when that is so clearly known, so clearly shown to be the most effective way to get about winning the war on drugs.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pelosi amendment, and I thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment because we desperately need to address the growing demand for drugs here in our own country, and we must address drug treatment programs.

Today, we are spending time, a lot of time, debating whether to appropriate funds to fight the supply side of the narcotics problem in Colombia. This debate is not complete unless we also tackle the connection between America's growing demand for drugs from other countries, like Colombia. In order for our international drug control policy to succeed, our drug policy must be balanced. It cannot focus only on supply reduction.

We must also include demand reduction right here at home. To do this, we must incorporate the Pelosi amend-

ment, as it rightly addresses the treatment gap on this side of the hemisphere. This amendment will expand our country's existing infrastructure for treatment. This investment will leverage additional local and State funds. It will strengthen State and local coordination and help to integrate service delivery. This funding will help our youth avoid a life of drugs and treat current drug users to help them turn their lives around. The amendment focuses on youth, while allowing communities to invest these funds according to local priorities.

Every day our children are bombarded with suggestive messages and opportunities to take drugs. Effective prevention programs engage youth interactively, involve parents and families, and start at a young age to build skills and reinforce a message over the long term. While children are only 25 percent of our population, they are 100 percent of our future. We must address their future. We must address the future of all children, particularly those involved in or at risk of drug abuse.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress needs to refocus its priorities. Each \$1 invested in drug abuse prevention will save \$15 in reduced health, justice and other societal costs. Each \$1 invested in drug use prevention will save communities \$4 to \$5 in costs for drug abuse counseling and treatment.

Mr. Chairman, we need to put people before weapons systems. For the total cost of each of the requests of 30 Blackhawk helicopters, we could treat 5,173 substance abusers or provide prevention services to 111,494 American children. If this Congress can fund \$1.3 billion for "Plan Colombia" to reduce supply internationally, we can surely afford to fund treatment services and prevention programs to reduce demand here in America.

I urge my colleagues to support the Pelosi amendment and support our youth.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen this movie before, starring Harrison Ford: Clear and Present Danger. Unfortunately, Harrison Ford did not win an Oscar for his role, but, quite frankly, some of my colleagues could have won an Oscar for their supporting cast in today's movie, which we have already dictated and determined what the future and outcome will be. Let us look at some of the underlying scripted parts of this movie, as I prepare to yield to the gentlewoman from California for her closing remarks.

The cost of the helicopters alone would provide treatment for almost 200,000 substance users or drug prevention services for more than 4 million Americans. Arianna Huffington, in her article "Drug War Comes at a High Price," was right. We are about to spend close to \$2 billion on Colombia, while here at home we have 3.6 million addicts not receiving the treatment

they need. This despite the fact that drug czar Barry McCaffery's budget is expected to rise to a proposed \$19.2 billion this year.

When Richard Nixon declared a war on drugs in 1971, he directed more than 60 percent of the funds into treatment. Now we are down to 18 percent. And since 1980, through both Republican and Democratic administrations, the emphasis has turned to interdiction, crop eradication, border surveillance and punishment. The evidence is clear, and that has been the misguided use of resources. But putting \$1.7 billion into Colombia in the middle of a civil war is more than misguided. Quite frankly, from my perspective, it is nuts.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from California, the distinguished ranking member on this committee who has done an outstanding job. And her leadership comes at a high price at this time during our Nation's history.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his very important statement on this significant subject, which is as personal as our own families and as important to our country as our national security.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank Members on both sides of the aisle, our distinguished chairman, our distinguished ranking member, for the very, very serious debate that we have had on this subject. It is a subject worthy of serious debate.

Let us stipulate from the start that we all agree that every person in this body wants to fight the scourge of substance abuse in our country. There is no question about that. Let us also agree that we want to help Colombia, President Pastrana. I think we all agree he is a very courageous person and has a very difficult challenge. The people of Colombia have suffered so many years because of drugs and because of the civil war, whatever they are calling it down there, and so we want to help them. But is this the right way to go?

As a Member, along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations, we know what the need is in SAMHSA, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. We have fought hard, in a bipartisan way, for more funding for substance abuse for treatment on demand for substance abusers. We have a golden opportunity, a golden opportunity in a supplemental bill to do drastically more.

So to those who say let us do this in the regular process, we have caps in the regular process. We have no offsets in a supplemental emergency bill. So that is why this is a golden opportunity. If we can spend \$1.3 out of a package of \$1.7 billion to send to Colombia within an emergency bill, we should be able to do at least that in our

own country. Our agencies can absorb it. The absorptive capacity is there and the need is there.

The need is this: Five and a half million people in our country are substance abusers. Of that number, 37 percent, or 2 million, have access to treatment. We have a 63 percent treatment gap. So, yes, we are doing something on substance abuse, but we are not doing nearly enough. And it should be our priority to start at home, to begin at home to address the demand side of this. Let us face it. If we eradicated every coca leaf in Colombia, do my colleagues think that that would be the end of the drug problem in our country? No. But we can help Colombia by eliminating the market for that coca leaf in the United States.

So my colleagues, as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, I have seen this "Plan Colombia" close up. We are supposed to put up \$1.3 billion, \$1.7 billion, in the fuller process over \$7 billion. We are told that our plan is heavily military because the rest of the \$7.5 billion is going to be humanitarian. We have not seen one penny of that other money.

We have not seen the elites of Colombia stand up to the occasion and meet the needs of the poor people in that country. The disparity in income and the poverty level there is so oppressive, yet the elites are running off to Florida. So let us be fair to our own people. Let us have treatment on demand in this full committee. And in that spirit, Mr. Chairman, I again thank our colleagues for the seriousness of this debate on both sides.

□ 1815

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her demonstrated ability to organize a very effective filibuster which we have enjoyed the last couple of hours. But it is essential that we get on with the consideration of this bill.

I would ask for a "no" vote on the amendment of the gentlewoman.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment sponsored by my colleague Mrs. PELOSI of California. This amendment, which recognizes the need to focus on reducing supply and decreasing demand in the fight against drugs, promotes a common sense approach to this problem. It devastates homes, communities and our nation at large. When excessive youth drug abuse, reduced treatment facilities and scare prevention services are the norm; we need to act. The Pelosi amendment does act. This measure adds much needed funds to drug prevention and treatment programs which are making a difference in the war against drugs.

If we fund \$1.3 billion for "Plan Colombia" to reduce supply internationally, less than half of that money will be used for treatment service and prevention programs to reduce de-

mand domestically. It is reprehensible to support a plan which authorizes money for Colombia's drug interdiction programs, when there are 5.7 million Americans in need of substance abuse treatment. In addition, it is not responsible drug policy to stop the supply of drugs from Colombia while virtually ignoring the fact that the demand for drugs especially among our youth has gone largely unchecked.

As the Representative of a mostly minority district I am keenly aware of the devastating affect that drugs has on the minority community. Drugs abuse and related illnesses such as HIV and AIDS have debilitating effects on women, people of color and the poor. If a \$1 investment in drug abuse prevention will save \$15 in reduced health, justice and other societal cost, most of which are felt within the minority community, it is logical to conclude that prevention programs are needed just as much as interdiction programs.

Yes, we need to address the supply of drugs to this nation but not at the cost of neglecting the treatment needs of this nation's addicts and our youth who are being lured into the drug trap every day. Let us put our drug control funds to use in programs that will be of greatest benefit to Americans. Successful drug prevention programs benefit individuals, families, communities, and this country. The country of Colombia cannot ensure the welfare of our citizens; we can. I strongly support the Pelosi amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HUTCHINSON

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. HUTCHINSON:

Page 2, after line 21, insert the following:

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES

Of the unobligated balances available in the program under this heading, \$15,000,000 shall be used for policing initiatives to combat methamphetamine production and trafficking.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment which addresses an emergency need not only in my State of Arkansas but in many States around the country facing a methamphetamine epidemic. Let me give the history.

First of all, in the 1990s, Congress recognized that the State needed some help in cleaning up these very dangerous methamphetamine labs and the environmental problems associated with it. So in 1998 and 1999, Congress

provided funds to the DEA through the COPS program to help them clean up these meth sites.

Then it changed in the last Congress. In the last appropriation bill, they took a different approach; and instead of giving the money to the DEA through the COPS program, they earmarked \$35 million for about 15 sites.

For all those sites that were not listed, including Arkansas, the DEA has been using left-over funds to help the local law enforcement clean up these sites. The problem is that pot of money has completely run out. There is no more money there and leaving the law enforcement with a very difficult problem. They bust a lab, but they have no resources in which to clean up the environmental problems and clean up the lab itself.

The amendment I am offering would provide \$15 million of the COPS program money to fund cleanup costs across the country through the end of this fiscal year. I believe this is an appropriate use of the COPS money, and it will help our police on the streets.

Three points of clarification, Mr. Chairman. First of all, this money, very importantly, was previously appropriated. It is not new money. Secondly, this will not impact the 15 sites that have been designated in the appropriation bill. And thirdly, it is for cleanup costs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, make no mistake about it, if they are in rural east Tennessee, the biggest drug problem they face is not from overseas, it is somebody's garage close by where methamphetamine may be being made by young people who read about it on the Internet.

The year before last, 42 labs were seized in Tennessee. Last year, 116 labs were seized in Tennessee. So far in this fiscal year, just in a few months, 137 labs had been seized. This is an epidemic.

General Barry McCaffrey says, "a seriously potentially national problem to become the next crack cocaine epidemic." McCaffrey says, "Methamphetamine remains one of the most dangerous substances America has ever confronted. It is proliferating terribly."

Local law enforcement breaks a lab up. They have a toxic site. It costs \$5,000 to clean it up. There is no way local law enforcement can keep up with this.

Our committee is doing a great job of fighting it. We have got to have DOJ's help. We have got to have the COPS program help. This \$15 million is the least we can do to help local law enforcement break up methamphetamines and clean up the labs.

This is a cancer in our culture, and it is attacking rural America. We have got to fight it at the State, local, and

Federal level. We need this amendment to pass.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for yielding me the time. I appreciate very much to have an opportunity to speak in support of the Hutchinson amendment.

Methamphetamine continues to ravage our communities. Now is the time, in my opinion, to take immediate and aggressive action and to continue immediate and aggressive action to bring it under control. We cannot allow this crisis to continue.

I have traveled with local law enforcement and drug rehabilitation experts throughout my district, and I have seen firsthand the damage this is reaping on our communities.

Today, I am proud to support this amendment to make an extra \$15 million available to the Drug Enforcement Agency to assist the cost in cleaning up meth labs.

Meth is the greatest threat to our young people I have ever seen. In fact, I would tell my colleagues that, in my lifetime, I have never seen anything more threatening internally to our country than what I perceive methamphetamine to be. And it is a real threat, and we are in a battle that we must win. We must win this.

Local law enforcement agencies are already working under extremely tight budgetary conditions. The high cost of cleaning up just one of these meth labs can mean the complete disruption of normal law enforcement activities and can wipe out their budget and their resources.

This is just a part of my efforts to battle meth. I have also introduced this, and I will call this to the attention of my friend from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), listen to this, we have introduced the Comprehensive Methamphetamine Abuse Reduction Act. This measure takes a multipronged approach to the problem and will provide our communities with the tools they need to win the battle against meth. I will hope my colleague will look at that.

This measure takes a multipronged approach, as we have said. The initiative increases resources for law enforcement to combat meth labs and traffickers and provides funds for State and local establishments to be involved in the program.

In closing, I want to say I strongly support the HUTCHINSON amendment. We must do all we can to win this battle with meth.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) and thank him for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hutchinson amendment. I also want to thank my colleague from

Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for his leadership in this matter.

We have a serious problem in this country, and we have a very serious problem in Arkansas with illegal meth labs. Our law enforcement people struggle every day to deal with it. It is absolutely ridiculous that they would not have the resources they need after they find one of these meth labs and do what they need to do to destroy them to take care of this problem.

I urge all the Members to support this amendment and let us do everything we can to fight this horrible scourge on our society.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman and I appreciate all of our efforts to get on top of this methamphetamine scourge that has so taken our country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), who has certainly recognized the extraordinary problem in our State that faces our law enforcement.

Every day we wake up to the newspaper that talks about another meth lab being busted and then, most recently, that the DEA is out of funds with which to help our local law enforcement in the cleanup.

This puts our law enforcement at a terrible problem, because we have had more meth lab busts in the last year per capita, I think we are second in the Nation, in terms of how many labs that have been busted. So I want to congratulate my friend and colleague for his work on this. I think this is very important. And the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) that just spoke, I appreciate his work on this and recognizing the problem.

It is not just Arkansas I have talked about, but it is California, it is Iowa, it is Oklahoma. There have been many speakers that have wanted to express their concern about this and their hope that this will be addressed, this emergency spending bill.

I want to end by saying that this emergency spending bill fights the war on drugs in the backyard of our hemisphere, which is very important and I support that. But my amendment that is supported by my colleagues fights the war against methamphetamine in our children's backyard. It is in our communities. And that is why this is so important to get us through this year, to help our local law enforcement; and then we can do it the right way in the next budget cycle.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say I appreciate the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and his concerns regarding this problem. And it is a problem. I do not oppose the amendment.

As I understand it, his amendment would provide funding to help State and local law enforcement agencies pay

the cleanup costs associated with methamphetamine labs that they have seized.

In the subcommittee on which I am chairman, we have heard testimony about the proliferation of this problem throughout the country. The gentleman is right on target.

Due to increased seizures of these labs the funding for this program has been depleted. They have to be dealt with in a certain way because of the hazardous wastes involved.

I do not oppose this amendment. But let me point out one thing to the gentleman. The Department of Justice, today, could reprogram or seek to reprogram funds from the COPS program to address this problem. If they will send a letter here saying, we wish to take X dollars from the COPS program and apply it to the meth lab program, I will sign it and the money will be provided out of this year's bill.

So I would hope they will do that. We can get the moneys flowing immediately to our State and local agencies. This amendment would no longer be required.

But, as I understand it, the concern of the gentleman is that the reprogramming request is stuck up at the White House, at the OMB; and, as a result, the problem is not being addressed.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the folks at the OMB would realize the danger that they are causing out across this country by not sending up the request to change monies from the COPS program to methamphetamine lab cleanup.

It is on their desk. It is on their shoulders. I would hope that they would do that. As soon as that request hits my desk, it will be signed and on its way.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. SAWYER:

Page 8, line 13, before the period insert the following: " : *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$50,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for internally displaced persons in Colombia".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER).

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say that the struggle that is going on in Colombia is

going on not only for the sake of drugs but for the sake of an important nation in our hemisphere. And for that reason, I would submit that any new U.S. aid package to Colombia should allocate a modest but substantial amount of money to directly deal with displaced communities and persons and bring about humanitarian aid for resettlement, reintegration, and development assistance.

Displaced people in Colombia live in fear. They receive little or no assistance from their own government or the international community. I am concerned that U.S. aid will have little effect if this refugee crisis is not addressed.

The common dimension when we are talking about Kosovo or Bosnia or Rwanda or Liberia or so many other places on Earth is one that is shared with Colombia, and that is the extraordinary number of displaced persons who themselves are a destabilizing force within the country that we are trying to stabilize.

The refugee crisis is even bigger than that which was experienced in Kosovo. A million and a half people are streaming towards borders and to the outskirts of cities where camps are themselves destabilizing. This has become not only a symptom of Colombia's instability but is a cause of Colombia's instability. It is something that, for a modest investment, we can make the dollars that are going in other programmatic areas pay off many times over.

□ 1830

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of this amendment. I want to speak about Colombia in a way that has not been spoken tonight on this floor and it has been a long day but I am the only Member to rise who has lived in Colombia. I lived there for 2 years. I represented this country as a member of the Peace Corps. Colombia is a beautiful country. It is one of the most diverse countries in the world. It is one of the oldest democracies in Latin America. It is now plagued; it is torn apart.

The root causes of its problems right now are drugs and corruption from those drugs. Colombia has over \$5 billion inside Colombia that is corrupt money. Think what that would do in your own State if that money was used for corruption. There is an obscene amount of money. This war on drugs, this displacement of people, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER) says, it has displaced a million and a half people, a million and a half people that do not have homes, do not have schools for their kids, do not have health care centers. These people become a problem in themselves because they have to resort to petty crime. So the only way we can begin solving the problem which is drugs in our country is to deal

with the root causes of drugs in Colombia. That has got to be in this bill.

A lot of people have talked about the problems of this bill, what it has, what it does not have. But, Mr. Chairman, there is a point when we have to stop our partisan bickering and say are we going to let a country continue to burn, a country continue to not have a solution to a problem or are we going to stand up and face the responsibility that we have been asked, not the only country to be asked, one of the countries to be asked to help with a plan that Colombians have derived. That plan is complete. But the one lacking part in it, the one lacking part in money is earmarking that money for the people who have been displaced.

I hope this amendment is accepted, because this amendment does not spend any more money, it just takes \$50 million and says you have got to deal with the homeless population, you have got to deal with the displaced people. If you do not deal with them, we cannot do all these other things. You cannot just attack this problem by dealing with the eradication of drugs. You have got to attack it in a comprehensive way. I think the bill speaks to a lot of points. This amendment makes it a better bill. I ask that it be supported.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will control the time otherwise reserved for opposition.

There was no objection.

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

I just wanted to say to the gentleman, we have no problem with the amendment, we are willing to accept the amendment. It is not incompatible with the report that accompanies the bill that we reported from the committee.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman for his comments. It is a modest amount of money, it is achieved through reprogramming of already existing dollars and will save many dollars in the future.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi:

Page 5, after line 7, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1202. (a) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN COLUMBIA.—The number of members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Colombia at any time may not exceed 300.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—(1) The limitation in subsection (a) does not apply to members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Colombia for the purpose of rescuing or retrieving United States military or civilian government personnel. The period for which a member of the Armed Forces of the United States may be in Colombia under this paragraph may not exceed 30 days unless expressly authorized by law.

(2) The limitation in subsection (a) does not apply to a member of the Armed Forces assigned to the United States Embassy in Colombia as an attache or as a member of the Marine Corps security detachment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, we have been involved in a long debate today about what exactly our Nation should do on the war on drugs. There are some who advocate spending a great deal of money and possibly using the Armed Forces of the United States in the war in Colombia.

Mr. Chairman, as we speak we have Americans, since I have been a Member of Congress, who have been sent to the Gulf, to Haiti, to Somalia, to Rwanda, to Bosnia, to Kosovo and there are now about 200 Americans who are stationed, involved in training the Colombians in Colombia.

My amendment is straightforward. It would reserve the rights and the duties that are assigned to Congress in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution which is to decide where and when Americans get involved in a war to Congress. It would limit the number of United States personnel in Colombia to 300. It would provide an exception to that, that for 30 days the Armed Forces could break this limitation if need be in order to rescue Americans, be they in the military or not.

Mr. Chairman, in testimony before the Committee on Armed Services last week when asked the question, General Wilhelm, our Southern Commander said that he would support a limitation of troop strength in Colombia. I am asking for this country to do this. There is a great deal of fear that there could be unintended consequences.

We all know what happens once Americans are under fire, once they are challenged, it will be the response of this country that we will do whatever it takes to win that conflict. I think that question needs to be asked now rather than later.

As the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) pointed out, this is indeed one of the most dangerous places on earth. We have Seal teams there, we have Special Forces A teams there, we have had submarines off the coast, we have

had people involved in riverine operations. In the course of a year, we have about 3,000 Americans transit through Colombia. Yet this Congress has never decided whether or not we are going to get involved militarily in Colombia.

I hear on a daily basis my colleagues lament the fact that time and time again Americans are sent on deployment without congressional approval. This would allow the present situation to continue but would not allow it to grow beyond 300 men without the Armed Forces of the United States coming to Congress and asking for a change in policy.

I am told that in the 1950s, then Senator John Stennis, when the Nation of Vietnam was asking for airplane mechanics asked the question of his colleagues, what happens if the mechanics are fired upon, what happens then? Apparently as a Nation we did not do a very good job of deciding for ourselves the answer then. I would hope we do a much better job of deciding that question now. I would ask my colleagues to support this language and to see to it that we do not get further dragged into this war.

I would also remind my colleagues that as we seem to be getting dragged further into this war, the Colombian people who have the most to lose seem to be doing less. In the past month or so, they have changed their constitution so that people who have a high school diploma are no longer eligible for the draft. They have changed their laws to decrease the amount of money they are spending on defense. One cannot help but be left with the feeling that the Colombians are expecting the United States of America, brave young Americans to fight their war for them. I want to send them a very strong message that this is not the case. We will help you with materiel, we will help you with training, but we are not going to send young Americans down to Colombia to fight your civil war for you.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida wish to assert his point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do.

I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part, "an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." The amendment is legislation.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this is an emergency supplemental bill about Colombia. It is all about the Colombian civil war, whether or not we are going to get further involved in the Colombian civil war. I would remind my colleagues that Co-

lombia is seven times bigger than Vietnam. This bill calls for 62 additional helicopters to be sent to Colombia. At the height of the Vietnam War, there were 2,200 American helicopters in Vietnam.

I would ask the Chairman, since he is in many ways deciding whether or not the United States of America is going to get involved in the Colombian civil war, to be extremely lenient in his decision, because this bill is indeed about Colombia. This would place restrictions on the spending of that money in Colombia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) does explicitly supersede existing law. The provision therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. GILMAN:

Page 9, after line 4, insert the following:

CHAPTER 5

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 1501. (a) CONDITIONS ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR COLOMBIA.—

(1) CERTIFICATION.—None of the funds appropriated in this title for military assistance may be made available to the Government of Colombia until the President submits to the Congress a certification that—

(A) the Government of Colombia has agreed to and is implementing a strategy to eliminate Colombia's total coca and opium poppy production by 2005 through a mix of alternative development programs; manual eradication; aerial spraying of chemical herbicides; tested, environmentally safe mycoherbicides; and the destruction of illicit narcotics laboratories on Colombian territory;

(B) the head of the Colombian Armed Forces has been granted and is exercising authority that is identical to that held by the head of the Colombian National Police to summarily dismiss Colombian Armed Forces personnel for gross violations of human rights;

(C) the Colombian Armed Forces are cooperating with civilian authorities in investigating Colombian Armed Forces personnel where credible evidence exists of gross violations of human rights, and, if those investigations result in indictments, the Colombian Armed Forces are cooperating with civilian authorities in prosecuting and punishing such personnel in the civilian courts; and

(D) the Colombian Armed Forces are developing and deploying in their field units a Judge Advocate General Corps to investigate Colombian Armed Forces personnel for gross violations of human rights.

(2) WAIVER.—The President may waive the limitation in paragraph (1) if the President determines that the waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(b) MONITORING.—Of the funds made available under this title—

(1) up to \$1,500,000 shall be made available to provide comprehensive law of war training

and to support the development of a judge advocate general corps to investigate Colombian Armed Forces personnel who are credibly alleged to have committed gross violations of human rights;

(2) up to \$250,000 shall be made available to enhance the United States Embassy's capabilities to monitor the use of United States assistance to Colombian Armed Forces to investigate reports of gross violations of human rights involving United States assistance; and

(3) up to \$250,000 shall be made available to enhance the United States Embassy's capabilities to monitor the role of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), or the United Colombian Self Defense organization (AUC) in criminal acts against American citizens and property, including, but not limited to, kidnapping, extortion, murder, and terrorist acts.

SEC. 1502. (a) DENIAL OF VISAS FOR PERSONS CREDIBLY ALLEGED TO HAVE AIDED AND ABETTED COLOMBIAN INSURGENT AND PARAMILITARY GROUPS.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act for any fiscal year for the Department of State may be used to issue visas to any person who has been credibly alleged to have provided direct or indirect support to the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), or the United Colombian Self Defense organization (AUC), including conspiracy to allow, facilitate, or promote the illegal activities of such groups.

(b) EXEMPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of State finds, on a case-by-case basis, that the entry into the United States of a person who would otherwise be excluded under this section is necessary for medical reasons, or to permit the prosecution of such person in the United States, or the person has cooperated fully with the investigation of crimes committed by individuals associated with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), or the United Colombian Self Defense organization (AUC).

(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if the President determines that the waiver is in the national interest.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Gilman-Goss-Delahunt-Farr amendment which is the result of true bipartisan cooperation. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), and the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for their patience, cooperation, and willingness to work on this issue.

We have a responsibility, Mr. Chairman, to stop the drugs that are poisoning our communities. We also must do our part to see that human rights are protected in Colombia. This emergency supplemental appropriations bill and this amendment gives us the tools

to do what is right by our Nation and by Colombia, our troubled Andean neighbor.

This amendment establishes common sense benchmarks that would make delivery of military assistance to the Colombian Army contingent upon the President certifying the following: An agreement by the government of Colombia to a strategy to completely eliminate illicit drug cultivation by the year 2005. Certifying that the commander of Colombia's Armed Forces having the same authority as the director general of Colombia's national police to dismiss persons for gross violations of human rights. Further certifying that Colombia's Armed Forces cooperating with civilian authorities in the investigation and prosecution in civilian courts of gross human rights abuses by Armed Forces personnel. And also certifying Colombia's Armed Forces developing and deploying a judge advocate general corps.

This amendment would make funds available to support the creation in the Colombian Armed Forces of a judge advocate general corps. It would also make funds available to enhance the American embassy's capabilities to monitor U.S. assistance to Colombia's military as well as to look into crimes committed against American citizens and property by narcoterrorist guerrillas and paramilitary groups.

Horrible acts of violence are visited on Colombians by insurgent and paramilitary groups. Just this past Saturday, Mr. Chairman, 26 Colombian policemen and eight civilians were brutally slain. Some were beheaded by the FARC. This amendment would deny U.S. visas to persons supporting illegal activities by insurgent and paramilitary groups. Our amendment includes appropriate waiver authorities to preserve the President's ability to protect American national interests. I join the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) in urging the managers to ensure that the President would provide written justification to the Congress if the waiver authority is invoked.

Our amendment advances core American values in our fight against drug traffickers by establishing meaningful conditions to safeguard human rights. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

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

□ 1845

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here long enough to see a few of these fights before, and whenever the question of military aid comes up, the question of human rights also arises. So we have to face the question: How much murder, how much torture, how much corruption are we going to tolerate on the part of parties to whom we are providing aid?

Invariably, what happens is that a set of so-called standards are drawn up which sound very good. They give Members of Congress a fig leaf that they can stand behind to give the impression that they are really doing something for human rights, but then they contain a perennial presidential waiver.

On occasion, presidential waivers are justified. But when Congress routinely sets human rights standards which can then be routinely waived by the President, it cheapens the process and trivializes our concern about human rights. It lets Congress claim credit for the aid that is being provided; it lets Congress claim credit for protecting human rights when, in reality, it does not in any meaningful way. Then it leaves the President standing there as a punching bag no matter what he does, whether he waives or whether he does not waive, those standards. I think that that, in the process, trivializes everything that we deal with on issues like this.

I think that is the reason why groups such as Amnesty International and other human rights organizations are opposed to this amendment. They understand that this amendment does not do what it purports to do, which is assure that the Colombian government and the parties with whom we will be dealing with, in fact, live up to the standards we expect them to live up to on human rights.

