

that I speak for every member on our side of the aisle, that we perceive the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) to be a man of great fairness who runs the committee so that everybody has the opportunity to participate fully. I want the gentleman to know that we appreciate that consideration and that involvement on his behalf. It is very impressive.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) is here, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) is here, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is here. Now if we had the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), we would be in good shape. And, of course, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama is here.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

The SPEAKER. 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 further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3908.

1006

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 further 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. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 29, 2000, amendment No. 8 printed in Part B of House report 106-549 by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 80, line 11.

Pursuant to the order of the House of that day, no further amendments shall be in order except pro forma amendments offered by the chairman and ranking minority member; the amendment printed in Part B of the report and numbered 12; and the following further amendments which may be offered only by the Member designated in the order of the House or a designee, shall be considered 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:

(1) An amendment by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) regarding certain reductions and limitations;

(2) An amendment by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) regarding an across-the-board cut;

(3) An amendment by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) regarding U.S. military in Colombia;

(4) An amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) regarding buy America;

(5) An amendment by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI) regarding building technology assistance conservation activities;

(6) An amendment by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) regarding the Food and Drug Administration;

(7) An amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) regarding the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to Part B Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania:

In the matter proposed to be inserted, strike section 512, page 4, line 4, through page 5, line 8.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

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 10(b)(1) through (3) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2106(b)(1) through (3)), \$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 non-governmental 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.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will not object and I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for an explanation of his modification.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland for yielding. This amendment is offered in the spirit in a bipartisan way of clarifying the intent and the substance of our legislation and our amendment, which we hope everyone will support, to provide for the first-time major funding of an emergency nature for our Nation's domestic defenders.

Mr. Chairman, it was never the intent of the author nor the coauthors of this legislation to negatively impact the use of Community Development Block Grant funds. Mr. Chairman, I will include my statement in the RECORD to explain in some detail the justification for what we originally intended to do and our agreement to work with the appropriate subcommittee to enact reforms to the Community Development Block Grant program.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH). I want to thank the leadership for their cooperation; and I encourage our colleagues to vote for this amendment.

After consultation with many of my colleagues, I am requesting unanimous consent to delete the portions of the Weldon-Hoyer amendment dealing with the reform of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).

I realize that many of my colleagues have strong feelings about CDBG and the role it plays in our low- and moderate-income communities. As a former mayor of a town that receives CDBG funds and as a former chairman of a county council that administers and distributes CDBG funds, I share that commitment.

The CDBG reforms that were included in amendment 42 were intended to do two things:

Clarify existing law to clearly define what fire and emergency service activities are eligible for CDBG funds under the current program.

Reform CDBG to allow counties and municipalities to designate portions of their CDBG funds for activities that benefit poor communities and also other areas of the community.

For example, my reforms would have allowed CDBG funds to be used for the following activities:

Allow the use of CDBG funds for municipal-wide training facilities for fire and EMS personnel—including basic fire and EMS training, HAZMAT, terrorist threat response, etc. Such facilities would obviously benefit poor communities, which often have less money available for training and could take great advantage of a municipal-wide facility. CDBG funds cannot currently be used for such an activity unless the municipal government proves that 51 percent of the activities at the facility benefit low- and moderate-income families—even if the facility itself is located in a poor community.

Allow the use of CDBG funds for local fire and emergency service organizations that routinely respond to emergencies in poor communities or in areas that have high concentrations of poor people—even if these groups are not themselves located in CDBG-eligible areas. For example, many fire companies located in towns bordering poor communities respond to fires and other emergencies in poor communities on a regular basis. Likewise, local fire companies from non-CDBG eligible communities are often the first response units for shopping malls, sporting arenas and other community gathering places that attract large numbers of people from low- and moderate-income communities.

Allow the use of CDBG funds for local fire and emergency service organizations that are the first response units for highway accidents and traffic incidents that impact low-income communities. For example, if a major thoroughfare cuts through a low- and moderate-income community, accidents on that thoroughfare impact the safety of that community. Fire companies from surrounding municipalities are routinely called upon to assist with major incidents—even though they themselves are not located in CDBG-eligible areas.

By offering CDBG reforms along these lines, I was merely recognizing the unique nature of fire and EMS response in our local communities. Local first responders do not ask whether an emergency occurs in a low- or moderate-income area, they respond without hesitation. It would seem that we could take some small steps to help these organizations that benefit many areas of the community—including our poorest communities.

It would not seem unreasonable to make some of these changes, given the existing “quirks” in the administration of the CDBG program, under which—

1. Curb cuts in even the wealthiest communities count as assisting low- and moderate-income people, and

2. CDBG monies can be used for historic preservation in even the wealthiest parts of the community once the municipality has certified its CDBG spending for low- and moderate-income communities.

I am pleased that there are efforts to reform many parts of the CDBG program in an authorization bill being authored by my friend Congressman LAZIO. I look forward to working with him to reform CDBG to make it easier for counties and municipalities to spend CDBG funds in cost-effective ways to benefit our low-income communities.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his action, and I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) who has been the principal sponsor of a very large bill pending which will be heard on April 12, of which this is a part.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, our leader on this issue, and on many issues, has spoken. I think that this change is in order and is something that all the sides have agreed upon. We should move quickly as our first down payment on what we will hope will be the beginning of a series of responses to the 32,000 fire departments and the hundreds of thousands of fire fighters in America.

So I want to commend all of those who worked through the night to put this together, and I believe it is absolutely necessary that we do this to get it done.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the subcommittee overseeing these matters.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I also am introducing a bill that hopefully takes care of this problem. I think because those with low-income need this protection, because fire departments are seeing a lot of damage in those homes that have bad wiring, it is a consideration that we need to work out; and we are going to do that. So in a more complete bill, we are headed in that direction.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), my friend and cochair of the Fire Service Caucus.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, because of this bipartisan agreement, the House is about to vote this morning for the first time in its history for \$100 million in direct aid to the fire service. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) has really spearheaded this whole effort and deserves enormous praise, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) for bringing forth the amendment, as well as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for championing it.

And let me say to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) that she deserves praise for bringing to our atten-

tion a very serious item that was corrected.

I do believe that communities should be able to use Community Development Block Grant money to help low-income areas for fire and public safety, but the proper venue to make that decision is through the authorizing process and in the appropriate committees. Because of the gentlewoman's leadership, we are going to do this. I support this.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving my right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), ranking member of the committee of jurisdiction.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER); and I first thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for the flexibility he showed, because I think we have a solution here which preserves the very important purpose that he and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) have been working on of getting assistance to the fire fighters without impinging negatively elsewhere.

The gentleman from Maryland played an important roll here, as well as the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), who has made her entrance as I speak. I do not know if the meek are going to inherit the earth, but they are entitled to inherit this bill after the brilliant work of the gentlewoman from Florida.

1015

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, under my reservation, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) who, in fact, I think has led us to this very outstanding resolution of this issue.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for removing all of the CDBG provisions from the amendment.

As my colleagues all well know, I have been a strong supporter of the fire service for many years, and I am glad to see that we were able to come to an agreement that provides firemen with the needed funds and without injuring the CDBG low- and moderate-income Americans that the CDBG program serves.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, again, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) for her outstanding leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment to H.R. 3908 by both Congressmen CURT WELDON and NICK SMITH. Throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and other States, millions of people in cities, towns, and rural areas depend on the volunteer fire service to be there when a fire burns a home or a child breaks a leg. If there is no money to help our volunteer firefighters what will our neighbors do in an emergency? The Weldon/Smith amendment will ensure that our volunteer firefighters will

have the money to purchase the equipment needed to help the victims of tragedy.

As a Member of Congress who represents a district that depends on dozens of volunteer fire companies to keep its communities safe, I would like to applaud the sponsors of this amendment. My State of Pennsylvania is home to the largest number of volunteer fire companies in the United States. Unfortunately, a great majority of them are underfunded. The typical budget for a volunteer fire department is less than \$20,000 a year. This amendment would provide for \$80,000,000 for a competitive grant program to award money to volunteer, paid, and combined departments that provide fire and emergency medical services and can demonstrate a legitimate financial need.

I am also pleased that this amendment expands on a bill I sponsored, H.R. 3155, known as the Firefighter's Local-Federal Assistance for Management of Emergencies Act of 1999, or FLAME Act. The idea for the FLAME Act started with one of my constituents, Mr. Francis Ditzler of the Lickdale Volunteer Fire Company in Lebanon County, PA. Mr. Ditzler pointed out that as the rate and severity of highway accidents has increased in the last 10 years along Interstate 81 in Lebanon County, the rate of funding increases for volunteer fire companies has not kept pace. In my home State, struggling Lickdale Volunteer Fire Company, like other struggling volunteer fire companies, does not have the money to purchase the equipment necessary to help treat the victims of auto accidents that occur along their 25 mile stretch of the Interstate. Twenty years ago, the answer in Pennsylvania was the Volunteer Loan Assistance Program that would allow volunteer companies to take out low-interest loans for needed equipment. Today, 20 years after this low-interest loan program was drafted, volunteer fire companies still need financial help.

The FLAME Act would provide a competitive grant program to those States that have a Volunteer Loan Assistance Program. The FLAME Act, which was introduced in the first session of the 106th Congress, creates a partnership between Federal, State and local governments that encourages volunteer fire companies to pay off their low-interest State-sponsored loans for equipment and buildings. H.R. 3155 will help our volunteer fire companies help themselves without raising taxes or earmarking another appropriation.

My legislation would provide a Federal matching grant of up to \$15,000 to any volunteer fire company that has a State-sponsored volunteer loan program and may raise equal amounts of money through voluntary contribution and through local government grants. The goal of the FLAME Act is to encourage other States to establish volunteer firefighter loan assistant programs.

The Federal Government is not the only level of government working to better fund our volunteer fire departments. The Pennsylvania Legislature is considering a \$25,000,000 grant program that mirrors the FLAME Act and will provide similar benefits as my bill. The Pennsylvania measure would also provide competitive grant programs to volunteer fire companies throughout the State.

The amendment we have before us today will accomplish many of the same goals as my legislation. These award grants may be used for purchase of personal protective equipment,

apparatus, establishing fitness programs for firefighting personnel, for the purchase of computers to integrate computer technology to improve records management and training capabilities, and to modernize fire stations among a myriad of other items. In an era of fiscal responsibility and Federal and State financial partnerships, I find this legislation to be one of the most important the House passes this year.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the earlier voice vote is vacated.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is modified, and the Chair will put the question on its adoption de novo.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlemen from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. KASICH

Mr. KASICH. 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. 12 offered by Mr. KASICH:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . (a) Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund" for military operations in Kosovo, not more than 50 percent may be obligated until the President certifies in writing to Congress that the European Commission, the member nations of the European Union, and the European member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have, in the aggregate—

(1) obligated or contracted for at least 33 percent of the amount of the assistance that those organizations and nations committed to provide for 1999 and 2000 for reconstruction in Kosovo;

(2) obligated or contracted for at least 75 percent of the amount of the assistance that those organizations and nations committed for 1999 and 2000 for humanitarian assistance in Kosovo;

(3) provided at least 75 percent of the amount of the assistance that those organizations and nations committed for 1999 and 2000 for the Kosovo Consolidated Budget; and

(4) deployed at least 75 percent of the number of police, including special police, that those organizations and nations pledged for the United Nations international police force for Kosovo.

(b) The President shall submit to Congress, with any certification submitted by the President under subsection (a), a report containing detailed information on—

(1) the commitments and pledges made by each organization and nation referred to in subsection (a) for reconstruction assistance in Kosovo, humanitarian assistance in

Kosovo, the Kosovo Consolidated Budget, and police (including special police) for the United Nations international police force for Kosovo;

(2) the amount of assistance that has been provided in each category, and the number of police that have been deployed to Kosovo, by each such organization or nation; and

(3) the full range of commitments and responsibilities that have been undertaken for Kosovo by the United Nations, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the progress made by those organizations in fulfilling those commitments and responsibilities, an assessment of the tasks that remain to be accomplished, and an anticipated schedule for completing those tasks.

(c) If the President does not submit to Congress a certification and report under subsections (a) and (b) on or before June 1, 2000, then, beginning on June 2, 2000, the 50 percent of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund" for military operations in Kosovo that remain unobligated (as required by subsection (a)) shall be available only for the purpose of conducting a safe, orderly, and phased withdrawal of United States military personnel from Kosovo, and no other amounts appropriated for the Department of Defense in this Act or any Act enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act may be obligated to continue the deployment of United States military personnel in Kosovo. In that case, the President shall submit to Congress, not later than June 30, 2000, a report on the plan for the withdrawal.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say to the Members of the House, this is actually not a burden-sharing amendment. This is just designed to get our friends across the ocean to live up to their commitment.

Just to give my colleagues a sense of where we are, the United States has a GDP, an economy, the size of about \$8.9 trillion. The Europeans compare favorably of \$8.3 trillion. Yet we spend \$283 billion on defense; they only spend \$180 billion. I wonder why we have to have our people over there for 40 years, because they have not been carrying the load.

This is not even an issue about them carrying the load in a more aggressive way. What this is designed to say is that the United States has committed \$20 billion to Bosnia, to Kosovo over the last few years. When we went into Kosovo, regardless of how one may feel about the action, let us put that aside for a second, and let us talk about the pledge that the Europeans made.

They told us that they would help in rebuilding the country. They told us they would help in a variety of ways. What this amendment is designed to do is to carry forward the idea of Senator WARNER who said that we need to get them to honor their commitment. This is not designed to increase their commitment. This is really not designed to

increase burden sharing. This amendment is only designed to say to the Europeans they made a pledge to us; keep it.

The Europeans pledged 3,883 policemen in Kosovo. They have only paid for 1,878. Our amendment says they pledged 3,800; deliver 3,800. They made a promise to do it. They said they would do it. Why do they not step up to the plate and keep their word.

The Europeans' pledge for the rebuilding of Kosovo, for civil administration, they pledged \$140 million. They have only given \$30 million. Now, how unreasonable is it to say to our European allies, you promised us \$140 million, come through with \$140 million? That is what you pledged to do.

In terms of reconstruction aid, rebuilding those arts of Kosovo that we bombed to a large degree on their behalf, they pledged \$410 million, but they have only delivered \$44 million.

So what does this amendment say? It does not say we expect them to dramatically increase their contribution. It only says that they ought to live up to the pledge that they made and keep their word. Their economy is relatively the same size as the United States. The least they can do, after we flew all those sorties and they made their pledges, is to simply keep their word. This is a time to change the way in which we conduct business post-World War II.

My colleagues are going to hear today, "not the right time," "not the right amendment," "not the right wording." Baloney. All we have to do in the United States is to say, keep your word. What we will find is the Europeans will. Now is the time to act.

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

Mr. Chairman, very reluctantly, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I do so, not because I disagree with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), because I agree with almost everything that he said.

The problem is with the amendment itself. I am concerned that his limitation on not more than 50 percent of the funds in the Kosovo section could not be released until certain things happened. The problem with this is, Mr. Chairman, money has already been spent. We are not providing money in this bill for Kosovo to rebuild Kosovo. We are not doing anything in this bill to actually deploy troops to Kosovo. What we do in this bill is replace the money that has already been spent by the deployment to Kosovo.

Now, if we were in a position to demand certain things from the European allies, I would be standing up here with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) to do that, because I think that that is only fair.

But as I read this amendment closely, not only on the first page, but the third page, just let me make one comment about a section on the third page, it says, if the President does not sub-

mit to Congress a certification required, et cetera, et cetera, then beginning on June 2, the 50 percent of the amounts appropriated in this act can only be used to remove the troops.

Now, I am for removing the troops. But I have to tell my colleagues that the money in the bill is not there to remove the troops. This money is to replace monies that have already been spent. The monies have been spent from the fourth quarter operations and maintenance accounts of our military services.

Now, if we do not replenish this money, we are going to have to stand down our training exercises, park the ships, park the airplanes, park the trucks, park the tanks, and training will grind to a halt. We do not have until June 2 to make that decision. That decision has got to be made late in April or early in May because, for those exercises that have to be stood down. The planning has to begin in April or May.

So as strongly as I agree with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and what he is trying to accomplish, this amendment will not accomplish that; and this amendment will cause severe chaos, in fact, in the operations and maintenance of our military during the last quarter of this fiscal year.

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds just to point out that, last night, we approved an additional \$4 billion in this bill. It is never the right time, never the right place.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, let me say this, we have an agreement here, and I think there is a consensus building which ought to pass this amendment. What that consensus is is that the military needs more money. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the full committee, said they may need money to withdraw from Kosovo. But if we do not approve this amendment, if we do not approve this bill, there is no money there.

Well, let me say something to every Member. Every cent of the money in the bill will go to the military if this amendment passes. This amendment does not stop any funding of our military. All the funding, every penny will go to our armed services.

If our allies live up to their commitments, if they deliver what they promised, look again, this is what they promised. This is what they promised. This is what they promised.

But look on that right-hand side as to what they deliver. If they deliver what they promised, every cent will go to the military to be used in Kosovo. Now, if they do not deliver what they promised, then as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the committee, said, our troops need to come home. That is what we provide. If they do not deliver on their promises,

the money is available to bring the troops home. But every cent of the money is available under the amendment.

Wesley Clark testified before the Senate, and he said the failure to have civil implementation is threatening the peace. It is threatening the military victory. We have either got to have a speedier implementation, or we need withdrawal.

Let me quote to my colleagues one other thing. How long are we going to be in Kosovo? Well, General Klaus Reinhardt last week said, "I am talking 5 years and it could be 10 years." "I am talking 5 years and it could be 10 years."

The reason we fail to commit the forces necessary to keep the peace, World War II lasted 4 years and World War I, 2 years. Korea lasted 3 years. Do we want to commit our third graders to Kosovo?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) mentioned that we did add additional money to the defense part of this bill. That is true. However, it is not applicable to the section that we are dealing with in his amendment, and that is the problem that I have in his amendment.

The money that we added yesterday was for specific purposes other than Kosovo. The gentleman's amendment goes directly to the issue of Kosovo, and that is not where the extra money was added.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the author of the amendment a question, please.

Last night, I had thought that I was going to be supporting this amendment, but I have a question. The House adopted last night a human rights amendment which had a presidential waiver on the subject, which is important to us, but certainly is not absolutely essential to our own national security interests.

It is my understanding now this morning that the gentleman's amendment does not have the authority for presidential waiver even if he believes that this would threaten national security or put U.S. troops in danger. Is that correct?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, there is no waiver.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I find that incredibly troubling. Perhaps it was fortunate we did not take this up last night so we have had a chance to reread the gentleman's amendment. What appeared to be innocent last night, absent the presidential waiver, would be extremely troubling, especially in light of the Secretary of Defense's statement it would put the interest of U.S. troops at risk.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds to make a point. It is

about time that the Congress of the United States started asserting itself when it comes to foreign policy. We are not engaging in some major foreign policy decision other than to tell the Europeans to live up to their commitment.

What is the message that gets sent when this is defeated? Do my colleagues know what it is? If you make a promise and you break it and you stiff us, that is okay. That is wrong. We better get on the stick and realize that we are a big chunk of how we set foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, by the end of next year, we will have spent \$20 billion, \$20 billion in the Balkans. The amendment that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and I are introducing is really the amendment of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, Mr. WARNER.

1030

And basically it says that our allies need to pay 33 percent of the construction costs they committed and 75 percent of the humanitarian assistance, the Kosovo Consolidated Budget and the international police budget. And if they do not, then we will withdraw our troops. We are saying they should live up to their commitments.

Now, why would we care if they pay their commitment? One reason is we ask the Japanese to pay 75 percent of the nonsalary costs of our troops in the Japan theater, and they give us \$3.6 billion. We ask the Europeans to pay for the 100,000 troops stationed on that continent, and they give us \$66 million. This is a joke, and it has got to end.

So at the very least, when our allies make a commitment, they should live up to it. They should pay their bills. And if they are not willing to, let them stop taking us for a ride.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), 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, the gentleman from Ohio just said that Members of Congress should assert themselves on foreign policy. I would like to bring to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget the law, the law written by the Committee on Appropriations and passed by this House. The law, in accompanying report language, specifically denies the ability of the administration to spend more than 15 percent of the total expenditures in Kosovo. So we have already addressed this issue.

The percentage that the gentleman from Ohio is using is going to be confusing because it appears to increase the ability of the United States. I wish the gentleman from Ohio would listen to this because I am responding to his indication. But it appears as if his amendment, although it is not his intent, might even say with the higher percentage factor that we are backing down on our insistence that our administration only spend 15 percent. So I would invite the gentleman from Ohio to read existing law whereby this Congress prohibits the administration from spending more than 15 percent.

Under the law, the President must come back to the Congress if indeed they violate that. They came to us in December of 1999, and they certified that the United States' contribution was only 14.9 percent.

So I share the sentiment of the gentleman from Ohio; I think he is moving in the right direction, but fortunately, the Congress has very responsibly already addressed this issue and the law is the law. We do not need confusing additional law to complicate the issue.

The President requested \$100 million for assistance in Kosovo. The committee rejected that, and we only included \$12 million. So I feel like the amendment, although I know that is not the intent of the gentleman from Ohio, the amendment would actually deplete the ability of the administration to have money to replenish money already spent.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is appropriate that we just heard from the gentleman in charge of foreign aid, because this is the biggest foreign aid program in the history of America. It is one in which the United States' taxpayers consistently and generously subsidize the other richest people in the world.

Europe will be very happy if the combined establishment here, the leadership, the President, all these putative opponents, come together to defeat this, because no bigger present could be given the European taxpayers than this amendment.

The gentleman from Alabama says we have already done that; we said they cannot spend more than 15 percent. Lo and behold it came to 14.9 percent, no doubt an independently arrived at calculation. But here is what the facts are. On March 1, two articles, which at an appropriate point I will put in the RECORD, reflect what General Shelton said.

"General Shelton's letter reflected anger at European allies for not contributing as many troops as requested for expected in Kosovo." That is from the New York Times. Here is The Washington Post quoting Mr. Bacon, the Pentagon spokesperson. "The chairman, General Shelton, made it clear he doesn't think it's appropriate for American troops to go to out-of-

sector operations on a regular basis to take up police work that should be done by the forces in those other sectors."

Yes, we have said that they should help out, but we have zero enforcement. This is the only enforcement. Now, I know when in control of the administration and in control of the appropriations process, one can always say it is not perfect. Agreed, it is not perfect. It is just better than anything that we have come up with.

Let us be very clear here. What we are seeing is the pattern in this House. When we see the administration do something, we will yell; we will scream; we will beat our chests. We will do everything but vote to change it. There is no doctrine of executive usurpation in foreign policy. What we have is a consistent unbroken pattern of congressional dereliction of duty in foreign policy.

There are Members here who will go home and make great speeches, some will not even wait to go home, saying it is terrible we are in Kosovo; we are spending too much; the Europeans are not doing anything. Here is a vehicle to do something about it, and there is not room under the table as Members jump to get under it. This is the only enforcement vehicle we have.

All this talk about what the rules are means nothing. Look at what General Shelton said. They are not there; we are there. My colleagues say we have to help our troops. Do we help our troops by continuing to allow Europe not to do this? What this House will be if we defeat this amendment, we will continue our roles as the enablers of European dependence. We will say to the Europeans, promise them anything, but do not follow through. And when anybody tries to enforce that promise, they do not have to worry, because they will come back and say, well, it is not perfect, it is not this.

As far as the waiver is concerned, the amendment does say the withdrawal has to be safe and orderly. The fact is this is the only enforcement vehicle around.

Mr. Chairman, the articles I referred to above are included for the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 1, 2000]

JOINT CHIEFS CHAIRMAN PROTESTS TROOPS' MISSION TO KOSOVO TOWN

(By Jane Perlez)

Irritated that American troops had to retreat from a bottle-throwing mob in Kosovo, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Henry H. Shelton, has written to NATO's supreme commander, Gen. Wesley K. Clark, telling him not to use American troops outside their designated sector.

The letter, according to Pentagon and NATO officials, told General Clark that other countries involved in the NATO peace-keeping operation had to send more troops to Kosovo before significant numbers of American troops would again be allowed on a mission outside the sector assigned to the United States' control.

General Shelton sent the letter to General Clark a few days after the retreat on Feb. 20 of 350 American soldiers from Mitrovica. The American soldiers had been sent out to the

troubled city, where Albanian and Serbian residents are at a standoff and where French troops needed reinforcements. Pentagon officials acknowledged today that General Shelton had concurred with General Clark's plan to send the troops from their sector in southeast Kosovo to Mitrovica before the mission was under way.

But although General Shelton had agreed ahead of time to the mission, the underlying tone of the letter, according to officials, questioned the wisdom of sending American troops into a volatile situation involving hostile Serbian civilians. General Shelton's letter, and a mood of discontent about the Kosovo peacekeeping operation in the Senate Armed Services Committee during a hearing with General Clark today, reflected anger at European allies for not contributing as many troops as requested or expected in Kosovo. Several senators complained that after the United States had led the air campaign in the Kosovo war, the Europeans had pledged to lead the peacekeeping in Kosovo but had failed to live up to their promise. "There is more than whiff of hype, where the Europeans talk of doing more," then fail to carry out their commitments in Kosovo, said Senator Carl Levin, Democrat of Michigan.

The chairman of the committee, Senator John W. Warner, Republican of Virginia, asked General Clark why American troops were involved in house-to-house searches for weapons in Mitrovica. Senator Warner recalled that in Somalia, where American troops were involved in an ill-fated peacekeeping operation in 1992, house-to-house searches by American soldiers were ruled out as too dangerous. General Clark said that in contrast to Somalia, where American troops were not welcome, the NATO troops in Kosovo were respected and wanted by large groups of the local population. But pressing ahead, Senator Warner questioned the utility of a weapons search in a city that was only a few miles from a porous border with Serbia across which weapons freely flowed.

Senator Warner asked, "What was the total number of arms" seized in Mitrovica? General Clark replied, "Twenty-five." A NATO official explained after the hearing that the searches for weapons in Mitrovica were conducted by troops of several nations and were announced to the community by community leaders just beforehand so that the searches appeared evenhanded. Both Albanian and Serbian homes were searched, in northern and southern Mitrovica, the official said. In his testimony, General Clark said that the Yugoslav president, Slobodan Milosevic, was very much in control in Serbia and that he was unlikely to be defeated or disappear any time soon.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 2000]
AMERICAN TROOPS IN KOSOVO RESTRICTED TO
U.S. SECTOR

(By Roberto Suro)

U.S. troops in Kosovo will stick to their own turf under orders announced by the Pentagon yesterday that sharply limit missions to assist the peacekeepers of other nationalities. The new restrictions reflect concerns in the Defense Department and the White House over a violent encounter last week between a Serbian mob and American soldiers who had been sent to help French peacekeepers with a police action in the French sector, according to a senior military official.

"The issue here is, how often do we get dragged into a situation where we have to perform out-of-sector operations that can diminish our ability to operate within our own sector?" Pentagon spokesman Kenneth H. Bacon said. About 5,300 U.S. troops patrol the southeastern sector of Kosovo. French,

Italian, German and British forces are in charge of their own sector of the troubled Serbian province. The extent to which troops of various nationalities are available to reinforce each other has become a matter of both military and diplomatic dispute, as NATO peacekeepers contend with rising unrest while their own numbers decline.

The new orders came in a letter from Gen. Henry H. Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to NATO's top military commander, U.S. Army Gen. Wesley K. Clark. "The chairman made it clear that he doesn't think it's appropriate for American troops to go to out-of-sector operations on a regular basis to take up police work that should be done by the forces in those other sectors," Bacon said.

The still-classified letter was dated Feb. 20, Bacon said. That was the day when a battalion of 350 U.S. soldiers helped conduct a house-to-house search for illegal weapons in Mitrovica, a town in the French sector where Serbs and the ethnic Albanians who dominate Kosovo have frequently clashed. The Americans encountered a rock-throwing mob of protesting Serbs; and although no U.S. soldier was seriously injured, senior civilian and military policy makers felt the mission was risky and unnecessary, senior officials said.

Clark informed Washington about the mission but ordered it on his own authority, just as he had on two previous occasions when U.S. forces went to the aid of peacekeepers in other sectors. Appearing before a congressional hearing yesterday, Clark defended cross-sector operations as essential in Kosovo. Under the terms of Shelton's letter, however, U.S. troops will operate in other sectors only "on an extraordinary emergency basis," Bacon said.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair advise us of the remaining time on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, surely he does not think the President of the United States or the Secretary of State would lie to Congress.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would respond to the gentleman from Alabama, that I do not think they would lie. I think they would be willing, however, to mislead my colleague, if he were as willing to be misled as he is.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the very distinguished leading expert on national defense issues.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, this deployment is not about Europe; this is about the United States. When we deploy troops, we deploy in our national security.

Now, this is a cute way of trying to reduce our deployment to Europe. We

had 400,000 troops in there for years against the Soviet Union. Now, we can argue about how many troops ought to be there right now, but when we are doing it this way, NATO's in command. We said the U.N. could not do it, so we put NATO in command. This amendment says no presidential waiver. It says, okay, if they do not live up to their obligation, then we have to pull our troops out.

Now, let us take Luxembourg; let us take Iceland. Let us say there is a lobbying effort for those two little countries, and they get them to pull their troops out. They are deciding the foreign policy of the United States. Iceland and Luxembourg, under this amendment, would be setting the foreign policy for the United States.

We are in Kosovo to save lives. Now, there is a lot of people that can disclaim that. A lot of people can say let the Europeans do it. They, obviously, could not get their act together, or we would not be involved. We are involved because of the security of the United States. Do my colleagues know how many wars have started in the Balkans? Two wars started in the Balkans. My dad and three of his brothers served in World War II.

We are talking about the security of the United States, and we are not going to allow Iceland, and we are not going to allow Luxembourg to set the policy for the United States. And that is exactly what these four gentlemen are doing. They are surreptitiously trying to figure out a way to get the troops out of Europe, reduce our deployment to Europe. This is not the way to do it.

If we want to limit the deployments, let us face it up front. Let us argue about it. Let us debate it and say we are going to limit the amount of money and we are going to pull our troops out. Let us not do it in a way that lets Luxembourg or Iceland take control, and then not have a presidential waiver that speaks to the security of our troops, or if the Secretary of Defense says this is endangering our troops, and there is no waiver in order to cover that.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. First, of course, Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about Luxembourg and Iceland, as the gentleman knows. The gentleman wants to get into burlesque. We are talking about France and Germany. They are the ones who made the commitment. They are the ones whose taxpayers the gentleman is so valiantly defending.

Secondly, the amendment says there must be a safe and orderly withdrawal.

But, finally, we are not making policy. We are just telling people to live up to it. It is General Shelton who said I am not letting the American troops be put at risk because of the failure of the Europeans to live up to their commitments. It is General Shelton, the

chairman of the Joint Chiefs, who has said, the failure, the ongoing failure of the Europeans, France and Germany, and Italy and England, they are the ones who are endangering the troops.

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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment offered by my friend from Ohio because the elimination of funding in Kosovo would not only make the time and resources that the U.S. has already expended a total waste, but it would also render meaningless the loss of life, the suffering and the hardship imposed on the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo.

We are talking about people and their lives. For us to walk away from a commitment to peace in Kosovo would essentially give Slobodan Milosevic free reign in his campaign to force the remaining ethnic Albanians out of Yugoslavia and Kosovo.

Peace in this region will not be coming overnight. Our forces who are currently stationed in Kosovo are working in partnership with our NATO allies. This is not our burden to carry alone. If our NATO allies are not paying up, why punish the Kosovar people?

Order, peace, and hope for long-term security are beginning to spread in Kosovo. However, without our leadership and commitment, I think our allies will not continue their efforts; and everything we have already spent will be for nothing.

Please join me, my colleagues, in opposing this amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, let me respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because he and I agree. We should not let the Europeans dictate our military policy. But, in fact, under the present status quo, they are directing our military policy.

In fact, President Clinton, in a letter to us in October, and I am going to introduce that, when asked when will we withdraw our armed forces, he said, "Our armed forces will be withdrawn from operations based on the assessment of the progress of civil implementation, and that depends on our European allies."

Here is the progress of that civil implementation. There has been no progress. As General Klaus said, we could be there 10 years.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), who is the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Our friend from Ohio said that we should assert ourselves and send a message. Let me tell my colleagues what that message would be. The message would be that raising the possibility of American troops withdrawing from

Kosovo encourages extremist elements in Kosovo and Belgrade who are determined to see NATO's mission fail in the Balkans.

This amendment would damage the readiness of our armed forces for the rest of the fiscal year and for the rest of our efforts there. Sure, European allies should and they will do more to meet their commitments in Kosovo. We should continue to encourage them to do so. But we do not by this amendment want to surrender to foreign nations the ultimate decision-making authority on the deployment of United States' troops. Congress and the executive branch should make that decision. Cutting off funds and forcing the withdrawal of our forces from Kosovo should not be an automatic based on what the Europeans do.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I can hardly believe the arguments here. We have spent over \$20 billion in the Balkans. We flew 75 percent of the sorties using American flesh and blood to do it. And what this amendment says is that when the Europeans make a pledge, they ought to live up to it.

If my colleague goes to a town hall meeting in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, and says the Europeans said they were going to give us \$140 million and they only gave us \$30 million, they are in trouble and so we have to cough up the rest of the bill. I would suggest to my colleague that, in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, he will be run out on a rail.

1045

The fact is that all we are doing in this amendment is to say, when they make a pledge, when they say they are going to give \$140 million to help Kosovo, just give it.

When it is said that we degrade the military by offering this amendment, that is total bunk. The military does not lose this money. In fact, the money would give increased readiness because it would say that we do not have to spread ourselves out all over the world. The military does not lose anything.

My colleagues should stand up for their taxpayers. Because if they do not, they are going to come to the town halls and they are going to hold them accountable.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds just to say that I agree with what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is saying, but that is not what his amendment does. What he is saying is great, but what his amendment does is not what he is saying.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the 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 opposition to this amendment because I think it is the right policy being put forth by the wrong branch of government.

The idea that we should assert ourselves in foreign policy is right. The

issue is when should we assert ourselves in foreign policy. I believe it is before we put thousands of young Americans at risk in a region of the world.

I think the administration should have come to us before they made this commitment, and we should have had this debate before the country got involved. But they did not.

I do not see this as an affirmation of legislative authority. I see this as an affirmation of a need to protect thousands of young Americans who are in Kosovo today.

Conditions change every day, every hour, every minute; and when conditions change, there needs to be the authority to make decisions quickly and flexibly. This amendment deprives the President of that authority.

For that reason, I cannot support it. I urge its defeat.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I hope some alert journalist is going to publish a catalogue of the excuses for Congress never to make a tough decision. We should have done it before. We cannot do it after.

We are told, by the way, that it is too dangerous for the troops to be there. Now, how do we increase the danger by withdrawing them? There may be good reasons for keeping them there. I believe there are. But protecting them from the danger of being there is hardly a good reason to keep them there. And that is what they are saying.

People say they agree, the Europeans ought to pay more. But this House has consistently refused to do anything to force the Europeans to do it. And they know empty rhetoric when they see it. They are very sophisticated.

What this amendment is intending to do, by the way, is not to pull out. This is an amendment that says Europe should begin to pay up. Apparently, there is a lack of confidence in our European allies amongst some of the leadership in the Committee on Appropriations that is greater than there is for us. Because they say, if we condition our staying there on the Europeans doing what General Shelton complains that they are not doing, that will lead to abandonment.

Well, if the troops are overexposed and it is costing us too much money, there are two things to do, have the Europeans pay their fair share or withdraw them. We hope it is the former. But in neither case are we increasing the danger to the troops.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which threatens the unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces and resources from Kosovo.

The need in Kosovo for peacekeeping reconstruction and development of civil and judicial administration is greater than all the promises put together by the NATO allies and the U.S.

The authors of this amendment are right in one respect. Every diplomatic effort to hold NATO allies to their agreement is entirely appropriate. But threatening to unilaterally end our freely given commitment just makes the peacekeeping job so ably done by our deployed men and women and the massive reconstruction that is needed, the job of massive reconstruction, makes those a great deal harder.

And, God forbid, if we were to actually act upon this threat, the end result could only be giving the final initiative back to Milosevic.

Vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inform Members that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, by the end of next year, we will have spent \$20 billion in the Balkans.

What we are asking is that our allies live up to their commitments. We are saying, on the reconstruction account for Kosovo, they make a 33 percent down payment; that they pay 75 percent of the humanitarian assistance in Kosovo that they pledged; that they pay 75 percent for the Kosovo Consolidated Budget that they pledged; and that they provide 75 percent of the international police force for Kosovo that they pledged.

Why does the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) assume that we will have to take our troops out? Does he assume they are not going to live up to their commitment? Well, maybe it is an assumption he is right in making.

They only give us \$66 million for 100,000 troops. We get \$3.6 billion for our 40,000 troops in Japan.

I rise in strong support of this amendment, which I have offered on a bipartisan basis with Congressmen JOHN KASICH, GARY CONDIT, BARNEY FRANK, and SPENCER BACHUS. They are among the hardest working Members of Congress and it is a pleasure to be offering this amendment with them. I also want to thank the author of this amendment, Senator JOHN WARNER, who intends to offer this amendment along with Senators DANIEL INOUE, PAT ROBERTS, and OLYMPIA SNOWE when the Senate takes up its version of this legislation. When the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee says our allies need to live up to their obligations, I think we all need to take this amendment seriously.

Our bipartisan amendment puts in place a framework for ensuring our European NATO allies live up to their financial commitments with respect to the war and subsequent peacekeeping mission in Kosovo. Last year, the United States puts its money, personnel and military equipment on the line to bring peace and stability to the Balkan region. Our

military's men and women served with great distinction and did our Nation proud. But to this day, our NATO allies have not lived up to their financial commitments and obligations. The most egregious example of our allies' noncompliance is their failure to deploy military personnel for the United Nations international police force for Kosovo. NATO and the EU nations committed to contribute 1,264 personnel for this force. But to date, they have deployed 747 members—or 59 percent.

The United States, in contrast, has deployed 489 (or 89 percent) of the 550 we have committed. And I am told that the remaining 61 are on their way and should be in Kosovo in the next week or two. Our amendment says our allies need to do better. They need to get that number up from 747 to 948. Surely they can accomplish this by June 1. Another reason we are offering this amendment is because there is simply a lack of good information as to what precisely our allies have committed to providing. In fact, our own Department of State and National Security Council can't seem to provide identical data. So I think it is very important to require the administration to submit a report to Congress specifying the commitments and pledges made by the European Commission, and the member states of the European Union and NATO.