In my view, until we do have language that does assure that, we most certainly should not support either this bill or this amendment, which makes it easier to continue the charade in this case that we have seen so often in Salvador, in Nicaragua, in Guatemala, in Indonesia, and in a number of other places around the world.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to rise in support of this amendment, also as a cosponsor of the amendment. I would like to take issue with my colleague who just pointed out that this will not make this a better bill.

Obviously, this amendment makes this a much better bill. In reading the amendment the beginning says, "None of the funds appropriated in this title for military assistance may be made available to the government of Colombia until the President submits to Congress a certification that Colombia has done the following things: that Colombia has agreed to implementing a strategy to eliminate Colombia's total coca and opium poppy production by the year 2005 through a mix of alternative development programs, by manual eradication," and so on.

It goes on to say, "The head of the Colombian Armed Forces has been

granted and is exercising authority that is identical to that held by the head of the Colombian National Police to summarily dismiss Colombian Armed Forces personnel for gross violations of human rights."

It goes on to say, "The Colombian Armed Forces are assuring that they are cooperating with civilian authorities in investigating Colombian Armed Forces personnel who have credible evidence of gross human rights violations," and so on.

This bill says we can have a waiver only by the United States President. Guess what? It is the same waiver that this Congress approved when Senator LEAHY added it in the 105th and 106th Congresses. It is the same waiver that is in the law now, is the waiver that is being repeated here.

Is it a stronger bill with this amendment? Absolutely. I would urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment. It makes it a better bill for us to make sure that if, indeed, we are going to be involved in conflict in Colombia dealing with civilian populations, that we are going to abide by the world standards on human rights protection, and it allows for monitoring those protections so that we in Congress can be certified that it is doing a good job.

I ask for support of the amendment. Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for his support of the measure.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the distinguished chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment. It is a strong statement of the U.S. effort to deal with the human rights issue. It is an amendment with teeth, and it deserves the support of every Member of this House.

We know we have to be especially sensitive to possible human rights abuses by recipients of U.S. assistance. We understand that. The American people deserve to know that we have done our very best to ensure that their tax dollars do not distribute to such horrible activities, the kinds of things we read about with disgust.

The gentleman from New York explained that the amendment does several things, but I want to focus on what I believe is the critical part. It prohibits any military assistance from being made available until the President of the United States certifies to Congress the following: first, that Colombia has a sound strategy to eliminate illicit drug cultivation by 2005. If the U.S. is going to provide assistance,

we reason, we better make certain our partner is up to the task and has the tools to do it.

Second, that the Colombian armed forces have the authority to deal with human rights violators in their ranks. This is a new departure, and it is critical; and it is part of the deal.

Third, that the Colombian military is cooperating with civilian authorities in the investigation and prosecution of gross human rights abuses.

These three requirements really get to the crux of the debate. They ensure that U.S. money is being provided to a partner that shares our determination to put the drug traffickers out of business and our commitment to do so in a way consistent with U.S. values and human rights concerns. On top of that, we have added a few dollars to make sure that the monitoring capabilities of our U.S. embassy and other appropriate concerns are fully provided for.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

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

As someone who was here during the El Salvador debate, not as a Member, but as a staffer, I saw firsthand how Congress trivialized the human rights issue with the passage of the so-called El Salvador certification language. The words in the certification amendments were always strong, always talked very passionately about human rights; but what we saw was that each time the certification was up for review, the Presidents who were in the White House routinely approved that language. One of the reasons why, I think, was because we were so much involved in that conflict in El Salvador.

I would support this amendment if, in fact, there were not so many waivers and there were not so many escape hatches. I would support this amendment if it truly meant what I think the proponents of this amendment wanted it to mean, and that is a serious statement in defense of human rights in Colombia.

The fact of the matter is, there is nothing preventing a future President, whoever that President will be next year, from basically ignoring everything in this amendment. If we are serious about human rights, let us put teeth in this amendment. I oppose this amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), a member of our Committee on International Relations who has visited Colombia on a number of occasions.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that does have teeth. Historically, it is no secret. The military in Colombia has had an abysmal human rights record. It has been appalling. Until recently, the majority of human rights abuses, better than 50 percent were perpetrated against the civilian population by the Colombian military. But it would be unfair, and it

would not reflect the current reality in Colombia if we did not acknowledge the significant progress that has been made under the leadership of President Pastrana and the new head of the Colombian armed forces, General Topeos.

According to our own State Department records, from 1994 to 1998, the percentage of human rights abuses directly attributable to the military declined from better than 50 percent down to 3 percent. President Pastrana and General Topeos correctly point out the recent dismissal of seven generals, two of whom are under indictment, and the referral of three colonels to the civilian courts for prosecution for human rights violations as evidence that things are changing. This is nothing less than astounding, given the historical record.

But let us be clear. I am not suggesting in any way that we or the Colombian government should be satisfied. There is still a long road ahead of us, particularly in light of recent human rights reports from well-respected human rights organizations asserting continuing links between the Colombian military and the paramilitaries. We have to go further, much further.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Latin American director of Human Rights Watch, who urged that new conditions be placed on all security assistance to Colombia, and I submit that this amendment does exactly that. The amendment goes much further than the current Leahy amendment. It would apply not only to the two counternarcotics battalions that are envisioned in the bill, but it would apply to the entire military structure, the culture, if you will.

Mr. Chairman, passage of this amendment, I submit, has the potential to effect a fundamental change in the Colombian military that will ensure once and for all its compatibility with democratic principles and respect for human rights. I have no doubt also that it will advance the peace process that recently has produced positive results. Because we are truly serious about substantial and permanent reduction of the flow of cocaine into the United States from Colombia, it is absolutely essential that this peace process be advanced.

Historically, it is no secret that the military in Colombia has had an abysmal human rights record. It has truly been appalling. Until recently the majority of human rights abuses—better than 50 percent committed against the civilian population of Colombia—according to the Department of State annual human rights reports—were directly attributable to the military. Not to the paramilitary. But to the Colombian military itself.

But it would be unfair. And it would not reflect the current reality in Colombia, if we did not acknowledge significant progress under the leadership of President Pastrana and the new head to the Colombian Armed Forces, General Fernando Topeos. According to DOS—from 1994 to 1998 the percentage of human rights abuses directly attributable to the military declined from more than 50 percent to less than 3 percent. President

Pastrana and General Topeos can correctly point to the dismissal of 7 generals—2 of whom are under indictment and the recent referral of 3 colonels to the civilian courts for prosecution for human rights violations as evidence that much has changed. This is nothing less than astounding given the historical record. But let's be clear. I am not suggesting in any way that we or the Colombian Government should be satisfied. There is still a long, long road ahead of us.

Particularly in light of recent human rights reports, from well respected human rights organizations, asserting continuing links between the Colombian military and the paramilitaries. We have to go further—much further.

The respected co-chair of the Human Rights Caucus, Representative LANTOS, in a Dear Colleague letter he has circulated in support of the aid package points out that all assistance provided to Colombia will go to fully vetted forces pursuant to the so-called Leahy amendment. Which means that every single soldier assigned to these two Counter-Narcotics Battalions envisioned will be reviewed and scrutinized to determine their commitment to human rights. I agree with Mr. LANTOS that it is important that Leahy applies. However, if it stood alone, I believe it would be insufficient. And would not support the Aid package.

I agree with the Latin American Director of Human Rights Watch—who according to a story in the February 24 edition of the Washington Post urged that strict new conditions be placed on all security assistance to Colombia.

I submit that this amendment accomplishes just that. This amendment goes much further than the current Leahy Amendment. It would not apply only to the two Counter Narcotics Battalions envisioned in the bill. It impacts the entire structure—the culture if you will—of the military as an institution in Colombia.

There are two key provisions:

It transfers from military tribunals to civilian courts, the prosecution of human rights violations by military personnel. This represents a major breakthrough for those concerned with human rights abuses in Colombia.

Furthermore, it confers upon the head of the armed forces the authority to summarily dismiss military personnel who commit gross violations of human rights. It is important to note, since the early 1990's, the head of the CNP has had this authority. And from a force of some 100,000—14,000 members of the department were discharged pursuant to this authority. Since that action the CNP has had a solid record on human rights. Previously they had shared the poor record of the Colombian military.

Passage of this amendment, I submit, has the potential to effect a fundamental change in the Colombian military that will ensure its compatibility with democratic principles and respect for human rights. I have no doubt it will also advance the peace process that has recently produced positive developments. Because if we are truly serious about substantial and permanent reduction of the flow of cocaine from Colombia into the United States—the stability that will come from social and economic justice that peace would achieve is absolutely essential.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, one of the previous speakers said that this is such great human rights language because it says none of the funds may be appropriated until the government of Colombia agrees that it has a strategy to eliminate coca production. It does not say that they have to be following that strategy; all it says is that they have to have a strategy. That can be a piece of paper. He said that it is great language because the head of the Colombian Air Force has to have the authority that is necessary to dismiss armed forces personnel from gross violations of human rights. It does not say he has to actually dismiss them; it simply says he has to have the authority.

This language is not based on performance; it is based on promise, and that is the problem with it.

This is beef soup without the beef. It is an empty ice cream cone. When we have meaningful language that will actually protect human rights, come back and see me. Until then, sorry, fellows. No sale.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

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

Mr. Chairman, it is with great, great reluctance that I rise in opposition to this amendment, because of the high regard that I have for the concern for human rights of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations; and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), my chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence; and my two champions for human rights, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

□ 1900

Both of them have been leaders in trying to help the people of Colombia, all four of them have been, but especially speaking to the credentials of my colleagues on the Democratic side.

As I say, I rise in reluctance. Here is why. It would be great if we could have these conditions that are set forth, very carefully prepared and set forth in this amendment without the waiver. We have lived through the waiver over and over again. Maybe this time it will work, but calling for certification by the President that these conditions have been met and then giving a weak waiver, a low threshold for waiver authority to the President, simply says to the military in Colombia that, really, they do not have to do much.

Again, as I said earlier, we all respect and admire the courage of President Pastrana. He has a very difficult task ahead of him. But giving this assistance to the military the way we are in this bill raises some questions.

In the last month alone, there were three reports about human rights abuses of the Colombian military. The U.S. State Department, our own State

Department country report on Colombia, speaks to the abuses that continue, with collaboration from the military.

The U.N. report that was released earlier in March speaks to that same issue, and the Human Rights Watch statement that they put forth was based on information gathered by the Colombian government about the Colombian military.

Specifically, it addressed the collusion between the paramilitaries, and some, some in the Colombian military, their collusion in the violations of human rights of Colombians.

When we said to the leadership in Colombia on our visit there, when I was there with my distinguished chairman earlier this year, with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), when we said to the leadership of the government, you must do more about the human rights record of the military, we were told, tell them. Tell them that they must do a better job. We told the military. We can speak to them through this amendment, as well.

But the very excellent message that our colleague shaped in terms of the conditions under which the assistance, military assistance would be sent, is totally undermined by the presidential waiver that is in this bill.

Our president, whoever he or she is, of whatever party, should always have the national security waiver that underlies all of our foreign policy, but to have a watered down, lower threshold waiver completely guts this amendment.

I know why some people might want it, because they do not want the strength of the amendment to begin with. I do not think that is the agenda of the makers of this motion, but I do think that it is a cause for opposition to it, as I say, very reluctantly, because up until that waiver I think they were going in the right direction.

My view is shared by Amnesty International, the Working Group on Latin America, and other human rights groups. Some do not even want us to go down the path of the military assistance, but certainly they do not want us to do it with a presidential waiver.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman respond, is it not true that the presidential waiver set out in our amendment is fully consistent with current law governing DOD military assistance abroad as was previously authored by Senator LEAHY, who has led the fight in the other body with regard to human rights concerns on military aid to Colombia?

Ms. PELOSI. The ranking member has asked me to yield to him on this, and I will be happy to address it, also.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. That is the problem. Does the gentleman know how many times I have seen presidents waive milquetoast language? The problem is not just with the waiver, the problem is that this language is so weak in the first place, it would not even require a waiver by an intelligent person. I have heard of watering down soup before. I have never heard of watering down water before.

Go to the Senate, come back with some stronger language, and we will be happy to look at it. But this, with all due respect, is no protection at all for human rights. It is simply protection for politicians.

Mr. GILMAN. If the gentlewoman will yield further, Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any prior exercise of the waiver of the Leahy amendment. Is the gentleman familiar with any exercise?

Mr. OBEY. I have not supported the Leahy amendment in the first place.

Mr. GILMAN. There has been no waiver of that amendment, if the gentlewoman will yield further.

Mr. OBEY. So what?

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) will be postponed.

The point no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a unanimous consent request that has been cleared by the minority and the Parliamentarian.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee be permitted to consider the Lewis amendment made in order under the rule to title II at this time, without prejudice to further amendments to title I or title II.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. LEWIS of California:

At the end of chapter 2 of title II (page 20, after line 10), insert the following new sections:

SEC. 2207. (a) QUALITY OF LIFE PROGRAMS.— In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of

Defense elsewhere in this Act or in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79), there is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2001, \$231,000,000, of which—

(1) \$221,000,000 is available only for the Basic Allowance for Housing program, as follows:

“Military Personnel, Army”, \$70,000,000;
 “Military Personnel, Navy”, \$56,000,000;
 “Military Personnel, Marine Corps”, \$17,100,000;
 “Military Personnel, Air Force”, \$58,600,000;
 “Reserve Personnel, Army”, \$4,100,000;
 “Reserve Personnel, Navy”, \$4,000,000;
 “Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps”, \$600,000;
 “Reserve Personnel, Air Force”, \$300,000;
 “National Guard Personnel, Army”, \$6,900,000; and
 “National Guard Personnel, Air Force”, \$3,400,000; and

(2) \$10,000,000 is available only for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, for the overseas special supplemental food program established under section 1060a of title 10, United States Code.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

SEC. 2208. (a) MILITARY RECRUITING, ADVERTISING, AND RETENTION PROGRAMS.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense elsewhere in this Act or in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79), there is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2001, and to be available only for military personnel recruiting, advertising, and retention programs, \$600,600,000, as follows:

(1) For military personnel accounts, \$450,600,000, as follows:
 “Military Personnel, Army”, \$76,400,000;
 “Military Personnel, Navy”, \$69,100,000;
 “Military Personnel, Marine Corps”, \$6,000,000;
 “Military Personnel, Air Force”, \$108,800,000;
 “Reserve Personnel, Army”, \$47,500,000;
 “Reserve Personnel, Navy”, \$14,100,000;
 “Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps”, \$1,000,000;
 “Reserve Personnel, Air Force”, \$11,700,000;
 “National Guard Personnel, Army”, \$103,300,000; and
 “National Guard Personnel, Air Force”, \$12,700,000.

(2) For operation and maintenance accounts, \$150,000,000, as follows:

“Operation and Maintenance, Army”, \$45,900,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, \$26,200,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”, \$14,700,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, \$21,600,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, \$8,800,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve”, \$11,900,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve”, \$1,600,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve”, \$1,000,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve”, \$2,100,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard”, \$14,000,000; and

“Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard”, \$2,200,000.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

SEC. 2209. (a) DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense elsewhere in this Act or in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79), there is hereby appropriated, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2001, \$750,000,000 for “Defense Health Program”.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

SEC. 2210. (a) DEPOT-LEVEL MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense elsewhere in this Act or in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79), there is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2001, and to be available only for depot-level maintenance and repair, \$1,205,600,000, as follows:

“Operation and Maintenance, Army”, \$200,000,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, \$538,800,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”, \$50,000,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, \$250,000,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve”, \$33,000,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve”, \$5,000,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve”, \$37,200,000; and
 “Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard”, \$91,600,000.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

SEC. 2211. (a) HIGH PRIORITY SUPPORT TO DEPLOYED FORCES.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense elsewhere in this Act or in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79), there is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, for the support of deployed forces as specified in subsection (b), \$1,212,700,000, as follows:

(1) For operation and maintenance accounts, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2001, \$738,900,000, as follows:
 “Operation and Maintenance, Army”, \$200,000,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, \$310,300,000;
 “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, \$197,000,000; and
 “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, \$31,600,000.

(2) For procurement accounts, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002, \$405,800,000, as follows:

“Aircraft Procurement, Army”, \$50,000,000, to be available only for Apache helicopter safety and reliability modifications;
 “Missile Procurement, Army”, \$50,000,000, to be available only for the Patriot missile reliability enhancement program;
 “Aircraft Procurement, Navy”, \$52,800,000, of which \$27,000,000 is available only for CH-

46 helicopter engine safety procurement and \$25,800,000 is available only for EP-3 sensor improvements and modifications;

“Aircraft Procurement, Air Force”, \$209,700,000, of which \$111,600,000 is available only for U-2 reconnaissance aircraft sensor modifications and \$98,100,000 is available only for flight training simulators;

“Other Procurement, Air Force”, \$30,300,000; and
 “Procurement, Defense-Wide”, \$13,000,000.

(3) For research, development, test and evaluation accounts, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2001, \$68,000,000, as follows:

“Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force”, \$10,000,000, to be available only for a JSTARS aircraft mission trainer; and

“Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, \$58,000,000.

(b) SPECIFIED PURPOSES.—Amounts appropriated in this section are available only for the provision to deployed United States forces of—

(1) equipment safety and reliability enhancements;

(2) improved materiel and logistics support; and

(3) upgraded intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities.

(c) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) seek to control time in opposition?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will be recognized for 15 minutes in opposition.

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

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to rise this evening in support of an amendment that is known by some as the Lewis-Spence-Murtha-Skelton amendment to this appropriations bill. It is an amendment that is a reflection of the very close working relationship on both sides of the aisle between all members and the committee leadership of the national defense effort, the authorizing committee as well as the appropriations committee.

It is important for the Members to know that this amendment is designed to be responsive to that list of critical high priorities given to us by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the individual chiefs, priorities that are absolute must-need items as we go forward in order to operate effectively in support of our national defense.

The amendment provides for some \$4 billion of additional funding in areas like military quality of life, recruiting and advertising and retention programs, military health care programs,

in this instance in cases where we actually have health care obligations must be met.

Further, the amendment provides broad-based support to deployed military forces throughout the world. And it is designed further to address unmet needs in equipment maintenance for a variety and mix of programs, including the repair of our ships throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD information that provides a breakout of the \$4 billion in this amendment, by appropriations account.

Military Personnel Quality of Life Programs: The amendment includes Section 2207, which appropriates \$221,000,000 for the Department's Basic Allowance for Housing program, and \$10,000,000 for the overseas supplemental food program, as follows:

<i>(in thousands)</i>	
Military Personnel, Army	\$70,000
Military Personnel, Navy	56,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	17,100
Military Personnel, Air Force	58,600
Reserve Personnel, Army	4,100
Reserve Personnel, Navy	4,000
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	600
Reserve Personnel, Air Force	300
National Guard Personnel, Army	6,900
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	3,400
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	10,000
Total	231,000
Military Personnel Recruiting Incentives: The amendment includes Section 2208, which appropriates a total of \$600,600,000 for recruiting and advertising programs, as follows:	
Military Personnel, Army	\$76,400
Military Personnel, Navy	69,100
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	6,000
Military Personnel, Air Force	108,800
Reserve Personnel, Army	47,500
Reserve Personnel, Navy	14,100
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	1,000
Reserve Personnel, Air Force	11,700
National Guard Personnel, Army	103,300
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	12,700
Operation and Maintenance, Army	45,900
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	26,200
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	14,700
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	21,600
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	8,800
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	11,900
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,600
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	1,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	2,100
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	14,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	2,200
Total	600,600

Defense Health Program: The amendment includes Section 2209 which appropriates a total of \$750,000,000 for urgently needed improvements to the military health care system.

Depot Maintenance: The amendment includes Section 2210 which appropriates \$1,205,600,000 to fund shortfalls in Department of Defense depot maintenance pro-

grams to be distributed as follows. (Included in this amount is \$220,000,000 for the unfunded backlog of ship depot maintenance that has emerged in execution of the fiscal year 2000 ship depot maintenance program.)

<i>(in thousands)</i>	
Operation and Maintenance, Army	\$200,000
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	538,800
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	50,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	250,000
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	33,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	5,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	37,200
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	91,600
Total	1,205,600
High Priority Support to Deployed Forces: The amendment includes Section 2211 which appropriates \$1,212,700,000 for shortfalls associated with requirements of deployed U.S. forces.	
<i>(in thousands)</i>	
Operation and Maintenance, Army (materials in support of prepositioned equipment sets) ..	\$200,000
Operation and Maintenance, Navy (aviation spares)	310,300
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (readiness spares packages)	197,000
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	31,600
Aircraft Procurement, Army (Apache modifications)	50,000
Missile Procurement, Army (Patriot missile reliability)	50,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (CH-46 safety, EP-3 sensor improvements and modifications)	52,800
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force U-2 aircraft sensor modifications (111,600)	209,700
AWACS trainer modification/flight simulator (25,000)	25,000
U-2 trainer (10,000)	10,000
RC-135 Rivet Joint flight training simulator (24,500)	24,500
Compass Call mission crew trainer (23,700)	23,700
C-17 weapon system trainer (14,900)	14,900
Other Procurement, Air Force (HARVEST EAGLE materials)	30,300
Procurement, Defense-Wide	13,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force (JSTARS mission trainer)	10,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	58,000
Total	1,212,700

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I do not have a problem with where much of this money would go. I support added funds for the defense health program. We have a recruiting and retention problem in the military, due in large part to a very strong economy. We ought to bolster those efforts.

But it is clear what is really happening here. The majority is embarrassed because their record on military spending has not matched their rhet-

oric. They like to talk about how the Clinton administration is not funding the military, but their own budget resolution, passed just last Thursday, places a priority on tax cuts, not military spending. Their budget resolution essentially endorses the Clinton defense budget.

I understand that did not sit too well with certain members of the majority party on the Committee on Armed Services and in other places who were asked by their leadership to vote to that budget resolution, so this amendment is a convenient way of giving them a repayment for their behaving well on their budget resolution. It gives them a \$4 billion fig leaf to say that they are for more military spending.

If it becomes law, it simply makes room, by transferring \$4 billion in spending for regular items into this year's budget, it simply makes room in next year's budget for \$4 billion worth of other items, including a lot of congressional projects and pork.

But we have a complication. The Senate leadership opposes it because it eats into the budget surplus. The Senate leadership has already said this additional spending is dead on arrival. The administration opposes it as well because it is not offset by other spending cuts.

So what is the ultimate impact of this amendment? Its most likely impact is that it will slow down further the critical aid for disaster assistance across the country. It will delay approving the money that is in this bill at this time that is needed to reimburse the Army for expenses already incurred in Kosovo and elsewhere, and to deal with the Tricare problem.

It will either cause a huge muddle or it will further discredit the budget process. In either case, it should not be supported by the House today.

As a practical matter, we have \$2 billion in this bill which the Pentagon badly needs, and if it does not get it, in the words of the Secretary of Defense, they will "need to make irreversible decisions to curtail training and maintenance activities essential to readiness," if they do not get that money by the end of April.

There is another \$2.5 million for Tricare and fuel costs which they do not absolutely have to have, but it would be nice if we could get it to the Pentagon. That money is also going to be put in danger in order to take a long shot chance that the public will buy and the Senate will buy a scheme which is nothing short of an effort to blow the budget by \$4 billion next year when that budget is only 5 days old.

That is the name of the game. I do not happen to think much of it, but I admire the skill with which the game plan has been put together, nonetheless.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield such

time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the chairman of the authorizing committee.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I want to especially thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for making this amendment a bipartisan amendment. We could not do it without them.

Not many people are here on this floor, and I cannot be talking to those people. I am trying to reach the people who are in the offices listening and the American people on C-Span that might see this.

I am going to say what I said at our Republican conference this morning. I say it to everyone now. We are considering an emergency supplemental. In prior years, we have talked about supplementals, emergency supplementals, real emergency supplementals. This is a real, real emergency supplemental from the standpoint of defense.

I know we all have different priorities. We have talked about them a lot today. We are going to continue to talk about them, all the things that are in this supplemental bill we have been talking about, drugs and all the rest.

I want to remind everyone, we would not be here as a free society, secure and prosperous, if it had not been made possible by our military, starting with the revolution when we gained our independence. Since that time, we have had World War I and World War II, big threats. Our forefathers, our fathers, our grandfathers, and their families sacrificed their lives and their health to make sure that we are free and secure, and to create the environment so we can discuss these other things as they come along.

□ 1915

The Cold War. Some people talk about the arms race. People say we spend more money on defense than all the rest of the world put together. We have to. Who else is able to do it? We are the only ones. To save ourselves, we have to save the rest of the world along with it. The Cold War is over, yes. I agree.

President Reagan, with a Democrat Congress, helped to restore us; and we beat the Soviet Union in the arms race. They could not keep up. They could not do it any longer. That is what ended the Cold War. But I have to say that we still today face a similar situation. We have more threats today than ever before. We still have the nuclear threats from now Russia, but now we have got China and North Korea and all the rest of them, and we are not prepared to defend against those threats.

We also have other threats now. Weapons of mass destruction other than nuclear, chemical, biological,

from these same countries and lesser countries. This threat is out there, and we are unprepared to deal with them.

We are not strong enough to fight one conventional war. Kosovo was a wakeup call. We devoted all of our air assets, just about everything, to that air war. And what would have happened if something big time had broken out somewhere else in the world? We could not have handled it certainly without a large loss of life.

Now it is our turn. We have to step up to the plate. We have to make sure that our country is free, first of all, and have the environment to consider these other priorities which I can sympathize with. The administration, I will give them credit, it has come a long way, but not nearly enough. This amendment is going to help a whole lot, but still not enough.

I conclude with this, a personal note: I have dedicated the rest of my life to making sure that I have done the very best I can do to see that we are free and secure. But we cannot do it alone. None of us here. We have to have all of our colleagues' help.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I could have the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), I would just like to say that while I disagree with his words, I wanted to express the appreciation of every single person in this House for the service that he has given this House through the years. We know that he says what he believes, and we honor him for it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) from the authorizing committee.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, let me first say that I compliment the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) our chairman, our friend, for his excellent statement a few moments ago. His care for the young men and young women in uniform today who have and who continue to serve our country so well have been represented so finely by his eloquent words through the years, and we thank him for his continued service for them.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lewis-Murtha-Spence-Skelton amendment. I thank the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS); the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA); our ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE); and those who have worked on this key issue for so long. This is a good news story because it is something that is truly needed in three areas: health care and quality of life, readiness, and maintenance.

First, I do not think it is any secret that the military health care system is in crisis, whether it is active duty service members or whether it relates to military retirees. We made a promise to the retirees that we must keep. This amendment is a major step for helping those who are active duty, those fami-

lies, and those military retirees. It is very, very important that we take this step in addressing this situation by appropriating the monies in this amendment.

The quality of life issue is so very important. We do not enlist soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, but we enlist families and these measures will help ensure quality of life issues for our military members and their families.

Mr. Chairman, military readiness is a great matter of concern. With ongoing deployments in the Middle East, Bosnia, Kosovo, the operational tempo of our forces has been steadily rising and I say, we are wearing the young men and young women out who are stationed abroad as well as in this country. We have to make sure that the readiness accounts are there for their training, their exercises, their maintenance, and their military operations.