Part B of our amendment does exactly this. It requires a report to be submitted by June 1 detailing these commitments. I want to stress that we are not applying a straitjacket to the administration. The President will have a certain level of flexibility in determining what it is our allies have said they owe. Our amendment would withhold 50 percent of the supplemental appropriation bill's funding for military operations in Kosovo until the President certifies that the European Commission, member nations of the European Union, and European member nations of NATO have provided at least:

33 percent of the assistance committed by them for 1999 and 2000 for reconstruction in Kosovo;

75 percent of the assistance committed by them for 1999 and 2000 for humanitarian assistance in Kosovo;

75 percent of the assistance committed by them for 1999 and 2000 for the Kosovo Consolidated Budget; and

75 percent of the number of police committed by them for the United Nations international police force for Kosovo.

I want to stress these thresholds are anything but arbitrary. They represent reasonable downpayments on the pledges and commitments made by our European allies. Recognizing that autonomous nations have different fiscal years and budget processes, we do not seek full compliance in this amendment, but merely a downpayment. And, recognizing that funding for reconstruction programs is often disbursed over a series of years, we merely require a portion of this funding to be made available right away.

If the President does not certify that these benchmarks have been met by June 1, 2000, the withheld funding appropriated for military operations in Kosovo would be made available only for the purpose of conducting a safe, orderly and phased withdrawal of United States military personnel from Kosovo.

I want to speak for a moment about what our amendment does not do. Our amendment does not change United States policy toward

Kosovo and the Balkans. Our amendment does not alter the parameters of our mission in Kosovo. Our amendment does not reduce the number of troops the United States has committed to the international peacekeeping force or the U.N. police force. Our amendment does not decrease the funding for Kosovo in this bill, which is equal the administration's request. And our amendment does not require our allies to pay for more than they promised. In fact, it asks for less. It merely requires a downpayment.

What our amendment does do is uphold current United States policy in Kosovo by requiring our allies to live up to their agreements. This is not an unjustifiable request. The United States has consistently met its obligations—even exceeded them—with respect to the conflict in Kosovo. This Congress has passed in a timely fashion appropriations bills fully funding our participation in this conflict, and the President has signed these appropriations bills.

Our allies, unfortunately, have failed to meet their obligations. Our amendment will help encourage our European allies to provide the necessary resources and personnel to implement the peacekeeping mission in Kosovo. An equitable burdensharing arrangement strikes us as being inherently fair and appropriate. After all, during the 78 days of combat over Serbia, the United States bore the major share of the air war, flying approximately 70 percent of the sorties. The men and women of our Armed Forces took the greatest personal risks. And the United States taxpayer paid the lion's share of the costs: more than \$4 billion at last count.

I know our allies contributed to the military intervention in Kosovo. But as they know all too well, it was the United States that provided the high-performance aircraft, the guided missiles, the transport aircraft, and the B-2 bombers that made this joint effort a success. I am afraid if Congress does not step in and say, unequivocally, that our allies need to live up to their commitments, this administration will simply allow them to slide, as they've done too many times in the past. The result, undoubtedly, will be that more of our Nation's tax surplus will be expended to pay for the rapidly increased rate of military deployments and our Armed Forces will continue to face retention and readiness deficiencies.

I am struck by the fact that, over the past 50 years, the United States military has been involved in 46 deployments. But a staggering 36 of those deployments have come in the past 10 years. Do these missions cost money? You bet they do. From 1993 through 2001, our operations in Kosovo and Bosnia are projected to have cost the United States taxpayer \$20.2 billion. Here is the bottom line of our amendment: We cannot, we must not, indefinitely commit our Armed Forces to keeping the peace in the Balkans without ensuring our allies live up to their commitments. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so we can put some pressure on our allies to live up to their commitments.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman knows that they are not going to live up to their commitment because they

know what strong support they have in this House for escaping any consequences of evading that commitment.

All they have to do is listen to this debate and listen to the administration, and they can say that they are free to make commitments, ignore them, and pay no penalty for them.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, unless we pass this amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, he is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I chair the Albanian Issues Caucus. I think I have done more work with Kosovo than almost anyone else in Congress.

This is a very ill-advised amendment. If we want to ensure a presidential veto, this is the amendment to do if it passes.

Generals Shelton and Clark have been mentioned. They certainly would not agree to this amendment. We have won the peace. We have won the war. Let us not lose the peace. Defeat this amendment. It is awful.

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

EDITORIAL

(By Madeleine K. Albright)

WASHINGTON.—A year ago this week, Slobodan Milosevic rejected an international peace plan and intensified a campaign of terror that had already killed hundreds of Kosovo Albanians and driven more than 200,000 from their homes. His new offensive, begun with peace talks still underway, ultimately caused more than one million Kosovars to seek refuge and was marked by burned villages, rapes, murders and ethnic cleansing.

President Clinton and his NATO counterparts responded forcefully and, through persistence, successfully. Most of the displaced have since returned to their homes. Communities are rebuilding. Children are in school. With international help, most of Kosovo is secure and preparing for its first democratic elections ever.

Having prevailed in war, our challenge now is to secure the peace. This is proving, as expected, costly and hard. The journey from conflict to cooperation is not made overnight. Impatient, some in Congress suggest we give up, put away our wallets and call our troops home. But the costs and risks of quitting far exceed those of maintaining a stable Kosovo.

History teaches us that America cannot be secure if Europe is not secure, and events have reminded us repeatedly that Europe cannot be secure when conflict engulfs the Balkans. With Mr. Milosevic still present, the region remains a tinderbox. If we check out, wide-scale bloodshed will almost surely check back in.

Moreover, the price of perseverance is affordable and the obstacles to success can be overcome.

During the cold war, we stationed nearly 400,000 troops in Europe. Today we have roughly 100,000. Of these, about 6,000 are in Kosovo. Surely, this deployment is not dis-

proportionate to America's stake in the region.

Further, Europe is committed to shouldering the majority of burdens in Kosovo. European Union members have contributed 64 percent of the international troops and provided hundreds of millions of dollars in humanitarian and reconstruction aid.

We are contributing fewer than 15 percent of total troops and less than 15 percent of the nonmilitary costs of helping Kosovo recover from war and build stability. There are proposals in Congress to make a 15 percent share of these costs a legal cap. But such a restriction would harm, not help, our ability to leverage contributions from Europe. It would reduce our flexibility in responding to future events.

And it would underestimate America's stake in our partnership with Europe, which extends beyond Europe itself. After Hurricane Mitch struck in our hemisphere, more than 60 percent of the bilateral aid pledged came from Europe. And Europe assumed a 33 percent share of the cost of establishing peace in El Salvador and 34 percent in Guatemala.

Those ready to give up on Kosovo point to recent incidents of ethnic violence there. We share these concerns, and international authorities are addressing them by beefing up resources, tightening security, and marginalizing and disarming extremists.

But the problems should not obscure overall progress. With United Nations leadership, a Joint Interim Administrative Council has been established in which Kosovo's factions can begin to share responsibility for governing their region. The ethnic Albanian militia has met its commitment to demobilize. The murder rate is now lower in Kosovo than in many American cities. In much of the region, morale is high and people are focused squarely on building a better life.

The depth of estrangement between factions in Kosovo is profound. Urgent needs for police, prosecutors and courts have not yet been met. And the risk that angry individuals will generate disturbances remains significant. But if our reaction to every setback is to pull back, a dangerous world will grow rapidly more dangerous.

We are not asking anyone in Kosovo to abandon legitimate interests. We are asking the people there to pursue their interests through cooperation with the international community and by participating in the joint governing structures being created. With time and sufficient support, the cooler heads on all sides will prevail. A sense of inter-ethnic community may or may not develop; but pragmatic coexistence is clearly possible.

The day may come when a Kosovo-scale operation can be managed without the help of the United States, but it has not come yet. If we are forced by ill-conceived legislation to depart Kosovo or to slash our commitment of resources, others will mimic our weakness, and the flames of renewed conflict will surely and quickly ignite.

The American people should be proud that we did the right thing a year ago and confident that by working with our partners to consolidate the peace, we are doing the right and smart thing now.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 6, 2000]

STAY THE COURSE IN KOSOVO

(By Michael O'Hanlon)

WASHINGTON.—Having won the war against Serbia last year, is NATO now losing the peace in Kosovo? Based on February's violence in the divided city of Mitrovica, one might easily think so. In fact, that is not the case: Overall trends in Kosovo are positive, and recent events in Mitrovica are not a fair referendum on the state of affairs there.

On the other hand, the US and other NATO countries have made some bad decisions in recent weeks—and if they keep it up, the favorable prognosis could change. Countries on both sides of the Atlantic need to get back to military basics to make sure their victory last year is fully consolidated.

First, though, how can one say that life is getting better in Kosovo today? After all, about 150 Serbs have been killed there since the June peace accord. Largely as a result of the violence, the province has been divided into two almost completely segregated ethnic communities—and half of the population of Serbs has left Kosovo altogether. In February, two more Serbs were killed in the ethnically divided town of Mitrovica when an ethnic Albanian fired a rocket at a bus; Serb reprisals raised the overall death toll to 11.

It's true that these developments are regrettable. But it would be remiss to forget that this was a land at war less than a year ago. Nor was this just any war. It was a systematic violation of ethnic Albanians by an organized Serb campaign of violence.

Expecting people to forgive and forget within months, when many ethnic Albanians are still mourning the loss of loved ones and the rape and abuse of many who did survive, is unrealistic.

At least in terms of physical security, life in Kosovo has improved a good deal in recent months. According to NATO commander Gen. Wesley Clark, the province's monthly murder rate declined from roughly 200 last summer to about 35 this winter. Even if the recent tragedies in Mitrovica have bumped the murder rate up somewhat, it remains at least four times less than six months ago—and lower than the per capita murder rate in Washington, D.C. Part of the reason, admittedly, is ethnic segregation—Albanians no longer have as easy access to Serbs as they once did. (In fact, the preponderance of violence in Kosovo today is Albanian on Albanian), but it is better to be segregated and alive than intermingled and at risk of death—particularly in the immediate aftermath of an ethnic war.

Another major, positive development is that the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA), which fought Serbian forces last spring, has surrendered large caches of weapons to international forces and demilitarized its activities. Even if pockets of KLA-related forces remain active, they pose only a limited threat to the peace at present.

That said, there have been troubling developments in recent weeks in the peacekeeping efforts of the NATO-led force in Kosovo. Last week, the New York Times reported that American troops were directed to stay out of Mitrovica by the Pentagon, out of concern for their safety after Serbs in that city threw snowballs, stones, and bricks at them. Other recent reports from Kosovo have described how other countries, including Britain, have drastically curtailed their military strength in Kosovo, leaving commanders worried they may not have enough forces to carry out required missions.

The U.S. is wrong not to send its troops into towns like Mitrovica out of concern for their safety, and should change its policy. It's right for the U.S. to expect its allies to provide most troops in Kosovo, given its role in the air war and other military responsibilities from the Persian Gulf to Korea. But whatever troops it has there should not have—and probably do not want—special treatment. That is unfair to the armed forces of other countries in KFOR, the NATO-led protection operation. And it is dangerous. If the U.S. telegraphs to the world that it is terrified of suffering casualties, as it did in Somalia in 1993, it puts a

bull's-eye on the chest of American troops around the world and severely hamstrings foreign policy.

U.S. troops are not cowards. Tens of thousands sleep near their gas masks in Korea, maintaining a still-tense cease-fire. Thousands patrol the Persian Gulf, where war and terrorist attacks have claimed American lives on several occasions in the last decade. Dozens lose their lives every year in training and operational accidents simply because they are using dangerous equipment or carrying out other risky activities in difficult environments. They are capable of facing down stone-throwing Serbs and Albanians, and if they're needed for that mission, they should be sent.

That does not mean troops should be asked to do the impossible, or to take unnecessary risks. Some want NATO troops to do whatever it takes to allow Albanians and Serbs to live together peacefully, protecting isolated pockets of citizens wherever they are in the ethnic minority, or searching house-to-house for weapons in a massive disarmament effort. These ideas are unrealistic.

Kosovo, for all the distance it has come since June, is a recent combat zone in a war that stoked ethnic passions and left many thousands dead. Neither U.S. troops, nor UN police, nor any other external assistance can change these facts overnight. But even if international forces cannot make Kosovo a harmonious multiethnic society, they must continue to keep it stable.

That is where the allies come in, too. Their recent troop cutbacks—12,000 out of a total KFOR force of 50,000—are a bad idea. KFOR must remain strong enough that extremists within Kosovo aren't tempted to test it. It also needs to remain strong enough to deter Serbia. After all, Slobodan Milosevic's military and police forces outnumber NATO troops—three to one—even when KFOR is at full strength. Given KFOR's superior forces, and Serbia's awareness that NATO would send reinforcements if trouble began, KFOR's numerical disadvantage is acceptable—but that doesn't mean we should cut forces further.

Recent problems aside, things are going reasonably well in Kosovo. But that's no reason to get careless, or tempt fate.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 2¼ minutes remaining and the right to close.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I have mixed feelings about this amendment, because I think the approach that is being offered is a serious one and it has worked. It has worked in Japan when we offered this on the floor years ago where we had 40,000 troops stationed; and it made a difference in millions of dollars. And it has been offered and suggested with respect to Korea and Germany, as well.

But my problem with it right now is the timing of this amendment. The timing is such that it has come in the aftermath of the war when reconstruction is going on when there is a very, very difficult situation in terms of bringing stability and peace to a region. I just think it does not work right now.

Now, I am not suggesting that this is not something that we should not use in the future with respect to our Europeans and getting them to make sure that they fulfill their commitments. But this is not the right time to use it.

I hope my colleagues will look at this. Serious border incursions are still going on. Ethnic tensions are very, very high. And certainly people need to rebuild. And sending a sign of no hope is not the right signal in this very, very difficult time.

I hope my colleagues will vote "no" on this.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let us not assume that our European allies will not live up to their commitment.

Let me, furthermore, say that what we are simply saying in this amendment is that when they pledge \$140 million, \$30 million is not good enough; that when they pledge \$410 million to reconstruct Kosovo and they only gave \$44 million, that is not enough; and when they pledge to put 3,800 police, which is a vital component of rebuilding, and they only provide 1,800, that is not enough.

We are not trying to force the Europeans to do more than what they want to do. All this amendment says is that they ought to do what they said that they wanted to do. All this amendment says is, they said they were going to give these dollars, they ought to give these dollars.

If the Europeans have no interest in, at least, keeping their word, then what is the prospect for long-term peace there? The fact is this amendment will strengthen the U.S. military. Secondly, it sends a clear message in post-Cold War America that people need to shoulder their burden. Thirdly, simple workers across America say, hey, if they made this pledge, why can they not live up to it? It was our flesh and blood that went over there and made the peace. We are not asking them to carry the whole load. We are only asking them to carry the load that they committed to us. That makes good sense.

So I hope, my colleagues, we will come to this floor and will be in a position to be able to support a reasonable and progressive policy towards Kosovo.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 1¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my chairman and my colleague yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that all of us must have empathy for the expression of concern about our commitment

to Kosovo, the number of troops we have there, and how long we have been there, and how quick we can get them out.

The difficulty I have with the argument today and this proposal is that we do not need 435 Secretaries of State; we do not need 435 Secretaries of Defense.

I went to Kosovo in January, and at our major base camp, I met with about 30 young sergeants who talked to me about why they were there. The re-up rates in the Army are the highest there than anywhere in the world because those people know they are there to save lives. They want us out, as well. But, indeed, behind this mission is the stability of Europe. And we need a unified America speaking about solving that problem.

To have a proposal that would essentially have us force withdrawal sends the wrong message to Milosevic. We should be most worried about the spring thaw, where the Albanians are about to react. They, too, want to have a head-on collision with the Serbs. Blood could flow as a result of a message that says America is not unified in its voice.

This is the wrong time for this amendment presented in the wrong way, and I urge a very strong "no" vote.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my friends and colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from Connecticut, the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the gentleman from Alabama.

Very simply put Mr. Chairman, this amendment is about asking our European allies to honor their commitments and keep their word. The United States has very clearly shouldered the largest portion of the burden in the Balkans. This amendment corrects that and puts a framework in place to ensure our European allies live up to their commitments with respect to the war and subsequent peacekeeping mission in Kosovo.

The United States has put money, personnel, and equipment on the line in Kosovo. We have met our obligations time and time again while our allies have failed to meet their financial commitments and obligations. As a result we are faced with the United States pouring more of its resources and money into Kosovo. While our allies do not pay their share, more and more of our nation's surplus is going into this open-ended military deployment.

Our amendment corrects this. Until the President certifies that our allies have met a set of realistic benchmarks—all of which are reasonable portions or percentages of their original pledges and commitments—we will withhold half of the emergency supplemental bill's funding for Kosovo.

Mr. Chairman, we fully understand that our fiscal calendars and budget processes may differ from our European allies. For that very reason we are asking for a "good faith" payment—a percentage of their original pledges of support. If the President doesn't certify these "good faith" benchmarks have been met by June 1, 2000, the withheld funding would be made available only to allow for the safe,

orderly and phased withdrawal of United States military forces from Kosovo.

In the final analysis, our allies made commitments. I urge my colleagues to support the Kasich-Condit-Shays-Frank-Bachus amendment in putting a framework into place for ensuring our allies live up to those commitments.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the Chair announces that immediately following this vote there will be a 5-minute vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 219, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]
AYES—200

Archer	Frank (MA)	Meehan
Armey	Galleghy	Metcalf
Bachus	Ganske	Mica
Baker	Gekas	Miller (FL)
Baldwin	Gibbons	Miller, George
Ballenger	Goode	Minge
Barcia	Goodlatte	Mink
Barr	Goodling	Moore
Barrett (NE)	Gordon	Moran (KS)
Bartlett	Goss	Myrick
Barton	Graham	Neal
Bass	Green (TX)	Ney
Berry	Green (WI)	Nussle
Biggert	Greenwood	Owens
Bilbray	Gutknecht	Paul
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Pease
Boswell	Hansen	Pelosi
Boyd	Hastings (WA)	Peterson (MN)
Brady (TX)	Hayes	Petri
Bryant	Hayworth	Pickering
Burton	Hefley	Pitts
Camp	Hergert	Pombo
Campbell	Hill (MT)	Portman
Canady	Hilleary	Pryce (OH)
Cannon	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Castle	Hooley	Ramstad
Chabot	Hostettler	Reynolds
Chambliss	Hulshof	Riley
Coble	Hutchinson	Rivers
Coburn	Insee	Roemer
Collins	Isakson	Rogan
Combest	Istook	Rogers
Condit	Jackson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Conyers	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Roukema
Cooksey	Jones (NC)	Royce
Cox	Kasich	Ryan (WI)
Cubin	Kingston	Ryun (KS)
Danner	Kucinich	Salmon
Deal	LaHood	Sanders
DeFazio	Largent	Sanford
Delahunt	Latham	Saxton
DeLay	LaTourette	Scarborough
DeMint	Leach	Schaffer
Deutsch	Lee	Sensenbrenner
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Sessions
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Shadegg
Duncan	Linder	Shays
Dunn	LoBiondo	Sherman
Ehlers	Lofgren	Shimkus
Ehrlich	Lucas (OK)	Shuster
Emerson	Luther	Smith (MI)
English	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Eshoo	Markey	Souder
Evans	McColum	Stark
Ewing	McCrery	Stearns
Fletcher	McInnis	Stump
Foley	McIntosh	Sununu
Fossella	McKinney	Sweeney
Fowler	McNulty	Talent

Tancredo
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman

Tierney
Toomey
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Wamp

Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wicker
Woolsey

NOES—219

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Engel
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman

Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinches
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller, Gary
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Northup
Oberstar

Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Sherwood
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Siskiny
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Becerra
Burr
Chenoweth-Hage
Crane
Everett

Franks (NJ)
Granger
Klink
Norwood
Quinn

Rush
Spence
Vento
Weygand
Young (AK)

Messrs. MICA, NEAL of Massachusetts, LEWIS of Georgia and SAXTON changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF PENNSYLVANIA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the Amendment No. 11, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment, as modified.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment, as modified.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 386, noes 28, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]
AYES—386

Abercrombie	Clay	Frelinghuysen
Ackerman	Clayton	Frost
Aderholt	Clement	Galleghy
Allen	Clyburn	Ganske
Andrews	Coble	Gejdenson
Armey	Combest	Gekas
Baca	Condit	Gephardt
Bachus	Conyers	Gibbons
Baird	Cook	Gilchrist
Baker	Cooksey	Gillmor
Baldacci	Costello	Gilman
Baldwin	Coyne	Gonzalez
Ballenger	Cramer	Goode
Barcia	Crowley	Goodlatte
Barr	Cubin	Goodling
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham	Gordon
Barrett (WI)	Danner	Goss
Bartlett	Davis (FL)	Green (TX)
Bass	Davis (IL)	Green (WI)
Bentsen	Davis (VA)	Greenwood
Bereuter	Deal	Gutierrez
Berkley	DeFazio	Gutknecht
Berman	DeGette	Hall (OH)
Berry	Delahunt	Hall (TX)
Biggert	DeLauro	Hansen
Bilbray	Deutsch	Hastings (FL)
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (WA)
Bishop	Dickey	Hayes
Blagojevich	Dicks	Hayworth
Bliley	Dingell	Hill (IN)
Blumenauer	Dixon	Hill (MT)
Blunt	Doggett	Hilleary
Boehlert	Dooley	Hilliard
Boehner	Doolittle	Hinches
Bonior	Doyle	Hinojosa
Bono	Dreier	Hobson
Borski	Duncan	Hoeffel
Boswell	Dunn	Hoekstra
Boucher	Edwards	Holden
Boyd	Ehlers	Holt
Brady (PA)	Ehrlich	Hooley
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Horn
Brown (FL)	Engel	Houghton
Brown (OH)	English	Hoyer
Bryant	Eshoo	Hulshof
Burton	Etheridge	Hunter
Buyer	Evans	Hutchinson
Callahan	Ewing	Insee
Calvert	Farr	Fattah
Camp	Fattah	Isakson
Campbell	Filner	Istook
Canady	Fletcher	Jackson (IL)
Capps	Foley	Jackson-Lee
Capuano	Forbes	(TX)
Cardin	Ford	Jefferson
Carson	Fossella	Jenkins
Castle	Fowler	John
Chambliss	Frank (MA)	Johnson (CT)

Messrs. LIPINSKI, COSTELLO, ADERHOLT, LAZIO, and BILIRAKIS and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Sherwood
Jones (NC)	Moran (KS)	Shimkus
Jones (OH)	Moran (VA)	Shows
Kanjorski	Morella	Shuster
Kaptur	Murtha	Simpson
Kelly	Nadler	Sisisky
Kennedy	Napolitano	Skeen
Kildee	Neal	Skelton
Kilpatrick	Nethercutt	Slaughter
Kind (WI)	Ney	Smith (MI)
King (NY)	Northup	Smith (NJ)
Kingston	Nussle	Smith (TX)
Klecza	Oberstar	Smith (WA)
Knollenberg	Obey	Snyder
Kolbe	Olver	Souder
Kucinich	Ortiz	Stabenow
Kuykendall	Osce	Stark
LaFalce	Owens	Stearns
LaHood	Oxley	Stenholm
Lampson	Packard	Strickland
Lantos	Pallone	Stump
Largent	Pascarell	Stupak
Larson	Pastor	Sweeney
Latham	Payne	Talent
LaTourette	Pease	Tanner
Lazio	Pelosi	Tauscher
Leach	Peterson (MN)	Tauzin
Lee	Peterson (PA)	Taylor (MS)
Levin	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (CA)	Phelps	Terry
Lewis (GA)	Pickering	Thomas
Lewis (KY)	Pickett	Thompson (CA)
Lipinski	Pitts	Thompson (MS)
LoBiondo	Pombo	Thornberry
Lofgren	Pomeroy	Thune
Lowe	Porter	Thurman
Lucas (KY)	Portman	Tiahrt
Lucas (OK)	Price (NC)	Tierney
Luther	Pryce (OH)	Toomey
Maloney (CT)	Radanovich	Towns
Maloney (NY)	Rahall	Traficant
Manzullo	Ramstad	Turner
Markey	Rangel	Udall (CO)
Martinez	Regula	Udall (NM)
Mascara	Reyes	Upton
Matsui	Reynolds	Velazquez
McCarthy (MO)	Riley	Visclosky
McCarthy (NY)	Rivers	Vitter
McCollum	Rodriguez	Walden
McCrery	Roemer	Walsh
McDermott	Rogan	Wamp
McGovern	Rogers	Waters
McHugh	Ros-Lehtinen	Watkins
McInnis	Rothman	Watt (NC)
McIntosh	Roukema	Watts (OK)
McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
McKeon	Ryan (WI)	Weiner
McKinney	Ryun (KS)	Weldon (FL)
McNulty	Sabo	Weldon (PA)
Meehan	Sanchez	Weller
Meek (FL)	Sanders	Wexler
Meeks (NY)	Sandlin	Whitfield
Menendez	Sawyer	Wicker
Metcalf	Saxton	Wilson
Mica	Schakowsky	Wise
Millender-	Scott	Wolf
McDonald	Sensenbrenner	Woolsey
Miller, George	Serrano	Wu
Minge	Sessions	Wynn
Mink	Shaw	Young (FL)
Moakley	Shays	
Mollohan	Sherman	

NOES—28

Archer	Graham	Rohrabacher
Barton	Hefley	Royce
Bonilla	Hergert	Salmon
Cannon	Hostettler	Sanford
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Scarborough
Coburn	Kasich	Schaffer
Collins	Linder	Shadegg
Cox	Miller, Gary	Sununu
DeLay	Myrick	
DeMint	Paul	

NOT VOTING—20

Bateman	Franks (NJ)	Spence
Becerra	Granger	Spratt
Burr	Klink	Tancredo
Chenoweth-Hage	Miller (FL)	Vento
Crane	Norwood	Weygand
Cummings	Quinn	Young (AK)
Everett	Rush	

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

Stated against:
Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 90. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."
Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 90, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, because my amendment to restore 401 agriculture research funds was subject to a point of order, I will not be offering an amendment, and rise to engage the chairman in a colloquy.

I greatly appreciate his participation in this, and that of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN). I am deeply disappointed that the measure strikes two very important programs for rural communities, farmers and ranchers in Indiana and across the Nation, the Fund for Rural America and the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems.

As a conservative, I strongly support offsets for increased expenditures elsewhere. However, these two are critical programs for future needs in agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman's assistance as the bill moves to the Senate, that we could move to re-insert those programs into the final bill that comes back to this House.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico, the distinguished subcommittee chairman, to respond to the gentleman's colloquy.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for his commitment to Indiana agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, every year the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies is requested to contribute offsets to the supplemental spending bills. We did so this year by putting limitations on two mandatory programs, one for agriculture research and one for rural development, for a total offset of \$106 million.

I certainly agree that it is important that critical investments are made in agricultural research. In fact, two major research programs in USDA will receive about \$1.8 billion this year. Rural development will get about \$2.2 billion.

I would assure the gentleman that we will continue to work with him to adequately fund agricultural research.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from New Mexico, and do want to state

that I greatly respect his wonderful efforts over the years to make sure that the Appropriations Subcommittee would support agriculture research, extension and education.

I look forward very much to working with him in the conference to try to increase that funding.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) NOTICE OF REPORT.—Any entity which receives funds under this Act shall report any expenditures on foreign-made items to the Congress within 180 days of the expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 29, 2000, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

My amendment is right to the point, Mr. Chairman. We provide an awful lot of money around the world, and many times these nations buy product made in Japan and China. I am very concerned that some day China, with a \$90 billion trade surplus, may literally attack our children.

My amendment says we promote and encourage, without violating the laws, the procurement of American-made products. The gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) has worked hard at this. I appreciate the fact that he has accommodated this.

Let me say this to the House, we cannot protect America with a neighborhood crime watch and styrofoam. We

need a domestic industry, and I think looking at procurement of American-made products is of vital importance.

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

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

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

I would like to announce to the House that we are prepared to accept the amendment. It is the excellent amendment that the gentleman has offered many times, and has been accepted by this House many times. We accept the gentleman's amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) for continuing his crusade on behalf of America's jobs, our workers, our communities.

We certainly would be pleased to accept the agreement, in agreement with the majority here today. I want to thank the gentleman again for keeping our eyes focused on what we should, and that is, America's strength and productivity.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge an aye vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. With no Member seeking to control time in opposition, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . . (a) ACROSS-THE-BOARD REDUCTION.—Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 10 percent.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount designated by this Act as an emergency requirement, or any amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the Department of Defense.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 29, 2000, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask, is any Member opposed to my amendment?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized to control the time in opposition.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is pretty simple. It attempts to establish fiscal responsibility.

As all of us know, these emergency supplementals come once, twice a year. This is pretty simple. I cut spending by 10 percent across-the-board only, and I say to the Members, only for non-defense or non-emergency spending. So it would reduce by 10 percent these non-emergency appropriations for programs added to the supplemental for FY 2000.

I offer this amendment because the rescissions used to offset this new spending are unauthorized funds whose use would be better served by using them for paying down the debt.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, the \$235 million reduction for emergency Y2K funds, these are the funds we appropriated for 1998. They are being used and this funding is being used, but it is not obligated, so we say, okay, let us use it. But the fact is, this is previously-allocated money that was appropriated, again, as emergency funding, and will now be used to offset this emergency supplemental.

If we hear the word "emergency supplemental" used over and over here, we have to say to ourselves, what is an emergency and what is not? We need to hold the line on spending and practice some kind of fiscal responsibility.

We have had several votes this morning, and we continue to add more money to the supplemental.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) had his amendment to set aside \$4 billion for FY 2000, non-social security, for the on-budget surplus. The question is, why are we using \$429 million, money that was appropriated but not spent to offset recently added spending, when we could apply it to debt reduction?

This is an emergency supplemental. The programs that fall under non-emergency, if they are non-emergency, could we not go through the normal process?

When we were in the minority, we always talked about all these legislative initiatives on the floor. We said, these are not necessary. These are non-emergency. Why are we putting them on the floor? We want to see them go through the normal, regular appropriations cycle under my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

What we see happening with this bill is reminiscent of past years, when we kept adding more and more spending. If we go back and look at the spending that we did in the last fiscal year, we will see that the emergency spending balloons. This thing continues to balloon far beyond the original when leadership said, we will put on a bill that will be about \$6.5 billion. Then it went

to 7, 8. Now it is at 9 billion they brought it to the floor. This thing is continuing to go up.

We have already loaded this bill up with money for Colombia, Kosovo, Bosnia, the Department of Energy security and cleanup. I am sure if this bill remained on the floor for a week, this thing would balloon up to \$25 and \$35 billion.

I ask my colleagues, this is a very simple amendment just to reduce the non-emergency, only the non-emergency and non-defense, by 10 percent. The actual cut will be in millions of dollars, it will not be in billions of dollars. We must not appropriate more spending in this emergency supplemental. We must try to hold the line.

We do not want to repeat last year's mistake. The final budget agreement exceeded the budget resolution by \$25 billion in non-defense outlays. We seem to be heading in the same direction, so my amendment is modest and should be adopted.

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 am reluctant to rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), because we do like to save money every chance that we can get, his comments to the contrary notwithstanding. I have an idea that he voted for one of the or for the biggest amendment yesterday that was added to this bill.

Anyway, the gentleman's amendment wants to reduce the non-emergency appropriations in the bill. The President asked for over \$400 million worth of non-emergency items, but he offered offsets for those non-emergency items. We reduced the President's request from the \$420-some million to \$160, but we maintained the \$420 million worth of offsets, so we have actually offset far more than we have non-emergency spending items in this bill.

One of the things that would be affected by the Stearns amendment would be safety at our nuclear weapons facilities in the United States. Some of this money that would be reduced by this amendment, has to do with upgrading and restarting the enriched uranium operations, which were shut down for safety reasons. We are trying to make them safe. This is at the Y-12 plant in Tennessee.

The money this amendment would reduce would also address hazard analysis, the safety authorization basis for activities to be performed in FY 2000 at the Pantex plant in Texas. So we are talking about safety in our nuclear facilities.

Another item that my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) might be interested in, because I know that he had supported it, and many of his colleagues have supported funding for abstinence education. This amendment would take a pretty good chunk

out of that money that was agreed to for abstinence education.

I do not think the gentleman wants to do that, because I know that he supports that program. I am against the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I think, in all deference to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), my distinguished colleague and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I think he would agree, and he has been on the floor many times saying, particularly when he was in the minority as an appropriator, he said, why can we not take the non-emergency, non-defense spending and run it through the appropriations process, or go through the appropriate committees? Why should not all 435 Members of this House have the opportunity to see this in place and evaluate it?

He has mentioned a couple of programs that he said this would cut. Now realize, Mr. Chairman, that we are only cutting 10 percent of 100 percent, so certainly, in government funding, if we cut 10 percent we are not decimating a program. We are not eliminating a program.

So this is a modest attempt to signal to the citizens of the country and to signal to the Senate, if they decide to vote on this bill, and to make us feel, on this particular morning when we are voting for all new spending, that we are taking the task of being fiscally responsible.

I would say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida, if these are that important to him, why does he not run them through the appropriate process?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is really amazing, if not amusing. We have a huge circus elephant rampaging through this room, and the gentleman has an amendment that is going to go after a fly.

If we take a look at this amendment, this bill spends almost \$13 billion, and what does he go after?

1145

He goes after a \$140 million tiny piece of the package. He endangers three nuclear weapons productions plants at Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Kansas City, Missouri; and Amarillo, Texas. They are critical to the improvement of our nuclear stockpile, and he endangers safety operations at those operations.

He is going to say to a thousand families, after every politician in this

House has been posing for political holy pictures about how they are opposed to the higher energy prices, while I know that in his district in Florida they do not need a lot of help to pay for home heating oil, but it gets pretty doggone cold in the Northeast and the Upper Midwest, this is going to deny thousands of low-income American families help on that score.

It will take away the ability to get FHA loans from 20,000 low- and moderate-income couples in this country. I do not think that is a gift to taxpayers, although Members who make what we make do not have to worry about those little folks, I suppose. Is that the way the gentleman feels?

Then we just made a big production out of adding a lot of money for fire protection. What does the gentleman do? He knocks out money for fire safety right in the Capitol Hill complex, after we have been chastised for the neglect of the buildings up here. And then lastly, after we have heard so much on that side of the aisle about the need to have family planning programs that emphasize abstinence, what does the gentleman do? He cuts that program by 10 percent. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) has moved heaven and earth to get that program funding up, and now he is knocking that baby down.

And what does he leave untouched? Yesterday, this House added \$4 billion, not million, billion dollars in Defense Department programs to this year's appropriation bill. None of those items were emergencies. The sole, crass purpose of that amendment was to move \$4 billion in defense expenditures into this year's budget, so you freed up room for \$4 billion in congressional pork in the next year's Defense budget. Now we see this House with this "let's pretend" amendment supposedly protecting the taxpayers' interest. Do not make me laugh.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see the Ranking Minority Member from the Committee on Appropriations fighting to reduce waste and to say that he was upset about congressional pork, because I have been here some time and I have been in the minority and I have seen these emergency supplementals and in this case, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was chairman at that time.

When the gentleman can stand on the House floor and take out a single program and say that we are going to decimate these people, we are going to hurt them because of the reduction, and it is only 10 percent, and, in fact, it is a program that has not been authorized by Members of Congress, why do we not just do away with all the procedures here in the House of Representatives and just bring to the floor any idea by any Member at any time and just vote on it? Pretty soon, we can be the brand-new Santa Claus of history where we just vote on bills, not on the

basis of merit, but on the basis of emotion.

So I urge my colleagues to look back at this bill and realize that this is not taking away from anybody. The programs are all left in place. This is non-defense. This is nonemergency.

The gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned this huge amount of money that was provided for defense. The gentleman could actually have an amendment here on the floor to reduce that on the floor if he wants. If he really felt that strong about it, why does he not come on the floor and offer an amendment to reduce defense spending? It is an open rule. Let us up or down it.

But the point is that we have to realize that at some point somewhere we are going to have to address these programs and not continue to bring them on the floor without being authorized without being brought to the appropriate committees.

So I urge my colleagues again to consider this modest amendment and vote "yes" on the Stearns amendment.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the other gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) what planet he was on yesterday. The amendment yesterday was to add that \$4 billion in waste. And who led the opposition to it? I did. Were you here or some place else yesterday?

Secondly, when I was chairman, the only year I was chairman, we finished every single appropriation bill on time; and we spent less money than the President. This bill going through here, which I am going to vote against, spends \$17 billion more than the President asked for; and you are probably going to vote for it.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, can we have the balance of time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would announce that I have only one speaker to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, let us talk about what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) just indicated, that he was strongly against the appropriations for defense. He said yesterday that he was on the floor objecting to the money that we added for defense. Is that correct?

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, no, that is not correct. I said that I supported the core bill yesterday which had the additional money for reimbursement for

Pentagon costs to fix the health care problems at the Pentagon and those other items, but I did not support the \$4 billion add-on because it was not an emergency and that portion was simply making room for additional congressional pork.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, will the gentleman answer whether he is going to vote for final passage of the emergency supplemental?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, am I going to vote for it? I have been speaking for 2 days in opposition to it. Where have you been?

Mr. STEARNS. So the gentleman is going to vote no?

Mr. OBEY. You bet. It is an outrageous breaking of the bank. But you are going after a gnat instead of an elephant.

Mr. STEARNS. Well, I do not consider this a gnat, one-tenth of—

Mr. OBEY. All right. It is a flea.

Mr. STEARNS. Let us call it a cat or a dog or something. But the point is, it is a start. And so the gentleman from Wisconsin is going to vote against the emergency supplemental. If he is trying to fight for fiscal responsibility, as he has been saying today, then certainly if we are cutting nondefense and nonemergency items and it is something that has not even gone through his Committee on Appropriations that he is the ranking member on, I would think the gentleman would be more than happy to say, "Stearns is a great amendment, I am with you, shoulder to shoulder we will fight for fiscal responsibility."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me say what my friend, Archie the Cockroach would observe: It is important to have a sense of proportion. What sense is there for a flea to fall in love with an elephant?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, if the budget was a dollar and 10 cents was on the floor, I would try to save 10 cents, which is one-tenth of what we are talking about. So I urge my colleagues to think about it in that term. All the change that we have at home in our bedroom, we save it. We do not throw it in the trash because it might represent one-tenth of a dollar. I am sure the gentleman has pennies at home in a little tray like we all do and these pennies pile up and we go to the bank and take these pennies in. I am sure the gentleman has quarters and dimes.