The high operational tempo associated with these deploying forces is straining our readiness, and we must do our best to keep their equipment and the spare parts and their training at high level.

Equipment maintenance is important to us. As we deploy our forces more often, we are simply wearing out much of that equipment. It is important, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee on Armed Services' ability to authorize the programs necessary to protect our national security interest depends on having sufficient resources. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), and I term this amendment as a readiness and operational necessity. We hope that every Member of this House will vote in favor of it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the specific accounts mentioned in this amendment are very appealing. Many of them ought to be funded. But they ought to be funded by the military showing the same kind of fiscal discipline that Members here claim they want the government as a whole to follow.

The military budget was increased substantially in the last appropriation. It will be again substantially increased. It is up to the military, in fact, to manage that money. And what we do today is, in effect, to give approval to a process by which they can so manage the money as to be able to point to some deficits in some of the most appealing accounts.

Let us understand this is \$4 billion taken presumably from some surplus. It is \$4 billion that cannot be used then for any other purpose. Not for tax cuts. Not for deficit reduction or other spending. I understand we have problems. We all have problems. We have been told that we cannot afford to provide prescription drugs for older people

to the degree that many of us want. Understand that this \$4 billion is \$4 billion that could have gone for prescription drug programs for Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, it is \$4 billion that could go to putting police on the streets. I believe there are some problems in the world. I must say I disagree with the notion, I in fact am intrigued by it, that the world became less safe when communism collapsed. I have heard that again and again. I guess maybe we should pray for the reestablishment of communism so we could all feel safer.

In fact, we do not face today the threat of nuclear destruction. Reference was made to the nuclear threat we face from the Russians. In the state of the Russian nuclear weaponry today, Russians face much more of a threat from Russian nuclear weapons than anyone else does. They are much more likely to blow up on site than to be delivered anywhere.

Mr. Chairman, what this does is to continue a pattern in which the military is rewarded for not spending efficiently. In which Members, as the Senator from Arizona correctly pointed out during his campaign, in which Members eat into the military budget with projects the military does not want and erode the military's ability to focus on what they should focus on and takes \$4 billion away from other things.

This is the time of year when people come to our offices and want help with health research and want help with prescription drugs. They want help with housing, and they want help with a lot of other issues. The \$4 billion today, over and above what they got last year and what they will get next year, comes from other pots.

If my colleagues vote for this \$4 billion today, they should remember that when they tell people that they sympathize with them when it comes to cancer research and they sympathize with them when it comes to prescription drugs for older people, they sympathize when it comes to environmental cleanup but we do not have the money, partly we will not have the money if this amendment passes because they took \$4 billion which would have been available for other purposes and gave it to the military. Again, because certain accounts sound attractive, but it is because the management has been such to put us in this position where we are told we have to spend the money here.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

(Mr. RYUN of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this nation's national security. Our United States military service Chiefs, under the current Administration, have consistently been forced to

fund their services with inadequate budgets. This amendment will give our military service Chiefs the funding levels needed to succeed in supporting their troops and protecting this nation's national security interests.

Mr. Chairman, according to recent reports, our military has been deployed on 48 overseas missions in the 1990s, costing \$30 billion and costing far more than that in worn-out equipment and personnel. This increase in Operations Tempo, coupled with reduced defense budgets, has put increased strain not only on military equipment but also on the structure of the military family.

Military personnel, often times at the request of their family, are choosing to leave the service at alarmingly high rates and our ability to recruit young people of this nation to serve in the military has fallen dramatically. As a Congress, we need to ensure that our military has the means to recruit, retain, equip and train the strongest and best-trained force in the world.

Mr. Chairman, military families consistently cite problems with the military health care system and reductions in quality of housing as reasons for leaving military service. This amendment will direct close to \$1 billion towards improving military quality of life with reduced out-of-pocket housing expenses and increased funding for the Defense Health Program.

Mr. Chairman, the funding levels in this amendment have been driven by what the military service Chiefs have identified as their top unfunded requirements. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment and give our quality military personnel the quality of care, support and equipment they need to achieve their goals.

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

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I too rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan amendment offered by the leaders of the defense authorization committee and the defense appropriations subcommittee.

There is no question that the military services are facing severe funding difficulties. The basic costs of operations of our overseas commitments are not properly budgeted. High operational tempo stresses military equipment and their maintenance. More critically, recruiting and retention are increasingly difficult for a variety of reasons.

This Congress has reformed the pay table and provided a significant pay increase for military personnel. We have worked hard to improve basic living and working conditions. All of that has helped to keep some military personnel in the force who otherwise would have left the service. We need to do more and the situation is urgent.

This amendment would continue our efforts by responding to the critical and immediate needs of military personnel and their families. By accelerating the buydown of out-of-pocket housing expenses, protecting military personnel from reductions in their housing allowances, and filling the gaps in the Defense Health Program, the adoption of the Lewis-Spence-Murtha-Skelton amendment will

strengthen the All-Volunteer Force that is the backbone of our national security.

The time to deal with the emergency confronting military service personnel is now. I urge a strong bipartisan vote in favor of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have no additional requests for time, except to mention that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), my partner in this whole process on the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations, has been more than great in his help; and we want to especially recognize the work of our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the chairman of the authorizing committee, in the entire effort.

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

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

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I very reluctantly rise in opposition to this amendment for basically two reasons. One, it was Paul Kennedy, the historian Paul Kennedy, who made the point in his book, *The Rise and Fall of Great Powers*, that economic supremacy is the precursor to military supremacy. And for us to maintain that economic supremacy, at least in part, rests on fiscal discipline. And for us to in essence breach a budget that we set last week to the tune of \$4 billion, I think, is a move away from the kind of fiscal discipline that, in fact, Paul Kennedy and others have talked about over time.

Secondly, I think at some point we have to draw the line on deployments. And I look at this money. I look at basically the Powell doctrine. The Powell doctrine was we go in, we make a difference, we have clearly defined military objectives, and then we get out of town.

Mr. Chairman, this is the list of different deployments that we have had. Basically, over the last 10 years, we had the highest number of deployments that we have had. Mr. Chairman, 149 deployments according to the Committee on Armed Services from 1990 to 1999, versus 17 deployments from 1982 to 1990. And, in essence, we are rewarding that.

At some point Congress has to draw the line and basically starve the beast by saying we will not continue to fund

these kinds of deployments. Since I have been here, we have funded Haiti, we funded Bosnia, we funded Kosovo, we are funding the Middle East operations over Iraq to the tune of \$1.2 billion a year. We had State Department officials telling us in testimony last week that it could last as long as Saddam is alive. If South Carolina is any guide on that front, that means another 50 years of us spending \$1.2 billion a year.

Mr. Chairman, at some point we have to draw the line on deployments, rather than continue to feed them. Therefore, I very reluctantly rise in opposition to this amendment.

□ 1930

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have only one remaining speaker, and I believe I have the right to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is correct.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I promise not to use all of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the dollars in this amendment and in the bill. Let us talk about them both together. I am for the dollars that we need to fix the TRICARE problem, the health care problem. I am for the dollars to help with the recruiting and housing. I am for reimbursing the Pentagon for the funds they have already expended in their Kosovo operations. I am for helping them meet their additional fuel costs. That is not my problem with this amendment.

I am for all of those things, but I am not for them in a way which will enable this House to bust the budget by \$4 billion for next year, just 5 days after the leadership twisted arms to get enough votes to pass that budget.

I do not think that we should drop our promises as an institution quite that fast. This is precedent setting. If you are going to do it on this, then do not be surprised when it happens again and again with far more justification.

I am for all of the things that I mentioned for the Pentagon because they are meeting legitimate national needs. But I am not for another result of this amendment. As I have said before, what this chart shows is that, before this bill came to the floor, so far this year, for this year's fiscal budget, the President had asked for \$568 billion in appropriated spending, and the Congress had provided him with \$578 billion. So the Congress was \$10 billion over the President in spending.

The bill that came to the floor today added to that difference, because it added several billion dollars the President had not asked for. So the President, because of his increase request,

the President had asked for \$573 billion for this year, and the Congress with the bill as it came to the floor would be spending \$587 billion, \$13 billion over the President's request. Now, with this amendment, this year, the President will have still asked for \$573 billion for this fiscal year, but the Congress will demand that we spend \$591 billion. To me, plain mathematics indicates that is a \$17 billion increase over the President's budget.

I really cannot believe that, only 5 days after we passed the budget for the next fiscal year that this House is going to bust the budget for this fiscal year and find a way to add \$4 billion for projects in the next fiscal year under the DOD portion of the budget. But evidently, that is what the House is going to do.

I have no illusions whatsoever about what the outcome of this amendment is going to be, but I for one will not vote for it.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. The amendment includes recruiting and quality of life, and health care funding essential to sustaining the readiness and well being of the all-volunteer military.

RECRUITING FUNDING

Mr. Chairman, the primary reason the Armed Forces of the late 1970's were declared hollow was the inability of the services to recruit and retain the required number and quality of people.

That hollow force history is repeating itself today, and we must act to change its course. To that end, this amendment would add \$600 million to a troubled recruiting program that is in urgent need of help.

How bad is the recruiting problem? Three of the four active duty services failed to achieve recruiting goals in fiscal year 1999, and at least one will certainly fail in FY 2000, and two others may fail.

Three of the six reserve components also failed to meet recruiting objectives in fiscal year 1999 and some analysts predict that five of six will fall below their FY 2000 authorized strength by 15,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, we must not allow recruiting to go unattended even for 1 year—we support this amendment that provides critical funding for enlistment bonuses and advertising right now.

QUALITY OF LIFE

Everyone has heard about the economic plight of men and women in the military. This amendment would put \$221 million directly into the pockets of military people to pay for housing. Without this money, thousands of families will continue to reach into their own pockets to pay for housing that is our obligation to provide them.

This amendment also dedicates \$10 million to fund the DOD's implementation of a Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) supplemental food program overseas. We must ensure that our youngest and most financially stressed families are not denied the food and nutritional counseling just because they serve overseas.

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

The Defense Health Program is chronically underfunded and there is a need to improve

and extend the benefit for a changing military beneficiary population. Therefore, the amendment would provide \$750 million to improve health care benefits for active duty and retired personnel and their families. Military families increasingly cite the crisis facing the military health care system as a reason for their growing disaffection with the military way of life. We cannot afford to neglect this problem.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues should be assured that meeting the needs of people and the armed services that I have outlined here is an urgent requirement. A vote in favor of this amendment is a vote to protect the people that serve our Nation in uniform—our most precious of resources. Vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to support a small, but important provision included in the amendment offered by Congressman LEWIS to H.R. 3908, the 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act. This provision would provide \$10 million to fund the Overseas Special Supplemental Food Program authorized as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000.

The Overseas Supplemental Food Program included in the National Defense Authorization Act is based on legislation I introduced on May 12, 1999 with Congressman KILDEE, CASTLE, and MCKEON, H.R. 1779, the "Overseas Special Supplemental Food Program Amendments of 1999."

As most of you know, the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (commonly known as WIC) provides vital benefits to low-income women, infants and children in the form of food packages and nutrition education. Until the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act, an estimated 46,658 women, infants and children living overseas were not eligible to receive the nutrition benefits that would have been available to them if the families were stationed in the United States and participating in WIC.

The Department of Defense is currently in the process of implementing the Overseas Special Supplemental Food Program. The \$10 million provided as a part of the amendment offered by Congressman LEWIS will help ensure it has the funding necessary to provide high quality nutritional assistance to program participants.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will guarantee that our hard-working, dedicated military personnel overseas have access to the same nutritional support as those families residing in the United States. It deserves our support.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I agree this amendment is necessary to address some of the critical unfunded requirements the Service Secretaries and Chiefs identified during the recent hearings before the House Armed Services Committee. However, I am concerned because it does not specifically target any funds for real property maintenance.

Every Service Secretary and Chief testified before our committee about their inability to fund their facility maintenance and repair accounts at the required level. They've had to use these accounts to pay bills for contingency operations, modernization, spare parts, and other high priority items.

Their unfunded requirements lists, submitted to this committee in February, include real property maintenance as one of the top eight priorities for every Service.

All of us who are homeowners know that if we don't keep our homes properly maintained, we're going to be facing even bigger bills in the future. I'm afraid we're already there on our military installations.

I'm not talking about cosmetic upgrades—I'm talking about things that impact readiness and the quality of life of our troops.

Things like airfield pavement repair to prevent pieces of the pavement flying up and putting out an aircraft engine. Or power outages which impact vital systems on the installation.

I'm sure any of the Members who have military bases in their districts, or have traveled to our overseas bases, have heard the horror stories of how barracks and dining halls are without heat or hot water because of a catastrophic failure, or of how buildings must be vacated when winds reach a certain speed because failing structural systems make them unsafe. You all have your own examples.

We have also seen the ingenious ways our troops engineer work-arounds just to get the job done—they should not have to work under these conditions! They deserve better.

I would urge the Appropriations Committee to add real property maintenance funds for each Service, based on the unfunded priority lists. These funds would allow each Service to immediately fix their most urgent requirements and improve their military readiness.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) will be postponed.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies.

Mr. Chairman, bovine tuberculosis has been identified in free-range deer in Michigan. The deer are quickly transferring this disease to cattle herds throughout the State.

Currently, the State is in danger of losing its bovine TB-free status. If that were to happen, Michigan farmers stand to lose \$156 million over the next 10 years. The State of Michigan has been working in conjunction with USDA to solve this problem. However, further assistance from the Federal Government is needed.

We have a bipartisan request for \$7.5 million to the State of Michigan to combat that disease. I seek the assurance of the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) that the committee will assist with funding for the bovine TB crisis, and that will be addressed when this bill is considered in the conference committee.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) for bringing this problem to our attention.

As we stated in our committee's report on the supplemental bill, we urged the Department of Agriculture to address this problem immediately through epidemiology and surveillance, deer ecology, risk analysis, disease control, eradication, and diagnosis and pathogenesis.

We have directed the Secretary of Agriculture to promptly notify the committee of any additional funding requirements, accompanied by official requests for additional funds, and to report to the committee by May 1, 2000, on his plan of action.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his efforts. We will follow this matter closely and do the best we can to address the need.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RAMSTAD

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. RAMSTAD:

Page 2, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 9, line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike title I, the entire \$1.7 billion in counternarcotics funding for Colombia. We have already spent over \$600 million to eradicate drugs at their source in Colombia, and what has been the result? A recent study on our effort in Colombia shows that both cocaine and heroin production in Colombia have more than doubled. That has been the result.

Colombia is now the source of 80 percent of the cocaine and 75 percent of the heroin coming into the United States, both significant increases, the \$600 million spent notwithstanding. That is what \$600 million in Colombia has done, Mr. Chairman.

Now, tonight, we are being asked to spend almost \$2 billion to escalate the war on drugs in Colombia. This is misdirected public policy; and it is simply wrong, when 58 percent of drug addicts who seek treatment here in our country are being denied treatment.

Let us face it, our drug eradication and interdiction efforts have been a costly and a colossal failure.

As a former United States Navy lieutenant commander, Sylvester Salcedo, who was involved in the Colombia effort as the Navy intelligence officer for 3 years, said today right outside this Capitol, "The \$1.7 billion," and I am quoting now, "proposed for drug eradication and interdiction in Colombia is good money thrown after bad."

Lieutenant Commander Salcedo also said, and I am quoting, "We cannot make progress on the drug problem by increasing our failed effort in Colombia." Let me repeat that. Somebody who was there 3 years in the Colombia effort, Lieutenant Commander Salcedo, said, "We cannot make progress on the drug problem by increasing our failed effort in Colombia." Instead, he said we should confront the issue of demand here at home by providing treatment to our addicts in our own country.

Mr. Chairman, we need to listen to this veteran of the war on drugs who added, "Washington should not spend its money on more helicopters but on treatment for addicts. The \$400 million cost of the helicopters alone in this bill would provide treatment for 200,000 Americans addicted to drugs."

Mr. Chairman, when President Richard Nixon first declared war on drugs in 1971, he directed 60 percent of the funding to treatment. To date, we are down to 18 percent for treatment. That is right. Sixty-six percent on the supply side, eradication, interdiction, border patrol. Sixty-six percent on the supply side; 16 percent for education and prevention; and 18 percent for treatment.

That is why over half the treatment beds available 10 years ago are gone. That is why 58 percent of the addicts seeking treatment last year were denied access. Our priorities in the war on drugs are wrong, and they are not working. Instead of spending two-thirds of our resources on the supply side and one-third on the demand side, those should clearly be reversed.

The bottom line is this, Mr. Chairman, we will never curb the drug epidemic until we curb the insatiable demand for drugs here at home. The drug problem goes much deeper than illegal drugs coming into our Nation. The fundamental problem is the addiction that causes people to crave and demand drugs.

Mr. Chairman, this is a defining moment in the 30-year effort to curb illegal drug use in America. We can keep pumping money into the eradication and interdiction dead end; or we can get serious, and we can shift our focus and resources to the drug addiction problem here at home.

It is time to reject the \$1.7 billion for the failed policy in Colombia. It is time to redirect those dollars to drug treatment here at home. Congress needs to just say no to this Colombia boondoggle.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD), and I know the emotion with which he offers this amendment. But I have to tell him that it was very disturbing when I listened to him say that this money would provide treatment for 200,000 addicts. I think, Mr. Chairman, that our goal here should be to eliminate that terrible drug that is causing these addicts, that the addicts are getting addicted to.

We need to destroy the fields where these poppies are growing. We need to destroy the mountain sites where the coca is growing. We need to eliminate the source of the drug. That way, if we dry up the source, we do a lot better than treating 200,000 addicts. What we will do is try to prevent 200,000 more people from becoming addicts. That is what we need to do.

Now, if we wanted to get rid of posse comitatus and let the United States military use its full force against the drug growers and the drug lords, that might be a way to solve this problem. But no one is going to repeal posse comitatus.

Or if we wanted to triple or quadruple the size of the United States Coast Guard and give them more helicopters and more ships and more manpower to interdict, we might be able to be a little more effective.

But the effective way is to eliminate these drugs at the source. Let us eliminate the opportunity for those 200,000 addicts that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) talked about. Let us eliminate the source of the drug that caused them to be addicts.

Let us think about whose kids are going to be next. If the drug is on the street, whose kid is going to be next? Who is going to become the next addict? Who is going to become the next casualty because of an overdose of drugs? Who is going to be the next person shot, killed because of a drug bust gone bad or drug violence on the streets?

□ 1945

Stop the drugs at the source. Defeat this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

I just want to repeat this. The bottom line is this: We will never curb the drug epidemic until we curb the insatiable demand for drugs here at home. We can put up all the fences on our border, hire all the border patrol money can buy, go after the source, spend all the money in crop eradication, interdiction, but until Congress realizes that the fundamental problem is the addiction that causes people to crave and demand drugs, not the supply, we will never put a dent in this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, we are about to go to war in Colombia. We are about to allocate \$1.7 billion for 63 helicopters and the United States military advisers to help the military in Colombia to fight a civil war. We are about to go to war in the jungles of Colombia.

We are about to take on an insurgency that controls 40 percent of the land mass of Colombia that has been at war with the government of Colombia for 20 years. We are about to relocate farmers off the land where they are growing coca leaf and put them into what can only be called strategic hamlets and protect them, of course, from attack during this time while we teach them to grow something other than coca leaf.

The time will come when these military advisers are fired upon, I fear. And when they are, what will the United States' response be? I suggest its response will be as it was in Vietnam, to increase the number of advisers, to protect those previously sent, to protect the air bases where the helicopters are, to protect the strategic hamlets where we have relocated the villagers to try to teach them to grow something other than coca leaf.

What we are voting on today is the last moment that we have, really, given the way that the war powers have been exercised by this President and previous Presidents, the last moment we have to say no. Because once this starts, the next step will be put more troops in to defend the investment that we have already made.

Can anyone doubt that this will be the case given what has happened in Bosnia, given what has happened in Kosovo? We originally were supposed to be in Bosnia for 6 months. It has now been 5 years. Kosovo we thought would be short term, now our troops will be there for as long as we can see.

We are today voting at the last moment we will have before being asked to observe another war. We are being asked to go to war in Colombia. I think that my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) expressed the point very ably, we will always have a problem of drugs while we have a demand for drugs.

Already chemicals, synthetic substitutes are available that do almost as much harm, in fact, in some cases more. The problem is one of demand. Today we vote to go to war.

I urge my colleagues to vote no, and that means vote yes on the Ramstad amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) who has offered this amendment. I would share with the gentleman that I do agree with him on some of his points, especially when he said that we have to go after the demand. I agree with him.

But when it comes to the drug issue, I think, as a Nation, we have to embrace a comprehensive approach, one that is, in fact, multifaceted. So when we do that, I stop and I think about, yes, the importance of education. I think about the importance of rehabilitation and treatment, but there are also other important factors out there.

It is deterrence. It is punishment, punishments of users, of pushers and of kingpins. There is also the glamorization of utilization of drugs, whether it is by Hollywood or stories, TV shows. What about going after the source countries, as the chairman just spoke of, or what about through the transit countries, where the drugs move out of the source countries and transit through other avenues and to find its way on the streets of this country?

What about the precursor chemicals that are coming from our other ally countries, such as Germany and others in Europe, and their relationships into South America, that they have those relationships dating all the way back to pre-World War II, they sell those chemicals, and then going after those precursor chemicals.

Talking about a multifaceted approach, when a Member stands here on the floor and says we are going to war in Colombia, give me a break. We are not going to war in Colombia. We are going to war on drugs.

I was rather stunned in the Committee on Armed Services when a member of this administration came so very cautious and concerned to tell the members of the Committee on Armed Services that in Colombia we are not choosing sides. Not choosing sides? What, are you going to then somehow be neutral? You want to defend the drug cartel, the narcoterrorists?

What do you mean you are not choosing sides? Who are you going to be for? Are you going to stand to defend a president who wants to engage us in the war on drugs in Colombia, the longest-serving democracy in this hemisphere, with the United States? Yes, that is who we need to stand with. So they want to engage in a comprehensive approach in the, quote, war on drugs; should we embrace them? The answer is yes.

We have great debates on this floor about the United States, we should only engage in certain areas of the world to protect vital national security interests. Can you define an interest that can be more vital to all of us than the drugs and the effects they have upon our children? I cannot think of one.

We will spend \$10 billion in Kosovo. And people cannot relate as to why we are spending these monies in Kosovo, when, in fact, if we would spend half of that in an endeavor to stop drugs from coming into our country, look how far ahead we would be, the 52,000 lives that are lost each year, I say to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

I would urge Members to vote against the gentleman's amendment for a comprehensive approach.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of points: One, basic economics, as the gentleman from California pointed out, the gentleman said supply always equals demand. If we push down supply here but do nothing about demand, we can be sure from Guyana or Venezuela or a lot of other places supply will be there to meet it.

Two, my wife got a \$218 ticket the other day for turning left on a green light in front of oncoming traffic. If she had been caught instead with a noncommercial quantity of marijuana in her car, she would have gotten a \$125 fine instead of a \$218 fine. We are not serious about this war on drugs.

Three, Colombia does not have a shutdown policy and, yet, we are about to send over a billion dollars. For that matter, America does not have a shutdown policy.

Finally, we have a flawed strategy. In military, you have to effect the center of gravity. You have to eliminate an enemy's ability to make war. We do not do that; what we are offering here is a false promise.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we have only one speaker remaining, and we reserve the balance of our time to close.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the Members of the majority can stand the shock of my speaking from the majority side, I would simply say that I had not wanted to go through this amendment because there are a number of things in this bill that I do not want to cut out, but we have not been given any other opportunity to cut out the things that I think really need to be cut out with respect to this new adventure in Colombia. And absent our ability to get more consideration of that, I am going to support the Ramstad amendment. I think it gives us no choice, given the choice the House presented to us today.

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

I want to thank the speakers on both sides of this issue. This truly is a defining moment in a 30-year effort to fight illegal drug use in America. We can continue down the road of a failed policy by spending another \$1.7 billion for more eradication, more interdiction efforts that have been proven futile, that have been proven not to work; or we can prioritize treatment for addiction, which has been proven cost effective in study after study, in addict after ad-

dict, in alcoholic after alcoholic lucky enough to be treated.

This is not a political issue, my colleagues. This is a life or death issue for five and a half million addicts in America who need treatment and cannot get it today.

This amendment is also fiscally responsible. I want to thank the National Taxpayers Union for endorsing this amendment. I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for cosponsoring the amendment.

Let us save the taxpayers \$1.7 billion. Let us begin the process of reordering our priorities in the war against drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote to delete funding for the Colombia boondoggle.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my chairman and colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), yielding me this time.

Indeed, I want to say to my colleagues in the House, but especially to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD), I could not believe more strongly in his expression of concern about the problems that relate to the demand side. Indeed, earlier today we had an extensive discussion regarding that as we went forward with the Pelosi amendment.

There is no doubt that America is concerned about impacting the demand for drugs in cities all over America. Indeed, we have made significant commitments over time during this Congress and the past Congress. Clearly, not nearly enough money, but this proposition today is in response to the administration's recommendation that we step forward in a relationship with our neighboring country, Colombia, a country that is attempting to raise between \$7 and \$8 billion themselves in order to fight the war on drugs at home.

Colombia is the source of something like 90 percent of cocaine that is imported into America. There is little doubt, unless we deal directly with that source, that we will never affect that piece of drug availability in the United States. So the proposition before us today is to essentially express support for the President, who is joining us in this effort, the effort to stop the flow of cocaine to our country.

Clearly, propositions that would expand the opportunities to impact demand should and do deserve our support. I expect in the months and years ahead that I will join my colleagues in that effort, as I ask all of my colleagues to vote against this amend-

ment and to support the bill in its final passage.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to take a very brief time to note that I forgot to mention one thing on the Gilman amendment.

I have a letter from the Taxpayers for Common Sense which reads, "Taxpayers for Common Sense urges you to oppose passage of H.R. 3908, the 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriation bill, and to vote against the amendment to add \$4 billion in undefined military spending to go the bill. What began as a modest appropriations bill to cover expenses for ongoing military deployments has turned into an enormous Christmas tree decorated with billions of extra dollars of pork placed there by special interests. The real emergency is the utter breakdown of the congressional budget and appropriations process."

I do not necessarily agree with all of those words, but I agree with most of them.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARR OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARR of California:

Page 5, line 22, after "activities" insert "(of which not less than \$6,500,000 shall be made available through the United States Agency for International Development for alternative economic development activities in Bolivia to be managed by the United Nations Drug Control Program)".

Page 6, beginning on line 1, after "activities" insert "(of which not less than \$3,000,000 shall be made available through the United States Agency for International Development for alternative economic development activities in Ecuador to be managed by the United Nations Drug Control Program)".

Page 6, line 4, after "Peru" insert ", of which not less than \$7,500,000 shall be made available through the United States Agency for International Development for alternative economic development activities in Peru to be managed by the United Nations Drug Control Program".