Mr. Chairman, we are only talking about 10 percent of the nonemergency and nondefense. So if my colleagues are keeping in their pocket right now pennies and dimes and quarters, then I would think they would be somebody that would want to support this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I wish he would vote for the bill, though.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the statement of the

gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS). He said that I supported the supplemental when I was chairman. There never was a supplemental appropriation bill when I was chairman, so the gentleman is wrong on that fact too.

What the gentleman has done with his amendment, we have got a nice fat sugar donut on the floor and he is managing to go after the hole.

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

Mr. Chairman, again, I just want to remind the Members that we reduced the President's budget request in the supplemental from over \$400 million to \$160 million. That was in the non-emergency part of the bill. So we have already made a substantial reduction. But the \$420 million worth of offsets, we kept those offsets. So we really made some money for the taxpayer in that regard.

Another point is that defense has become a part of this discussion. I mentioned in my opening comments about the nuclear weapons facilities that we need to upgrade for safety reasons. That is national defense. The nuclear weapons facilities are part of our national defense. They are a major part of our deterrence that says to the rest of the world: Do not mess with America.

But those facilities have to be safe to protect the people who live around them and work around them. The Stearns amendment would make a reduction in monies going to make those nuclear weapons facilities safe. I just cannot accept that amendment. I wish that I could, but I cannot.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) will be postponed.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, since the subject has been raised, and since the subject of what the content is of this bill and "Who shot John and who has not" in terms of busting the budget, I think it is important to point out the facts on the overall bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), ranking member on the Committee on the Budget, to illuminate the House on that matter.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, shortly the House will pass a \$12.6 billion supplemental appro-

priation bill. I guess it will pass. The House should understand that this bill, this supplemental, breaches the spending levels that were set just last week when we passed the House Republican budget resolution passed.

During the debate of the budget resolution, we tried to point out that the Republican resolution assumed 5-year spending cuts of \$117 billion, which we did not believe that the Congress, under Democrats or Republicans, was likely to make or would make based on past experience.

The supplemental appropriations bill the House will adopt is \$4.1 million in budget authority above the funding level that was assumed just last week in the House budget resolution. And since the extra spending is not fully offset, the surplus for fiscal year 2000, fiscal year 2001, and fiscal year 2002 will be lower.

We had a chart on the House floor last week. We have not been able to blow it up again. We do not have the equipment that they do. I have it run on a single 8½ by 11 page. It picks up where we left off when I was trying to say last week that if we assume that we do the Medicare prescription drug benefit, 45 billion over 5, 155 billion over 10, and you do what you said you were going to do and pass a \$200 billion tax cut, that you would soon be back into Social Security.

Well, there were objections on that side saying we were not distributing the actual revenue losses due to the tax cut properly. So we said give us the numbers. Give us the numbers. We got the numbers, and we have run the numbers. We have added in this particular bill that we are about to pass, this supplemental, and here is how it distributes.

Pass this and pass the budget resolution, enact the resolution that we did last week, and the surplus this year will go to \$4.9 billion. Next year, a surplus of \$15 billion will go to \$7.8 billion. In 2002, pass the budget resolution we did last week, pass this supplemental, factor in the results, in 2002 we are \$541 million in deficit. In 2003, we are \$172 million in deficit. This is using your numbers and your assumptions and your budget resolutions.

In 2004, we are \$68 million in deficit. That is where this takes us, if we also pass the budget resolution. If Members voted for the Republican budget resolution last week, and if they vote for the supplemental today, these numbers, your numbers, clearly say we are headed straight into the Social Security surplus. That is where it takes us. Purely arithmetic. These are the consequences of having this ad hoc resolution on the floor and of having a budget resolution which, frankly, is not realistic.

Mr. Chairman, I am not contesting the validity of items in this supplemental. I support many of them and will probably vote for it. But I am contesting the validity of the budget resolution and the assumption that we can

do the things that we did last week, because it did not factor in the things that we are doing this week.

1200

Who in this House, who in this House thinks that the \$1.6 billion, or whatever it is we are providing for Colombia, is a nonrecurring item that we will wipe the problem out with this one-time allotment?

Who thinks that these adjustments in military pay to get around the food stamps problem and base housing will not recur again or that we will not have the O&M requirements again in the future?

My colleagues have understated discretionary spending in their resolution; and based upon that understatement, they projected a tax cut that is simply not sustainable. If my colleagues do that, let me repeat it again, if my colleagues who voted for the Republican budget resolution last week, and if my colleagues vote today for this supplemental, according to our calculation and their numbers, they will be back in deficit in a year's time, back into Social Security.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, the fact is that, for this fiscal year, rather than the next fiscal year about which the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has just been speaking, for this fiscal year, if my colleagues vote for this bill, they are going to be voting for a bill which is \$17 billion in spending over the amount the President asked for for this existing fiscal year. I will be interested to see how many so-called fiscal conservatives are going to do that.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. KAPTUR:

Page 80, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 5109. The Secretary of Energy shall annually acquire and store as part of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve 300,000,000 gallons of ethanol and 100,000,000 gallons of biodiesel fuel. Such fuels shall be obtained in exchange for, or purchased with funds realized from the sale of, crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday March 29, 2000, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am proposing is very straightforward. Essentially what it does is it allows the Secretary of Energy at this time of very high gas

prices to take a portion of our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, draw it down, and use the proceeds to purchase ethanol and biodiesel, adding those to the reserves that we have across this country. There is no budget impact to this proposal.

Essentially what we are doing here is recognizing that rising gas prices, in fact, harm and create havoc within our economy. This is a great economic vulnerability and a great military vulnerability.

We also recognize that we want to encourage domestic production of all fuels to the best extent possible. My colleagues should know that 92 percent of the fuels, the crude in the Petroleum Reserve, in the SPRO, has been imported. So it is not domestic. In fact, what fueled America this past year, over two-thirds of it is all imported. This is not a position that we should permit for our great country.

This amendment promotes alternative fuels focused on biofuels, specifically ethanol and biodiesel. It is a very reasonable proposal. Even after being implemented, this would represent less than 2 percent of all fuel that is in the reserve.

In addition, it is very competitive in the sense that, if one looks at the prices of ethanol now at about a dollar a gallon, when one purchases the amount we are talking about here, 300 million gallons, and biodiesel at \$1.50, we are at the point now where it makes sense to do this.

In addition, let me say, if one looks at the SPRO today, there are about 750 million barrels in it or allowed to be in it. But only 575 million are actually in it, which means we have a shortfall of 175 million barrels. So there is room in terms of the authority that exists within the law.

So I would just ask for favorable consideration of this. In particular, at a time when prices in rural America are so very low, let us use the cellulose, let us use the power of the fields and force of our country and help put us on a course of renewables and not such dependence on imported fuel inside this great economy. I ask for favorable consideration of the membership of what I believe is a very worthy amendment.

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

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) wish to make his point of order at this point?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do.

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on the appropriations 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 exchanging existing law."

The amendment directly amends existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Ohio wish to be heard briefly on the point of order?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say I have the greatest respect in the world for the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the full committee, and also the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies.

I would hope that, as we move toward conference, we might find some language that would achieve some of what we wish to have happen here, giving direction to the administration at a time in our country where the American people expect us to do more than dither here in the Nation's chief legislative body. I really think we have a reasonable direction here.

I thank the gentleman from Florida for permitting me to talk on this amendment. I will withdraw the amendment in hopes that, as we move toward conference, we might be able to find some reasonable course here to help America find a better way in this new century.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we will work with the gentlewoman and try to do that.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by Mr. PAUL:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . (a) The amounts otherwise provided in title I for the following accounts are hereby reduced by the following amounts:

(1) "DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—Drug Enforcement Administration—Salaries and Expenses", \$293,048,000.

(2) "DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY—OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense", \$185,800,000.

(3) "BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—Funds Appropriated to the President—Department of State—Assistance for Plan Colombia and for Andean Regional Counternarcotics Activities", \$1,099,000,000.

(b) None of the funds made available in title I for "Military Construction, Defense-Wide" may be used for construction outside of the United States or any of its territories or possessions.

(c) None of the funds made available in title II may be used for operations in Kosovo or East Timor, other than the return of United States personnel and property to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday,

March 29, 2000, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 10 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to assure the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that I am not dealing with a fly, a gnat, or a flea with my amendment. I would rather not categorize this as dealing with an elephant for obvious reasons.

But I would like to say that my amendment deals with what I consider a monster, and that monster to me is careless foreign military interventionism in which we engage way too often and something we are getting ready to further engage ourselves now in Colombia.

I am quite convinced that, when most of the Members go back to their districts, they never brag and they never say that, "I go to Washington, and I always vote for the United States to be the policemen of the world. I enjoy deferring to the United Nations and NATO forces for us to pursue some of our policies overseas." Quite frankly, I believe most of us go home and say that we do not believe that the United States should be the policemen of the world.

Earlier on, we debated the issue of whether or not our allies are paying their fair share, and it is obvious they are not. So not only do we defer to them for policy and we extend ourselves throughout the world, we actually end up paying the bill, as most American citizens know.

Last year, when we were dealing with Kosovo and our initial involvement in there, we had several votes on the floor dealing with the sentiment of the Congress. For the most part, the sentiment was strongly opposed to our military troops being placed in Kosovo.

But, unfortunately, when it came time to deal with the funding, we were all too anxious to permit and authorize and appropriate the money to go into Kosovo. Today we are continuing to fund our activities in Kosovo as well as Bosnia, East Timor, and now with plans to go into South America, principally Colombia.

My amendment deals with this. It would strike these funds, and it would permit funds to be used in Kosovo to bring troops home. Some people argue that if we strike funds for areas like Kosovo, that we are deserting our troops and it will be detrimental to their morale. Quite the opposite. I think it would absolutely be helpful, because the morale of our servicemen cannot get much lower. The morale is low because they do not know what their real function is in areas where we're involved. They have become policemen dealing with local laws as well as Peace Corps type operators.

The morale would be tremendously helped by bringing these troops home. This is what this amendment deals with. And it strikes the funding for the expansion of our efforts in Central America.

In Colombia, there are a lot of weapons already, and we are responsible for 80 percent of them. There is one irony about this bill that strikes me. The administration and many here on the floor who vote for these weapons are the same individuals who are anxious to prohibit the right of an American citizen to own a cheap weapon in self-defense. At the same time, they are quite willing to tax these individuals and take their money to spend it on the weapons of war around the world and become involved in no-win situations.

I cannot think of a worse situation where there is a four-way faction in Colombia for us to get further involved. Buying 63 helicopters is bound to cause trouble and some will be shot down thus requiring more involvement by American troops.

It is time to reassess this policy; to come home. We should not be the policemen of the world. The American people are not anxious for us to do this. They have spoken out. A recent poll has shown that 70 percent of the American people are very anxious for us not to be involved in policing the world. They certainly are not interested in us placing United States troops under the command of U.N. and NATO forces.

This is a good time for the Members of the Congress to decide whether or not they would like to vote clearly and say to the American people, "I do not endorse the concept that we should have an open-ended commitment to the world, to be the policemen of the world." This is what this amendment says. Quite frankly, the large majority of the American people are strongly supportive of this position.

This is a clear amendment. This is not dealing with a gnat or a flea. This is dealing with a principle. Some say this amendment deals with a principle of foreign policy, and we should defer to the President.

That is not correct. Under the Constitution, the words "foreign policy" do not exist. All the obligations fall on the Congress, especially with the power of the purse. The President is the Commander in Chief. But he should never send troops around the world without permission, which all Presidents continuously have done in the last 50 years. This amendment addresses that subject.

I would have preferred an amendment that would have struck some of these funds from overseas and placed them into beefing up the military, increasing the pay of our military personnel, giving them better housing and better medical care, as well as having some of those funds spent here at home. That amendment was not permissible under the rule.

But this point, if my colleagues are anxious to make it, can be made by

voting for this amendment. If you are sick and tired of America being the patsy, sick and tired of us picking up the bill, sick and tired of our troops being exposed around the world, this is the amendment to support.

I think this is a very important amendment, and I the American people support it.

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 want to agree with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) that this is not an insignificant amendment. This is a major amendment. But here is what it does. It waves the white flag of surrender in the war against the drug lords in Colombia, which provide most of the drugs, illegal drugs that come into the United States. Now we want to wage the effort to eliminate those drugs at their source. This waves the flag of surrender.

I have already talked many times during the various amendments today about the money for Kosovo. This bill is not sending any money to Kosovo. The money spent in Kosovo was already spent. The President made that deployment without getting the approval of the Congress, but the money has been spent. The money was taken from the fourth quarter operations and maintenance accounts of the military services, which means, if we do not replace that money, they have to stand down their training activities for the last quarter.

This amendment is also very significant. It deals with military construction. It says that none of the funds can be used for construction outside of the United States or its territories or possessions.

I wonder if the gentleman from Texas is not familiar with the fact that we have 37,000 American troops in Korea, in and around Korea, in that region, 37,000 American troops. They need some medical facilities. They need some housing, some new housing. The facilities are very old in Korea.

The CINC who just retired from Korea has given us a substantial argument as to why there are military construction requirements in Korea. The new CINC, who has just assumed the job in Korea, has also told us that there are needs in military construction.

This amendment would prohibit us doing for our troops who are in Korea, whether they like it or not, and that is not one of the most favored deployed areas, those needed construction jobs. That to me is significant.

If we cannot take care of our own troops, and we have been there ever since the end of the Korean War, and it is at least a year-long deployment for most of the troops that are there, we cannot even consider supporting this amendment if we believe that we have a responsibility to the Americans who serve in uniform.

1215

And I urge a strong rejection of the Paul amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Texas has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

I do not believe for one minute this is a surrender to the drug war. This is an acknowledgment that the \$250 billion we have spent over the last 25 years has not worked; that the strategy against drugs is wrong.

Why continue a war that does not work? This is money down a rat hole. This is totally wasted money and, as far as I am concerned, only an excuse to sell helicopters and go in to Colombia and protect oil interests. That is the real reason why we are down there.

We say this is only replacement of money for Kosovo. Well, what makes us think if we put the money in and replace it the President will not do the same thing over again? Of course he will. The fact that we are not watching the purse strings tightly enough is the problem.

The gentleman suggests that this would mean that there would be no more building and no support for our troops in Korea. My amendment only deals with the money in this supplemental. What about the current year's budget? Those funds can still be spent. But it also suggests that we shall question how long are we going to be in Korea. It is time to start thinking about these matters. It is time to bring these troops home.

If we want to spend the money, spend it here at home. Spend the money here. Build up our national defense. If we wish to continually expand our interventionism and aggravation overseas, then I guess we have to vote against this amendment and for the bill. But this is a policy statement. Should we continue current policy of forever spending money and being involved overseas? I say it is time to start thinking about what is good for our people, what is good for our taxpayers, what is good for national defense, and what is good for our constitutional republic. Should we be doing this? I do not think so. Are we authorized to do it? No, we are not authorized to police the world.

This is the furthest stretch of the imagination to believe that what we are spending here on this budget, especially what we are going to do in Colombia, has anything to do with national security. What are we worried about? Are the Colombians going to attack us? This is not national security. This is special interest spending. This is conservative welfarism; that is what it is.

We condemn all the welfare from the left, but we always have our own wel-

fare on the right, and it is not for national defense. We should do less of this military adventurism overseas and put it into national defense, take better care of our troops, which would boost morale, and increase our ability to defend our country. But, instead, what do we do? We subsidize our enemies to the tune of many billions of dollars for a country like China at the same time, when they are aggravated and annoyed with Taiwan, we send more weapons to Taiwan and then promise to send American servicemen to stand in between the two of them.

Some day we should ask the question of whether is this policy in good for us. I am frightened to think that this will only change either when we are in such a mess, a lot worse than Vietnam, or we totally go broke or both. But we should not wait. We should speak out and do what is best for our country. We have a good guideline as to what we should do in foreign policy, and it comes from the constitution, certainly we should note the tradition of the last 50 years. The Constitution gives us the guidance to pursue a proper foreign policy.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 7 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, let me take this opportunity to associate myself with the comments of the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). He is right on on this.

What this amendment does is absolutely ignores the history and the role the United States has played since the days of Harry Truman, and I think that opposition to this amendment is proper and just and it must be defeated.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and let me begin by congratulating the gentleman in the manner in which he has conducted this debate. I think he has done a wonderful job, both yesterday and today.

I do rise in opposition to this amendment, because I believe it goes too far, it covers too many things, and withdraws from too many places and too many important operations. However, I do want to speak more favorably at least on one aspect of the amendment. This appropriation package has, as its linchpin, aid to Colombia. That is both its greatest strength and, I am afraid, its greatest risk. It is risky because its success in the long run is dependent upon cooperation and commitment, a commitment to justice on the part of the Colombian government, and this is, I am afraid, where I have some doubts.

Just over a year ago three innocent Americans were discovered, their bodies. They had been brutally slaughtered in northeast Colombia, slaughtered while they were educating the people of northeast Colombia, slaughtered by thugs from FARC narcoterrorists. One of these Americans was a constituent of mine, Ingrid Washinawatok of Menominee County, Wisconsin. If we are not careful, I am afraid these three Americans may become victimized yet once again. And here is why.

Last October, this body unanimously, unanimously, passed a Sense of the Congress Resolution which decried these murders, condemned FARC, but also, and this is the most important part, called upon the government of Colombia to arrest and to extradite to the United States for criminal trial these awful people. Some weeks ago, at a subcommittee hearing before the Committee on International Relations, I had the chance to ask our drug czar, the esteemed General Barry McCaffrey, for help in pushing for extradition. He assured me he would, and he assured me that he would keep me and my constituents posted. Unfortunately, I have to report today that we have heard nothing from him.

And now, just recently, we have heard from the president of Colombia that he will not extradite at least one of these murderers, German Briceno. So it looks as though the family of Ingrid Washinawatok may be let down once again. For this initiative, for this initiative aiding Colombia, to work, there must be trust, there must be understanding, and there must be a commitment to justice; and I am afraid that commitment may be slipping away.

I see my friend and colleague, the esteemed chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and I would ask him and ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the drug czar, and the President all to help us push for extradition.

I do speak in opposition. I believe this amendment goes too far, but some of the sentiments are valid.

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, because I want to assure him that we will try to work with him in conference, and wherever we can, to assist in his desire in getting this criminal extradited.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. That means a great deal to us. And I thank the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations as well, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat that this is a serious amendment and should

be rejected in a very serious way. Now, the issues that our colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), has raised, are major policy decisions that need to be made, but this is not the bill to do so.

I would suggest to the gentleman that he should go to the Committee on International Relations or he should go to the Committee on Armed Services to deal with the issues that he has raised. He deserves a debate on those issues but not on this bill. This is an appropriations bill, this is not a bill where policy is set. And so I ask the Paul amendment be rejected in a very strong and serious way.

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

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi:

To restrict funding for in excess of 300 U.S. military personnel in Colombia.

On page 80 after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available by this Act may be expended for the support of in excess of 300 United States military personnel in Colombia.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 29, 2000, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) claims the time in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I ask my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, for a few minutes to try to remember what it was like before we all got caught up in which party we are in and which committee chairman is for something and which committee chairman is against it, and try to remember why I think all of us ran for this office. It was to do good things and to keep bad things from happening.

It is the second point that I would like to discuss today, because I think that the needless loss of an American service person is quite possibly the worst thing that can happen.

The amendment that I am offering today is an effort to keep a bad thing from needlessly happening. Colombia is a dangerous place. The FARC and the ELN, the two primary guerilla groups, now control better than 40 percent of the Colombian countryside. They are well financed, they are well armed, they are well trained. And in increasing instances, they are working in large units to overwhelm Colombian army outposts; and just this week killed about 30 Colombian policemen.

In my opinion, they threaten the Nation of Colombia. And yet the political leaders of Colombia in the past year have reduced their defense spending. The political leaders of Colombia in the past couple of months have actually changed their law so that people who hold a high school diploma are no longer eligible for the draft in Colombia. In private conversations with their business leaders, they tell me, yes, there are taxes on the books, but they do not pay them. And I suspect that they are expecting someone else's kid to defend their country.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. We have no problem on this side with the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and assure him I will go quickly.

Usually it is some poor uneducated kid from the Colombian countryside, and I get every indication that they expect American kids to fight in a war they will not fight in and the American taxpayers to pay for a war that they will not pay for.

It is with some hesitation that I will vote to help them with America's money and equipment. I will not, however, vote to send America's sons and daughters off to fight a war in Colombia that the sons and daughters of Colombia and their political leaders often will not fight in.

This amendment would limit America's troop strength in Colombia to 300 military personnel. In a hearing before the House Committee on Armed Services last week on Colombia, General Charles Wilhelm, the United States Commander in Chief of the Southern Command, was told of my reservations and asked if he would agree to a troop limitation. His response was:

Would I be willing, as the Commander in Chief of the United States Southern Command, to subscribe to a properly considered and developed troop cap for Colombia? I certainly would. Categorically, yes.

That was 1 week ago today.

I am asking my colleagues to put such a cap on American troop strength in Colombia. Should it be the will of the majority of this House to break

that cap, then it should be done in a deliberate manner and by a vote of this body, and not something that some president on a whim gets us involved in.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I think that this amendment is an important one because it helps point out the fact that the strategic thought on the fight against drugs is being directed in the wrong place.

1230

What should happen and should, of course, come from the Colombian military and their government is to put a stop to the traffic, the drug traffic coming across the Andes by air as the Peruvians stopped, and through the three, and only three, mountain passes through the Andes. Instead, we might find ourselves enmeshed in a civil war, going after one-third of the guerillas who, of course, are being supported by the drug trafficking.

The proposed strategy is a 6-year strategy; that should not be. It should be one where you shoot down the airplanes as they fly over the Andes and stop up the three passes and then should we look at assisting in going after the guerillas if that be our policy. Let us go the first things first.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield our 10 minutes for purposes of control to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) will control 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, as my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), indicated we are not going to have any problem with this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN).

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman (Mr. LEWIS of California) for yielding me this time. I do not rise in opposition to this amendment. I would not ask for a rollcall vote on this amendment.

I do have to tell my colleagues in the House that within the last hour, I have spoken to General Wilhelm; and General Wilhelm says that he does not believe this figure of a 300-person cap on military personnel in Colombia is realistic. And he does not know where it came from.

If there was going to be a cap, as he said in his statement before the committee, it should be properly considered and developed. This, I do not believe meets that test. I am not opposed

to there being one. And I would hope in the course of the legislative process that that kind of deliberation on what the cap should be and what exemptions might be in order to that cap would be a matter that would be considered.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time. I am prepared to yield it back as soon as we are through on both sides.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for the help of the committee chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I think that it is very, very important, speaking as a Member of the Committee on Armed Services who was there when this statement was made, and reflecting for a moment on very cogent remarks of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN), the reason that we need to pass this today is to at least set in motion the fact that we are not going to make an open-ended commitment here.

We are dealing with numbers that have been the case so far with the commitment of the United States. It is very, very important in the context of what has happened from Vietnam on that we not find ourselves stumbling into something from which we cannot come back, getting into something from which we cannot retreat if it is found to be necessary. Of course, we need to take into account exactly what should be done with respect to numbers or anything else, but failing to do this today we will find ourselves in a position where that kind of benchmark has not been established.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very, very important for us to pass this amendment today on the basis that we do not find ourselves drifting inextricably into a situation that we cannot only control, but for the consequences of which may be something that all of us would find most grievous in terms of what the Congress of the United States did.

I recognize that we are near the end of a day in which people may be leaving; that the full attention may not be on this question right now. That is even a more important reason that we pass this amendment today.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to yield the balance of my time, presuming the other side is as well.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) for their assistance in this.

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

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

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. TANCREDO

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by Mr. TANCREDO:

At the end of the bill, add the following section.

SEC. . The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES—Food and Drug Administration Buildings and Facilities by \$20 million.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 29, 2000, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

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

Mr. Chairman, in the proud tradition of the \$500 hammer, the \$1,000 toilet seat and the \$1 million outhouse, the FDA and this bill now bring us a hugely expensive Federal office building in Los Angeles. This building, 133,000 square feet, will cost us, when it is done both in construction and in land acquisition and design, some \$53 million. That is an extraordinarily expensive piece of property, and as you can see by this picture here, it looks nothing like what one would consider to be an appropriate design building for a Federal Government agency.

By the way, this amount, this \$52 million, \$53 million for this 133,000 square foot building does not include the cost of furniture, telecommunications, or security systems. It is just the building and the land. Yes, there are some laboratories in the building, but that does not account for the massive expense.

It is the incredible opulence of this building, the building itself, a rendering of which, by the way, the architect proudly displays on his Web site, and proud he should be.

Look at this thing. Does this look like a building designed with the slightest consideration for cost containment? Of course not. But why should anyone care. After all, it is just government money.

Let us take this \$20 million that they are asking this year and use it for debt reduction and not for pork production.

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

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

and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this construction project is not included in this bill at the request of any Member. This replacement laboratory has been in the agency's program of requirements for some time. It was included in the President's budget request last year, and it was included in the House-passed bill last year.

As we moved towards our conference agreement last year, this was one item that we could not fit within our overall spending levels. But that did not mean that the requirement went away. It only meant that the building has gotten older, more decrepit, and more dangerous for employees.

What is done in this laboratory? This lab does the scientific and analytical work that backs up the FDA's consumer-protection mission, with a heavy emphasis on the surveillance of important products. Fully 25 percent of the agency's laboratory work related to imports is done in this one location.

What happens if this replacement construction is further delayed? Eventually, and the time is soon, operations in the existing facility will have to halt because of the combination of lack of worker safety and questionable scientific results due to substandard conditions.

What happens then? Laboratory work will be performed elsewhere at reduced efficiency and higher costs. Turn-around time on sample analysis will increase, and fresh imported foods being held for this analysis will rot on the dock; or worse yet, unsafe food will find its way to our homes and tables.

So if the goal is to increase the cost of Federal efforts to ensure the safety of imported products, increase the health risks to the American consumer, increase the risk to Federal workers in doing their jobs, and increase the cost of industry of complying with necessary regulation, then, by all means, my colleagues should support this amendment.

I do not support those goals; and, therefore, I oppose the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I ask all Members to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been on the ground at this facility. It is an absolutely ruinous situation, very dangerous. I do not know whose artistic presentation that was. But in a place where this facility is today, it has to be redone and has to be moved, or we will lose it.

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in response.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, the artist rendering of the building that we presented here is the architect, the architect that has been hired by FDA. This we took off of his Web site. This is not our representation. This is the artist rendering the building that they are going to put on a piece of property that

they have purchased for somewhere around \$9.8 million is the cost they gave us for land acquisition and for some design.

Let us assume that the design was for a million dollars. Let us assume that the architect got to us for a million dollars for the design. That still means that we paid almost, what, \$800,000 or \$900,000 an acre for the property on which this is going to sit. And after we do that, we are going to build a building that will cost us \$100 to \$300 a square foot.

This is enormously expensive, incredibly opulent. This is not a conservative stewardship of tax dollars when it comes to building Federal buildings. And then let me say that my colleague has indicated what happens in this building and he leads us to believe that there is a great deal of concern that we should have if these people do not have all this room.

There is almost, by the way, 700 square feet individual space per employee in this building. The GSA standard, by the way, runs to about 175 feet; and that is even including the expanse outside of one's work space, the average that the GSA indicates. This is a 700-square-foot-per-employee building.

Let me tell my colleagues what is going to go on in this building that is so incredibly important to the health and safety of the Nation. We took this off of the FDA's Web site about what they do. This is what they describe as what will be going on in this building for the Office of Regulatory Affairs:

Advises and assists the commissioner and other key officials in regulations; coordinates, interprets, and evaluates the agency's overall compliance efforts; stimulates awareness within the agency of the need for prompt and positive action to assure compliance; evaluates and coordinates all proposed legal actions to ascertain compliance; executes direct-line authority over all agency field operations; provides direction and counsel to the regional food and drug directors; develops and/or recommends to the commissioner policy programs plans.

All this bureaucratic gobbledygook, which we know really and truly, when we get down to it, what is this all about but a lot of paper shuffling.

We are not talking about a massive building with a great many laboratories in it. What has happened here is that they are consolidating two office buildings and one lab into this building. But the majority is office building, office building.

1245

Look at that office building. I ask my colleagues, how many buildings even here in Washington, DC, do we see that look like that? It is not the cost of what goes on inside that building necessarily or the construction of it that is so expensive, it is what it looks like.

This is something again, even if it is necessary, Mr. Chairman, even if every-

thing that my colleague has said is necessary, I ask, is this an emergency, on the level of the hurricane disaster, on the level of all the other things that we know to be in the true definition of the term emergency it is known to fit. But if some FDA employee has to go to a building that is less convenient, perhaps less opulent, certainly dustier and in a seedier neighborhood, because that is what they list here as being their big problem, they do not like the neighborhood where they presently are housed. They do not like the neighborhood. I am sorry about that. A lot of folks I know are not terribly pleased, but they do not have the luxury of just coming to the Congress and getting \$52 million to move out.

I should say to my colleagues that if that is what really prompts this kind of move, it is not an emergency, it should not be in here. If all the things that are true about the need for this kind of construction are there, then it should come through the regular process, go through the regular appropriations process and end up yea or nay on the floor. It should not be in this particular piece of legislation.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I want to say to the gentleman from Colorado that had he contacted our subcommittee at any point during our discussions on this, perhaps we could have clarified some of the misinformation that he is bringing to the floor. This is not an office building. This is a laboratory. One-quarter of all imported food that comes into our country is probed and the samples from that are sent through this lab.

Keep in mind that in our country today, we only are able to test, the American people cannot even believe this but it is true, less than 2 percent of what comes over our borders. But of what we do test, one-quarter is sent to this lab, which by the way I wish he would put up the picture of the current obsolescent, dilapidated embarrassment that sits in South Los Angeles today that calls itself a building and a lab which is unsafe for the workers to work in.

The reason this is an emergency, and we should have passed this last year, is simply because the building is in such bad shape if this does not pass and we cannot start construction very soon, and this has been a competitively bid project, that means that we are going to have to move everybody out of that lab and put them somewhere else which will be a waste of taxpayers' money. We ought to get this building up. If he takes the trees off that little drawing he has got there and just look at the building, it does not look too fancy to me.

They had to come in within budget, what was budgeted for it. If we think

about what is happening in our country today, 5,000 people died last year of food poisoning in our country. Seventy-three million had different types of illnesses related to food. Of what is coming over the border, over 5 percent of what we do test has microbiological pathogens such as E. coli and salmonella and shigella.

This is a serious situation. We should not ask people to work in those kinds of conditions. It is an embarrassment to the city of Los Angeles to have this antiquated structure there. I do not think it would be a very pleasant place to go to work. As conditions are today, it certainly is not. This particular lab located where it is in Southern California, way out there in the Southwest, I am sure his California colleagues do not support this because we have so much produce coming in from Mexico now and it is growing at alarming rates, we have to be able to test this in the public interest.

I should tell the gentleman that the L.A. district, not just this lab or the border but the L.A. district, the region, represents one of the three largest ports of entry for all commodities coming into the United States. This is a place that needs attention. I do not think it would be very wise to shut it down or to try to transfer it to some other part of the country. If we probe in Texas, we have to send the probes over to Los Angeles because we do not have enough money to build other labs. I say let us build a structure that will stand for a number of years.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman, if he had come to our committee and we could have spent time talking with him about this, we would be happy to work with him in the months ahead. I personally will be willing to go with the gentleman out there and see what we have got now. I leave it to the experts to build the new lab, but let us move on with it. It is the 21st century, let us get out of the 19th. Defeat the Tancredo amendment.

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

The information that we have about this facility comes to us from the FDA. It is their own information. It is their own documentation. It is the rationale for their budget request. It states that restricted funds will serve to consolidate three district's sites, the laboratory on People Boulevard, the current district office in Irvine, and the San Pedro resident post.

If that has changed and it is a different configuration than this, I will be happy to entertain that consideration, but that is what they said this is for. They also said that this replacement facility was going to house 75 laboratory staff and 120 office personnel at an estimated construction cost of \$40.4 million.

Again, \$40.4 million for the building and the gentlewoman and I both know that the building will never come in at that amount. When was the last time a

Federal building project ever came in at budget? But our best hope is \$40.4 million. Again add the \$9.8 million to that that we have spent for land and design, and we have got a building that is now approaching \$400 per square foot in cost. This is extraordinary.

I repeat, that if all of the information provided is inaccurate that we have here, if there is greater need than what we are able to identify on this floor and certainly than what has been able to be offered here on the other side as a justification for this expenditure, I suggest that all could have been done in an even more appropriate setting and, that is, the regular appropriations process, a committee of reference, not just an appropriations committee but an authorizing committee.

The Citizens for Government Waste has identified this particular project as a particularly egregious example of government waste, and they are supporting the amendment. They and others have looked at this whole thing and recognize that once again it is not just the fact that we may need a building. I am not arguing that point. Some facility may be necessary. I certainly would not stand here and tell Members that all of the claims to the contrary are accurate, but I am saying that a building of this nature is what I am concerned about and a building this expensive. Eight hundred, \$900,000 an acre for the building for 10 acres to build a 133,000 square foot building seems to me to be exorbitant.

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

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

I have some questions for the proponent of this amendment. Regarding the gentleman's figures on the cost per square foot of the facility, does the gentleman realize that you do not test for botulism and salmonella in a garage? Does the gentleman understand that you do not test for E. coli with a high school science kit in your kitchen? Would the gentleman be happy if FDA were testing the food that he and his family eat and that the families of all the Members here eat using old, outmoded equipment in poor facilities?

Is there a Member in this body who does not want the country to have the safest and best food supply in the world? Is there a Member in this body who thinks that we can do that on the cheap?

Mr. Chairman, here in Washington, we are pretty good at taking care of ourselves. We have nice offices, nice staff, lots of parking. We even have our own police force. We work here less than half the days in the year. Why then do we expect Federal government employees to protect our food supply and our health every day of every week of every year and not give them the means to do it?

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I go back again to the information provided by the FDA about what exactly goes on in the Office of Regulatory Affairs for which this building is being constructed, the Office of Regulatory Affairs. I read the list. I certainly did not give a detailed description of each one of these things because, quite frankly, they are quite amorphous. But I assure Members that none of them, not one of the things identified on this entire list except the last thing that says operates the Federal medical products quality assurance program for the agency is even remotely connected to the kind of thing my colleague brings up about what FDA does.

Then we went to the Web site to find out exactly what the medical products quality assurance staff does to determine just exactly how close it came to this quality control issue. Here is what they do. This is again from the FDA. The functional statement for the medical quality assurance staff are develop and maintain liaison with the government agencies procuring medical products, develop and manage operational agreements and systems, receive and process requests from other Federal agencies, maintain liaison, coordinate, direct field and headquarter activities relating to the governmentwide assurance program.

Mr. Chairman, nothing in here, nothing they have given us certainly, would lead us to believe that any of the activities going on in this building reach the level of importance in terms of maintaining the food quality of this Nation that has been identified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) has expired.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to our colleagues, do not take a safe food supply for granted. We have to thank the lab workers across our country who work at wages below what they would earn in the private sector and in this Los Angeles lab I want to pin a gold star on every one of them because they work under terrible, terrible conditions.

Yet they are there because they are dedicated to the public health and welfare of the people of the United States and to food safety. We still have the safest food supply in the world but we have got some tears in the fabric. One of the answers for us is to try to provide a more modern facility where we can test faster, move more product through and increase the amount of surveillance that we do as imports absolutely avalanche into this country.

Remember, we only check now under 2 percent of the food that you buy, the fresh fruits and vegetables that you buy in the store, we only check less

than 2 percent. We have had outbreaks across this country. The question becomes, are we going to put our money where our mouth is in terms of food safety for our families and for our children? Defeat the Tancredo amendment.

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

I think the essence of this thing is, Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many Members have seen this FDA laboratory in Los Angeles. I have. It is an absolute ruin. I have been there. I have seen what it is like for the FDA employees who work in the trenches, so to speak, doing the job that we all want them to do to ensure the safety of the food supply. They are in danger of their own situation because the place has been broken into time after time. It is in a terrible location. It is in a terrible state of repair. It is not worth this effort that we have gone through.

I would say to the gentleman, a trip out there to see it would probably change his whole viewpoint because he has been led down the primrose path. Is this construction project an emergency? My answer is "yes." This facility is in such poor shape that it is getting in the way of FDA's performance and its consumer protection mission. That is not a small statement on the situation that we have in this particular laboratory. You have to go and see it. You cannot do it from the presentation that you have had from this today.

I would like to read part of the letter I have received from an association known as the Grocery Manufacturers of America.

I quote:

On behalf of the members of the Grocery Manufacturers of America (GMA), I want to express support for the continued inclusion in H.R. 3908, the FY 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, of funding for the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) Los Angeles, California, laboratory facility.

The food industry agrees that FDA must have up-to-date facilities and state-of-the-art laboratory instrumentation to stay on top of the huge task of monitoring imported food products, many of which enter the U.S. through southern California. The current Los Angeles laboratory is an old, outdated facility, with equipment and instrumentation that is quite simply not up to the task. With more than 1 million import entries through this facility alone, the undertaking is enormous and the potential risk to the public of failing to do the job properly is significant.

As you may know, GMA is the world's largest association of food, beverage and consumer product companies. With U.S. sales of more than \$460 billion, GMA members employ more than 2.5 million workers in all 50 states. The organization applies legal, scientific and political expertise from its member companies to vital food, nutrition and public policy issues affecting the industry. Led by a board of 42 Chief Executive Officers, GMA speaks for food and consumer product manufacturers at the state, federal and international levels on legislative and regulatory issues. The association also leads efforts to increase productivity, efficiency and growth in the food, beverage and consumer products industry.

Food safety is one of our highest priorities, as we know it is yours. Providing FDA with

the funds it needs for its Los Angeles laboratory project is definitely a needed component of a broad food safety agenda, as it will ensure better response and more appropriate scientific evaluations of potential risk from imported foods.

Again, I oppose this amendment, and I ask all members to oppose this amendment.

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. TANCREDO).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) will be postponed.

1300

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BALDACCI

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDACCI:
On page 80, after line 11, insert the following:

“SEC. . Funds made available under title IV of this act for weatherization activities shall also be available for other building technology assistance conservation activities authorized in law”

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 29, 2000, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to talk about the need for an energy policy, something that the leadership in this Congress has not yet addressed today or for the last 6 years.