Page 6, line 9, after "objectives" insert "Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$9,000,000 shall be made available through the United States Agency for International Development for alternative economic development activities in Colombia to be managed

by the United Nations Drug Control Program: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this chapter for the United Nations Drug Control Program to be made available through the United States Agency for International Development may be obligated to the United Nations Drug Control Program only if the congressional committees described in section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2394-1) are notified 15 days in advance of such obligation in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under such section: *Provided further*, That not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 6 months thereafter, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in consultation with the head of the United Nations Drug Control Program, shall prepare and submit to the congressional committees described in section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2394-1) a report on the status of the United Nations Drug Control Program's alternative development projects in Colombia, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru".

Mr. FARR of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) reserves a point of order, and the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the chairman is reserving a point of order, and what I wanted to do is to explain my amendment and hope that we can work something out in conference here.

This amendment earmarks existing funding for alternative development in the UNDCP, the United Nations Drug Control Program, for the countries of Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Colombia.

□ 2000

The amendment enhances the accountability of this money by requiring that the funding go through USAID, be subject to congressional notification, and be monitored via the regular reporting process.

The reason that it is important that we put this money in is that, indeed, if we are going to eradicate the crops, we have got to teach the campesinos how to grow something as an alternative. Just going in and eradicating crops, it will reappear. So what the UNDCP program has done is very effective and has an approval record in Bolivia and Peru.

In this alternative, development is essentially the ability to wean farmers off growing coca or opium poppy and get them into a constructive alternative agricultural practice.

What also happens to the region is they begin recovery from a drug cul-

ture to a legitimate private sector agricultural economy in a rural country and in a rural area; and it allows, essentially, what we have always been trying to promote is democratization, essentially, of building of communities.

So what this amendment does is it takes existing funds and earmarks those to those four countries for the exact same purposes.

Just in closing, I would like to sort of sum up what the UNDCP programs have done. They have had a 78 percent reduction in the hectares of illicit coca in Bolivia in the last 3 years, 78 percent in the last 3 years alone. In 2000, alternative development crops occupy 100,000 hectares of land, an area 10 times greater than that devoted to growing illicit coca.

So this is particularly important as we move into Colombia, eradicate the crops, which is going to be done by the Joint Military National Police and then move in behind them with a program that has a proven track record of being able to work with the campesinos to get them into these alternative programs.

As I said, the money is funded through our United States Department of International Development, and it is subject to notifying us on all aspects of it and keeping us informed with progress reports.

So I would ask that we can get this amendment and work the best we can to get these earmarks in. I think it makes it a stronger bill. We have bipartisan support for this effort.

Mr. Chairman, I am hoping we can get assurance that we can look at this in the conference committee.

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

Mr. FARR of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, certainly we, of course, intend to work with the gentleman. We are concerned about the issue, as he is; and we will work with him. This amendment is definitely subject to a point of order. But we understand what he is trying to accomplish, and we will work with him.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR of California. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we cannot promise the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) what the conference committee will do. We appreciate very much his knowledge of this problem in South America and his history of being concerned about it. But I cannot commit to the gentleman or to anyone else what the conferees may do.

My personal observation is that this is sort of an indirect funding of the United Nations. And in President Pastrana's Plan Colombia, he has already worked with the United Nations and they have committed to provide him a portion of the \$1.8 billion as their contribution to this overall plan.

So it may not be necessary, as the United Nations has already agreed with President Pastrana. It may be moot.

So I cannot commit to the gentleman that the conference committee will come back with some language that will fulfill the desire of the gentleman as his amendment states. But I do appreciate his concern, and I agree with the gentleman that they did a good job in Bolivia and that they probably are needed as well in Colombia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FARR of California was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this is a program that the funding is unique. It goes right to the program. It does not go through the United Nations. It goes through a separate account, the UNDCP.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, but the organization is a United Nations organization; and, therefore, we would have to send the money to the United Nations. That is my observation.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we will work those differences out, hopefully, in conference.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of Rule XXI.

The Rule states in pertinent part:

An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if it changes existing law.

And this amendment does.

So I ask the Chair to sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I accept the point of order. We will work out the amendment with bipartisan support in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) proposes to change to existing law and constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of Rule XXI.

As noted on page 799 of the House Rules and Manual, propositions establishing affirmative directions for executive officers constitute legislation.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California proposes, in part, to require the Administrator of

the United States Agency for International Development to prepare and submit a report to certain congressional committees.

Thus, the amendment offered by the gentleman imposes a new duty on an executive officer and constitutes legislation.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Part B amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. LEWIS of California; Part B amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. RAMSTAD; and Part B amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. GILMAN.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the third electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on Part B amendment No. 9 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 289, noes 130, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

AYES—289

Abercrombie	Buyer	Etheridge
Aderholt	Callahan	Evans
Allen	Calvert	Fletcher
Andrews	Campbell	Foley
Archer	Canady	Forbes
Army	Cannon	Fossella
Baca	Capps	Fowler
Bachus	Carson	Frelinghuysen
Baker	Chambliss	Frost
Baldacci	Chenoweth-Hage	Galleghy
Ballenger	Clayton	Gejdenson
Barcia	Clement	Gekas
Barr	Coble	Gephardt
Barrett (NE)	Coburn	Gibbons
Bartlett	Combust	Gilchrest
Bass	Condit	Gillmor
Bateman	Cooksey	Gonzalez
Bentsen	Costello	Goode
Bereuter	Cox	Goodlatte
Berkley	Cramer	Goodling
Bilbray	Cubin	Gordon
Billirakis	Cunningham	Goss
Bishop	Danner	Graham
Bliley	Davis (VA)	Green (TX)
Blunt	DeLauro	Green (WI)
Boehlert	DeLay	Greenwood
Boehner	DeMint	Hall (OH)
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart	Hall (TX)
Bonior	Dickey	Hansen
Bono	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Borski	Doolley	Hastings (WA)
Boucher	Doolittle	Hayes
Boyd	Doyle	Hayworth
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Hefley
Brady (TX)	Dunn	Heger
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Hilleary
Bryant	Ehrlich	Hobson
Burr	Emerson	Hoefel
Burton	English	Holden

Horn	Miller (FL)
Hostettler	Miller, Gary
Houghton	Mink
Hoyer	Mollohan
Hulshof	Moore
Hunter	Moran (KS)
Hutchinson	Moran (VA)
Hyde	Murtha
Inslee	Myrick
Isakson	Nethercutt
Istook	Ney
Jackson-Lee	Northup
(TX)	Norwood
Jefferson	Ortiz
Jenkins	Ose
John	Oxley
Johnson (CT)	Packard
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Johnson, Sam	Pascarell
Jones (NC)	Pastor
Kanjorski	Pease
Kelly	Peterson (PA)
Kennedy	Phelps
Kildee	Pickering
King (NY)	Pickett
Knollenberg	Pitts
Kolbe	Pombo
Kuykendall	Pomeroy
LaFalce	Price (NC)
LaHood	Pryce (OH)
Lampson	Radanovich
Lantos	Rahall
Larson	Reyes
Latham	Reynolds
Lewis (CA)	Riley
Lewis (KY)	Rodriguez
Linder	Roemer
Lipinski	Rogan
LoBiondo	Rogers
Lucas (KY)	Rohrabacher
Lucas (OK)	Ros-Lehtinen
Maloney (CT)	Royce
Maloney (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Manzullo	Ryun (KS)
Mascara	Salmon
Matsui	Sanchez
McCarthy (NY)	Sandlin
McCollum	Saxton
McCrery	Scarborough
McHugh	Schaffer
McInnis	Scott
McIntosh	Sessions
McIntyre	Shadegg
McKeon	Shaw
Meek (FL)	Sherwood
Menendez	Shimkus
Metcalf	Shows
Mica	Shuster

NOES—130

Ackerman	Fattah
Baird	Filner
Baldwin	Ford
Barrett (WI)	Frank (MA)
Becerra	Ganske
Berman	Gutierrez
Berry	Gutknecht
Biggert	Hill (IN)
Blagojevich	Hill (MT)
Blumenauer	Hilliard
Boswell	Hinchee
Brown (OH)	Hinojosa
Camp	Hoekstra
Capuano	Holt
Cardin	Hooley
Castle	Jackson (IL)
Chabot	Jones (OH)
Clay	Kaptur
Collins	Kasich
Cook	Kilpatrick
Coyne	Kind (WI)
Crowley	Kingston
Cummings	Kleczka
Davis (FL)	Largent
Davis (IL)	LaTourette
Deal	Lazio
DeFazio	Leach
DeGette	Lee
Delahunt	Levin
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)
Dingell	Lofgren
Dixon	Lowe
Doggett	Luther
Duncan	Markey
Ehlers	McCarthy (MO)
Engel	McDermott
Eshoo	McGovern
Ewing	McKinney
Farr	McNulty

Simpson	Sisisky
Skeeh	Skeeh
Skelton	Slaughter
Smith (NJ)	Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)	Snyder
Souder	Spence
Spratt	Stabenow
Stearns	Stenholm
Strickland	Stump
Stupak	Sununu
Sweeney	Talent
Tancredo	Tanner
Tauscher	Tauzin
Taylor (MS)	Taylor (NC)
Terry	Thomas
Thompson (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Thornberry	Thune
Thurman	Tiahrt
Toomey	Traficant
Turner	Turner
Visclosky	Vitter
Walsh	Walsh
Wamp	Watkins
Watts (OK)	Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)	Weller
Weygand	Whitfield
Wicker	Wilson
Wise	Wolf
Wynn	Young (AK)
Young (FL)	

Stark	Upton	Weiner
Tierney	Velazquez	Wexler
Towns	Waters	Woolsey
Udall (CO)	Watt (NC)	Wu
Udall (NM)	Waxman	

NOT VOTING—15

Barton	Franks (NJ)	Martinez
Clyburn	Gilman	Quinn
Conyers	Granger	Rothman
Crane	Klink	Rush
Everett	Kucinich	Vento

□ 2027

Messrs. SHAYS, PORTMAN, EWING, COOK, GUTIERREZ and FORD changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. PHELPS and Ms. DELAURO changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RAMSTAD

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 262, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

AYES—158

Abercrombie	Ford	McInnis
Archer	Fossella	McKinney
Baird	Ganske	McNulty
Baldwin	Gekas	Meehan
Barcia	Goodling	Meek (FL)
Barrett (WI)	Graham	Metcalf
Bereuter	Green (WI)	Miller, George
Berry	Gutierrez	Minge
Blumenauer	Gutknecht	Mink
Bonior	Hall (OH)	Moakley
Boucher	Hastings (FL)	Moran (KS)
Brown (FL)	Hefley	Morella
Brown (OH)	Hill (MT)	Nadler
Camp	Hilleary	Neal
Campbell	Hinchee	Norwood
Capuano	Hoekstra	Nussle
Carson	Horn	Oberstar
Castle	Hulshof	Obey
Chabot	Inslee	Olver
Clay	Istook	Owens
Clayton	Jackson (IL)	Paul
Coburn	Johnson, E.B.	Payne
Collins	Jones (OH)	Pelosi
Combust	Kaptur	Peterson (MN)
Condit	Kelly	Petri
Conyers	Kennedy	Phelps
Cook	Kilpatrick	Pitts
Costello	Kind (WI)	Porter
Cox	Kleczka	Ramstad
Coyne	Kucinich	Rivers
Danner	Largent	Roemer
Davis (IL)	LaTourette	Rohrabacher
Deal	Leach	Royce
DeFazio	Lee	Ryan (WI)
DeMint	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Dickey	Linder	Salmon
Doggett	Lipinski	Sanchez
Duncan	Lofgren	Sanders
Ehlers	Luther	Sanford
Ehrlich	Manzullo	Scarborough
Eshoo	McCarthy	Schaffer
Evans	Matsui	Schakowsky
Fattah	McCarthy (MO)	Scott
Filner	McDermott	Sensenbrenner
Foley	McGovern	Serrano

Simpson
Smith (MI)
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sununu
Tancredo
Terry

Thompson (CA)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky

Walden
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wicker
Woolsey
Wu

Barton
Clyburn
Crane
Everett
Franks (NJ)

NOT VOTING—14
Granger
Hunter
Klink
Martinez
Quinn

Rothman
Rush
Spence
Vento

Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoefel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslie
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jones (NY)
Kanjorski
Deal
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin

Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Hall (OH)
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
PICKERING
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard

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

NOES—262

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Arney
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clement
Coble
Cooksey
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons

Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoefel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kildee
Skeen
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Mascara
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Ortiz
Ose

Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pease
Peterson (PA)
PICKERING
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Ryun (KS)
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vitter
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 2046
Mr. MOORE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan and Mr. HOLT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the last amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 380, noes 39, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—380

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Arney
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell

Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combust
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford

Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoefel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslie
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jones (NY)
Kanjorski
Deal
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin

NOES—39

Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Blagojevich
Bliley
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Cox
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLay
Doggett
Eshoo
Hill (IN)
Jackson (IL)
Kaptur
Knollenberg

Lee	Nadler	Snyder
Markey	Oberstar	Stark
McDermott	Obey	Tierney
McGovern	Olver	Waters
McKinney	Paul	Wexler
Miller, George	Pelosi	Woolsey
Moakley	Schakowsky	Wu

NOT VOTING—15

Barton	Franks (N.J.)	Quinn
Burr	Granger	Rothman
Clyburn	Klink	Rush
Crane	Martinez	Spence
Everett	Pryce (OH)	Vento

□ 2055

Mr. BAIRD changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 87 I was in advertably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I could have the attention of the House, I would like to announce that it is our intention to proceed this evening for about 1 additional hour; that we will consider several amendments and roll the votes until that hour is up, and then at approximately 10 o'clock we will take whatever votes there are, and we will then be finished with this bill for tonight and take it up again tomorrow morning.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman apprise us of whether in fact the education bill will be up tomorrow?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I can only speak for this bill. This bill will be up tomorrow.

Mr. BONIOR. May I ask the distinguished majority leader, who is on his feet and ambling to the microphone?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's inquiry. The gentleman, like myself, understands the importance of that legislation. However, this legislation has an enormous priority, and we must first finish this bill, which we expect to do tomorrow. At that point, we will have to take a decision.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman saying that the decision on whether we go into the education bill will be made tomorrow and not this evening?

Mr. ARMEY. Again, I appreciate the gentleman's interest in that important legislation.

Mr. BONIOR. Does that mean, Mr. Chairman, if I could ask the gentleman from Texas, does that mean that the Committee on Rules members should be alert that they may meet at 2

o'clock or 3 o'clock in the morning and stay here? What is in store for them?

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's inquiry. Let me just tell the gentleman, we will complete work on this bill for this evening in about an hour. Tomorrow we will come back and we will finish this bill in the morning.

At that point, we will have a decision about whether or not we have completed our week's work or whether or not we will try to take up additional legislation.

Mr. BONIOR. May I ask this one further question, and then I will sit down.

Can I go to our Committee on Rules members and tell them that they will not be meeting this evening?

□ 2100

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not see the chairman of the Committee on Rules, but I think the gentleman would be safe in telling them that.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. That is what we needed to know. Is there a way to roll the votes until tomorrow? Is there a way to roll the votes until tomorrow evening?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, we will roll several votes this evening and we will vote at approximately 10 o'clock.

Mr. BONIOR. So we will continue and have votes at 10 o'clock this evening?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Approximately 10 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS IN KOSOVO AND OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY MATTERS

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SECURITY AND MAINTENANCE OF UNITED STATES MISSIONS

Notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, an additional amount for "Security and Maintenance of United States Missions", \$104,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$19,532,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", \$20,565,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", \$37,155,000:

Provided, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$30,065,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to provide assistance to Vieques, Puerto Rico, including a study of the health of Vieques residents; fire-fighting related equipment and facilities at Antonio Rivera Rodriguez Airport; construction or refurbishment of a commercial ferry pier and terminal and associated navigational improvements; establishment and construction of an artificial reef; reef conservation, restoration, and management activities; payments to registered Vieques commercial fishermen of an amount determined by the National Marine Fisheries Service for each day they are unable to use existing waters because the Navy is conducting training; expansion and improvement of major cross-island roadways and bridges; an apprenticeship/training program for young adults; preservation and protection of natural resources; an economic development office and economic development activities; and conducting a referendum among the residents of Vieques regarding further use of the island for military training programs, \$40,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That such funds shall be in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided under this heading to any agency or office of the United States Government in order to implement the projects for which funds are provided: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That for purposes of providing assistance to Vieques, any agency or office of the United States Government to which these funds are transferred may utilize, in addition to any authorities available under this heading, any authorities available to that agency or office for carrying out related activities, including utilization of such funds for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That any amounts transferred to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, "Community development block grants", shall be available only for assistance to Vieques, notwithstanding section 106 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading may be used to make direct payments to registered Vieques commercial fishermen: *Provided further*, That the Department of the Navy may provide fire-fighting training and funds provided under this heading may be used to provide fire-fighting related facilities at the Antonio Rivera Rodriguez Airport: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading may be used to construct or modify a commercial ferry pier and terminal and associated navigational improvements: *Provided further*, That except for amounts provided for the health study, fire-fighting related equipment and facilities, and certain activities in furtherance of the preservation and protection of natural resources, funds provided in this paragraph shall not become available until

the Secretary of the Navy has certified to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, that the integrity and accessibility of the training range is uninterrupted, and trespassing and other intrusions on the range have ceased: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY
RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve", \$2,174,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY
NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard", \$2,851,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
TRANSFER FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the "Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund", \$2,050,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer the funds provided herein only to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance, including Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; the Defense Health Program; and working capital funds: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force", \$73,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Defense Health Program", \$3,533,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 2201. (a) MINIMUM RATES OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING FOR MEMBERS OF THE

UNIFORMED SERVICES.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2000, and ending on September 30, 2001 (or such earlier date as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate), a member of the uniformed services entitled to a basic allowance for housing for a military housing area in the United States shall be paid the allowance at a monthly rate not less than the rate in effect on December 31, 1999, in that area for members serving in the same pay grade and with the same dependency status as the member.

(b) ANNUAL LIMITATION ON ALLOWANCE.—In light of the rates for the basic allowance for housing authorized by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may exceed the limitation on the total amount paid during fiscal year 2000 and 2001 for the basic allowance for housing in the United States otherwise applicable under section 403(b)(3) of title 37, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 2202. In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act for the Department of Defense or in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79), \$1,556,200,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense for the "Defense-Wide Working Capital Fund" and shall remain available until expended, for price increases resulting from worldwide increases in the price of petroleum: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall transfer \$1,556,200,000 in excess collections from the "Defense-Wide Working Capital Fund" not later than September 30, 2001 to the operation and maintenance; research, development, test and evaluation; and working capital funds: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided in this section is in addition to the transfer authority provided to the Department of Defense in this Act or any other Act: *Provided further*, That the entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 2203. (a) The Secretary of Defense may transfer up to \$90,000,000 to the account "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 2000/2002", from funds specified in subsection (b). Amounts so transferred shall be merged with, and shall be available for obligation for the same period as, the account to which transferred.

(b) Amounts which may be transferred under this section are unobligated amounts that would otherwise expire for obligation on September 30, 2000, that were appropriated for Air Force or Defense-Wide accounts in the following provisions of law:

(1) Titles I and II of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79).

(2) Title IV of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-262).

(3) Title III of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105-56).

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 2204. The Secretary of Defense shall transfer \$125,000,000 from unobligated funds in the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund to "Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army 2000/2002" only for procurement, advance procurement, or economic order quantity procurement of Abrams M1A2 SEP Upgrades under multiyear contract authority provided under section 8008 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000: *Provided*, That amounts so transferred shall be merged with, and shall be available for obligation for the

same period as, the account to which transferred: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this section shall be obligated until the Secretary of the Army certifies to the congressional defense committees that these funds will be used to upgrade vehicles for an average unit cost (for 307 vehicles) that does not exceed \$5,900,000.

SEC. 2205. In addition to the amounts provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79), \$854,500,000 is hereby appropriated for "Defense Health Program", to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available only for the purposes described and in accordance with section 2206 of this chapter: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

SEC. 2206. (a) Of the amounts provided in section 2205 of this chapter for "Defense Health Program"—

(1) not to exceed \$90,300,000 shall be available for obligations and adjustments to obligations required to cover unanticipated increases in TRICARE contract costs that (but for insufficient funds) would have been properly chargeable to the Defense Health Program account for fiscal year 1998 or fiscal year 1999; and

(2) not to exceed \$764,200,000 shall be available for obligations and adjustments to obligations required to cover unanticipated increases in TRICARE contract costs that are properly chargeable to the Defense Health Program account for fiscal year 2000 or fiscal year 2001.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees before charging an obligation or an adjustment to obligations under this section.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on obligations made under this section no later than 30 days after the end of fiscal year 2000.

CHAPTER 3

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

For an additional amount for "Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development", \$13,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE
BALTIC STATES

For an additional amount for "Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States", \$95,825,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That this amount shall only be available for assistance for Montenegro and Croatia, assistance to promote democratization in Serbia including support for nongovernmental organizations and independent media, and not to exceed \$12,400,000 for assistance for Kosovo: *Provided further*, That the amount specified in the previous proviso for assistance for Kosovo may be made available only for police activities: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND
TRAINING

For an additional amount for "International Military Education and Training", \$2,875,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001, for grants to countries of the Balkans and southeast Europe: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Foreign Military Financing Program", to enable the President to carry out section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, \$31,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001, for grants to countries of the Balkans and southeast Europe: *Provided*, That these funds shall be nonrepayable, notwithstanding sections 23(b) and 23(c) of the Act: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CHAPTER 4

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

SEC. 2401. In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2000, \$6,700,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to cover incremental Operation and Maintenance costs to family housing, as authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, as follows:

"Family Housing, Army", \$2,000,000,—
"Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps", \$3,000,000; and
"Family Housing, Air Force", \$1,700,000:
Provided, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$6,700,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

SEC. 2402. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to use funds received pursuant to section 2601 of Title 10, United States Code, for the construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of Quarters Number 6, located at Marine Corps Barracks, 8th and I Street, Washington, D.C.: *Provided*, That the Secretary notifies the appropriate committees of Congress thirty days in advance of the intended use of such funds.

BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE
DEVELOPMENT

DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

SEC. 2403. (a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to evaluate and demonstrate methods for more efficient operation of military installations through improved capital asset management and greater reliance on the public or private sector for less-costly base support services, where available. The section supersedes, and shall be used in lieu of the authority provided in, section 8168 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79; 113 Stat. 1277).

(b) AUTHORITY.—(1) Subject to paragraph (4), the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out at Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, a demonstration project to be known as the "Base

Efficiency Project" to improve mission effectiveness and reduce the cost of providing quality installation support at Brooks Air Force Base.

(2) The Secretary may carry out the Project in consultation with the Community to the extent the Secretary determines such consultation is necessary and appropriate.

(3) The authority provided in this section is in addition to any other authority vested in or delegated to the Secretary, and the Secretary may exercise any authority or combination of authorities provided under this section or elsewhere to carry out the purposes of the Project.

(4) The Secretary may not exercise any authority under this section until after the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of the Congress a master plan for the development of the Base.

(c) EFFICIENT PRACTICES.—(1) The Secretary may convert services at or for the benefit of the Base from accomplishment by military personnel or by Departmental civilian employees (appropriated fund or non-appropriated fund), to services performed by contract or provided as consideration for the lease, sale, or other conveyance or transfer of property.

(2) Notwithstanding section 2462 of title 10, United States Code, a contract for services may be awarded based on "best value" if the Secretary determines that the award will advance the purposes of a joint activity conducted under the project and is in the best interest of the Department.

(3) Notwithstanding that such services are generally funded by local and State taxes and provided without specific charge to the public at large, the Secretary may contract for public services at or for the benefit of the Base in exchange for such consideration, if any, the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(4)(A) The Secretary may conduct joint activities with the Community, the State, and any private parties or entities on or for the benefit of the Base.

(B) Payments or reimbursements received from participants for their share of direct and indirect costs of joint activities, including the costs of providing, operating, and maintaining facilities, shall be in an amount and type determined to be adequate and appropriate by the Secretary.

(C) Such payments or reimbursements received by the Department shall be deposited into the Project Fund.

(d) LEASE AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary may lease real or personal property located on the Base and not required at other Air Force installations to any lessee upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate and in the interest of the United States, if the Secretary determines that the lease would facilitate the purposes of the Project.

(2) Consideration for a lease under this subsection shall be determined in accordance with subsection (g).

(3) A lease under this subsection—

(A) may be for such period as the Secretary determines is necessary to accomplish the goals of the Project; and

(B) may give the lessee the first right to purchase the property at fair market value if the lease is terminated to allow the United States to sell the property under any other provision of law.

(4)(A) The interest of a lessee of property leased under this subsection may be taxed by the State or the Community.

(B) A lease under this subsection shall provide that, if and to the extent that the leased property is later made taxable by State governments or local governments under Federal law, the lease shall be renegotiated.

(5) The Department may furnish a lessee with utilities, custodial services, and other base operation, maintenance, or support services performed by Department civilian or contract employees, in exchange for such consideration, payment, or reimbursement as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(6) All amounts received from leases under this subsection shall be deposited into the Project Fund.

(7) A lease under this subsection shall not be subject to the following provisions of law:

(A) Section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, other than subsection (b)(1) of that section.

(B) Section 321 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 303b).

(C) The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.).

(e) PROPERTY DISPOSAL.—(1) The Secretary may sell or otherwise convey or transfer real and personal property located at the Base to the Community or to another public or private party during the Project, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate for purposes of the Project.

(2) Consideration for a sale or other conveyance or transfer of property under this subsection shall be determined in accordance with subsection (g).

(3) The sale or other conveyance or transfer of property under this subsection shall not be subject to the following provisions of law:

(A) Section 2693 of title 10, United States Code.

(B) The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.).

(4) Cash payments received as consideration for the sale or other conveyance or transfer of property under this subsection shall be deposited into the Project Fund.

(f) LEASEBACK OF PROPERTY LEASED OR DISPOSED.—(1) The Secretary may lease, sell, or otherwise convey or transfer real property at the Base under subsections (b) and (e), as applicable, which will be retained for use by the Department or by another military department or other Federal agency, if the lessee, purchaser, or other grantee or transferee of the property agrees to enter into a leaseback to the Department in connection with the lease, sale, or other conveyance or transfer of one or more portions or all of the property leased, sold, or otherwise conveyed or transferred, as applicable.

(2) A leaseback of real property under this subsection shall be an operating lease for no more than 20 years unless the Secretary of the Air Force determines that a longer term is appropriate.

(3)(A) Consideration, if any, for real property leased under a leaseback entered into under this subsection shall be in such form and amount as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(B) The Secretary may use funds in the Project Fund or other funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department for use at the Base for payment of any such cash rent.

(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department or other military department or other Federal agency using the real property leased under a leaseback entered into under this subsection may construct and erect facilities on or otherwise improve the leased property using funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department or other military department or other Federal agency for such purpose.

(g) CONSIDERATION.—(1) The Secretary shall determine the nature, value, and adequacy of consideration required or offered in exchange for a lease, sale, or other conveyance or

transfer of real or personal property or for other actions taken under the Project.

(2) Consideration may be in cash or in-kind or any combination thereof. In-kind consideration may include the following:

(A) Real property.

(B) Personal property.