The amendment that I have introduced is a modest expansion of a number of programs funded with \$19 million for weatherization assistance grants. Although it is a small change, it is all that was allowed; but it raises a larger question: When is this Congress going to do something, and what they do do is counterproductive to the interests of the American public.

When one lives in a State where the temperature dips in below zero and dramatic increases in heating oil prices are serious matters, for people who are on fixed incomes, it has presented a life-threatening choice between paying for the delivery of heating oil or buying medicine, between heating the house and buying groceries.

Now OPEC has decided to increase production and non-OPEC countries have also increased production.

The most important tool that is available to the President of the United States and the Secretary of Energy is said to expire tomorrow, the tool that has allowed them to negotiate with OPEC and non-OPEC countries to increase the production, readily available so that our consumers, our small business people, our truckers, our potato farmers and fishermen can make sure that they have reasonable costs for energy and are not being put on the of business.

Millions and hundreds of millions have been spent on low-income heating assistance and hundreds of millions more need to be spent. The one tool is set to expire tomorrow. It has been languishing in the committee, and an extension has been sought by the President to last until 2003. This reserve was created during the Nation's energy crisis. What tools are we going to have to make sure that OPEC and non-OPEC are increasing their production, and how are we going to be assured that they honor that increase and not another emergency arises?

There have been suggestions in the Office of Energy Information that there may be shortages in New England and California this summer, even with the increased production. This inaction compromises the President's ability to negotiate with our allies. It raises doubts about the President's ability to use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in emergencies. The last thing that we want to do is to send a message to the world, a message that the President of the United States' ability has been compromised because of the failure of this Congress to act.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who has shown leadership in this and many other matters.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Baldacci amendment. This year we faced a major crisis in the Northeast where there was not a sufficient oil supply to take care of the people in our districts who desperately rely on home heating oil as the way they heat their homes in cold winters, and we have cold winters in the Northeast. We had a supply problem leading to a serious price increase. Hard-working American families trying to heat their homes, drive to work, fill the tanks of their trucks and boats are suffering from these price hikes.

Two days ago, thanks to heavy pressure from the administration, OPEC and non-OPEC countries agreed to increase the oil supply. This will help to bring prices down.

In the meantime, the Republican leadership of this House has done little more than point fingers at the administration, but it is important to lay out the energy policy of this same Republican leadership over the past 5 years. Their policy abolishes the Department of Energy, sells off the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, slashes funding for alternative energy sources, underfunds conservation programs that would help to

make us energy independent, the kinds of programs that are listed in the Baldacci amendment.

What is more, they will not bring up a bill that extends the President's authority to release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve if there is a national emergency in this country. This authority expires tomorrow. This is leverage with the OPEC countries. They would handcuff the President, jeopardize our national security. My God, this would be laughable if it were not so serious.

We need to move forward on a national energy policy, and we should get an energy policy in order. That is why we should immediately reauthorize the President's authority in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We should consider our investments in energy efficiency, conservation, alternative energy sources like those listed in this amendment. We should provide tax incentives for our domestic oil and gas industry, and we should set up a Northeast home heating reserve in order to ensure that our constituents do not have to choose between heating their homes and eating their meals.

Mr. Chairman, that is the way to an energy policy. Let us stop pointing fingers; let us roll up our sleeves; let us get to work. Let us start that with the Baldacci amendment.

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

The gentleman's purpose in offering this amendment is good. The need to reauthorize the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is very real. I would point out that it was delayed downtown for 5 days last year.

However, the gentleman's amendment does not accomplish his stated purpose of reauthorizing the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Indeed, it deals with another program all together.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman to withdraw his amendment, and I give him my commitment to work with him through the appropriate venue to reach his goal of a Strategic Petroleum Reserve reauthorization. I think the gentleman's comments focus our attention on this need, and we certainly will do everything possible to get it done. I hope the administration will support it.

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

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

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman in wanting to work on this and addressing this in a constructive way, and I look forward to doing that.

I have one other speaker, and then that would be it.

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

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), a leader in these matters also, and an esteemed colleague here in the Chamber.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for raising this issue of

what this Congress has to do in order to deal with the long-term energy security of our country.

Mr. Chairman, we are very fortunate that between 1980 and the year 2000, the percentage of our gross domestic product that oil represents has dropped from 7 percent to 3 percent. That is good. But much of that is as a result of decisions that were made by this Congress. We forced the automobile industry to improve its energy efficiency from 13.5 miles a gallon to 27 miles a gallon. If we had not done that, we would have to import 4 million barrels of oil a day additionally.

The same thing is true with all of our appliances, those with Federal regulation. Money for weatherization, which the gentleman from Maine has wisely used as the vehicle to have this discussion, that money helped, to make sure that homes were more energy efficient, less oil had to be imported.

Now, short term, we do have to reauthorize the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. And this time, maybe we will buy when oil is cheap, \$12 a barrel. We will sell when it is expensive. We do it just the opposite in this Congress. We buy when it is expensive, and we sell when it is cheap. If we had 1 billion barrels, we could do 2 million barrels a day for nearly 3 years. Let us give some future President that weapon going up against the heads of the states across this world that seek to hold us hostage. Mr. Chairman, 2 million barrels a day. We do not have that capacity right now. We are down to 560 million. We should still use it. And a regional petroleum reserve, which the gentleman from Maine is leading on, to make sure that New England, New York, New Jersey are not held hostage every single winter.

Moreover, let us talk about better fuel economy standards for our automobiles. If we just increased it up to 35 miles a gallon, we could push out another 2 million or 3 million barrels ourselves. All of Alaska, all of Alaska only gives us 1 million barrels a day. If we have the biggest strike of all time up in Alaska, we might only add another 500,000 million barrels. It does not even touch what we could do to make sure homes are weatherized, automobiles are more efficient, refrigerators and stoves and light bulbs do not consume as much energy.

The power is within ourselves, I say to my colleagues. But the Congress acted in the 1970s and 1980s. They have not acted in the 1990s. That is what is central. Short term, Strategic Petroleum Reserve, let us fill it, make sure we can deploy it, a regional petroleum reserve, let us fill it. We are going to have to use that, no question about it. But long term, let us work smarter, not harder. Let us use our advantage in technology. Let us ensure that we make the investment, pass the regulations, and then we can just thumb our noses at OPEC. We have the power within ourselves to do it. We do not have to drill off of the coast of Cali-

fornia, off Florida. We can do it in our own vehicles, our own technologies and make ourselves energy independent.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the gentleman that it was the Subcommittee on the Interior of the Committee on Appropriations that refused to sell the oil, so it is still there.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding me this time.

Let me just say to the gentlewoman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Massachusetts, I have also had the opportunity to live in New England, and I know how sensitive it is up there. In fact, during the energy crisis I was up there, and I was well aware that people were heating their homes with wood stoves; the cost of energy was soaring. But I thought I would put in the RECORD something that perhaps should be put in. It is not the end of the world if the EPCA, the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, expires. It is supposed to expire, as I understand, tomorrow. It is not the end of the world. In fact, the House and Senate passed a reauthorization for the EPCA on September 30, 1999, last year. It was sent to the President on the day it was to expire. The President of the United States, President Clinton, did not sign it. In fact, he waited 5 days and it lapsed.

So I point out that here it is not a crisis. We are going to take care of this, and I assure my colleagues, I am on the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, and working with the appropriators, we will do this; and I assure the gentleman we will. I am very sensitive and empathetic and sympathetic to what he has to say here.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I would again urge the gentleman to withdraw his amendment. The gentleman has our assurance as well as the authorizing committee that we will deal with this issue. The gentleman pointed out a problem that is necessary for us to take action on, and I commend the gentleman for that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). I want to make a point, and then I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

I wanted to raise the point that a year ago, it makes a big difference in the situation that we are now in, in the negotiations that have been taking place, and we have all been watching it. Not just us, but the people we represent and our families, the gas prices, home heating oil prices, daily, hourly, weekly. So it is different, and to take this tool away and not to be sure that he has it to be able to negotiate with our allies diminishes his being able to do the job of the national security interests of this country.

I look forward to working with the gentleman on this matter, this very important matter, and to begin to accomplish some energy legislation in a comprehensive way.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN THE 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:

The amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS of Florida;

Amendment No. 5 printed in the RECORD by Mr. PAUL of Texas; and

Amendment No. 16 printed in the RECORD by Mr. TANCREDO of Colorado.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) 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 126, noes 291, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

AYES—126

Archer	Ganske	McKinney
Bachus	Gekas	Meehan
Barcia	Gibbons	Metcalf
Barr	Goode	Miller (FL)
Barrett (NE)	Goodlatte	Miller, Gary
Bartlett	Goss	Minge
Barton	Graham	Moore
Bass	Green (WI)	Moran (KS)
Bereuter	Greenwood	Myrick
Brady (TX)	Gutknecht	Nethercutt
Burton	Hall (TX)	Norwood
Camp	Hastings (WA)	Nussle
Campbell	Hayworth	Paul
Castle	Hefley	Pease
Chabot	Herger	Peterson (MN)
Coble	Hilleary	Petri
Coburn	Hoekstra	Pickering
Collins	Hostettler	Pitts
Condit	Houghton	Pombo
Cook	Hulshof	Portman
Costello	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Cox	Insee	Radanovich
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Ramstad
Cunningham	Kasich	Riley
Deal	Kind (WI)	Roemer
DeMint	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Deutsch	Kleczka	Royce
Doggett	LaHood	Ryan (WI)
Dooley	Largent	Ryun (KS)
Doolittle	Lazio	Salmon
Duncan	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez
Ehrlich	Linder	Sanford
English	Luther	Scarborough
Ewing	Maloney (CT)	Schaffer
Foley	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Fossella	McInnis	Sessions

Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Stearns

Stenholm
Sununu
Tancredo
Tanner
Terry
Tiahrt

Toomey
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Weldon (FL)
Wu

Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman

Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson

Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Cubie
Coble
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Green (TX)
Green (WI)

Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica

Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Picketing
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Ryum (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Siskisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu

NOES—291

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combust
Conyers
Cooksey
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Fowler

Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica

Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Ney
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogers
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sweeney
Talent
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vislosky
Walden

Becerra
Burr
Chenoweth-Hage
Crane
Everett
Franks (NJ)

Granger
Klink
McIntosh
Quinn
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen

Rush
Spence
Thompson (MS)
Vento
Weiner

NOT VOTING—17

1335

Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Messrs. LI-PINSKI, BRYANT, MARTINEZ, DAVIS of Virginia, JONES of North Carolina, and NEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. LUTHER, HUNTER, WU, SESSIONS, DOOLITTLE, MEEHAN, and LAZIO 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 he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL
The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) 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 CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 45, noes 367, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

AYES—45

Archer
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Cannon
Chabot
Coburn
Collins
Combust
Cook
Danner
Deal
DeMint
Dickey
Duncan
Ewing

Gekas
Graham
Gutknecht
Hill (MT)
Hillery
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Jones (NC)
Largent
Linder
Manzullo
Metcalf
Moran (KS)
Paul
Peterson (MN)

Petri
Pitts
Ramstad
Rohrabacher
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Simpson
Stark
Tancredo
Terry
Toomey

NOES—367

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci

Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen

Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer

Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Cubie
Coble
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Green (TX)
Green (WI)

Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)

Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Picketing
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Ryum (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Siskisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu

Sweeney Trafficant
Talent Turner
Tanner Udall (CO)
Tauscher Udall (NM)
Tauzin Upton
Taylor (MS) Velazquez
Taylor (NC) Visclosky
Thomas Vitter
Thompson (CA) Walden
Thornberry Walsh
Thune Wamp
Thurman Waters
Tiahrt Watkins
Tierney Watt (NC)
Towns Watts (OK)

Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogers
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherwood

Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Terry
Thune

Tiahrt
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Wickler
Wilson
Young (AK)

Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry

Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Trafficant
Turner
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)

Waxman
Weygand
Whitfield
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Becerra
Burr
Chenoweth-Hage
Crane
Everett
Franks (NJ)
Granger
Hinchev

Hoyer
Istook
Kaptur
Klink
McIntosh
Quinn
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen

1344

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

1345

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. TANCREDO

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 16 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) 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 CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 267, answered “present” 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

AYES—146

Aderholt
Archer
Army
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bentsen
Biggart
Blunt
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burton
Camp
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combust
Cook
Cubin
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dickey
Doggett

Doolittle
Duncan
Ehrlich
English
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Ganske
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Graham
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Insole
Isakson
Istook

Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
Kind (WI)
Klecza
LaHood
Largent
Lazio
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Luther
Manzullo
McInnis
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Paul
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Portman
Ramstad
Reynolds

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing

NOES—267

Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrist
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)

McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Velazquez

NOT VOTING—20

Bateman
Becerra
Burr
Chenoweth-Hage
Crane
Ehlers
Everett

Franks (NJ)
Granger
Klink
Martinez
McIntosh
Quinn
Rogan

Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Spence
Thompson (MS)
Vento
Weiner

1353

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 93, I was summoned from the House Chamber for a meeting and was unable to return before this vote was completed. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last two lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act”.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to this bill.

There are good things in it that I support. The parts of the bill that truly concern “emergencies”—funding to help low-income families cope with sharply rising home heating oil bills; funding to repair damaged roads and bridges and to develop affordable housing for those dislocated by recent floods, tornadoes, and other natural disasters; disaster loans for small businesses, farm aid, and rural economic and community development grants to meet needs arising from natural disasters—these are all important and worthwhile and appropriate purposes for an “emergency” spending bill. Also important is funding that the bill provides for NASA’s Space Shuttle upgrades, security at our nation’s three nuclear weapons laboratories, and funds to accelerate environmental cleanup of DOE facilities.

But these good things are far outweighed by what I consider to be some very problematic provisions in the bill. One of the most troublesome is the \$1.7 billion package for Colombia. I don’t doubt the magnitude of the problem that the proposal attempts to address. Indeed, there is much cause for alarm. Colombia produces 80 percent of the world’s cocaine and about two-thirds of the heroin consumed in this country, and new estimates show that cocaine production in Colombia is up 126 percent in the last five years. That said, I am not convinced that a costly military approach is the best response to the problem. I believe we should be considering other ways to address the source of the problem—the U.S. demand for drugs—by funding additional treatment and education programs right here at home.

There is very little about the Colombia package that has been shown to merit our support. Think for a moment about the dismal human rights record of the Colombian military. The

military would itself be the recipient of the billions of dollars in U.S. aid. Human rights organizations have linked right-wing paramilitary groups to the Colombian military and to drug trafficking and atrocities against civilians. How can we be content to pass a bill that could well make this situation worse?

We should also think about the lack of clear objectives for this program. There is no "exit" strategy spelled out. There is no way to ensure farmers won't resume cultivating drug crops once this billion-dollar assistance package dries up. None of these questions about the long-term goals for this program have been adequately answered. Still, we're being asked to support a program that could draw U.S. troops into a protracted counter-insurgency struggle—and one that may ultimately have little effect on the drug trade.

On top of that, Mr. Chairman, was the adoption of the amendment yesterday that increases military spending levels by an additional \$4 billion. That makes my opposition to this bill that much stronger. While I agree that defense health programs and recruitment and retention are areas of legitimate concern, I don't understand why we should make \$4 billion exceptions for our military that we can't seem to make for prescription drugs or our children's education or shoring up Social Security. The military budget was increased substantially last year and well may be again this year through the regular appropriations process. This isn't the time or the place to prematurely commit to additional billions of dollars in military spending or to label it as an "emergency" item.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that as we go forward with this year's appropriations process, we do so in a thoughtful and careful manner and that we try to come up with spending bills that deserve the full support of the entire House.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I speak today to express my strong opposition to this so-called Supplemental Appropriations bill and to express my outrage at its ridiculous level of funding.

H.R. 3908, as approved by the House Appropriations Committee on March 9, would appropriate \$1.701 billion for counter-narcotics activities, including \$1.07 billion for Colombia, \$4.956 billion for peacekeeping operations in Kosovo and related matters, and \$2.243 billion for Hurricane Floyd and other disaster assistance, plus several smaller non-emergency items.

Amendments considered during the course of debate on this measure have dramatically increased its cost.

A major concern of mine regarding this supplemental is that no authorization language was passed to allow Members the opportunity to argue for funding for projects important to them. As a Member of the Committee on International Relations and the Representative of the largest Colombian-American community in the U.S., I was hoping to be involved in the development of our policy on Colombia.

We should have developed a bill that would strike a balance between the needs of international concerns, such as Colombia, human rights and Kosovo, and domestic spending priorities. I would have supported such a bill. Unfortunately, despite the inclusion of the amendment by Congressmen GILMAN, GOSS, DELAHUNT and FARR, this supplemental doesn't balance these issues.

Mr. Chairman, the reasons to oppose this legislation are too numerous to list in a short floor statement, so I will just highlight some key issues, mostly dealing with the military and counter-narcotics assistance provided in this package.

First, I object to the fact that such a large change in U.S. policy regarding Colombia and counter-narcotics assistance has not gone through the normal authorization process. The Republican leadership and the International Relations Committee had ample time to introduce legislation and have it debated in Committee. As it now stands, we are appropriating billions of dollars in military and counter-narcotics assistance, and who knows what else, without the benefit of thoughtful policy evaluation that the authorization's process was designed to give.

Second, the supplemental originally sent to the House floor is about \$3.8 billion higher than the President's request and the Appropriations Committee had only offset \$421 million. Meaning the rest must come out of the budget surplus—not that there is any left after the Republican tax cut scheme passed recently.

Third, while I am extremely supportive of assistance to Colombia, it needs to be the right kind of assistance. The provisions in this legislation dealing with civil society programs are woefully inadequate, especially when compared to the vast funding levels for counter-narcotics assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I have met with Colombia leaders in Washington, D.C., in my Congressional District and in Colombia. I have traveled to Colombia and seen the need for U.S. assistance. I know the problems of the Colombian people and I am especially supportive of judicial reform efforts, but this supplemental is not going to help them.

Fourth, where is the money for domestic prevention and treatment? Interdiction plays a role, but it is next to useless without prevention and treatment programs. Demand will always find supply. Congresswoman PELOS's amendment should have been protected under the rule.

Fifth, I am troubled by some of the provisions in this supplemental which are being termed an emergency. Certainly, I believe the money for LIHEAP, the assistance for Colombia civil society and money for peacekeeping funds for Kosovo warrant an emergency, although one we saw coming last year. However, there are a number of spending provisions which do not come close to meeting the definition of an emergency, yet they are not offset.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the supplemental and I request that the relevant committees be asked to deal with these funding increases through the normal budget process.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3908, the FY 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill. Since coming to Congress last year, I have been determined to carefully review federal spending to ensure we spend our taxpayers money efficiently and effectively. Our Nation has many needs and our government can do much to address these problems. Using our resources wisely is very important.

As a member of the House Budget Committee, I have been fortunate enough to be able to focus on our federal budget and our

priorities. Although not perfect, our budget and appropriations process allows for orderly consideration of spending requests. When unexpected expenditures are necessary, we have the flexibility to pass emergency supplemental appropriations bills. However, this process is for true emergencies, not for readily predictable expenditures that can be incorporated into the annual appropriations process.

I don't understand why we are here today considering a bill that would spend more than \$13 billion. We do not have \$13 billion in emergency spending needs. Most of the money we are spending in this bill is not in response to real emergencies. These initiatives should be considered as part of the normal appropriations process.

Is \$1.7 billion in military assistance for Colombia to fight the drug war and its insurgency an emergency?

Is \$4.0 billion in military maintenance, health care coverage for our soldiers, and housing upgrades an emergency?