(C) Goods or services, including operation, maintenance, protection, repair, or restoration (including environmental restoration) of any property or facilities (including non-appropriated fund facilities).

(D) Base operating support services.

(E) Improvement of Department facilities.

(F) Provision of facilities, including office, storage, or other usable space, for use by the Department on or off the Base.

(G) Public services.

(3) Consideration may not be for less than the fair market value.

(h) PROJECT FUND.—(1) There is established on the books of the Treasury a fund to be known as the "Base Efficiency Project Fund" into which all cash rents, proceeds, payments, reimbursements, and other amounts from leases, sales, or other conveyances or transfers, joint activities, and all other actions taken under the Project shall be deposited. Subject to paragraph (2), amounts deposited into the Project Fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation.

(2) To the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts, amounts in the Project Fund shall be available to the Secretary for use at the base only for operation, base operating support services, maintenance, repair, or improvement of Department facilities, payment of consideration for acquisitions of interests in real property (including payment of rentals for leasebacks), and environmental protection or restoration. The use of such amounts may be in addition to or in combination with other amounts appropriated for these purposes.

(3) Subject to generally prescribed financial management regulations, the Secretary shall establish the structure of the Project Fund and such administrative policies and procedures as the Secretary considers necessary to account for and control deposits into and disbursements from the Project Fund effectively.

(i) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—(1)(A) Any Federal agency, its contractors, or its grantees shall pay rent, in cash or services, for the use of facilities or property at the Base, in an amount and type determined to be adequate by the Secretary.

(B) Such rent shall generally be the fair market rental of the property provided, but in any case shall be sufficient to compensate the Base for the direct and overhead costs incurred by the Base due to the presence of the tenant agency on the Base.

(2) Transfers of real or personal property at the Base to other Federal agencies shall be at fair market value consideration. Such consideration may be paid in cash, by appropriation transfer, or in property, goods, or services.

(3) Amounts received from other Federal agencies, their contractors, or grantees, including any amounts paid by appropriation transfer, shall be deposited in the Project Fund.

(j) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—(1) Section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, shall apply to transactions at the Base during the Project.

(k) LIMITATION.—None of the authorities in this section shall create any legal rights in any person or entity except rights embodied in leases, deeds, or contracts.

(l) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to enter into a lease, deed, permit, license, contract, or other agreement under this section shall expire on September 30, 2004.

(m) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "Project" means the Base Efficiency Project authorized by this section.

(2) The term "Base" means Brooks Air Force Base, Texas.

(3) The term "Community" means the City of San Antonio, Texas.

(4) The term "Department" means the Department of the Air Force.

(5) The term "facility" means a building, structure, or other improvement to real property (except a military family housing unit as that term is used in subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code).

(6) The term "joint activity" means an activity conducted on or for the benefit of the Base by the Department, jointly with the Community, the State, or any private entity, or any combination thereof.

(7) The term "Project Fund" means the Base Efficiency Project Fund established by subsection (h).

(8) The term "public services" means public services (except public schools, fire protection, and police protection) that are funded by local and State taxes and provided without specific charge to the public at large.

(9) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Air Force or the Secretary's designee, who shall be a civilian official of the Department appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(10) The term "State" means the State of Texas.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE.—For an additional amount for "Military Construction, Army Reserve" to cover the incremental costs arising from the consequences of Hurricane Floyd, \$12,348,000, as authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, to remain available until September 30, 2004: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for \$12,348,000 that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 35, line 3, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MRS. FOWLER

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 8 offered by Mrs. FOWLER:

Page 11, line 24, insert "and" after the semicolon.

Page 11, line 25, strike "and conducting" and all that follows through the comma on page 12, line 2.

Page 13, line 10, strike "fire-fighting" and all that follows through the comma on line 12.

Page 13, strike lines 14 through 17 and insert the following: "the President has cer-

tified to the Congress that trespassing and other intrusions on the range have ceased; that the integrity and accessibility of the training range is uninterrupted; that he has directed the Attorney General to strictly enforce all Federal laws aimed at preventing trespassing and other violations of security and safety on the range; and that he has directed that military training operations utilizing the full range of live ordnance in use prior to April 19, 1999, be resumed and that such training operations have been initiated."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, life and death. That is what this amendment is all about. Will we allow the illegal acts of a few to jeopardize the lives of many?

The Fowler-Hansen amendment does three things. First, this amendment prevents the \$40 million contained in this bill for Puerto Rico from being used to pay for a binding referendum on whether live-fire training on the Navy range on the Island of Vieques should be resumed.

Second, it strengthens language in the bill making the money contingent on the removal of illegal trespassers from this range, who have it closed down.

And, last, it would require the resumption of live-fire training in Vieques before Puerto Rico could receive any of the \$40 million.

Mr. Chairman, remarkably, a group of people engaged in civil disobedience have occupied a critical military installation with no reaction from this administration. Their protests began last year after a Navy civilian employee was killed by an errant bomb while he was on a military live-fire range 9 miles from the nearest town. The gold star up here shows where he was. The town is down here, 9 miles away.

According to our military leaders, we have a clear national security requirement to do live-fire training on the East Coast. Holding a referendum on the subject as the President has proposed is not sound public policy and will set a terrible precedent.

According to Secretary of the Navy Richard Danzig, and I quote,

Vieques is a uniquely valuable training site. It is the only one available to East Coast units where mission essential combined arms training can be conducted.

End of quote.

The people of Vieques do not bear a unique burden. They are 57 other live-fire and inert-weapons ranges in the United States. It is deeply ironic, I just found out tonight that the Puerto Rican National Guard performs their live-fire artillery training at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, only 1.9 miles from an incorporated area of 90,000 residents, while the Governor of Puerto Rico supports the closure of the live-fire range

on Vieques, 9 miles from a civilian population.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the authority to provide and maintain a Navy. We must not shirk our responsibilities. Support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, with great reservation, I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER). I very simply do so because we do have an agreement presently struck with the people of Vieques. It is our desire to obtain the same objectives as the gentlewoman would wish to obtain. The fact is there is a referendum next year and if we should, by way of legislation in this process, essentially rub the people of Vieques' nose in that process, what more could we do to undermine that election from our point of view?

So it seems to me that this is not the time to have such a language. And it is because of that that I very regretfully oppose the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, what happened yesterday at the White House? Somebody jumped over the fence and they apprehended the person because he was trespassing and they took him to jail. Guess what we are talking about here tonight? Only trespassing.

These people went on to this range and trespassed on the range. Now instead of saying like we did at the White House, we say now they can determine whether or not they are going to get \$40 million or \$50 million for doing it.

Does anyone think they would really do that, when they do not do this they are going to get the whole shooting match? They get \$250 million and they can do with it what they want and no military there.

I have had some of my friends say: Let this process work. We are going to win on this one. So I called down to Puerto Rico and I asked the question: Please tell me what the polls show. Do my colleagues know what the polls show? Four percent of the people in Puerto Rico would vote for this. Let us say if someone went to Twentynine Palms or the Utah Test and Training Range and trespassed, what would we do? We would kick them out. In this instance who are we kicking out? We are kicking out the military who absolutely needs this particular area.

A lot has been said about this letter from the Navy. This did not come from

the Navy. This came from a political appointee. We do not see the CNO of the Navy on here. We do not see the Commandant of the Marine Corps on here. We do not see any of these people. What do we expect? This is not worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO).

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Chairman, to compare the situation in Vieques to any other situation in the rest of the land is like comparing a ping pong ball with a basketball. There is no place in the U.S., no place in our Nation where there is bombing from the air, shelling from the ocean, and also from the land at the same time.

That is what they say. That is why the Navy has said that Vieques is such an important thing. The Navy has sent a letter to the chairman of this committee saying: I am writing to express the grave concern of the Department of the Navy with the proposed amendment to H.R. 3908 concerning the economic assistance program on the Island of Vieques, Puerto Rico. They end up by saying: The Department of the Navy strongly believes that the negotiated agreement represents the best opportunity for the Navy to resume crucial training on the Vieques range.

Mr. Chairman, the Navy right now could never resume any bombing because they have violated the Clear Water Act and there is no permit. The only way that it can resume is with inert bombs. There is no other way to resume any maneuvers. This is for the interest of the national defense.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of this amendment. I tell the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. Romero-Barcelo) to come to California and see San Clemente Island. It is bombed from the land, bombed from the sea, and strafed.

The fact is if we are going to set this precedent that Puerto Rico is going to be able to vote if they want a bombing range in their neighborhood, then the 32 million people of California also want to have the same right to be able to say we do not want our islands bombed.

Fairness is fairness. If we are going to set the standard in Puerto Rico, then apply it in the rest of the country. And see if Utah wants to be bombed. This is an issue of national defense, but also the constitutional responsibility of this Congress to apply to military defense.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) knows how reluctant all of us are to rise in opposition to this, but I feel I must as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and a

witness to the experience of the Island of Kahoolawe, which was an island in Hawaii which had received live-fire operations for many decades and where that has ceased as a result of the efforts of the people of Hawaii.

We certainly share the national security concerns of the gentlewoman from Florida, but I feel very strongly that her amendment would stall the progress towards a positive solution.

Mr. Chairman, the agreement worked out between the Department of Defense and the Governor of Puerto Rico was very thoughtfully crafted and a product of tireless effort. This agreement was not reached with the protestors, but with the lawful authorities of Puerto Rico. Resolution is best accomplished by moving forward with the agreement.

Mr. Chairman, I can say that I have a copy of the Navy Times of April 3, and it says, "Stay on Vieques, residents say." It may very well be that the referendum will turn out in a positive way in the direction that the gentlewoman requires. So I ask that her amendment be defeated.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I live in Colorado Springs and we love Fort Carson on the outskirts of Colorado Springs. It has a live-fire range and we are continually working to make sure that we do not build up around that live-fire range and impinge upon it, because not only do we love Fort Carson, but if they need to train with a live-fire range, we want them to have it.

The people in Puerto Rico seem to love Roosevelt Roads, but they do not love the live fire. If we do not have the live fire, we do not need Roosevelt Roads; and we ought to close Roosevelt Roads if we are not going to have a live fire range.

The Navy has spent the last 2 years trying to convince me that we need desperately this range and that we should not do anything to impinge upon that. I hope Members will support the amendment.

□ 2115

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. David Sanes Rodriguez was killed as a Navy employee, a civilian, a Puerto Rican, but a civilian of the Navy. He was killed on sight by a misfiring 9 miles from any civilians. Our sailor, our pilots are going to be in extreme danger if they are not allowed to have a practice range.

JOHN MCCAIN and so many others before they went off to battle practiced right here, and they needed that practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time remaining to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) said that JOHN MCCAIN practiced here. In 1952, we deployed there. I was on Vieques at the time. There was no one understands more the importance of the Vieques than me. The Navy says in their correspondence to me, if this money is taken out, the agreement will be breached.

We can stand here and beat our chest. We can say we are going to force this issue on the Puerto Ricans. That does not solve the problem. They have come to an agreement. The Navy did not live up to their agreements since 1986. They did nothing for economic development. We are saying here that they have to give in to our demands.

There is no question about the importance of Vieques, but this is not something we dictate. The Defense Department has worked out what they consider the best possible agreement. They have negotiated with the governor of Puerto Rico; a lot of the Members here do not like the agreement. They do not think it is fair. They do not think there should be an agreement like this. We put the \$40 million in to live up to our end of the agreement.

Believe me, if we take the \$40 million out, there will not be any agreement, and we will not have opportunity. The Navy said they will not be able to go forward if we take this money out as important as it is to them. I would urge the Members not to vote for this amendment, to vote against this amendment, with the idea that we will be able to solve this problem. They will have a referendum, and they will allow us to go forward with using this as a tactical training base.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, one quick correction. This amendment does not strike the \$40 million. It does not strike it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I have to disagree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), who is highly respected. This is a bad agreement. If you have a bad agreement, then get rid of it. Why would we ever endorse extortion of the taxpayers' money? And that is what this is. I do not care how you call it. If we do this in Puerto Rico, then what are we going to do about the Tohona Oden tribe outside of Tucson who want their Indian lands back? Then the Committee on Appropriations are going to say we have to give money to them. We are going to be doing this all across the country. Enough is enough. Support the Fowler amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) will be postponed.

Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. FOWLER

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. FOWLER: Page 16, after line 21, insert the following new subsection:

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MILITARY FAMILIES ON FOOD STAMPS.—It is the sense of the Congress that members of the Armed Forces and their dependents should not have to rely on the food stamp program, and the President and the Congress should take action to ensure that the income level of members of the Armed Forces is sufficient so that no member meets the income standards of eligibility in effect under the food stamp program.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I just want to say this amendment is very straightforward. It is noncontroversial, but it is very important. It puts this Congress on record that having U.S. military families on food stamps is simply unacceptable.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to say for the record to the gentlewoman that we are happy to accept this amendment that you present to the House.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I am so glad we can agree on this one. This just expresses the sense of Congress that the President and Congress should take all steps necessary to ensure that no military man or woman must rely on public assistance to provide for their families.

My amendment does not seek to prescribe a solution or fund an answer to this immoral situation. This is not the appropriate vehicle or venue for that. The Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations are best equipped to devise a solution.

All I am seeking to do today is to send a message from this Congress to every soldier, sailor, and Marine that we believe they deserve better. They deserve better for themselves and for their families, that the sacrifices they make day in and day out for this country of ours will not go unnoticed and unrewarded by this Congress.

I just want to share real quickly a personal story that really brought this home for me. Several months ago, I was home on a Saturday night and the phone rang; and it was a young woman married to a Navy lieutenant, sta-

tioned out at Mayport, and she was in tears. And I said what is wrong, and she said we ordered a pizza tonight.

And when the pizza delivery man came and I opened the door, it was a young petty officer who had been working all day in Mayport, and he is delivering pizzas at night so he will not have to go on food stamps so he can feed his family.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, we have no problem with this amendment over here.

Mrs. FOWLER. I appreciate that. I am almost through. She asked me, because I told her I would bring this here, so I made a commitment to her. Her husband is flying with the Navy. She said what kind of country treats its soldiers so poorly they have to deliver pizzas to feed their families?

This is why I have the amendment here tonight. I appreciate both sides accepting it. And I know we can work tonight to send a message to these young men and women that we will provide for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

Are there further amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

NATURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND OTHER EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Office of the Inspector General", \$2,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Salaries and Expenses", \$7,140,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$77,560,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as

an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

EMERGENCY CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Unobligated balances previously provided under this heading may be used to repair and reconstruct essential farm structures and equipment that have been damaged or destroyed, after a finding by the Secretary of Agriculture that: (1) the damage or destruction is the result of a natural disaster declared by the Secretary or the President for losses due to Hurricanes Dennis, Floyd, or Irene; and (2) insurance against the damage or destruction was not available to the grantee or the grantee lacked the financial resources to obtain the insurance: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

CORPORATIONS

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

For an additional amount for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund, up to \$13,000,000, to provide premium discounts to purchasers of crop insurance reinsured by the Corporation (except for catastrophic risk protection coverage), as authorized under section 1102(g)(2) of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277): *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

The Secretary of Agriculture shall reduce the amount of any principal due on a loan made by the Department to a marketing association for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity by up to 75 percent if the marketing association suffered losses to the agricultural commodity in a county with respect to which a natural disaster was declared by the Secretary or the President for losses due to Hurricanes Dennis, Floyd, or Irene.

If the Secretary assigns a grade quality for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity marketed by an association described in the preceding paragraph that is below the base quality of the agricultural commodity, and the reduction in grade quality is the result of damage sustained from Hurricanes Dennis, Floyd, or Irene, the Secretary shall compensate the association for losses incurred by the association as a result of the reduction in grade quality.

Up to \$81,000,000 of the resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used for the cost of this provision: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RURAL ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

RURAL COMMUNITY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM

For the additional cost of water and waste grants, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(2), to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters, \$28,000,000 to remain available until expended; and for an additional amount for community facilities grants pursuant to section 381E(d)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009d(d)(1)) for emergency needs, \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the additional cost of direct loans, as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, \$15,872,000 from the Rural Housing Insurance Fund for section 515 rental housing, to remain available until expended, to address emergency needs resulting from Hurricanes Dennis, Floyd, or Irene: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans estimated to be \$40,000,000: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

For additional gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to be available from funds in the rural housing insurance fund to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters, as follows: \$296,000,000 for loans to section 502 borrowers, as determined by the Secretary and \$13,000,000 for section 504 housing repair loans.

For the additional cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters, to remain available until expended, as follows: section 502 loans, \$25,000,000 and section 504 loans, \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Rental Assistance Program" for rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed pursuant to section 521(a)(2) of the Housing Act of 1949, for emergency needs resulting from Hurricanes Dennis, Floyd, or Irene, \$13,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is

designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490c), to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters, \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For grants and contracts for very low-income housing repair, as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 1474, to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters, \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

FARM LABOR PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For grants to assist low-income migrant and seasonal farm workers, as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 5177a, to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

LOANS PROGRAMS ACCOUNT

For the additional cost (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) of direct loans under section 305 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 935), \$1,021,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001, to enable financing of the purchase of a utility by a non-profit cooperative to address the high cost of electric power in the service area attributable in part to a hurricane disaster: *Provided*, That the amount made available under this heading shall be made available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans estimated to be \$113,250,000: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE AND GENERAL SALES MANAGER

For an additional amount for the "Foreign Agricultural Service and General Sales Manager", \$2,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Buildings and Facilities", \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 3101. Notwithstanding section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714i), an additional \$35,000,000 shall be provided through the Commodity Credit Corporation in fiscal year 2000 for technical assistance activities performed by any agency of the Department of Agriculture in carrying out the Conservation Reserve Program or the Wetlands Reserve Program funded by the Commodity Credit Corporation: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

SEC. 3102. The Act of August 19, 1958 (7 U.S.C. 1431 note) is amended—

(1) by striking "clause (3) or (4) of" the first place it appears and inserting "the Food for Progress Act of 1985,";

(2) by striking "clause (3) or (4) of such" and inserting "the Food for Progress Act of 1985, such"; and

(3) by striking "to the President".

SEC. 3103. Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including the Federal Grants and Cooperative Agreements Act), the Secretary of Agriculture shall use not more than \$40,000,000 of Commodity Credit Corporation funds, to remain available until expended, for a cooperative program with the State of Florida to replace commercial trees removed to control citrus canker and to compensate for lost production: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the

Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

SEC. 3104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the area bounded by West 197th Avenue, North S.W. 232nd Street, East U.S. Highway 1 and S.W. 360th Street in Dade County, Florida, shall continue to be eligible to receive business and industry guaranteed loans under section 310B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932) until such time that population data is available from the 2000 decennial census: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CLAYTON

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. CLAYTON: Page 48 after line 18 insert the following section:

SEC. _____. Of the funds available for Emergency Watershed Protection activities in the State of North Carolina, \$1,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Natural Resources Conservation Service, to provide technical and financial assistance for implementation of the project known as the "Flood Water Mitigation and Stream Restoration Project—Pineville, North Carolina".

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I understand there is a point of order to be reserved, but I want to speak on the amendment.

This amendment does not cost any money. It merely provides authority to NRCS where such authority does not now exist. The amendment is on behalf of a one-time only project for Princeville, North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, Princeville is a small town in eastern North Carolina that was totally destroyed by the flooding from Hurricane Floyd. Nearly every home, every business, every school, every church was completely destroyed in Princeville.

This amendment will allow NRCS to clear internal drainage within the town. Both the Corps of Engineers and the National Fish and Wildlife Agency agree that this project is needed.

The NRCS State conservationist has the money to do this project within the current budget. The authority to do the project, however, is not present.

This amendment provides that authority. It will not require any new monies.

I urge the support, obviously, of this amendment, realizing there is a point of order being reserved.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) of the subcommittee to speak on the amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, as I told the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) earlier this evening, I appreciate the problem that she has, and we would like to work with her and see if we can remedy her problem.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from New Mexico will work with me in the conference to see that we can get the provision consistent.

Mr. SKEEN. We will go the whole gamut with the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. CLAYTON. The whole gamut. In other words, Mr. Chairman, we will get the drainage that is needed for Princeville.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from North Carolina is a lucky lady.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, that is all I wanted to ask.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to conclude my remarks by thanking both sides of the aisle for working with us for eastern North Carolina and other States that are flooded.

I also want to recognize that there are parts of this bill that I may have problems with, but the devastation that many of the citizens who suffered, not just in my State, but throughout the East Coast, the citizens will be thankful to those of us who understood that we, as America, are best when we respond to citizens when they are at their lowest.

So I want to kind of praise everybody that this is at least one good part of the bill that we ought to celebrate. I want to thank both sides for working with me.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, with the understanding that the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) will work with me to achieve our goals.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

□ 2130

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. KAPTUR:

On page 48 after line 18, insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. **Equity Loans and Grants for Farmer-Owned Cooperatives.**

The Secretary of Agriculture shall use not more than \$130,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to remain available until expended, for grants and loans for equity capital to establish farmer-owned cooperatives composed of small and medium sized producers for the processing

and marketing of agricultural commodities (including livestock). The Secretary shall establish reasonable limits on the amount of any individual loan or grant so as to maximize the total number of awards that may be made: *Provided*. That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 as amended: *Provided further*. That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

Ms. KAPTUR (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes on her amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to explain this amendment so everyone is aware of what we are proposing here.

First of all, I do not think it is a surprise to say to anyone in this chamber tonight that rural America and farmers are experiencing the lowest prices in modern history, in all sectors, and this particular supplemental bill is the only opportunity we have to try to offer greater assistance to those small- and medium-sized enterprises that this year, not the 2001 appropriation, but this year, in the year of 2000, need assistance in trying to reposition themselves for the marketplace.

This amendment essentially provides \$130 million of funds, makes them available, through the Commodity Credit Corporation essentially as an emergency. And because it is the Commodity Credit Corporation, those dollars do not flow through the appropriations process. It makes up to that amount, \$130 million, available to farmers and farmer-owned cooperatives for feasibility studies to reposition their businesses, business development strategies, restructuring of their own individual operations into cooperative operations to try to meet the market that is out there, as well as the processing and marketing of those commodities to try to get them to the market.

Now this is different from the language that we offered in full committee the other day. We have done a lot of consultation with the department. We have changed the language a little bit to include both equity capital and loans. We have put a ceiling on the amount of funds that any one enterprise could get at \$10 million, up to that amount out of the \$30 million. We

have worked with the American Meat Institute to address many of the concerns that they had about the original language. We have made this much more specific.

I also wanted to say that this particular amendment is better than the kind of bills this Congress has been passing to try to plug holes in the dike of Freedom to Farm. We have literally appropriated billions of dollars to producers across this country and, as everyone knows, the formula is not based on what people produce or may have lost this year because of bad weather or low prices, the formula is based on something that is 6 years old, that has no relationship to what has actually been done in the field or on the ranch in any given year.

So those AMTA payments are going out in a very inequitable way. And many sectors of rural America, vegetable and fruit producers, certainly those involved in the sugar beet industry, citrus, livestock, any sector that is not row crop, have been deeply hurt and not aided through the AMTA system. This measure would give some hope to those farmers. And I have met many of them. They have come to my office. And God bless them, because, as they are losing everything they have worked for, all they are asking for is the ability to reposition, try to combine together in co-ops to try to survive.

Now, this Congress ought to listen to them. These are people who are feeding our country and literally feeding the world and they are losing everything that they have worked for. It seems to me that we actually have a marvelous opportunity here in this year of 2000. Many of these people cannot hang on until 2001 when our other bill comes through this Congress. Hopefully, it will.

So if we think about the AMTA payment scheme in our country today, five districts got 20 percent of the money that went out under the last financing that was done last year. And so many large operators got huge amounts of money. I had people in the Midwest come up to me and say that they really felt guilty because so-and-so up the street, who was a small- and medium-sized farmer, was going under, and they got payments when they did not even produce a crop. So even the farmers in America know what is going on out there.

The credit systems in these communities are extremely fragile. All I am asking for is the ability to provide a line of credit to these farmers who deserve our attention here in the Congress of the United States. So I would really ask the cooperation of the majority in this effort in this emergency bill. There is no greater emergency than what is going on in rural America today.

I am asking for support to try to find a way to work this measure in this Congress as a part of the supplemental bill as it moves through. I would ask for that consideration.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) wish to make his point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 rule XXI.

The rule States, in pertinent part, "An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. KAPTUR. I do. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has tried to be understanding in prior years in the measures that we have brought forward. So in the spirit of that, I would hope that during the conference committee that the gentleman would give consideration to working with our subcommittee to see if we cannot find a way to incorporate the spirit of this in some of what is done.

I would humbly withdraw this amendment this evening knowing full well that the farmers of America deserve a better turn than we are giving them tonight.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida wish to be heard further?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to the gentlewoman that we will always be willing to work with her to try to accomplish what she wishes to accomplish.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is withdrawn.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have just been reminded once again by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, that the people who live and work in rural America, who own and work on the farms and ranches of our country, are in deep trouble. That trouble has been visited upon them as a result of acts both natural and man made.

First of all, we have seen serious drought sweep across vast sections of the country. Following that, large sections were hit with hurricanes. Hurricane Floyd, for example, did an enormous amount of damage. All this follows upon the devastating impacts of the Freedom to Farm Act which was enacted by this Congress in 1996, which in and of itself has done extraordinary

damage to people on the farm and ranchers all across America.

Yesterday, I went before the Committee on Rules and asked that we have an amendment made in order which would address an important part of this problem. This Congress has done much to help the farmers of the traditional row crops. We have, in fact, appropriated billions of dollars in the last several years to deal with agricultural disaster affecting these five traditional row crops. However, we have pointedly ignored the producers of specialty crops. And what I mean by specialty crops, of course, are the producers of fruit, apples, pears, orchards of various kinds, as well as vegetable growers, peanut growers, and other specialty crops, which have been hard hit both by these natural and man-made disasters.

I ask the Committee on Rules to make in order an amendment which would allow \$150 million in disaster assistance for the farmers who produce these row crops and whose incomes have been so devastatedly impacted as a result of these natural and man-made disasters. Unfortunately, the Committee on Rules saw fit not to make that amendment in order. So I am taking this opportunity to bring this issue before the Members of the House and, particularly, once again, to my dear friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies in the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) has been gracious enough to allow me to consult with him on this issue and to bring it to his attention. We have had several discussions about it. And he has assured me of his deep concern and interest in this issue. I hope that together we can find a way to provide the relief that is so desperately needed by the agriculture community, particularly the growers of these row crops.

I am putting my faith in the chairman of my subcommittee and the other Members of this House, and the people who grow these crops all across our country, in the Northeast and Florida, in the South, and in the far West, also are putting their faith in the chairman of our subcommittee and the Members of this House. They need relief. They need it desperately, and they need it now. This is, in fact, a disaster, and we have a responsibility to come to their aid.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman explained it very well. We are here to help, and we are going to do it. We are going to do whatever is possible in this thing to try to make it work.

We appreciate the gentleman's interest, and the gentleman certainly has mine and also, I think, the chairman of

the full committee. I want to thank the gentleman for the backup that he has given me and the rest of our committee. He is a great member of the committee. I appreciate it.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank both gentlemen very, very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 2

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, last night we appeared before the Committee on Rules in order to attempt to make a bipartisan common sense approach in order due to a real emergency and a real disaster. The emergency aid involves West Coast fishermen and owners of small fishing boats.

This is a real emergency caused by a precipitous decline in fish population and bad Federal policy. It affects the entire West Coast. Simply put, there are too many fishing boats, too few fish, and too many Federal fishing restrictions based on spotty data. This bipartisan common sense amendment offered by myself, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), and the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL), two Democrats and two Republicans, would have addressed these challenges by bringing better science and better fish counting to the problem, a boat buy-back program and financial aid to affected families.

This common sense bipartisan amendment was not made in order, and I would inquire of the chairman on behalf of myself and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) about the prospects of providing assistance to the hard-hit West Coast fishing industry when this bill is conferred with the Senate. I understand that a number of issues not in the House bill may be considered at that conference, and I would like to know whether the chairman would consider at that time providing assistance for West Coast fisheries, which are dependent on ground fish.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for bringing this matter before the House.

I know there is a great concern on this issue, and I would appreciate any further information that the gentleman could develop as we go through the process on this supplemental. I can guaranty the gentleman that we will look very closely at the issue.

We understand the importance, we appreciate the work that the gentleman has done at this point, and we ask him to provide us with additional information so that we can make a proper judgment.

Mr. WU. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I understand that there

were monies in the appropriation bill last year for studies. The challenge that we face is a continuation of studies and a failure to act.

I appreciate the gentleman's offer to work with me on this issue. Do I have the chairman's assurance that this is an assurance to cooperate in action and not study alone?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I can assure him that we will do the very best we can to do what is right.

Mr. WU. I thank the chairman.

□ 2145

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to urge my colleagues as we finish these amendments to support this appropriation bill that includes over \$350 million for North Carolina's victims from Hurricane Floyd.

I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and the members of the committee and the members of the administration, really, who worked together on this bill, to come up with a strong relief package for the victims of this devastating storm.

I know there are some Members of this House who are opposed to this bill because of the funds it is spending on various projects overseas. There are tens of thousands of North Carolinians and others along the East Coast who have been devastated economically, physically, and emotionally by this historic storm.

I sure would appreciate it if my colleagues would think about them when they cast their vote this evening or tomorrow. Think about the thousands of small businesses who will never open their doors again. Think about the widow or the widower who lost a life partner in the flood waters that ravaged our State. Think about the farmers, and we just heard about them, who are struggling to repair their fields, their barns, their equipment, and who are desperately hanging on hoping that they can get through this spring planting season. Think about the thousands of families who are in cramped travel trailers or who are sharing quarters with relatives and desperately need to have a place that they can call home. Think about children who are traveling on roads every day that need to be repaired.

I urge my colleagues to think about these things and ask themselves this question: How would I cast my vote if these were my neighbors? Regardless of what else they may have against what is in this bill. Think about that before they cast their vote. Think about the Americans that we all represent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief statement and then enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from New

Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

In 1999, we saw the nearly complete disappearance of lobsters in Western Long Island Sound and the destruction of our commercial lobster fishery. Many of the men and women who depend on this industry are faced with having to sell their boats, traps, and other equipment; and many of them will soon lose their homes, as well.

Commerce Secretary Daley has already declared the Sound a commercial beneficiary failure under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, paving the way for emergency supplemental funding.

According to the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection, the State as a whole saw an 81 percent decline in pounds of lobster caught in the fall of 1999. The towns of Greenwich and the City of Stamford, the westernmost part of Connecticut, showed declines greater than 99 percent. This is not merely a bad year; it is a disappearance of a species. It is a disaster no one anticipated and, therefore, no one prepared for.

Researchers from Connecticut and New York, working with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, have indicated a parasite is responsible for the die-off but have not been able to identify why the parasite is suddenly flourishing.

I am grateful the legislation being considered today includes \$8.6 million for additional research and a revolving fund to help the lobstermen refinance their business obligations. The committee's recognition of this tragedy is important.

My colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), and I rise today to address the critical need for aid to the individuals in communities directly affected by this unexplained disaster, like the citrus growers for whom the Committee on Appropriations has designated \$40 million to compensate for lost production due to the unexpected breakout of citrus canker. The Long Island Sound lobstermen deserve our help.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), and ask my good chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), a question.

The lobstermen in Connecticut have lost their crop. They lost their income. They are proud people. They cannot afford to maintain their equipment or to make payments on their boats. Their industry is disappearing. The Long Island Sound lobstermen are not asking for much. They are simply asking their government to help them through a hard time, which no one could have predicted. They want only enough to provide for their families and avoid having to sell their boats, in hope the

fishery will recover and that they can return to the life that they know and that they love.

When the Committee on Appropriations considered this legislation, I offered an amendment with my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), to appropriate additional aid to the individuals affected. We withdrew our amendment in order to work more closely with the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN), who indicated that he would work with the Long Island Sound members as the supplemental appropriations process moves forward.

Mr. Chairman, our understanding is that, as this supplemental aid package moves forward, we will continue to assess the assistance given to Long Island Sound lobster fishery failure in order to ensure that the package includes sufficient aid for the Long Island Sound lobstermen and for their families.

Mr. Chairman, is that the understanding of the gentleman, as well?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the willingness of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) to have this discussion, and I equally appreciate their obvious concern for the welfare of the fishermen.

The assistance that they are seeking as a result of the massive lobster losses is commendable. However, there are numerous questions which must be answered before a resolution can be reached, not the least of which is the question of jurisdiction between the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture and the Appropriations Subcommittee, which fund their budgets.

Accordingly, I look forward to discussing this issue further with the gentleman and the gentlewoman from Connecticut and hope that we will be able to arrive at some form of a workable decision. I thank the gentlewoman for her patience, and I thank her for the willingness to work it out.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues a current plight of nonprogram specialty crops in our country, and more specifically that of the onion and vegetable growers in my congressional district in Orange County, New York.

While it is clear that farmers throughout our Nation have experienced severe crop damage due to weather-related disasters during the 1999 growing season, I know of no other circumstances than the one that exists in the "black dirt" region of Orange County.

Onion and vegetable growers in that area have suffered devastating losses 3 out of the last 4 years, 1996, 1998, and

now 1999, and now are more than ever in desperate need of meaningful assistance, assistance that the Department of Agriculture and the current crop insurance program has failed to offer.

The small sums which crop insurance and the USDA paid to these farmers due to their 1996 and 1998 crop losses has failed to provide anything close to minimal relief. If these growers receive a similarly insignificant indemnity, and regrettably there is no reason to believe otherwise, under 1999 losses, more families are going to lose their farms.

In fact, I was just informed today by a grower in our area that creditors are already beginning to deny additional loans for growers in the valley. Should this trend continue and force more families to lose their farms, the economy of our region will be adversely affected, individuals will be uprooted, and a traditional way of life will be jeopardized, and a segment of our national food supply will be further diminished.

This is the very upheaval which crop insurance and the USDA are designed to prevent. Yet for the growers in this region, the system has failed.

Accordingly, I am hopeful that the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG); the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN), the subcommittee chairman; and all the conferees will provide for the needs of all specialty crops in this supplemental measure and will remember the plight of our onion growers and vegetable growers in Orange County, New York.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard, as have all of us this evening, of vital concerns about our Nation's disasters or impending disasters. We have heard about farmers and fishermen and natural disasters. As we are speaking, in Ft. Worth, Texas, yet another disaster has occurred.

I rise not to offer anything other than what I hope is some measure of creativity that does not seem to come about in this glacial body.

Is there anything wrong with us having a 14th committee that would consist of the respective chairs of the committees of jurisdiction of this Congress and perhaps two or more members appointed by the Speaker and the minority leader that handle nothing more than disasters so that we can move in better fashion than we do?

It seems that we wait for people who are flooded out and people who are blown away, and we are here going back and forth and back and forth all the time without having a committee that can do this.

I just invite my colleagues to consider something different so that we can expedite the process. Disasters are going to continue to occur.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a little over an hour ago, I announced that it was my intention to have our final votes of the

evening at approximately 10 o'clock. But we have used up nearly half an hour of that time in just motions to strike the last word.

So the approximately 10 o'clock will be a little bit beyond 10 o'clock, with our intention to go through the Kasich amendment this evening before the committee rises. I am hoping we can expedite and get that done. But we will continue to go until we complete the Kasich amendment, and then we will have the final votes for the evening.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs," \$25,800,000, to remain available until expended, for planning, public works grants and revolving loan funds for communities affected by Hurricane Floyd and other recent hurricanes and disasters: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Operations, Research and Facilities," \$19,400,000, to remain available until expended, to provide disaster assistance pursuant to section 312(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Management Act, and for repairs to the Beaufort Laboratory, resulting from Hurricane Floyd and other recent hurricanes and disasters: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RELATED AGENCY

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for the cost of direct loans, \$33,300,000, to remain available until expended to subsidize additional gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and for direct administrative expenses to carry out the disaster loan program, an additional \$27,600,000, to remain available until expended, which may be transferred to and merged with appropriations for "Salaries and Expenses": *Provided further*, That no funds shall be transferred to and merged with appropriations for "Salaries and Expenses" for indirect administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For an additional amount to conduct a study and report to the Congress on the feasibility of a project to provide flood damage reduction for the town of Princeville, North Carolina, \$1,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the study of a flood damage reduction project may include any flood mitigation measures that the Secretary of the Army determines are necessary for areas that are affected by the project: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, general" for emergency expenses due to hurricanes and other natural disasters, \$27,925,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, the amount for eligible navigation projects which may be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund pursuant to Public Law 99-662 shall be derived from that Fund: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
ENERGY PROGRAMS

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

For an additional amount for "Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund", \$16,000,000, to be derived from the Fund, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Other defense activities", \$63,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$4,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from unobligated balances in the "Biomass energy development" account: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Department is authorized to initiate design of the Highly Enriched Uranium Blend Down Project.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KILPATRICK

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. KILPATRICK: Page 53, after line 5, add the following:

CHAPTER 3A—BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
CHILD SURVIVAL AND DISEASE PROGRAMS FUND

For an additional amount for "Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund", \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, for flood recovery efforts in the Republic of Mozambique and surrounding affected countries: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emer-

gency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that at an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Development Assistance", \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, for flood recovery efforts in the Republic of Mozambique and surrounding affected countries: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that at an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "International Disaster Assistance", \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, for flood recovery efforts in the Republic of Mozambique and surrounding affected countries: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that at an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

Ms. KILPATRICK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, a little over a month ago, there was a cyclone that hit Mozambique. There has been much discussion about that all day long, so I will not go into the details of that.

A little more than 3 weeks ago, our Subcommittee on Appropriations and the full committee brought forward this supplemental that we have been debating all day. In that supplemental and in the committee, as the discussion went on, I offered an amendment for \$60 million, \$20 million to go in the Child Survival Account, \$20 million to go into the Development Assistance Account, and \$20 million to go into International Disaster Relief to replenish the accounts that I was hoping that

we could take out that day and appeal to my colleagues today, as we have 3 weeks later, to go forward to Mozambique to address the tragedies that are there, with over a million people homeless, over 50,000 children orphaned, water contaminated, mines floating.

At that time, in the Committee on Appropriations, I withdrew that amendment because the chairman of our Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), made the commitment that they would work with us after the assessment is finished.

I understand that assessment should be finished on Friday, Mr. Chairman, or thereabouts; that the President and his advisors will be giving it to the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and presenting our case to my colleagues.

It is important. With his commitment, I appreciate that. I appreciate the work that he has done in the committee, both the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and working with us as we address the Mozambique crisis.

□ 2200

The appropriations process will continue as the gentleman knows as we finish this supplemental process. I hope that after the assessment has been made, I understand that will be Friday, that they will report to the gentleman and that they will make the commitment and we carry out on the commitment that we have made in appropriations under the gentleman's leadership and with the leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) to make sure that we assist in Mozambique. I appreciate the report language that both of the chairs as well as our full committee adopted in our supplemental appropriation which is in the bill today.

Mr. Chairman, as we move to the assessment and its completion, as we replenish the accounts and I know that we will as the supplemental moves through the process, that we do what is proper and what is right for Mozambique.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. KILPATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all compliment the gentleman from Michigan. She certainly has been the front mover of trying to bring to the attention of the Congress and to the country the needs of Mozambique, and certainly they deserve immediate attention by those of us in Congress that are responsible for providing the funds to the administration. I support her movement. I compliment her on that. But let me point out that so far we have already spent \$17 million through USAID plus \$21 million in DOD

activities in Mozambique. They need more. It is my understanding that the gentleman is going to ask the administration to submit a supplemental to the supplemental requesting emergency assistance for Mozambique, and if indeed the administration does that, we will address it in conference.

Ms. KILPATRICK. I thank the gentleman. It is my understanding that the administration will be sending that information forward. With that, Mr. Chairman, and the gentleman's support as well as the support of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), I will withdraw this amendment and continue to work with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 4

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Wildland Fire Management", \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended, for emergency rehabilitation and wildfire suppression activities: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That this amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount as an emergency requirement as defined by such Act, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, to repair or replace buildings, equipment, roads, and water control structures damaged by natural disasters: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended, to repair or replace visitor facilities, equipment, roads and trails, and cultural sites and artifacts at national park units damaged by natural disasters: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for "Surveys, Investigations, and Research", \$1,800,000, to remain available until expended, to repair or replace stream monitoring equipment and associated facilities damaged by natural disasters: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RELATED AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Wildland Fire Management", \$150,000,000, to remain available until expended, for emergency rehabilitation, presuppression, and wildfire suppression: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That this amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount as an emergency requirement as defined by such Act, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLAGOJEVICH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAGOJEVICH:
Page 55, after line 19, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Training and Employment Services" for youth activities under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, \$500,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirements as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would add \$500 million to this bill for summer jobs. Many communities across our country are facing a funding crisis for their summer jobs programs. We live in a time, Mr. Chairman, of game show millionaires and Internet IPOs. I think sometimes we fail to recognize and overlook that the old-fashioned recipe for success really boils down to hard work. A recently released study shows that a student who gets a job early in life can expect to increase his or her future earnings by up to 10 to 12 percent. That is contrasted for a student who goes to an elite school. The study indicates that student would only increase his or her chances for future economic success by 1 percent. The summer jobs program was designed to help kids learn early in life the value of hard

work and to give them an opportunity to get the work experience they need to thrive in the American economy. To a young person, a summer job is not just about wages to help his or her family for the summer. More importantly, a summer job is about learning a work ethic that he or she can take with him or her throughout their lifetimes. But the looming summer jobs crisis threatens to derail the summer youth employment programs of towns and cities all across America.

I will in a moment withdraw this amendment, but I would first ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) if it is possible to address this issue in conference.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I understand the concerns of the gentleman from Illinois. While I cannot make any promises, I will bring this concern to the attention of the conferees.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply say, I also am familiar with the problem. I certainly will also bring it to the attention of the conferees.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I certainly want to thank the gentleman for his amendment. I was hoping that the chairman might be willing to make a further commitment to us in his instructions to the conferees to certainly consider the summer jobs program. As the calendar continues to tick, certainly this issue is becoming a pressing issue for those of us who live in inner cities across the country. So while it may be discussed with the conferees, if in fact it is not addressed in this particular bill, could the gentleman be kind enough to be a little bit more specific about what the appropriate measure is for those of us on the committee who will be willing to advance this?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman will yield further, I will be specific to this point, that yesterday morning the committee received a request from the administration to add \$40 million for this effort. That was just too late. You just cannot send an amendment to your supplemental that late in the game. So the best that I can offer is that we will do our very best to deal with the subject when we go to conference with the other body. We basically support the program, but the Committee on Appropriations, as the gentleman knows because he is a valued member of that committee, tries to be thorough, and we try to understand exactly what it is that we are doing. That is the approach we will bring to the conference on this subject.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I understand the difficulty of trying to come up with an amendment for \$40 million at the last minute, but we did earlier today adopt an amendment for \$4 billion for the Pentagon which if my arithmetic is right is about 100 times as much. So if we could put an amendment together for \$4 billion for the Pentagon after the bill came out and we cannot do \$40 million for this program, I think that says a lot of unfortunate things about our priorities.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Chairman, let me just close by thanking the gentleman from Florida. I know when he does his best and I am a supplicant, so he can take this with a grain of salt, but I know when he does his best, that means an awful lot. I want to thank him for his effort and interest in looking at this. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH) is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in lieu of the discussion that has just taken place, summer jobs are as critical for young people in cities like Chicago and other economically challenged communities throughout the country as one could possibly imagine. While the city of Chicago is making every effort under the leadership of its mayor to go into the private sector and convince members of the private sector to provide work opportunities for these young people, we know that we are not going to be able to get enough. There is no greater need that we have during the critical summer period than the opportunity for young people, 14, 15, 16 years old to have a chance to work, to be engaged, to be productive, to be involved, to provide not only hope but help for themselves, for their families and for their communities. And so I would certainly hope that when we come to conference and when all of the I's are dotted and the T's are crossed that we will have found a way to make sure that adequate resources are put into this very valuable and critical component for the needs of our young people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 5

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Low Income Home Energy Assistance" for emergency assistance under section 2602(e) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621(e)), \$600,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is hereby designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to

section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget And Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARDIN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARDIN:

Page 56, after line 12, insert the following:

RELATED AGENCIES

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The limitation on administrative expenses under this heading in the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106-113) is increased by an additional \$336,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

Mr. CARDIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase Social Security's limitation on administrative expenses for fiscal year 2000 by \$336 million, bringing it to the level requested by the Social Security Commissioner. Quite simply this funding is necessary if SSA is to maintain vital services that are being threatened by the agency's inadequate administrative budget.

Mr. Chairman, I might point out that the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Committee on Ways and Means recently held a hearing when the Commissioner was there and some of the concerns on the administrative budget was expressed at that hearing.

Every day over 100,000 individuals visit SSA's field offices and over 240,000 individuals call SSA's 800 number. Every month SSA pays benefits to approximately 50 million individuals. In this coming year it expects to issue 16 million new and replacement Social Security cards and take more than 5 million new claims for benefits. Last year, Social Security also began sending benefit statements to workers over

the age of 25, enabling 126 million American workers to better plan their financial future. There is just no way around it. Providing efficient service on this vast scale takes more than good management, it takes resources. Yet Congress has funded SSA's administrative budget below levels requested by the President and by the Social Security Commissioner every year since the agency became independent in 1994. Despite these funding constraints, the Social Security Administration last year received an overall grade of A on the Government Performance Project's report card and 88 percent of SSA's customers rate the agency's service as being excellent, very good, or good. SSA's administrative budget represents less than 2 percent of the value of the benefits it provides each year and the OASI program enjoys a payment accuracy of over 99 percent.

SSA has a history of a solid and reliable customer service and this must be maintained. Yet over the next decade the number of OASI beneficiaries will increase by 16 percent and the number of DI beneficiaries by 47 percent. At the same time the agency estimates that almost 3 percent of its workforce will retire in 2001 and that these losses will continue and peak around 2009. SSA must be prepared now for both the expected spike in its workload due to the baby boomers' retirement and the retirement of its own aging workforce.

These challenges are already placing an unprecedented strain on SSA as the agency tries to prepare for the future using a persistently underfunded administrative budget. SSA's workforce has declined by 26 percent between 1982 and 1998, much more quickly than the rest of the Federal workforce. At the same time it is trying to flatten its retirement wave by offering early retirement to some employees while hiring and training new individuals to ensure an adequate supply of trained personnel within the next several years.

For fiscal year 2000, Congress provided \$6.57 billion for SSA's administrative budget, a level \$336 million below the Commissioner's request. As a result, SSA will process a quarter of a million fewer disability, retirement and survivors claims than projected and will be unable to conduct over 200,000 SSI redeterminations. In addition, the agency projects declines in its telephone service.

Congress is simply not providing SSA with the resources necessary to prepare for the future. We expect SSA to develop service delivery plans, to provide timely and accurate benefits to the elderly and disabled, to use current information technology and to maintain the integrity of its program. But for SSA to continue meeting these expectations this year and in future years Congress must provide the agency with necessary administrative resources.

That is why my amendment is necessary and should be included in this bill. These funds do not come out of the general fund but rather are financed al-

most entirely out of the OASDI trust funds. At a time when the trust funds are running surpluses it makes little sense to restrict Social Security's ability to administer its own programs. Without this increase, your district offices will begin to receive calls from constituents whose expectation of SSA customers are out of step with the levels of service Congress is supporting through the LAE allocation.

Mr. Chairman, the programs administered by the SSA touch the lives of almost every American. I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has raised a point of order and the amendment is subject to a point of order. But I would hope during the appropriation process this year, we would be mindful of the need of SSA to have adequate administrative resources in order to carry out this increased responsibility. I know that the chairman has been sensitive to this in the past.

I would be glad to yield to the chairman, but I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman withdraws the amendment, then I will not be required to raise the point of order.

Mr. CARDIN. I will be glad to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 6

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses", \$37,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That \$18,000,000 shall be available only for costs related to the delivery of health care to Coast Guard personnel, retirees, and their dependents, and \$19,000,000 shall be available only for aircraft spare parts: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For an additional amount for the Emergency Relief Program for emergency expenses resulting from floods and other natural disasters, as authorized by 23 U.S.C. 125, \$600,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RELATED AGENCY

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$24,739,000, for emergency ex-

penses associated with the investigation of the Egypt Air 990 and Alaska Air 261 accidents, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available for wreckage location and recovery, facilities, technical support, testing, and wreckage mock-up: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 3601. None of the funds provided in the Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000, shall be available for operation of the transportation computer center.

SEC. 3602. The Executive Draft on Federal Transportation in the National Capital Region which has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget by the Secretary of Transportation shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to the Congress a report on the implementation of Executive Draft referred to in the preceding proviso.

□ 2215

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 3602 of the bill on page 58, lines 9 through 17.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I raise a point of order against section 3602 of the bill on page 58, lines 9 through 17, on the grounds that it constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill in violation of clause 2 of Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Section 3602 of the bill provides that the executive draft on Federal transportation in the National Capital Region has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget and shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this bill. The section further provides that within 60 days of enactment, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to Congress a report on implementation of the executive draft.

This provision would enact into law a policy that Congress has not reviewed; a policy, in fact, that is still in the process of being written by the administration. Although the latest version of the draft Executive Order referenced in section 3602 has not been made available, we understand that it sets forth a variety of requirements for Federal agencies in the National Capital Region in an effort to reduce the number of employees who drive alone to work.

We understand that the draft Executive Order would require Federal agencies to develop and implement transportation management plans designed to reduce vehicle miles traveled by Federal employees, and various other requirements.

In addition, the draft Executive Order would apparently require all

agencies in the National Capital Region to provide maximum tax-free transit benefits to all employees. This transit benefit alone, Mr. Chairman, is estimated to cost \$60 million to \$80 million each year for this region and would ultimately be extended to other regions across the country and be even more costly. The cost of complete implementation of the policies set forth in the draft Executive Order may be far greater.

While some of these requirements may have merit, they are, nevertheless, significant policy changes. Not only have no congressional hearings been held on the draft Executive Order, its contents have not even been made known to Congress. Costly and significant policy changes such as these should be subjected to the normal congressional authorization and review process, not approved sight unseen.

Mr. Chairman, clause 2 of Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives prohibits the reporting of a provision changing existing law in a general appropriations bill, including a supplemental appropriations bill, such as we are dealing with here tonight. In other words, this rule prohibits legislation on an appropriations bill.

For the reasons stated previously, section 3602 of this bill on page 58, lines 9 through 17, constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill in violation of clause 2 of Rule XXI.

Mr. Chairman, I have to insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOLF. Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I am not going to go into detail. This was the language that would have allowed people to telework; it would have taken a lot of traffic off of streets. It also would have encouraged car-pooling and done a lot of other things. But in light of the objection that has been made, we will not appeal the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Tennessee makes a point of order that section 3602 of the bill changes existing law in violation of clause 2(b) of Rule XXI.

The provision mandates that the Executive Draft on Federal transportation in the National Capital Region take effect on the date of enactment of the act. The provision also requires the Secretary of Transportation to transmit a report on implementation of the Executive Draft.

As stated in section 1055 of the House Rules and Manual, a proposition to impose a duty on an executive official is legislation and not in order under clause 2 of Rule XXI.

Accordingly, the point of order is sustained, and section 3602 is stricken.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title III be considered as

read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 58, line 18 through page 64, line 6 is as follows:

CHAPTER 7

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625), as amended, \$36,000,000: *Provided*, That of said amount, \$11,000,000 shall be provided to the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs and \$25,000,000 shall be provided to the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency for the purpose of providing temporary assistance in obtaining rental housing, and for construction of affordable replacement housing: *Provided further*, That assistance provided under this paragraph shall be for very low-income families displaced by flooding caused by Hurricane Floyd and surrounding events: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 3701. (a) Subject to subsection (d) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, from any amounts made available for assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) that remain unobligated, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, for each request described in subsection (b), make a 1-year grant to the entity making the request in the amount under subsection (c).

(b) A request described in this subsection is a request for a grant under subtitle C of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381 et seq.) for permanent housing for homeless persons with disabilities or subtitle F of such title (42 U.S.C. 11403 et seq.) that—

(1) was submitted in accordance with the eligibility requirements established by the Secretary and pursuant to the notice of funding availability for fiscal year 1999 covering such programs, but was not approved;

(2) was made by an entity that received such a grant pursuant to the notice of funding availability for a previous fiscal year; and

(3) requested renewal of funding made under such previous grant for use for eligible activities because funding under such previous grant expires during calendar year 2000.

(c) The amount under this subsection is the amount necessary, as determined by the Secretary, to renew funding for the eligible activities under the grant request for a period of only 1 year, taking into consideration the amount of funding requested for the first year of funding under the grant request.

(d) The entire amount for grants under this section is designated by the Congress as an

emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended. The entire amount for grants under this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY DISASTER RELIEF

For an increase in the authority to use unobligated balances specified under this heading in appendix E, title I, chapter 2, of Public Law 106-113, in addition to other amounts made available, up to an additional \$77,400,000 may be used by the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for the purposes included in said chapter: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT

For an additional amount for "Human Space Flight" to provide for urgent upgrades to the space shuttle fleet, \$25,800,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY

For an additional amount for "Science, aeronautics and technology to provide for urgent and unanticipated program needs, \$29,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

MISSION SUPPORT

For an additional amount for "Mission Support" to provide for urgent augmentation of personnel required to support the space shuttle program, \$20,200,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced

Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on the Interior of the Committee on Appropriations in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for fully funding the administration's request in the area of Wildland Fire Management. This is an issue that is of very great importance to rural Nevada and other States in the Great Basin.

The gentleman's bill provides \$100 million for wildland fire management on Bureau of Land Management lands and \$150 million for lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service. These funds are critical to suppress wildfires and rehabilitate public lands that have been scourged by fires.

The Great Basin region remains particularly susceptible to fire hazards. Just last year my home State of Nevada experienced one of the worst wild-fire seasons on record.

Nationwide, more than 4.6 million acres of Federal lands burned in the 1999 fire season. Of that amount, 1.7 million of those acres, nearly half, were in Nevada.

The wildfires damaged critical animal and wildlife habitats, destroyed fences which managed domestic livestock and wild horses, imperiled watersheds, and allowed for the spread of cheatgrass, a very flammable weed and persistent contributor to fire hazards in the Great Basin.

Because of its ability to overwhelm and choke native vegetation, cheatgrass is pushing the sagegrouse to the point of where the bird is on the verge of being listed as a threatened species under the Federal Endangered Species Act. If listed, the sagegrouse will become the Great Basin's very own "spotted owl" and virtually destroy Nevada's rural economy.

Mr. Chairman, the emergency fire rehabilitation funding is a tremendous step forward and the people of Nevada are grateful. However, I believe much more can be done with existing Federal funds to better manage these fires and actually prevent their spread in the future.

Mr. Chairman, as you work with the Senate Energy Committee on funding for wildland fire management and on the regular Interior and Agriculture Appropriations bills, I hope we can address the current limitations on the emergency funding and give the Department of Interior more flexibility in rehabilitating public lands with the funds in this supplemental.

I also hope that we can work on language to clarify to the BLM and the

Forest Service that emergency wildfire funds contained in this supplemental will be used expeditiously to help rehabilitate the acreage burned in 1999.

Also, for the longer term, I hope we can work together with my colleagues from California, Oregon, Idaho, and Utah to implement the Great Basin Restoration Initiative. This plan would fund restoration work in the Great Basin so the BLM and Forest Service can restore lands and prevent costly fire rehabilitation expenditures in the future.

I thank the chairman for his time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Nevada's concerns. He is correct that this bill provided the requested emergency wildland fire fighting funds. We will work with the gentleman, and the other body, to see that appropriate rehabilitation needs, including those in the Great Basin area, can proceed.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his willingness to work with us, and I thank him for his understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND OFFSETS

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Weapons activities", \$55,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER 2

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "State and Private Forestry", \$500,000, to be derived by transfer from unobligated balances in the Forest Service "Wildland Fire Management" account and to remain available until expended, for volunteer fire assistance programs in eastern North Carolina.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY CONSERVATION

For an additional amount for "Energy Conservation", \$19,000,000, to become available on October 1, 2000, and to remain available until expended, for weatherization assistance grants.

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The matter under this heading in the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106-113) is amended by striking "including not to exceed \$750,000 may be collected by the National Mine Health and Safety Academy"

and inserting "and, in addition, not to exceed \$750,000 may be collected by the National Mine Health and Safety Academy".

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For "Health Resources and Services" for special projects of regional and national significance under section 501(a)(2) of the Social Security Act, \$20,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2000, and shall remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That such amount shall not be counted toward compliance with the allocation required in section 502(a)(1) of such Act: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be used only for making competitive grants to provide abstinence education (as defined in section 510(b)(2) of such Act) to adolescents and for evaluations (including longitudinal evaluations) of activities under the grants and for Federal costs of administering the grant: *Provided further*, That such grants shall be made only to public and private entities which agree that, with respect to an adolescent to whom the entities provide abstinence education under such grant, the entities will not provide to that adolescent any other education regarding sexual conduct, except that, in the case of an entity expressly required by law to provide health information or services the adolescent shall not be precluded from seeking health information or services from the entity in a different setting than the setting in which the abstinence education was provided: *Provided further*, That the funds expended for such evaluations may not exceed 2.5 percent of such amount.

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

Funds appropriated under this heading in the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106-113) for fiscal year 2000, pursuant to section 414(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, shall be available for the costs of assistance provided and other activities through September 30, 2002.

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Payments to States for Foster Care and Adoption Assistance" for payments for fiscal year 2000, \$35,000,000.

ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

AGING SERVICES PROGRAMS

The matter under this heading in the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106-113) is amended by inserting after "\$934,285,000" the following: "of which \$2,200,000 shall be for the Anchorage, Alaska Senior Center and shall remain available until expended".

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

SEC. 4301. Section 206 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106-113) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "": *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to funds appropriated under the heading "Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—Disease Control, Research, and Training", funds made available to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention under the heading "Public

Health and Social Services Emergency Fund", or any other funds made available in this Act to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention".

SEC. 4302. Section 216 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106-113) is repealed.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 68, line 22 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman there Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this portion of title IV? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT

The matter under this heading in the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106-113) is amended—

(1) by striking "North Babylon Community Youth Services for an educational program" and inserting "Town of Babylon Youth Bureau for an educational program";

(2) by striking "to promote participation among youth in the United States democratic process" and inserting "to expand access to and improve advanced education";

(3) by striking "Oakland Unified School District in California for an African American Literacy and Culture Project" and inserting "California State University, Hayward, for an African-American Literacy and Culture Project carried out in partnership with the Oakland Unified School District in California"; and

(4) by striking "\$900,000 shall be awarded to the Boston Music Education Collaborative comprehensive interdisciplinary music program and teacher resource center in Boston, Massachusetts" and inserting "\$462,000 shall be awarded to the Boston Symphony Orchestra for the teacher resource center and \$370,000 shall be awarded to the Boston Music Education Collaborative for an interdisciplinary music program, in Boston, Massachusetts".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISAKSON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. ISAKSON: Page 69, after line 1, insert the following:

HIGHER EDUCATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Higher Education" for the Web-Based Education Commission established in part J of title VIII of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, to be derived from funds made available for fiscal year 2000 under section 458(a)(1)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087h(a)(1)(A)), \$225,000, to remind available until expended.

Mr. ISAKSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) is recognized.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Chairman, I am aware that the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has raised a point of order. I respect that, and in just a minute I will have a unanimous consent motion.

However, I would like to ask the chairman to consider, as this bill goes through the conference process and to the Senate, that there is a major issue that this amendment deals with. It is a small amount of money, but a major issue. This would add money to the congressionally created Web Base Commission which was created for the purpose of recommending to this Congress by the end of this calendar year what road map we are going to take in terms of dealing with the digital divide, dealing with technology, and dealing with the role of the Federal Government as it relates to public education.

I understand the point of order is because of a lack of authorization, although the time was expended, and I respect that. But I sincerely hope the chairman will work during the process to see if there is any way to add the additional funding so that the complete work of this commission may be done by the end of this calendar year.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I can assure the gentleman that we will be happy to work with him as we go through the balance of the legislative process on this bill and do the best that we can to accommodate him within the confines of this particular legislation.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 74, line 22 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 70, line 8 through page 74, line 22 is as follows: SEC. 4303. Section 304 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106-113) is repealed.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 4304. Section 513 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and

Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106-113) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "Provided further, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any funds appropriated to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or to the Department of Education".

SEC. 4305. Section 403(a)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(5)), as amended by section 806(b) of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106-113) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F), by striking "\$1,500,000" and inserting "\$15,000,000";

(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking "\$900,000" and inserting "\$9,000,000"; and

(3) in subparagraph (H), by striking "\$300,000" and inserting "\$3,000,000".

CHAPTER 4

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

JOINT ITEMS

CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS

For an additional amount for costs associated with security enhancements to the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress, as appropriated under chapter 5 of title II of division B of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277), \$1,874,000, to remain available until expended.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

FIRE SAFETY

For an additional amount for expenses for fire safety, \$15,166,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$7,039,000 shall be for "CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS—CAPITOL BUILDINGS—SALARIES AND EXPENSES"; \$4,213,000 shall be for "HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS"; \$3,000 shall be for "CAPITOL POWER PLANT"; \$26,000 shall be for "BOTANIC GARDEN—SALARIES AND EXPENSES"; and \$3,885,000 shall be for "ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL—LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS—STRUCTURAL AND MECHANICAL CARE"; *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5) shall not apply to the funds made available under this paragraph.

CHAPTER 6

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

Funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 106-74 and for fiscal years 2001 and 2002 shall be available for use by the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide assistance with the 2002 Paralympic Games: *Provided*, That such expenditures for fiscal year 2000 shall not exceed \$200,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

The referenced statement of the managers in the sixth paragraph under this heading in title II of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-74), is deemed to be amended by striking the word "Montgomery" in reference to the planning and construction of a regional learning center at Spring Hill College, and inserting the word "Mobile" in lieu thereof.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

In the third proviso under this heading in Public Law 106-74, add the words "and management and information systems" after the words "technical assistance".

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

FHA—GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for FHA—General and special risk program account for the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3 and 1735c), including the cost of loan modifications (as that term is defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended), \$49,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Under this heading in Public Law 106-74, add "", to remain available until September 30, 2001" after the number "\$83,000,000"; and add "of the amounts provided herein, \$6,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2000: *Provided further*, That" after the words "*Provided*, That".

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—THIS CHAPTER

Title V, subtitle C, section 538 of Public Law 106-74, is amended by striking "during any period that the assisted family continues residing in the same project in which the family was residing on the date of the eligibility event for the project, if" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the assisted family may elect to remain in the same project in which the family was residing on the date of the eligibility event for the project, and if, during any period the family makes such an election and continues to so reside,".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to this portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. HOEKSTRA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. HOEKSTRA:

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Office of Inspector General" for reviews and audits of the State Commissions on National and Community Service (including alternative administrative entities) established under section 178 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12638), \$1,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the unobligated balance in the National Service Trust account for educational awards authorized under subtitle D of title I of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12601 et seq.).

□ 2230

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed shall be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inform the gentleman from Wisconsin

(Mr. OBEY) that under the rule, points of order against amendments in Part B are waived.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is an issue about accountability. In 1993, this Congress voted to create the Corporation for National Service. This is not a debate about the merits of the corporation. As a matter of fact, in 1993, I voted for its formation. I voted for its vision of implementing leading edge and best business practices to this new government agency.

The Corporation has fallen short. For 5 years it has never had a clean audit, despite repeated promises from its leadership to improve its accountability, its accountability to Congress and to the American people.

My amendment is very simple. It moves \$1 million from the estimated \$100,000 overfunding from the Educational Trust Fund to the Inspector General to conduct an audit of State commissions.

Our subcommittee, in the Committee on Education and the Workforce, has received testimony of lax enforcement mechanisms and financial controls at the State level. As we move more than two-thirds of the Corporation for National Service funds through State agencies, we need to ensure that we protect the investment of the American taxpayer, and that we maintain the integrity of the program itself.

Five years is enough time, it is enough patience, to show to the Corporation. It is enough patience to deal with the stories of waste and abuse within the program.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman that we think this is a good amendment. We accept the amendment.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the chairman for his courtesy.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair not seeing a Member seeking to claim the time in opposition, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA). The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT
(INCLUDING TRANSFER)

Of the amount appropriated under this heading in title III of Public Law 106-74, \$2,374,900, in addition to amounts made available for the following in prior Acts, shall be and have been available to award grants for

work on the Buffalo Creek and other New York watersheds and for aquifer protection work in and around Cortland County, New York, including work on the Upper Susquehanna watershed.

Of the amount appropriated under this heading in title III of Public Law 105-276 to establish a regional environmental data center and to develop an integrated, automated water quality monitoring and information system for watersheds impacting Chesapeake Bay, \$2,600,000 shall be transferred to the "State and tribal assistance grants" account to remain available until expended for grants for wastewater and sewer infrastructure improvements for Smithfield Township, Monroe County (\$800,000); the Municipal Authority of the Borough of Milford, Pike County (\$800,000); the City of Carbondale, Lackawanna County (\$200,000); Throop Borough, Lackawanna County (\$200,000); and Dickson City, Lackawanna County (\$600,000), Pennsylvania.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

The referenced statement of the managers under this heading in title III of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-74), is deemed to be amended by striking the words "in the town of Waynesville" in reference to water and wastewater infrastructure improvements as identified in project number 102, and by inserting the words "Haywood County" in lieu thereof.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 78, line 17, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 76, line 11, through page 78, line 17, is as follows:

CHAPTER 7

OFFSETS

SEC. 4701. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out section 793 of Public Law 104-127, the Fund for Rural America.

SEC. 4702. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out the provisions of section 401 of Public Law 105-185, the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 106-60, \$13,000,000 are rescinded.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 105-277 to implement a United States/Russian accord for the disposition of excess weapons plutonium, \$40,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT
(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts appropriated under this heading in title II of the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106-113), \$20,000,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That the amount rescinded is from the amount designated to become available on October 1, 2000, and to remain available until September 30, 2001.

SEC. 4703. Of the funds transferred to the Department of Transportation for Year 2000 conversion of Federal information technology systems and related expenses pursuant to Public Law 105-277, \$26,600,000 of the unobligated balance are hereby rescinded: *Provided*, That the Department of Transportation shall allocate this rescission among the appropriate accounts within the Department and report such allocation to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS AND RELATED EXPENSES

Under this heading in division B, title III of Public Law 105-277, strike "\$2,250,000,000" and insert "\$2,015,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. LARGENT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. LARGENT:

Page 78, after line 17, insert the following new chapter:

CHAPTER 8
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Of the amount appropriated under this heading in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(1) of Public Law 106-113) (113 Stat. 1537-1), \$750,000 shall be available to the Commission on Online Child Protection established under section 1405 of the Child Online Protection Act (47 U.S.C. 231 note) for carrying out the duties of the Commission, to remain available until the termination of the Commission under section 1405(1) of such Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT).

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment that I am offering tonight is for a righteous effort. I want my colleagues to know that I do not use that term often or loosely. I believe my amendment will receive overwhelming

support, if not unanimous support, by my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, there is a communicable disease coursing through our country. In fact, half our homes and 4 million men, boys, husbands, and fathers will be exposed every single day. That disease is illegal pornography, available without consent or request via the Internet.

In fact, leading porn trade magazines, journals, have proudly boasted that there has never been a better time to be in the adult entertainment business, a business that grosses \$14 billion a year, \$1.4 billion on the Internet alone.

Why? Because the Department of Justice has chosen to look the other way. Prosecutions for illegal pornography or obscenity have declined 79 percent in the last 6 years.

Mr. Chairman, the porn industry through the Internet has turned every home office, every family room, in fact, every public library, into the worst porn shop imaginable.

Congress, through the Child Online Protection Act, tasked a commission with finding ways to keep our children away from material that is considered harmful to minors. Sadly, Congress has never appropriated any dollars to fund the Commission that is due to report to Congress in October of this year.

My amendment would provide \$750,000, taken from the salaries and expenses portion of the general administration account appropriated to the Department of Justice. My hope is that the Commission will supply some hope, some immunization, for our families and for our children, to protect us through technology from this disease that is running rampant in our country.

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

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

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

I would like to advise the gentleman that we think this is a very good amendment. We are accepting the amendment.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any Member seeking to control time in opposition?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 80, line 11, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 78, line 18, through page 80, line 11, is as follows:

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 5101. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 5102. Sections 305 and 306 of H.R. 3425 of the 106th Congress, as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(5) of Public Law 106-113, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 5103. Section 1001(a) of Public Law 106-113 is amended by striking "paragraph 4 of subsection 1000(a)" and inserting "paragraph (5) of section 1000(a), and the provisions of titles V, VI, and VII of the legislation enacted in this division by reference in such paragraph (5)". This section shall be deemed to have taken effect immediately subsequent to the enactment of Public Law 106-113.

SEC. 5104. Notwithstanding section 251(a)(6) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, there shall be no sequestration under that section to eliminate a fiscal year 2000 breach that might be caused by the appropriations or other provisions in this Act.

SEC. 5105. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414).

SEC. 5106. The following provisions of law are repealed: sections 8175 and 8176 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79), as amended by sections 214 and 215, respectively, of H.R. 3425 of the 106th Congress (113 Stat. 1501A-297), as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(5) of Public Law 106-113.

SEC. 5107. No funds appropriated to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for fiscal year 2000 may be used to relocate, or to plan or prepare for the relocation of, the functions or personnel of the Technical Training Center from its location at Chattanooga, Tennessee.

SEC. 5108. It is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of State should immediately place the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (Autodefensas Unidas de Colombia) on the list of foreign terrorist organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order by the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania:

Page 80, after line 11, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 5109. For an additional amount for the Secretary of Agriculture for carrying out section 306(a)(14) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(14)), \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 5110. (a) For an additional amount for carrying out this section, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(b) The Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall establish an office in the Agency to establish specific criteria of grant recipients and to administer grants under this section.

(c) The Director may make grants, on a competitive basis, to safety organizations

that have experience in conducting burn safety programs for the purpose of assisting those organizations in conducting burn prevention programs or augmenting existing burn prevention programs.

(d) The Director may make grants, on a competitive basis, to hospitals that serve as regional burn centers to conduct acute burn care research.

(e) The Director may make grants, on a competitive basis, to governmental and nongovernmental entities to provide after-burn treatment and counseling to individuals that are burn victims.

SEC. 5111. (a) For an additional amount for carrying out this section, \$80,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(b) The Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall establish a program to award grants to volunteer, paid, and combined departments that provide fire and emergency medical services.

(c) Grants awarded under this section may be used—

(1) to acquire personal protective equipment required for firefighting personnel by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and other personal protective equipment for firefighting personnel;

(2) to acquire additional firefighting equipment, including equipment for communication and monitoring;

(3) to establish wellness and fitness programs for firefighting personnel to reduce the number of injuries and deaths related to health and conditioning problems;

(4) to promote professional development of fire code enforcement personnel;

(5) to integrate computer technology to improve records management and training capabilities;

(6) to train firefighting personnel in firefighting, emergency response, and arson prevention and detection;

(7) to enforce fire codes;

(8) to fund fire prevention programs and public education programs about arson prevention and detection, and juvenile fire setter intervention; and

(9) to modify fire stations, fire training facilities, and other facilities to protect the health and safety of firefighting personnel.

(d) Applications for grants under this section shall include—

(1) a demonstration of financial need;

(2) evidence of a commitment for at least an equal amount as the amount of the grant sought, to be provided by non-Federal sources;

(3) a cost benefit analysis linking the funds to improvements in public safety; and

(4) a commitment to provide information to the National Fire Incident Reporting System for the period for which the grant is received.

(e) Grant recipients under this section shall be subject to audits to ensure that the funds are spent for their intended purposes.

SEC. 5112. (a) Section 105(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (23), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (23) the following new paragraph:

“(24) provision of assistance to local fire fighting, emergency medical, or rescue services for—

“(A) acquisition, repair, or rehabilitation of equipment (including any accessory, communications, or protective equipment) or vehicles for fire fighting, emergency medical, or rescue services,

“(B) construction, acquisition, rehabilitation, or improvement of facilities for local fire fighting, emergency medical, or rescue services, or

“(C) training or planning involved in providing fire fighting, emergency medical, or rescue services; and”.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, tonight we have an opportunity to do something that this body has never done before. That is to provide some immediate dollar assistance to those brave men and women across America who, day in and day out, have responded to our natural and man-made disasters.

Today I met with all the fire service groups of America, the Fire Fighters Union, the Volunteer Fire Council, the fire chiefs, the arson investigators, the fire instructors, the National Fire Protection Association. All across America tonight, Mr. Speaker, they are watching this vote to see whether or not this Congress will equate fire and emergency services personnel with law enforcement personnel, with teachers, because they have all benefited from our work, but we have done nothing of substance for the brave men and women, largely volunteers, who protect this country from disaster.

Tonight is that opportunity: \$100 million of funding to provide assistance for burn research, volunteer fire assistance, an \$80 million competitive grant program for the 32,000 fire departments in every district across America, plus a facilitation of the CDBG program to provide flexibility for fire and EMS personnel to use those dollars.

I encourage our colleagues to vote for this important amendment. I will ask for a recorded vote upon the completion of the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the cosponsor of this amendment and chairman of the Subcommittee on Basic Research.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, adopting this amendment is going to demonstrate the firm commitment this House has to those individuals who literally put their lives on the line. Fire fighters, first responders, lost 100 lives last year, half as many as all the law enforcement people in this country. We need to move ahead in this area. There are 32,000 fire departments. They need help.

This allows more research, more funding, and it is going to be the kind of gesture that is really going to put us on the front line.

When we have disasters it is the first responders that are there, whether it is a shooting, whether it is a hurricane, whether it is a tornado or a volcano or earthquake. It is the people who want to help the school when there is a fundraiser, it is the first responders and firemen who come to that assistance.

Let us give them this support. I thank the gentleman from Maryland

(Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL), and certainly the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), and many others who have joined in in making this a bipartisan effort.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation is well-served by the 1.2 million men and women who work as fire and emergency services personnel in over 32,000 fire departments across this country. They play a crucial role protecting and preserving our lives and our property . . . a dangerous role—an average of nearly 100 firefighters a year lose those lives in the line of duty. Eighty percent of those who serve do so as volunteers.

This amendment recognizes the contributions of volunteer firefighters by providing \$10 million to fully fund the USDA's Volunteer Fire Assistance Program. This program allows the nearly 28,000 rural fire departments nationwide to apply for cost-share grants for training, equipping and organizing their personnel. These rural fire departments represent the first line of defense for rural areas coping with fires and other emergencies.

This amendment also establishes two grant programs at the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The first is an \$80 million competitive grant program for volunteer and paid fire and emergency services departments. With these 50/50 matching grants, departments can get assistance acquiring safety equipment, firefighting and communications equipment, funds for training, and assistance funding fire prevention programs.

In addition, this amendment establishes a \$10 million burn research grant program through FEMA. Under this program, safety organizations, hospitals, and governmental and nongovernmental entities that are responsible for burn research, prevention, or treatment are eligible for competitive grants to continue their important work.

We see our firefighters and EMS personnel responding to emergencies every day, more than 18 million calls a year. From car accidents, to brush fires, to large scale disasters like the tornadoes that ripped through Ft. Worth last night, emergency responders are first on scene, first to react, first to provide the assistance we've come to take for granted.

Mr. Chairman, adopting this amendment would demonstrate the firm commitment this House has toward these emergency first-responders, to those who literally put their lives on the line each day. I'm thankful for the bipartisan support this amendment enjoys, and I'd like to thank my colleagues Mr. WELDON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PASCARELL, and Mr. ANDREWS for their work helping bring this to the floor. I urge your support for this important bipartisan amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek to control the time in opposition?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to take the 5 minutes in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) controlling 5 minutes reserved for opposition to the bill?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I want to control time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) seeks to control the time in opposition?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, throughout my history and throughout my service, I have always supported firemen. I have always supported fire services. I have always supported the fine work that they do. But I do not think that this House recognizes what is going on with this particular amendment.

First of all, this amendment should never have come to this floor because it violates everything that makes it eligible for the floor. This has not been heard in any committee. It is substantive legislation. I think if we begin to look at it, regardless of how good the delivery of service is, this is violating the rules of making legislation on appropriations. Therefore, a point of order should have been called by the chairman or someone on the other side.

The second thing is, this particular amendment changes the meaning of low and moderate income in the CDBG legislation. I will read it, Mr. Chairman.

Section 105 of the Housing and Community Development Act is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph: "An assisted activity described in subsection A-24 shall be considered to benefit persons of low and moderate income if the service provides such services to all persons in the geographical area served, including any low and moderate income persons.

That is substantive legislation. That is a substantive change in the law which we are allowing them to come to the floor on, and it should be defeated. I have nothing against the fire service, but I think it is duplicitous to bring this to the floor tonight to present to us as good legislation, and it is, because helping firemen is, but why did they want to add another purpose to the Community Development Block Grant fund? And then that other purpose changes the definition of low and moderate income.

I appeal to the House to not pass this piece of legislation, let it go back, and let us look at it. The firemen can stand on their own merits. They do very well for us all. But why should we cut and change the definition to benefit the good low and moderate income people? The firemen are good, as well.

Why could this not have gone through committee, been voted on in VA-HUD and other authorizing committees? Why? It was brought to this floor with this kind of subterfuge in it. We do not need to pass it. We need to stop it right here, and make them go back and change this so that they will not change the low and moderate income.

Think about it, there are already 23 reasons of eligible activities on the CDBG. This adds another one, the 24th,

and opens it up by changing the definition. This should not happen in this House, Mr. Speaker. This should not happen on that side of the floor, either. This should be stopped right now, and I am sure the designers of this bill, this amendment, may not have known what they were doing, but they had to because they added a new section which eliminated or changed low and moderate income.

So I appeal on this House to hold up on this, not to vote for it, because it brings in a new level. It should have gone through committees.

What about the cities and the small communities and the small CDBG groups? All Members have community-based groups in their districts. What about those community-based groups when they find out a new purpose has been put to this particular amendment and that low and moderate income definition has been changed?

So I am appealing to all who know what is right and what is wrong, this is wrong. They have done the wrong thing. They need to hold it up and come before a committee and look at this.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, the Community Development Block Grant program monies have been eligible to be used for fire and EMS for years. This is not a new use. The money has been used for impoverished people in cities for years. It is not a new use.

Secondarily, the decision as to whether or not to use CDBG monies for local purposes is not mandated by any legislation. That is a decision made by local elected officials, county commissioners, and members of city councils across America. This provision does nothing to change that.

Furthermore, thirdly, we have met with the chairman of the appropriate subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO). We have promised to work with him through the entire process. There is no attempt to undermine the commitment of the CDBG fund for poor people.

□ 2245

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), coauthor of this amendment, for any comments he would like to make.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I have not had the opportunity to talk to the gentlewoman from Miami, Florida (Mrs. MEEK) who is my great friend and whom I deeply respect. I had understood that this question had been discussed with the committee and did not know about this particular problem.

I would assure the gentlewoman as a strong supporter of this amendment, which I think is an important amendment, that I will work strenuously to

make sure that we protect each and every community. Because my own community, Prince George's County, obviously cares a great deal about the CDBG and the integrity of its provisions. What this amendment does, it provides a portion of what the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) has been working on very, very hard, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), and others on behalf of the fire fighters of America, both paid and volunteer.

This money will be also used for burn victims, \$10 million of it will be for victims of fire and fire research. Frankly, I regret that I did not know of the concern of the gentlewoman from Florida until just now. I was surprised. But at some point in time I would like to have the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who is really the author of much of this, have some time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inform Members that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for his leadership in our efforts to make America safe from fire.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment because it will help rural fire fighters in Oregon and throughout the country fight fires before they become big, expensive, and dangerous. Each year in my district, fires destroy countless acres of forest and rangeland and threaten homes and even the lives of my constituents. In many cases, small volunteer fire departments are the first line of defense against these killer fires. These departments are located near where fires start, and they are uniquely situated to fight and contain fires before they grow out of control.

But the men and women who give their time to bravely serve and protect their communities need our help. They need training and equipment to help them fight wildfires safely and effectively. That is why I have worked to increase the funding for the Volunteer Fire Assistance Program to \$10 million. This money will go a long way in preparing volunteer fire departments to fight wildfires.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania addresses the crucial need for increased funding for VFAP. Volunteer fire fighters in Prineville, Spray, Boardman, Baker City and other communities deserve no less.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding me this time. As chairman of the subcommittee of jurisdiction on the Committee on Appropriations, I rise to express some concern about this amendment. It is a well-intended amendment aimed toward helping fire fighters throughout the country. But I would caution on several points.

One point is on FEMA. FEMA is not prepared to do burn studies. That is clearly an area where they do not have the expertise to perform.

Secondly, and even of more concern, the issue of Community Development Block Grants, as I understand it this amendment would waive the requirement that Community Development Block Grants go to low- and moderate-income recipients only. This has never been attempted before. This change in the Community Development Block Grant, legislation has never been attempted to change this before.

So I would express caution on this amendment. I would hope that as we go through the process, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) would be willing to work with us to try to resolve some of these issues. Clearly, the intent of the amendment is good, but the effect may not be.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to answer some of the questions raised.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues. And I would just say that first of all, the gentleman from New York (Chairman LAZIO) and I had discussions about the CDBG provisions, and we have given him full assurance that we would work with him to protect the program as I explained.

Further, FEMA Director James Lee Witt called me today and offered his unequivocal support for this entire provision. He said it was the right thing to do, and publicly he was solidly behind this as the head of FEMA. So we have the administration on the record saying it is positive legislation. They support it thoroughly. They are not going to be administering burn programs; they are going to be providing funding for burn research centers across America.

Mr. Chairman, I hope our colleagues will support this legislation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Time is controlled on this amendment, and it is not permissible. By unanimous consent the gentleman may revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the measure.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON along with Congressmen HOYER, SMITH, PASCRELL, SHUSTER and ANDREWS for their dedication to our Nation's firefighters and the work they have done to bring this amendment before the House this evening.

Each year, thousands of firefighting men and women risk their lives to defend the citizens and properties of communities throughout our Nation. However, too many of our Nation's firefighters have been seriously injured or killed because tight budgets have forced municipalities to cut funding. Personal protective gear goes unpurchased, dangers in fire stations go uncorrected, staffing shortages go unaddressed, and firefighters are forced to rely on antiquated equipment, due to a lack of funding. The nationwide increase in the use of hazardous materials and the recent rise in both natural and man-made disasters pose new threats to our Nation's firefighters.

The Congress now has an opportunity to provide the support necessary to address this national crisis. For the first time, we can fully fund the Volunteer Fire Fighter Assistance Program, fund grants for burn research, allow community development block grants to be used for fire and emergency services and authorize a competitive grant program, which will allow our Nation's firefighters to acquire vital equipment.

As a Member of the Congressional Fire Caucus, I am dedicated to assisting our local communities in their efforts to protect their firefighters. Let us provide funding for personal protective gear, communications and monitoring equipment, firefighter wellness and fitness programs, and other vital uses. Let's join together in letting our Nation's firefighters know that their health and safety is a national priority deserving national support.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment for our firefighters and for our communities throughout our Nation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes on each side?

Mr. HOYER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman has requested 5 minutes?

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield, yes, 5 and 5.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. For what purpose?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment. And the reason is the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), has been a major sponsor of this legislation and has been unable to speak. That is not fair to him as one of the major sponsors of this legislation. It is the way the rule runs, and I would hope the Chairman would allow us the 5 minutes to do that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I simply did not hear it. I understand the request is 5 and 5. Who will be controlling the time?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what is happening. What are we doing? I want to see the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) have an opportunity to speak also. What are we agreeing to?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, the agreement is that it be 5 and 5. Obviously, if we are asking for 5 additional minutes as proponents, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), who is not objecting to the request, correctly observes that she ought to have 5 minutes in opposition and I think that is fair.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, there are some Members on our side who would like to have part of that 5 minutes. Is the gentleman prepared to yield?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) and he wants to speak, and I have ½ minute left.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) each will control 5 additional minutes on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), whose bill will be heard on April 12, which is a major fire service bill. He has worked very closely with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and I and others on this and we have worked very closely with him on the major piece of legislation which we hope it see move forward as well.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, nearly 2 years ago I proudly introduced H.R. 4229, the 21st Century Fire and Public Safety Act. It was a bill to provide competitive grants directly to over 32,000 paid, part-time, part-paid volunteer fire departments across America.

The money could be used for personnel, equipment, vehicles, training, health and safety initiatives, and prevention programs.

At that time, I stated that our fire fighters were the forgotten part of our public safety equation. I said that the Congress should make a commitment to those who make a commitment to us every day. I put a large authorization on this bill because I wanted to

send the message that we were serious. There was a legitimate and overwhelming need. We needed to show that it was no longer acceptable to pay lip service to the fire fighters in our districts on the weekends, and not put our money where our mouth is during the week.

Mr. Chairman, I proudly reintroduced this legislation in the 106th Congress, the fire bill. We are today a far cry from that day in July of 1998 when only three of us put our name on the bill. Today, there are over 206 cosponsors in the House of Representatives, over 20 sponsors in the Senate. The administration has announced their full support of this measure and will work to see it passed. We are making progress and this is part of a process and a procedure to get us to our final goal.

Last night I was presented with this amendment modeled after the concept in the fire bill. This amendment does some very, very important things. It provides funding for protective equipment, for modifying fire stations, for prevention, and wellness programs.

We are here today because considering this amendment, the work we did on the fire bill has brought us to this point. And 260 Members have gotten us here, because of the strong voice of fire fighters across America. We would not be considering this otherwise. Let me be clear in the details. It is very important, very different than the bill we are going to have before committee on April 12.

This bill does not allow the grant funds to be used to hire needed fire personnel. These are big ticket items. They are what the fire folks back home talked to us about in paid departments and in volunteer. Unlike the fire bill which requires a 10 percent match, this amendment requires an equal match. This is where we are today. Between now and April 12, hopefully we will come home and hopefully this amendment which I support will pass.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the group that I have no objection to the money and what they are using it for. My objection is to changing the definition of low- and moderate-income.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO), who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity.

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), and I thank the House for allowing me to speak to this.

What is at stake here is really the future of the Community Development Block Grant. The CDBG is not a revenue sharing measure; it is a measure that is supposed to be addressed to moderately low-income people. It is meant to build housing, to provide safe, healthy housing for people who cannot afford market rents. It is meant to help provide economic development

and jobs for people who are low- and moderately low-income. It is not meant to simply redistribute money from the Federal Government to the State and local governments for any purposes whatsoever.

My concern with this amendment, and I think the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL) spoke to a separate bill which is probably the appropriate vehicle in which to do this. And I think virtually everyone in this House is supportive of volunteer fire services, but the question is whether we would undermine the primary mission of the Community Development Block Grant program in order to try and speak to an admittedly popular public works issue, which is the development of fire houses and related services.

It is true that I have been speaking to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), and I do not think in this House is a better advocate for men and women who protect our homes and our businesses through fire services. But it is also true that this is an overly broad amendment, that it needs work, and it simply does undermine the basic mission of the Community Development Block Grant program, which is to serve the neediest among us. The neediest among us.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply take 30 seconds to say I think that the observations of the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) should be recognized, and that language has to be fixed in conference if a lot of people who would like to support this are going to be able to support it. We cannot divert these funds away from the poorest and the neediest low-income people who are supposed to be the primary beneficiaries of it.

□ 2300

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate the Republican Party for bringing forward to this House an expansion of the Federal Government's role on American society.

As we have heard today, this is a new venture to get the Federal Government involved in helping local fire fighters. I congratulate the Republican Party on sloughing off that old notion that the Federal Government was something whose influence should be resisted and restricted.

Having the Republican Party bring forward a new Federal program, putting the Federal Government into a new area where it had not previously been, helping local fire fighting, shows a degree of intellectual growth on which I congratulate them.

Now, as to this amendment, there is one problem with it. Most of the

amendment, the part of the Republican Party getting us into the fire fighting business for the time, which I am glad to see, the problem is not how they do it.

There is a mistake in the end where it says, I think a mistake in policy, it says, and here is the problem that the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) quite cogently pointed out to some of us who had not seen it: "An activity shall be considered to benefit persons of low and moderate income if the service provides such services to all persons in the geographical area served, including any low and moderate income persons."

In other words, a wealthy area with live-in help, that would then be covered. If one has got maids who live in a rich area, they are covered. That is the problem with the definition. That is what has to be changed.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who are from rural areas certainly support our rural firemen, and we do not want to be put in the position of making an election between our rural poor and our rural firemen. Certainly those who support rural firemen should not want to be seen doing it at the expense of the poorest of the poor.

Community development, scarce funds are limited now for the design eligible activities; and adding another activity really siphons off those resources that go to rural citizens. Small cities, rural communities depend on community development. Disadvantaged communities depend on community development.

To have our needed fire activities now put in, choosing between the poorest and the poor and a needy service, I think is a wrong way to go. We need to amend this. Find other sources to do this. This is a good and honorable activity, but not at the expense of the poorest of the poor.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time remains on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment because I believe there are two important points of view that can be reconciled here.

I think there is broad support for \$100 million of support for America's first line of defenders in the fire service. I

believe it is the intent of those of us who drafted this amendment that it can be expressed in conference.

The point of view of the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) can be accommodated in the following way: to the extent that community development block grant funds are used for fire protection, they must be focused on communities which would otherwise qualify under CDBG rules. I think that that correction and clarification would solve the problem. I would recommend in conference it be done that way.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think everybody agrees, and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) has said, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) has said, and I certainly agree with what both of them have said, and I have discussed with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) said, not only can we fix this, but I would hope we would all pledge, as I will, to fix this.

What the concern is, correct, nobody had any intention to divert from low-economic or medium-income areas assistance. Clearly, it was my intent, I think the intent of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the intent of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), I know that the assistance here would go, CDBG funds are for, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) correctly pointed out, for low- and moderate-income areas.

We need in conference to make sure that that is made very explicit; not implied, explicit. The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) is correct. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) will agree with that. In conference, we will make sure that language explicitly limits such expenditures to areas currently eligible for CDBG.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO).

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I would say in response to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), I believe the gentleman is sincere that he feels like this bill will be fixed. But if we really believe it is going to be fixed, why do we not just do a unanimous consent request right now and fix it right here on the floor.

Why do we not make sure that we do not eviscerate the income targeting, and if one wants to provide for, if this is an eligible activity, I think we can probably agree to that. But let us not make sure that we are building fire houses in upper middle-income areas as a complete income transfer.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to aid the fire and emergency services of this country.

The men and women who risk their lives day in and day out to protect life and property deserve our full support and I believe this amendment recognizes this by proving substantial federal funding in several areas.

First, it provides \$10 million to fully fund the volunteer fire assistance program.

It makes \$10 million available for burn research.

It makes \$80 million available to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for grants to volunteer, paid, and combination departments that provide fire and emergency medical services.

I should point out that matters relating to FEMA fall within the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. As vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight Investigations and Emergency Management of that committee, I note that we fully support this amendment which would set up new grant programs within FEMA.

The amendment also makes community development block grant funds (currently at \$4.75 billion) available for use by local authorities for the fire service.

The amendment before us will strengthen the local capability to deal with fires and other emergency situations.

Mr. Chairman, the Weldon-Smith amendment is a substantial step forward to help protect the health and safety of the public and firefighting personnel.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has again expired.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. On each side. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. There is an objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for even 1 minute. I will go back to 1. I will take whatever I can get.

The CHAIRMAN. On each side. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida that each side have 1 additional minute?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. There is objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, having had the time expire, would it nevertheless, notwithstanding the fact that the time has expired, be possible for the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) to offer the unanimous consent for the amendment that he suggests be in order at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Is the inquiry of the gentleman from Maryland whether it would be in order to offer a new amendment or a modification to the existing amendment?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the intention of the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO), it would be a modification of the existing amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Such a request for a modification would be entertained only from the proponent of the amendment, in this case the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Subsequent to the closure of debate on this subject, the vote being rolled, would it be in order, then, for a Member to strike the last word and ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to the amendment after the debate? Without extending the debate time, under the 5-minute rule, could a Member then rise and offer a unanimous consent amendment to offer the modification the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) has in mind?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the pending part B amendment is not subject to amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. But the parliamentary inquiry is that, subsequent, by unanimous consent, could an amendment to that be offered if the body gave a unanimous consent to a modification such as the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) has proposed?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would respond to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Chair would entertain a request only from the proponent of the amendment to modify his amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, is the Chair ruling that I could offer a perfecting amendment when we return for the vote on this amendment? Is that what the Chair is stating?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair responded that the gentleman from Pennsylvania could ask unanimous consent of the Committee of the Whole to modify his pending amendment.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. At the time of the vote, Mr. Chairman. Very good.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, would that be in order at any time prior to the vote? That is, could he offer that, if he was not ready to offer it immediately, prior to the vote being taken?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, further proceedings on

the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) will be postponed.

□ 2310

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SCHAFFER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. SCHAFFER:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . . Within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct and complete a comprehensive fraud audit of the Department of Education and submit a report setting forth the results of the audit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think there is some confusion about what is before us. This next amendment has nothing whatsoever to do with the fire issue that we have just disposed of.

My understanding is that the Schaffer amendment goes to the question of conducting an audit of the Department of Education. Would it be in order to modify that amendment to also include an audit for the Department of Defense?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would respond that the same situation exists for the Schaffer amendment as existed for the previous amendment. Only modifications offered by unanimous consent by the proponent of the amendment would be entertained under this rule.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Chair when would that modification be in order; at any time during the consideration of the amendment or would that modification have to occur at this moment?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not have to be at this moment. It could be requested before the disposition of the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the Chair, and I would at the proper time ask to control the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

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

This amendment is one that is offered to the emergency supplemental

and directs the comptroller general of the General Accounting Office to conduct a comprehensive audit of the Department of Education, following up on previous investigations and reports of a more narrow focus with respect to waste, fraud, and abuse. The education Inspector General and the GAO have previously identified instances of waste, fraud, and abuse. This study would delve deeper and is more comprehensive.

The Department has issued over the last 2 years over \$50 million in duplicate payments. The Inspector General and the Department of Justice are currently investigating an alleged computer theft ring within the agency that has been operating for more than 5 years. We are concerned that these examples are but the tip of the iceberg. And with that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Colorado, through the Chair, if the gentleman would be willing to modify his amendment to include also an audit for the Department of Defense?

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SCHAFFER. This amendment is crafted carefully in cooperation with the GAO. The dollar amount and the establishment of the priority has been limited to the discussion on the Department of Education. Being unsure as to the full impact, effect, and cost of the suggestion the gentleman is offering, I would regretfully decline and say that I would be opposed to broadening the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, what is going on is that some of the folks in this institution, including some who wanted to abolish the Department of Education just a few years ago, are now trying to selectively ask for additional audits of agencies and they have zeroed in on the Department of Education. Yet under this rule I am denied the opportunity to offer a substitute amendment which would ask for the same audit of the Department of Defense which is being asked of the Department of Education.

I would point out that yesterday the Inspector General of the Department of Education testified that the Department of Education's financial management has improved this year compared to last year and stands in stark contrast to the Department of Defense. If we take a look at the Department of Defense, the GAO said the following:

Despite recent steps to improve financial management, DOD continues to face serious weaknesses. These weaknesses undermine DOD's ability to manage an estimated \$280 billion and \$1 trillion in assets. No major

part of DOD is able to pass the test of an independent financial statement audit.

If my colleagues do not believe what the GAO says, the DOD Deputy Inspector General said that, "The DOD financial statements for fiscal 1998 were less timely than ever, and a record \$1.7 trillion," trillion dollars, "of unsupported adjustments were identified by auditors."

We waste more money at the Defense Department each year than the entire budget for the Department of Education, and yet we are not being allowed to ask for an additional audit of the largest agency in the government. I think that that indicates that there is clearly an imbalance in people's concern about the waste of taxpayers' money.

I am perfectly willing to support audits across the board at agencies that require it. I am not interested in participating in an ideological attack on one agency, which some people in this House have targeted for extinction since the day they got here.

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

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

Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleague from Wisconsin that we are developing a bill to do exactly what he has asked for, which will include comprehensive audits of all the agencies that have failed their audits in 1999. I believe that is 12 out of the 24 Federal agencies. We hope to work together with the gentleman on that bill.

As it relates to the Department of Education, my colleague from Colorado and I share oversight responsibilities for the Department of Education. What we have experienced is 2 years of failed audits, 3 years where the Department of Education has made over \$50 million in duplicate payments and the misprinting of 3.5 million forms. Currently there is a vigorous investigation going on into computer theft at the Department of Education. And recently the Department of Education awarded 39 scholarships to young people called the Jacob Javits scholarship. The disappointing thing is that these 39 students did not actually qualify for the awards.

The Department has told us that there will be 2 more years of failed audits and perhaps in 3 years is when there will be a clean audit. Any company in the private sector that had this kind of performance would have the trading of its stock suspended. It would be in major trouble. That is exactly where the Department of Education is today. It has created an environment ripe for fraud, waste, and abuse.

Now is the time to step in and do an aggressive investigation of that Department to make sure that the 35 to \$38 billion that we give to that agency each and every year makes it to the

place where the dollars are supposed to go: Helping our kids learn. Making sure that the dollars get to local classrooms so that our kids are learning exactly what they need to learn.

Now is the time for a vigorous fraud audit of the Department of Education.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that I have the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OBEY. Has all time on that side expired?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

□ 2320

Mr. Chairman, this is an important amendment. I am wholly sympathetic to the desires of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who would like broader, more comprehensive audits of other agencies and departments. I suspect that last night the Committee on Rules would have considered those, just as they did this amendment.

I, along with my colleague from Michigan, serve on the Subcommittee on Education Oversight and Investigation, and this is the focus of our concern and the only portion we brought to the body.

Simply speaking, and I will finish with this, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) referred to the GAO and its recent report. Twenty-eight days ago, GAO testified in front of our subcommittee: "The Education Department continues to be plagued by serious internal deficiencies that need to be addressed to reduce the potential for waste, fraud, and abuse within the Department."

With that, I think it fully explains the necessity of the amendment. Those who are concerned about getting dollars out of the bureaucracy of Washington and toward the more noble purpose of educating children in classrooms ought to stand strong behind this amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would simply assert that this is not a request for an audit tonight. This, in my view, is simply another ideological attack against an agency that a number of people in this House have never liked and would abolish if they had the votes to do so.

We have been told that we cannot ask for a similar audit for a department which wastes far more money than any agency of government. And we are told that somehow we are sup-

porting the taxpayers' interest to ask for this audit by the GAO.

The fact is we currently spend \$34 million each year of taxpayers' money to pay for 285 people who work for the Inspector General's Office of the Department of Education, and their full-time job is to investigate and audit the financial and management practices of the Department of Education. We are already spending \$34 million to do that.

Now, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) wants us to duplicate that effort. I do not think it is for financial reasons. I think it is because this is just another way to harass an agency that they do not like.

I would point out, maybe the Department of Education would have done a bit better in managing its operation if this Congress had not eliminated \$65 million of the Department's request for program management funds since fiscal year 1996. And if the majority party had had its way, those fiscal management cuts would have exceeded \$112 million. I think we understand what the target is. It is not waste; it is the agency itself.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MRS. FOWLER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 232, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No 88]

AYES—183

Aderholt	Camp	Ewing
Archer	Canady	Fletcher
Armey	Cannon	Foley
Bachus	Castle	Fowler
Baker	Chabot	Ganske
Ballenger	Chambliss	Gekas
Barr	Chenoweth-Hage	Gibbons
Barrett (NE)	Coble	Gillmor
Bartlett	Coburn	Gilman
Barton	Collins	Goode
Bass	Combest	Goodlatte
Bateman	Cook	Goodling
Bereuter	Cooksey	Goss
Biggett	Cox	Graham
Bilbray	Cubin	Greenwood
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Hall (TX)
Bliley	Dunn	Hansen
Blunt	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Boehlert	DeMint	Hayes
Bono	Dickey	Hayworth
Boswell	Doolittle	Hefley
Brady (TX)	Dreier	Hill (MT)
Bryant	Duncan	Hilleary
Burr	Dunn	Hobson
Buyer	Ehlers	Hoekstra
Callahan	Ehrlich	Hostettler

Houghton	Myrick	Sherwood
Hulshof	Nethercutt	Shimkus
Hunter	Ney	Shows
Hutchinson	Norwood	Simpson
Hyde	Nussle	Sisisky
Isakson	Ose	Skeen
Istook	Oxley	Smith (MI)
Jenkins	Paul	Smith (TX)
Johnson (CT)	Pease	Souder
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)	Stearns
Jones (NC)	Petri	Stenholm
Kasich	Pickering	Stump
Kingston	Pickett	Sununu
Knollenberg	Pitts	Talent
Kolbe	Pombo	Tancredo
Kuykendall	Pryce (OH)	Tauzin
Largent	Radanovich	Taylor (MS)
Latham	Ramstad	Taylor (NC)
LaTourette	Regula	Terry
Leach	Riley	Thomas
Lewis (KY)	Rogan	Thornberry
Linder	Rogers	Thune
Lucas (KY)	Rohrabacher	Tiaht
Lucas (OK)	Roukema	Toomey
Manzullo	Royce	Upton
McCrery	Ryan (WI)	Vitter
McHugh	Ryun (KS)	Walden
McInnis	Salmon	Wamp
McIntyre	Sanford	Watkins
McKeon	Scarborough	Watts (OK)
Metcalfe	Schaffer	Weldon (FL)
Mica	Sessions	Weldon (PA)
Miller (FL)	Shadegg	Weller
Miller, Gary	Shaw	Whitfield
Moran (KS)	Shays	Wolf

NOES—232

Abercrombie	Eshoo	LoBiondo
Ackerman	Etheridge	Lofgren
Allen	Evans	Lowe
Andrews	Farr	Luther
Baca	Fattah	Maloney (CT)
Baird	Filner	Maloney (NY)
Baldacci	Forbes	Markey
Baldwin	Ford	Mascara
Barcia	Fossella	Matsui
Barrett (WI)	Frank (MA)	McCarthy (MO)
Becerra	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (NY)
Bentsen	Frost	McCollum
Berkley	Gallegly	McDermott
Berman	Gejdenson	McGovern
Berry	Gephardt	McIntosh
Bishop	Gilchrest	McKinney
Blagojevich	Gonzalez	McNulty
Blumenauer	Gordon	Meehan
Bonilla	Green (TX)	Meek (FL)
Bonior	Green (WI)	Meeks (NY)
Borski	Gutierrez	Menendez
Boucher	Gutknecht	Millender-
Boyd	Hastings (FL)	McDonald
Brady (PA)	Hill (IN)	Miller, George
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Minge
Brown (OH)	Hinchey	Moakley
Burton	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Calvert	Hoefel	Moore
Campbell	Holden	Moran (VA)
Capps	Holt	Morella
Capuano	Hooley	Murtha
Cardin	Horn	Nadler
Carson	Hoyer	Napolitano
Clayton	Inslee	Neal
Clement	Jackson (IL)	Northup
Condit	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Conyers	(TX)	Obey
Costello	Jefferson	Olver
Coyne	John	Ortiz
Cramer	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Crowley	Jones (OH)	Packard
Cummings	Kanjorski	Pallone
Danner	Kaptur	Pascarell
Davis (FL)	Kelly	Pastor
Davis (IL)	Kennedy	Payne
Davis (VA)	Kildee	Pelosi
DeFazio	Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)
DeGette	Kind (WI)	Phelps
Delahunt	King (NY)	Pomeroy
DeLauro	Kleczka	Porter
Deutsch	Kucinich	Portman
Diaz-Balart	LaFalce	Price (NC)
Dicks	LaHood	Rahall
Dingell	Lampson	Rangel
Dixon	Lantos	Reyes
Doggett	Larson	Reynolds
Dooley	Lazio	Rivers
Doyle	Lee	Rodriguez
Edwards	Levin	Roemer
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
English	Lipinski	Sabo

Sanchez	Stabenow	Velazquez
Sanders	Stark	Visclosky
Sandlin	Strickland	Walsh
Sawyer	Stupak	Waters
Saxton	Sweeney	Watt (NC)
Schakowsky	Tanner	Weiner
Scott	Tauscher	Wexler
Sensenbrenner	Thompson (CA)	Weygand
Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Wicker
Sherman	Thurman	Wilson
Skelton	Tierney	Wise
Slaughter	Towns	Woolsey
Smith (NJ)	Traficant	Wu
Smith (WA)	Turner	Wynn
Snyder	Udall (CO)	Young (AK)
Spratt	Udall (NM)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Boehner	Hall (OH)	Rush
Clay	Herger	Shuster
Clyburn	Klink	Spence
Crane	Martinez	Vento
Everett	Mink	Waxman
Franks (NJ)	Quinn	
Granger	Rothman	

□ 2354

Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. MCCOLLUM changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. SHOWS, KASICH, and RAMSTAD changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first, I would announce that as we conclude the business on this bill tomorrow, that the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations that were scheduled for hearings, because of the rule, those hearings will not be held tomorrow, inasmuch as we will be in session trying to conclude this bill.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I will shortly move that the committee rise, and once we rise and go back into the House, I will have a unanimous consent request to propose; in fact, two unanimous consents, one having to do with legislative days to revise and extend, and then before I make this motion to rise, Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to give the chairman a round of applause for having conducted this day's activities in a very, very excellent and professional way.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3908) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3908, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3908, 2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 3908 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 450, no further amendment shall be in order except as follows:

One, pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations for the purpose of debate;

Two, the amendment printed in Part B of House Report 106-549 and numbered 12; and

Three, the following further amendments:

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) regarding certain reductions and limitations;

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) regarding an across-the-board cut;

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) regarding U.S. military in Colombia;

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) regarding buy America;

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI) regarding building technology assistance conservation activities;

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) regarding the Food and Drug Administration;

And an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) regarding the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Each further amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think Members need to understand that the reason they were kept here until midnight tonight is because there was an expectation and a hope that we would be able, by holding Members here this late this evening, to get Members out roughly around noon tomorrow so that all Members of the House, not just a few, could catch planes back to their districts.

That would have necessitated, in my judgment, a number of the amend-

ments just described being at least debated tonight. A number of those amendments would not even have been in order if the committee had not worked with Members in order to help them get them in order, and so I think it would have been fair to ask those Members to debate those amendments tonight, because if we had not helped them, they would not have been able to debate them at all.

Secondly, there is at least one committee chairman in the House who has an amendment which is going to take longer than the others. It would have been very helpful if we could have had that amendment debated tonight and the vote coming tomorrow.

□ 0000

That is what happened with a lot of people. An awful lot of people had their amendments debated late tonight, but evidently he does not want to take it up tonight.

So I think Members need to know that it is my judgment that under this agreement, they had probably better not plan on being out of here much before 2 o'clock. I regret that. I wish some of these amendments would be considered tonight. I am sorry that the authors would not be willing to do that, but I want Members to understand the problem.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman, when we were here at 9 o'clock, we were told it was unlikely that the amendment on Kosovo, in fact, we were not going to get to the amendment on Kosovo, and people on the gentleman's side of the aisle sent some staff home. We were under the impression it was not coming up tonight.

And then when we came back to the floor, we were told we might consider it at 11 o'clock. Some of the cosponsors of the amendment had dismissed their people. They did not have all of their material, and I suggested that we come in fresh and get right on it. I did not care what time it was.

So I would say to the gentleman if it inconvenienced the House, I want to apologize for that. But we were operating under the assumption that it would not be considered tonight and we wanted to make sure it was considered when Members were prepared and we could have a full debate. So I wanted the gentleman to understand what the confusion was.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Ohio. Let me simply say that I had intended to vote for his amendment, and I still do. But the fact is that I have been asking people all night long to enable us to finish the gentleman's amendment and a number of others. No one ever talked to me about the assumption that the gentleman's amendment was not going to be considered