Is \$75 million for upgrades to the space shuttle and hiring of 300 new NASA employees an emergency?

Is \$73 million for the purchase of a used aircraft for the Foreign Emergency Support Team an emergency?

Is \$55 million for workforce and infrastructure improvements at nuclear weapons facilities an emergency?

Is \$37 million for operating expenses for the Coast Guard an emergency?

None of these items need to be addressed this month. All of these can wait for the normal funding process. I support many of these spending priorities. For example, the \$4.0 billion in benefits for our men and women in uniform is a very worthwhile expenditure, which I would otherwise support. However, this money can be provided as part of the regular appropriations process—it does not require an emergency spending bill.

The majority talks a lot about spending discipline, but what we have before us today a huge spending bill that funds programs that were never authorized. This is not the right way to spend taxpayer money.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I rise today to express my support for the \$600 million in emergency LIHEAP funding and to express my disappointment that the disaster relief provided in this emergency supplemental appropriations bill will not help apple growers in the Northeast.

The Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) is nothing less than a lifesaver. LIHEAP provides the means for low-income households to purchase energy for their homes. This past winter was one of the coldest in memory. Combined with the high cost of home heating oil, this winter placed a huge strain on many families in the Northeast. Fortunately, President Clinton did the right thing by releasing the entire amount of emergency LIHEAP funds during the course of the crisis.

However, this emergency fund provides relief not only during the winter months but also for the extreme summer heat that occurs throughout this country. The emergency LIHEAP money undoubtedly saved many lives in the Northeast during a true crisis. It is only right that we replenish this fund, and I fully support providing \$600 million to do so.

The amount of LIHEAP funding provided in this bill is a stark contrast from years past, when the Republican majority attempted time

and time again to cut the funding for this program. I am pleased that the majority has realized the importance of this program. However, I am very disappointed and dismayed that the same Republican leadership has prevented the U.S. House of Representatives from providing emergency disaster assistance to another group that needs our help—namely, the Northeast apple growers.

Many people don't realize that the apple crop in the Northeast was damaged due to adverse weather conditions, including Hurricane Floyd, which caused tremendous damage up and down the East Coast. The crop damage in states like North Carolina and Florida was much different than the crop damage in the Northeast. The crop production in Southern states was damaged by the hurricane. Although production in the Northeast was not affected, the quality of the apple crop was. The damage diminished the value of the apple. Apple growers are now selling their crop at reduced prices because the quality is not as good as it would have been if Hurricane Floyd had not hit the Northeast.

This supplemental appropriations bill contains relief for Hurricane Floyd for some of the states that need help. Unfortunately, the Republican majority does not feel that everyone who needs help should get it.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORBERRY, 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, pursuant to House Resolution 450, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. OBEY. I most certainly am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3908, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House with provisions that appropriate \$262,000,000 to the Office of National Drug Control policy for grants to recognized national, State, or local prevention and treatment organizations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a general instruction to the committee. The committee has the authority and latitude to bring a bill back within existing or lower levels, and it is fully authorized.

This motion would require the Committee on Appropriations to report a new supplemental bill that includes \$262 million for the Office of National Drug Control Policy for purposes of distributing grants to State, local, or national organizations that provide substance abuse treatment and prevention services.

The intention is to recognize that if the House is going to spend \$1.3 billion for source-country control of cocaine, then we ought to include at least some funds for treatment services which, according to the Rand Corporation, are 23 times more effective.

This motion recognizes that only 37 percent of the 5.5 million Americans in need of treatment can get it, and a vote for recommitment will reduce that treatment gap in all of our communities.

If we want to destroy the drug traffickers, we should destroy their source of income. That is the best way to get at them. If we invest in drug treatment and drug prevention, we are destroying their source of income. That is the way to kill them.

Vote for this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT).

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to recommit. I do this out of respect for the other side and not to lecture anyone. But I, like many of my colleagues, have traveled through Colombia and Peru and Bolivia, took the drug routes, the roads that the drug traffickers took, and met with coca leaf farmers, met with law enforcement and a variety of different other individuals and groups in those countries.

I came to the conclusion that the drug problem is our problem, and for us to solely blame it on those folks is misplaced. Today, we have an opportunity, I think, to correct that. We could do a great service to this country by making sure that we fight the war on our terms and in this country and not in somebody else's country.

Now, for us not to believe that this is our problem, I believe we are sort of like an individual that is addicted. We are in denial. We are in denial that we have to come to grips with this problem.

For us to pick a group of people, whatever country one wants, talk about interdiction, which we ought to do some, but we ought to have drug treatment programs for people in this country.

We as a Congress, Republicans and Democrats, we can do one good thing before we leave here this year, and that

is provide a safety net to families, to individuals in this country so that they do not go through the dilemma of, where do I send my young child, where do I send my spouse. We have all been confronted with that. This is a problem that has probably touched every life in this Chamber and probably most families throughout this country.

1400

So I am here today not to just lecture anyone, but simply say that for us to think that it is someone else's problem, that it is not our problem, is misplaced. And if we want to do a service for the people of this country, I think we should recommit this bill, send it to committee, put a program in for people across the country, and I think then we can really talk seriously about a drug war within our borders, not somebody else's.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and close by simply saying that we are putting the money in the drug czar's office because this subcommittee which funds this office currently has \$262 million remaining under its existing 302(b) allocation. I ask for a vote in support of the motion.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) rise in opposition?

Mr. YOUNG OF Florida. Mr. Speaker, I do rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the issue that the gentleman's motion brings to the attention of the House is an important issue and one that in the next few weeks, as we go to prepare for marking up the regular appropriation bills, I would like to work with the gentleman to try to find the proper way to handle this and not just do it here at the last minute. If we were to agree to this motion to recommit, we will have undone basically everything we have done here in the last difficult 16 hours, yesterday and today.

So I just simply ask the Members to vote "no" on the motion to recommit, then vote "yes" on final passage, and then for everyone to have a safe trip back home to their districts, visit with their constituents, and come back next week all fired up for another round.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 220, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

AYES—194

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Neal
Ackerman	Gordon	Oberstar
Aderholt	Green (TX)	Obey
Allen	Gutierrez	Olver
Andrews	Hall (OH)	Ortiz
Baca	Hall (TX)	Owens
Baird	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Baldacci	Hilliard	Pascrell
Baldwin	Hinchee	Pastor
Barcia	Hinojosa	Payne
Barrett (WI)	Hoefel	Pelosi
Bentsen	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Holt	Phelps
Berman	Hooley	Pomeroy
Berry	Hoyer	Porter
Blagojevich	Inslee	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Ramstad
Borski	(TX)	Reyes
Boswell	Jefferson	Rivers
Boucher	John	Rodriguez
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Jones (OH)	Rothman
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Kennedy	Sabo
Capuano	Kildee	Sanchez
Cardin	Kilpatrick	Sanders
Carson	Kind (WI)	Sandlin
Clay	Klecza	Sawyer
Clayton	Kucinich	Scarborough
Clement	LaFalce	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Lampson	Scott
Condit	Lantos	Serrano
Conyers	Larson	Sherman
Costello	Lee	Shows
Coyne	Levin	Skelton
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cummings	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Danner	Lofgren	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Spratt
DeFazio	Luther	Stabenow
DeGette	Maloney (CT)	Stark
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Stenholm
DeLauro	Markey	Stupak
Deutsch	Mascara	Tanner
Dicks	Matsui	Tauscher
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Dixon	McCarthy (NY)	Thurman
Doggett	McGovern	Tierney
Dooley	McIntyre	Towns
Doyle	McKinney	Turner
Edwards	Meehan	Udall (CO)
Engel	Meek (FL)	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	Meeks (NY)	Velazquez
Etheridge	Menendez	Visclosky
Evans	Millender-	Waters
Farr	McDonald	Watt (NC)
Fattah	Miller, George	Waxman
Filner	Mink	Wexler
Forbes	Moakley	Weygand
Ford	Mollohan	Wise
Frank (MA)	Moore	Woolsey
Frost	Moran (VA)	Wu
Ganske	Morella	Wynn
Gejdenson	Nadler	
Gephardt	Napolitano	

NOES—220

Army	Bishop	Camp
Bachus	Bliley	Campbell
Baker	Blunt	Canady
Ballenger	Boehrlert	Cannon
Barr	Boehner	Castle
Barrett (NE)	Bonilla	Chabot
Bartlett	Bono	Chambliss
Barton	Boyd	Coble
Bass	Brady (TX)	Coburn
Bateman	Bryant	Collins
Bereuter	Burton	Combest
Biggert	Buyer	Cook
Bilbray	Callahan	Cooksey
Bilirakis	Calvert	Cox

Cramer	Johnson (CT)	Rogers
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Cunningham	Jones (NC)	Roukema
Davis (FL)	Kanjorski	Royce
Davis (VA)	Kasich	Ryan (WI)
Deal	Kelly	Ryun (KS)
DeLay	King (NY)	Salmon
DeMint	Kingston	Sanford
Diaz-Balart	Knollenberg	Saxton
Dickey	Kolbe	Schaffer
Doolittle	Kuykendall	Sensenbrenner
Dreier	LaHood	Sessions
Duncan	Largent	Shadegg
Dunn	Latham	Shaw
Ehlers	LaTourrette	Shays
Ehrlich	Lazio	Sherwood
Emerson	Leach	Shimkus
English	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Ewing	Lewis (KY)	Simpson
Fletcher	Linder	Sisisky
Foley	LoBiondo	Skeen
Fossella	Lucas (KY)	Smith (MI)
Fowler	Lucas (OK)	Smith (NJ)
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Gallegly	Martinez	Souder
Gekas	McCollum	Stearns
Gibbons	McCrery	Strickland
Gilchrest	McHugh	Stump
Gillmor	McInnis	Sununu
Gilman	McKeon	Sweeney
Goode	Metcalf	Talent
Goodlatte	Mica	Tancredo
Goodling	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Goss	Miller, Gary	Taylor (MS)
Graham	Minge	Taylor (NC)
Green (WI)	Moran (KS)	Terry
Greenwood	Murtha	Thomas
Gutknecht	Myrick	Thornberry
Hansen	Nethercutt	Thune
Hastert	Ney	Tiahrt
Hastings (WA)	Northup	Toomey
Hayes	Norwood	Traficant
Hayworth	Nussle	Upton
Hefley	Ose	Vitter
Herger	Oxley	Walden
Hill (IN)	Packard	Walsh
Hill (MT)	Paul	Wamp
Hilleary	Pease	Watkins
Hobson	Peterson (PA)	Watts (OK)
Hoekstra	Petri	Weldon (FL)
Horn	Pickering	Weldon (PA)
Hostettler	Pickett	Weller
Houghton	Pitts	Whitfield
Hulshof	Pombo	Wicker
Hunter	Portman	Wilson
Hutchinson	Pryce (OH)	Wolf
Hyde	Radanovich	Young (AK)
Isakson	Regula	Young (FL)
Istook	Reynolds	
Jenkins	Riley	

NOT VOTING—21

Archer	Granger	Rogan
Becerra	Klink	Ros-Lehtinen
Burr	McDermott	Rush
Chenoweth-Hage	McIntosh	Spence
Crane	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
Everett	Quinn	Vento
Franks (NJ)	Rangel	Weiner

1420

Mr. BACHUS and Mr. LOBIONDO changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Ms. DELAURO and Mr. MCINTYRE changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on Rollcall No. 94, I was unavoidably detained at a meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, on Rollcall No. 94, I inadvertently voted "yes." I meant to vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 263, nays 146, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—263

Abercrombie	Green (TX)	Oxley
Ackerman	Green (WI)	Packard
Aderholt	Greenwood	Pallone
Allen	Hall (TX)	Pascrell
Andrews	Hastert	Pastor
Armey	Hastings (WA)	Pease
Baca	Hayes	Peterson (PA)
Bachus	Hayworth	Pickering
Baker	Herger	Pickett
Baldacci	Hilleary	Pombo
Ballenger	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Barcia	Hinojosa	Portman
Barrett (NE)	Hobson	Price (NC)
Bartlett	Hoefel	Pryce (OH)
Bass	Horn	Radanovich
Bateman	Hostettler	Rahall
Bentsen	Houghton	Rangel
Berkley	Hoyer	Regula
Berman	Hunter	Reyes
Biggert	Hutchinson	Reynolds
Bilirakis	Hyde	Riley
Bishop	Isakson	Rodriguez
Bliley	Istook	Rogers
Blunt	Jackson-Lee	Rothman
Boehlert	(TX)	Roukema
Boehner	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Bonilla	Jenkins	Ryan (KS)
Bonior	John	Sanchez
Bono	Johnson (CT)	Sandlin
Borski	Johnson, E. B.	Sawyer
Boucher	Jones (NC)	Saxton
Boyd	Kanjorski	Scarborough
Bryant	Kasich	Scott
Burton	Kelly	Shaw
Buyer	Kennedy	Sherman
Callahan	Kildee	Sherwood
Calvert	King (NY)	Shimkus
Camp	Kingston	Shows
Canady	Knollenberg	Shuster
Capps	Kolbe	Sisisky
Cardin	Kuykendall	Skeen
Carson	LaFalce	Skelton
Clayton	Lampson	Smith (MI)
Clement	Lantos	Smith (NJ)
Clyburn	Larson	Smith (TX)
Coble	Latham	Smith (WA)
Condit	Levin	Snyder
Cooksey	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Cramer	Lewis (KY)	Spratt
Cummings	Linder	Stabenow
Cunningham	LoBiondo	Stenholm
Davis (VA)	Lowey	Strickland
DeLauro	Lucas (KY)	Stump
DeLay	Lucas (OK)	Sweeney
Deutsch	Maloney (CT)	Talent
Dickey	Martinez	Tanner
Dicks	Mascara	Tauscher
Dingell	Matsui	Tauzin
Dixon	McCarthy (MO)	Taylor (MS)
Dooley	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor (NC)
Doyle	McCollum	Thomas
Dreier	McCrery	Thompson (CA)
Edwards	McGovern	Thornberry
Ehrlich	McHugh	Thune
Emerson	McIntyre	Tiahrt
Engel	McKeon	Toomey
English	Meek (FL)	Traficant
Etheridge	Meeks (NY)	Turner
Evans	Menendez	Vitter
Farr	Metcalf	Walden
Fletcher	Mica	Wamp
Foley	Millender-	Watkins
Forbes	McDonald	Watt (NC)
Ford	Miller (FL)	Watts (OK)
Fowler	Miller, Gary	Weldon (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Moakley	Weldon (PA)
Frost	Mollohan	Weller
Gallegly	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gejdenson	Morella	Weygand
Gephardt	Murtha	Whitfield
Gibbons	Myrick	Wicker
Gilchrest	Napolitano	Wilson
Gillmor	Neal	Wise
Gilman	Nethercutt	Wolf
Goode	Ney	Wynn
Goode	Northup	Young (AK)
Goodling	Norwood	Young (FL)
Gordon	Ortiz	
Goss	Ose	

NAYS—146

Archer	Goodlatte	Obey
Baird	Graham	Olver
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Owens
Barr	Gutknecht	Paul
Barrett (WI)	Hall (OH)	Payne
Bereuter	Hansen	Pelosi
Berry	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)
Blagojevich	Hefley	Petri
Blumenauer	Hill (IN)	Phelps
Boswell	Hill (MT)	Pitts
Brady (PA)	Hinchev	Porter
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Brown (OH)	Holden	Rivers
Campbell	Holt	Roemer
Cannon	Hooley	Rohrabacher
Capuano	Hulshof	Royce
Castle	Inslee	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Jackson (IL)	Sabo
Clay	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Coburn	Jones (OH)	Sanders
Collins	Kaptur	Sanford
Combest	Kilpatrick	Schaffer
Conyers	Kind (WI)	Schakowsky
Cook	Klecza	Sensenbrenner
Costello	Kucinich	Serrano
Cox	LaHood	Sessions
Coyne	LaTourette	Shadegg
Crowley	Lazio	Shays
Cubin	Leach	Simpson
Danner	Lee	Slaughter
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Stearns
Deal	Lofgren	Stupak
DeFazio	Luther	Sununu
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Tancredo
Delahunt	Manzullo	Terry
DeMint	Markey	Thurman
Doggett	McDermott	Tierney
Doolittle	McInnis	Towns
Duncan	McKinney	Udall (CO)
Dunn	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Ehlers	Miller, George	Upton
Eshoo	Minge	Velazquez
Fattah	Mink	Visclosky
Filner	Moore	Waters
Fossella	Moran (KS)	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Woolsey
Ganske	Nussle	Wu
Gekas	Oberstar	

NOT VOTING—26

Barton	Everett	Rogan
Becerra	Ewing	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Franks (NJ)	Rush
Brown (FL)	Granger	Spence
Burr	Klink	Thompson (MS)
Chambliss	Largent	Vento
Chenoweth-Hage	McIntosh	Walsh
Crane	McNulty	Weiner
Diaz-Balart	Quinn	

1429

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 95, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 95, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 95, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 95, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to be present for the vote on final passage of H.R. 3908. Had I been present I would have, albeit reluctantly, voted in favor of the bill.

Stated against:

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 95, supplemental final passage, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall numbers 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall numbers 91, 92, 93, 94, and "aye" on rollcall number 95.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2559, AGRICULTURAL RISK PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2559) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers by providing greater access to more affordable risk management tools and improved protection from production and income loss, to improve the efficiency and integrity of the Federal crop insurance program, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COMBEST, BARRETT of Nebraska, BOEHNER, EWING, POMBO, STENHOLM, CONDIT, PETERSON of Minnesota, and DOOLEY of California.

There was no objection.

1430

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3660

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3660. Apparently, it was inadvertently added without my knowledge or that of my office.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purposes of inquiring from the majority about the schedule for the remainder of this week and the following week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO).

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed its legislative business for this week. The House will not be in session tomorrow. The House will meet next for legislative business on Monday, April 3 at

12:30 p.m. for morning hour, and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list which will be distributed to Members' offices tomorrow.

On Monday, no recorded votes are expected before 6 p.m. On Tuesday and the balance of the week, the House will consider the following measures, all of which will be subject to rules:

H.R. 3671, the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Improvement Act of 2000;

H.R. 2418, the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network Amendments of 1999;

H.R. 3660, the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2000; and

H.R. 1776, which, I might add, is a signature bill for the entire House of Representatives, the American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if I can ask my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) a couple of questions. Does the gentleman anticipate any late night sessions next week?

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I say to the gentleman from Michigan that the only anticipation of a late night possibly would be on Thursday, and that would be as a result of 1776, the American Homeownership bill, which will be on the floor that afternoon and perhaps evening.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, what about next Friday?

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we are looking at a busy week, and we will know later next week if we will be in for sure for legislative business. Right now I think Members should expect to have business on Friday, but we will know by midweek whether we will actually have to be here for legislative business.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the Coverdell voucher bill be brought back to the floor next week? If it will be brought back, can we anticipate that the Rangel-Johnson substitute will be made in order on school modernization?

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman is referring to the education savings accounts, which would bring opportunity through investments, public investments, in individual investment accounts that would become available. We are going to continue to have a dialogue about that.

We, obviously, ran out of time this week with the supplemental taking up so much time on the House floor, rightfully so. Of course, next week is very busy. I would suggest that we are not optimistic about it coming up next week, but it is not out of the question.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will that give us the opportunity to offer a school modernization bill?

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, I hope the gentleman will be discussing this also with the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER),