

I assume Loral's claim of innocence is correct, but questions remain unanswered. That is why I ask all Members of Congress who care about our national security to join in an effort to find out the answers to these questions.

TRANSFERRING MISSILE TECHNOLOGY TO CHINA IS WRONG

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the national security of the United States has been damaged, in my opinion, by the action of Hughes Electronic Corporation and Loral Space and Communications. They have transferred sensitive missile technology to the Chinese in violation of our laws.

The President of the United States is supposed to protect and defend the interest of the United States. But it seems that when it comes to our foreign policies and trade policies, this administration's attitude is that it has been elected to defend the interests of multinational companies who promise big campaign contributions.

Instead of pursuing legal actions against these companies, our President has, instead, tried to help them cover their tracks on this issue. He needs to be more concerned about the national security of the United States than he is with the security of a friend who happens to raise a lot of campaign contributions for the President's party.

I do not know if there is a quid pro quo. I do not care. I do not know if \$100,000 is involved or not, but it is wrong to transfer missile technology to China.

HOPING REPUBLICANS STAND FIRM FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues this morning have raised very serious issues regarding the transfer of technology to China as well as Chinese donations. I would simply say the President as well as this administration is welcoming an investigation into whether or not any of these donations were improper and whether or not the transfer of this technology was improper.

But I would say to my colleagues who were so indignant and filled with horror this morning that as we prepare to debate campaign finance, I hope that they bring the same degree of passion and the same degree of integrity and certainly, the same degree of energy to that discussion.

We have an opportunity to ban soft money which, in many ways, would help us correct many of the ills and the pariahs that affect this great system, this great democracy of ours. Twenty States in this Nation have already done so.

If Shays-Meehan comes to the floor, I would hope that my dear friend the majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), despite what Roll Call and all of the other newspapers in town have said, that he, in fact, will refrain.

I hope that the leadership on the Republican side as well as those on the Democratic side will stand firm for reform, will stand firm against the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and those in the Republican leadership who seem adamantly opposed to campaign finance.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 441 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 441

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3616) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes. No further general debate shall be in order. The bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on National Security now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Except as specified in section 5 of this resolution, each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Unless otherwise specified in the report, each amendment printed in the report shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment (except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment).

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

(e)(1) Consideration of the amendments in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the subject of the policy of the United States

with respect to the People's Republic of China and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security.

(2) Consideration of the amendments in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the subject of the assignment of members of the armed forces to assist in border control and shall not exceed 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on National Security or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier disposed of germane modifications of any such amendment. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read (except that modifications shall be reported), shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. For the purpose of inclusion in such amendments en bloc, an amendment printed in the form of a motion to strike may be modified to the form of a germane perfecting amendment to the text originally proposed to be stricken. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendments; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes.

SEC. 5. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration of any amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules out of the order printed, but not sooner than one hour after the chairman of the Committee on National Security or a designee announces from the floor a request to that effect.

SEC. 6. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), a very strong supporter of our military, pending which I would yield myself such time as I might consume. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of

this resolution, all time yielded is for debate purposes only.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for further consideration of H.R. 3616, the National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 1999, under a structured rule. It is one of the most important bills that comes before this House every year because it provides for funding for our military and for our national defense and our strategic interests around the world.

The rule provides that no further general debate shall be in order since we completed that last night.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill and as an original bill for the purposes of amendment which shall be considered as read.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute. Mr. Speaker, as is typical for this bill, the rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report and the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, which Members all have on their tables before them.

The rule provides that, except as specified in section 5 of this resolution, amendments will be considered only in the order specified in the report. They may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

Except as otherwise provided in the report, amendments shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided between a proponent and an opponent. Amendments are not amendable. All points of order against the amendments are waived.

The rule also provides for an additional 2 hours of general debate on United States policy towards communist China, which shall precede consideration of the four amendments in part A of the Committee on Rules report that deal with missile technology.

The rule also provides for an additional 30 minutes of general debate on the subject of placing our armed forces on the border, which shall precede the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) printed in part C of the report.

In addition, this rule allows for extensive debate time on several important and controversial issues. We have set aside special times for these issues, such as abortion at military installations overseas; the global warming treaty; the prospect of a U.N. standing army, which we should oppose with every bit of strength we have; and medical benefits for our military retirees.

The rule authorizes the Chairman of the Committee on National Security or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments in part D of this report. En bloc amendments shall be debatable for 20 minutes each and shall not be subject to amendment.

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

Mr. Speaker, this kind of structured rule is typical for the defense authorization bill, as Members well know.

The Committee on Rules has gone to great lengths to ensure this rule has met the concerns of as many Members as possible. Exactly 100 amendments were filed with the committee, and we have made half of them in order. Of the amendments ruled in order, the ratio of amendments by the minority is nearly exactly the same as the ratio of minority amendments filed with the committee.

Thus, I believe this is a fair rule and a rule that deserves the support of all Members of this body so we can get on to the consideration of the important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend two Members of this body. One is the chairman of the Committee on National Security. He is the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE). Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has been here even longer than I have. I have been here for 20 years. But the gentleman is one of the truly outstanding and respected Members of this body. What the gentleman has done for our military preparedness over all those years deserves special commendation.

The gentleman from South Carolina has a counterpart on the Democrat side in the minority, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON). He, too, has been an outstanding and respected Member of the Committee on National Security. I just want to commend both of them for having brought this bill to the floor.

We have increased the dollar request of the President of the United States so that we can at least try to maintain an adequate military. I do not have to tell most of you that we, today, because of the reduced spending on military, we are beginning to go back to the 1970s when our military was in deplorable condition; when, just to dramatize that, if you recall back in 1979 our hostages had been held. American hostages had been held in Teheran and Haran.

President Carter at the time had ordered our military to try to undertake a rescue mission. We had to cannibalize 10 helicopter gunships just to get five that would work. That is how bad our military was in, the condition of it at that time. Do you know that four out of the five of those helicopters, even after we did cannibalize the others to get them to work, failed, and so did that rescue mission. It was a disgrace what was happening to our ability to defend our interests around the world.

□ 1045

In those days as well, because the military personnel who had enlisted and wanted an honorable career in the military, they knew that because of the reduced funding that they did not

have a career, that they could not stay in the military, and, consequently they were leaving in droves. This was not only noncommissioned officers that were needed with their technical ability, but commissioned officers as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to Members, go to your recruiters back in your districts, and I want you to talk to the Air Force, the Navy, the Army, the Marine Corps, and they will tell you that they are no longer getting the interest of a cross-section of America to serve in our military today, because they are worried they could not have a career there if they were to enlist.

If you look at your applicants to your military academies, I know in my district we used to have over 100 that would apply for the four appointments that I have each year, and today that has dropped from over 100 down to about 25 or 30. That is because they know that they cannot depend on a career in the military.

That is what is happening, and that is why we need to vote on this bill today, because it is certainly a step in the right direction for providing adequate procurement, adequate research and development and adequate pay and benefits and housing for our military personnel.

Again, I want to thank both the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member. I was just praising the gentleman before he came on the floor, along with my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Chairman SPENCE).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today our Nation is strong and free. We owe much of our strength and freedom to the men and women in uniform who have throughout the history of our great country been willing to stand ready to defend our country and our way of life. We should be proud of our military services and the difficult tasks we as a country have asked them to perform for us.

In asking so much of them, the Congress must in turn assure each and every soldier, sailor, airman and marine, from the four-star general to the newest recruit, that the Congress will provide them with the means to carry out their difficult mission.

It is our responsibility, our duty really, to examine the state of our national defenses each year. In doing so, we often find shortcomings in our ability to adequately fund the programs, missions and operations of the military. But it is important to remember that in today's world, Federal dollars are finite, and, given the fiscal restraints that the Congress has imposed upon itself in the budget agreement that has led us to a balanced budget, the Committee on National Security has done an admirable job in balancing the needs and imperatives of our far-flung security forces.

H.R. 3616 keeps the promise of our budget agreement, and, in doing so, strives to fulfill our responsibilities to the armed services. To be sure, there is not enough money to do everything we should, but this bill balances the hardware needs of all branches of the military, while, at the same time, trying to assure that the human needs of our military and their families are addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 3616. I am pleased that the Committee on National Security has continued its commitment to the development of the next generation of tactical fighter by providing \$1.6 billion in research and development funding for the F-22 Raptor. As we approach the 21st Century, the development of this next-generation fighter will be an increasingly important component in our ability to defend our borders and our troops, no matter where they may be deployed. In addition, the bill contains \$595 million for two test F-22s and \$190 million for advanced procurement of six low-rate initial production aircraft in fiscal year 2000.

The Committee on National Security has continued to show its strong commitment to the production of the V-22 Osprey tiltrotor aircraft, a medium lift capability aircraft specifically designed for Marine Corps and Special Operations Forces assaults.

H.R. 3616 provides \$735 million for the production of eight aircraft in fiscal year 1999, and an additional \$54 million for advanced procurement. The committee has also endorsed an increase of production to 30 aircraft per year by the year 2004, which is also supported by the findings of the recent Quadrennial Defense Review.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on National Security has signalled its ongoing support for the B-2 Stealth Bomber program by providing \$276 million for B-2 post-production support. These funds will enhance the operational effectiveness of the current B-2 fleet, while both the Defense Department and the Congress examine the needs of the Air Force in a long-term bomber force structure plan. The Committee on National Security has wisely included a provision in this bill which directs the Secretary of the Air Force to prepare such a long-range plan and submit it to Congress by next March 1st.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has reported a rule which makes in order a wide variety of amendments to this vital legislation. Those amendments range from transfers of missile-related technologies to foreign governments, including China, to using military forces to patrol our borders, to capping U.S. contributions to NATO expansion.

However, the committee chose not to make in order a very significant amendment to a controversial section of the reported Committee on National Security bill. As Members know, last year's defense authorization created a

Federal advisory committee on gender integrated training, now commonly known as the Kassebaum-Baker panel.

In March, former Senator Kassebaum-Baker's panel reported recommendations that all basic training and housing be segregated by gender. The committee bill adopts this recommendation by requiring each of the military services to assign male and female recruits to separate units during basic training, and further requires each of the services to house male and female recruits in separate buildings beginning on April 15th of next year.

While the bill does provide for some waiver of this last requirement because of facility limitations at certain installations, this requirement sets in motion a procedure which will drastically change basic training for all recruits in the Army, Navy and Air Force. The Marine Corps, of course, is currently the only branch of the service which currently separates male and female recruits during basic training.

Mr. Speaker, the branch chiefs of the Army, Navy and Air Force have indicated they do not support the recommendations of the Kassebaum-Baker panel. In spite of their opposition to these recommendations, the Committee on Rules did not provide the opportunity to fully debate this issue. An amendment was proposed by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) which would have stricken these provisions from the bill, but, because the Committee on Rules did not make it in order, the House has been denied the opportunity to examine this issue. This is a major shortcoming of this rule, Mr. Speaker.

The committee did not make in order several other worthy amendments offered by Democratic Members. But in spite of the fact the House will not be able to debate these worthy issues, I will support the rule. I support it because it is necessary to move this authorization through the legislative process.

We may do little else of great value in the 105th Congress, but, at the very least, we should assure the passage of legislation which serves the needs of our military and the interests of our national security.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the gentleman I was heaping praise on a few minutes ago, the chairman of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time really to return the compliment. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has been one of the biggest defenders of our military in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have been here for 28 years. I have seen a lot of people come and go. In the administrations over the years and in Congress, we have never had a person who is a bigger defender

of our military than the gentleman from New York (JERRY SOLOMON). He has made it possible for us to do a lot of things we could not have done otherwise in trying to revitalize our military, which needs very badly to be revitalized.

I want to personally thank the gentleman for all the help he has been to me and our committee as chairman of the Committee on Rules in helping us overall these years.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that this body may vote on something I think is very important, and that is a measure that would require all Department of Defense employees to be subject to random drug testing.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to Latin America on a number of occasion. Most recently in February I went to Colombia, to towns like Neiva, to San Jose, where American special forces are training Colombian Lanceros in what is a very real war on drugs.

The unit that we visited one week was annihilated the next. Out of 125 Colombian soldiers that went out, 18 returned. The rest were killed or captured.

When you go to Colombia, you do not drive around, you have to fly. The reason you have to fly from place to place is that the guerrillas control the countryside. So everywhere we went was either on a Colombian National Police Huey, or a Drug Enforcement Agency plane. That is how real the war on drugs is.

But we have a tremendous disconnect in our country. You see, we are asking American soldiers as we speak to get shot at. We are asking the Americans who fly the crop dusters that are trying to eradicate the coca fields and the poppy fields that are being shot at, and they are shot down periodically. We have American soldiers in Iquitos, Peru, and American sailors, American Seals, training the Peruvians in riverine operations, mostly on drugs coming out of Colombia by way of the Amazon.

But this body will not even ask the technicians and the people who work for our Department of Defense, who are paid by our tax dollars, to take a drug test to see if they are on our team or on their team.

I offered this amendment for two years in a row. Last year the Committee on Rules, in what I thought was a particularly cowardly action, did not even vote on it. This year they voted it down in a straight party line vote.

So every Republican who goes home and tells you he is tough on drugs, privately we know, in looking at that room in the Committee on Rules, voted against it.

All I am asking for is 15 minutes worth of debate on each side and a vote, up or down. Until I get it, I will

continue to ask for motions to adjourn before this House.

So I think the Committee on Rules and my fellow Members can make a choice: We can vote on it today, or we can vote on it Sunday, but we will vote on this. Because I do not think people who work for our Nation ought to take their Federal paycheck and buy drugs with it. I think we ought to have the confidence that those people who are working on our war on drugs are on our team.

I do not think it is asking a lot for the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Personnel of the House Committee on National Security to have an amendment made in order that deals with the personnel who work for our Department of Defense.

So, Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I would hope that our ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) would recognize me for a motion to defeat the previous question. But also I want to assure my colleagues that if the previous question is not defeated and if this amendment is not made in order, we in all probability will be here Saturday or Sunday. I have already canceled my plans. So the question for my fellow Members is, do you want to cancel yours?

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

Mr. Speaker, I sort of hesitate to get up to respond to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR). I guess I have a reputation of having a short temper sometimes, and I do not want to do that because he is a respected Member of this body.

I just want, first of all, to let it be known that in my 20 years here in this body I have offered literally dozens of amendments dealing with the war on drugs, including random drug testing and mandatory drug testing of Federal employees throughout this government.

When Ronald Reagan took office, he was somewhat of a libertarian, and he was not sold on the idea of random drug testing in our military. But we did a study at that time and we found out that back in the mid-eighties, the early eighties, that 25 percent of our military personnel admitted to using drugs of some kind. Twenty-five percent. When you look at that, you said how could they be effective if, God forbid, they had to go into battle and jeopardize the other 75 percent? So Ronald Reagan agreed by executive order to implement random drug testing of every single one of our military. That meant every buck private, right up to every general.

When Ronald Reagan took office, he was somewhat of a libertarian, and he was not sold on the idea of random drug testing in our military. But we did a study at that time and we found out that back in the mid-eighties, the early eighties, that 25 percent of our military personnel admitted to using drugs of some kind. Twenty-five percent. When you look at that, you said how could they be effective if, God forbid, they had to go into battle and jeopardize the other 75 percent? So Ronald Reagan agreed by executive order to implement random drug testing of every single one of our military. That meant every buck private, right up to every general.

Do you know what happened over the succeeding four years? Just the threat of the random drug testing dropped the use of drugs by our military personnel from 25 percent down to 4 percent. Four percent. Can you imagine that? And they became much more effective.

Would it not be great if we could implement that throughout the entire Federal Government, as the gentleman

from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) wants to do with the civilian personnel in the military? Would it not be great if we could do it with all the Department of Transportation and the IRS and everybody else? Then would it not be great if we could do it with State governments, if State governments would implement the same kind of random drug testing, and if local governments, the counties and towns and cities and villages would do the same thing?

□ 1100

Then, would it not be great if our Fortune 500 companies, most of which now do random drug tests on their employees as a condition of employment, would that not be great? Think what would happen if we reduced the use of drugs by 80 percent of the American people. That would knock the price right out from under it, but we would have no more problem with drugs coming into this country, because there would not be any value to them because there would be so few users.

When we look at the Rand study not too many years ago, there were 2 startling things in there that I just was shocked to see, and one was that 75 percent of all of the crime against women and children in America today is drug-related. Think what that would do if we reduced the use of drugs by 80 percent throughout this country by American citizens.

Then, what was even more shocking was, and I represent an area of middle class America in the Hudson Valley, the Catskills on one end, the Adirondacks on the other, but I was shocked to find out that some of my constituents, 75 percent of the illegal drug use in America today, was used by recreational weekend drug users; in other words, people, middle class or upper middle class who were driving into the cities, buying marijuana, buying cocaine and then using it recreationally on the weekend thinking that it was not going to be any problem. I said, my God, if we could drug test all of those people, the threat of losing their jobs, they would stop using these recreational drugs on the weekend.

So I would say to the gentleman, I support his amendment. We were going to wait until mid-June, when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and myself would bring to this floor a resolution that would change the Rules of the House and it would then begin to random drug test every single Member of this body; that means me and every other Member. Then, in addition, we would drug test all employees as a condition of employment.

Now, of course, I am told that that is probably unconstitutional and so is the testing of Members. Nevertheless, the resolution we will bring to this floor will random drug test every Member, it will random drug test every employee of the House. There are thousands of them, when we take into consideration all of the branches of our House of Representatives. We would then test all

new hires, in other words, who had suspicion, in other words, of drugs. We would then random drug test all of the security and public safety, and then finally, we would test any House employee who has access to the floor of this body.

Now, if my colleagues notice, I have gone from the severest to the least, and in this bill we will have a separation clause that says that any one of these, if testing Members is unconstitutional, then the other 5 classes stand. If testing all employees as a condition of employment, if that is found unconstitutional, then the other 3 stand.

Now, that is what we are going to bring on the floor along with a lot of other legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, I am going to vote for what the gentleman is trying to do later, but this is today. I am sure when we left last fall, Sonny Bono thought he would be here this spring, but he is not, and I regret that.

We are given an opportunity today on a bill that we know the Senate has to vote on. This is the defense authorization bill for the Nation, and without it, no ships, no planes, no helicopters, the troops do not get a pay raise, nothing happens in the Department of Defense unless this bill becomes law.

On the contrary, what the gentleman from New York is talking about the Senate never has to vote on, and anyone who follows Washington knows that more often than not, anything controversial, they simply choose not to vote on it.

So I would say to the gentleman, I would hope, if he is gentleman enough to listen, I would hope since the gentleman is in agreement with what I am trying to do for this portion of the government that he would accept my efforts along the lines of the previous question, and we will know for certainty, for at least this portion, for the most important thing our Nation does, which is to defend the Nation, that we will have random drug testing for all Department of Defense employees.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly clear. A moment ago I heard the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) say he would support the gentleman's amendment. By country interpretation, from a country lawyer in Missouri, that means that it will be made in order; is that correct?

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

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that he is one of

the men that I most respect in this body, and the gentleman is not just a country lawyer, the gentleman is one of the most astute Members of this body.

If the gentleman would like to have the Taylor amendment made in order.

Mr. SKELTON. I would, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we have a very delicate balance of the number of Republican and Democrat amendments that were made in order; we tried to maintain that balance.

At the appropriate time, if the gentleman is asking me to make an exception and make the Taylor amendment in order.

Mr. SKELTON. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would, during this debate, I would ask unanimous consent at the appropriate time to make the Taylor amendment in order, and also to make then a Terry Everett of Alabama amendment in order, modified, and that will sort of keep, I guess, our balance in shape. Would that be all right with the gentleman?

Mr. SKELTON. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman so much for his courtesy.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, I would make the unanimous consent statement.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Members should not think that there will not be a vote now on the previous question, because I have no choice but to emulate my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR). The gentleman threatened to vote on the previous question and he got his amendment made in order. I have some amendments I would like made in order and I do not want to be open to the inference that I am less committed to mine than he to his, so I now will announce that I will be moving for a rollcall on the previous question.

The rule is a disgrace. I understand the desire of the Republican leadership to make something out of the China issue. It ought to be fully debated, but it should not come at the expense of this House debating some of the most important public policy questions we face. Bosnia, and I did not know that the principle was equal Democrat and Republican amendments. That seems to be rather an odd way to make public policy, but I do not threaten that, because the amendments I want made in order are totally bipartisan.

I have an amendment sponsored by myself and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) to put a freeze on defense spending. That was not made in order. Let us be very clear. Defense spending represents a large chunk of what we have said we will spend. Not a single amendment is made in order that would reduce the budget.

This House will not be given a chance to vote on whether or not the budget

ought to be reduced. That is simply a degradation of the democratic process and inappropriate. Members may want to vote to keep this spending level up, particularly since we are in a zero sub situation, and Members who have talked about how committed they are to spending for the elderly and for the environment and for housing and for crime control will be diminishing our ability to do that if they vote for this bill. Not to allow even a chance to vote on a freeze seems to me wholly disrespectful of the democratic process.

Similarly, Bosnia. I do not know how often I have heard Members on the other side complain about Bosnia and the troops in Bosnia. Why, then, does the Republican leadership refuse to allow this House to vote on an amendment sponsored by 3 Democrats and 3 Republicans to compel withdrawal of the troops from Bosnia by December 31?

According to the administration, it costs us \$2 billion a year incrementally to keep the troops in Bosnia. These amendments go together. We could cut out the troops in Bosnia and save money. We could cut out the American troops and let the Europeans do what they ought to do and use that money for other purposes. It simply does not wash for Members on the other side to say, the President has unilaterally overcommitted us. The President has overextended us; we wish the troops were not in Bosnia, and then frustrate an effort to let the membership vote. What possible justification can there be for not letting this membership vote on a bipartisan amendment as to whether or not the troops stay in Bosnia?

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was critical of my trying to have a fair balance of amendments, and let me just say to my good friend, and he is a good friend, that I served for 16 years in the minority. For many years we felt that we were being discriminated against by the majority, and the gentleman knows I have done everything in my power as the chairman of the Committee on Rules to try to be as fair as possible.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I understand that; the gentleman has done what was in his power and my criticism is not aimed at the gentleman, but at the Republican leadership, which has somehow decided that, I don't know, it may be that they do not want to detract attention from the China issue, and the China issue deserves full debate, but how can the Republican leadership justify not letting this House vote on whether or not the troops stay in Bosnia?

I will say this: If we vote for the previous question on the rollcall I will ask for and my colleagues vote for this rule and they vote for this bill, they will

have refused the option to vote on Bosnia. So I will ask Members, have the intellectual consistency, if they vote down the line to keep us from debating Bosnia, not to complain about the troops being in Bosnia. There ought to be a basic rule that Members are enjoined from complaining about circumstances which they brought about.

So let us now face the choice. A vote for the previous question, a vote for the rule, a vote for the bill, my colleagues will have given their okay to the troops staying in Bosnia ad infinitum. They are going to be pulled out shortly after the dome comes off this building as long as the current policy of the administration is in effect, and I think Europeans ought to be made to step up to the plate.

I will give Members a chance, if they will take it, to vote on whether or not we ought to keep the troops in Bosnia at a \$2 billion a year cost. I think that is bad public policy. That is debatable. What is not debatable is that the United States House of Representatives, where many Members have complained about the troops being in Bosnia, cannot even vote on the subject. That ought not to happen. Neither should we have a situation where Members are not allowed even to vote on whether or not we ought to reduce military spending.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that Members, particularly those who have talked about the troops in Bosnia being a problem, who vote against the previous question, I will then offer that balanced bipartisan amendment, and we can go forward with our business.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Each side has 14 minutes remaining.

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

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

For the record, there were 50 amendments made in order, 15 of those are Democratic amendments, and 35 of those are Republican amendments, not exactly a balance. The chairman of the committee was trying to suggest that there was some sort of an equal division; there was not an equal division of amendments, Mr. Chairman. There were 15 Democratic amendments out of the 50 made in order, if we want to discuss the merits of the individual amendments as to whether they should have been made in order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member, for allowing one of my amendments to be in order.

This legislation will tighten a loophole in the law regarding military retirement pensions. I was very disappointed to see a soldier who was recently convicted of a felony go unpunished. Certainly, any soldier who has served honorably deserves a full pension, but any soldier who has been demoted due to the commission of a crime should not be entitled to retire based upon the highest rank served.

Unfortunately, this defense authorization bill also includes a provision that no one wants. I am very disappointed in the Committee on Rules for not allowing a vote on gender segregation during basic training in all branches of the Armed Services.

My amendment to strike this language was dismissed by the Committee on Rules. The Army, the Navy, the Air Force have all come out against gender segregation, because they know men and women must train as they fight. Separating them creates an atmosphere of distrust and may affect military readiness. Just as soldiers from diverse ethnic and social backgrounds must learn to become a cohesive group, so must men and women.

Separate and secure quarters are achieved without placing unit members in different buildings. Segregating the sexes will cost the Army \$159 million, according to the Department of Defense. Why should we spend this kind of money to create a situation that no one wants?

□ 1115

Secretary Cohen, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Shalikashvili, all came out against separating the sexes.

Sexual misconduct issues are not a result of training policy, but a manifestation of poor leadership. We cannot cure a social problem with a logistical solution. Further isolating women will not solve the problem. If nothing else, it will make the problem worse. It is not an issue of segregation or separation, it is about respect and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as we speak here on the floor today, men and women are defending our country in all parts of the world. They are fighting together. In some parts of Bosnia they are living together in the same tents. It is being done with respect and leadership.

Segregating men and women in the military amounts to giving women their marching orders back into the dark ages. Women are defending this country. We should defend their right to be treated equally in the military. I urge a vote against the rule on this issue alone, and on the issues raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BARNEY FRANK).

MODIFICATION TO RESOLUTION OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any other provision of the pending resolution, that the Taylor and the Everett amendments that I have placed at the desk shall be deemed to have

been included as the last amendments printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to be offered by Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi:

At the end of subtitle C of title X (page 227, after line 14), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1023. RANDOM DRUG TESTING OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EMPLOYEES.

(a) EXPANSION OF EXISTING PROGRAM.—(1) Chapter 81 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1581 the following new section:

“§ 1582. Random testing of employees for use of illegal drugs

“(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall expand the drug testing program required for civilian employees of the Department of Defense by Executive Order 12564 (51 Fed. Reg. 32889; September 15, 1986) to include the random testing on a controlled and monitored basis of all such employees for the use of illegal drugs.

“(b) TESTING PROCEDURES AND PERSONNEL ACTIONS.—The requirements of Executive Order 12564 regarding drug testing procedures and the personnel actions to be taken with respect to any employee who is found to use illegal drugs shall apply to the expanded drug testing program required by this section.

“(c) NOTIFICATION TO NEW EMPLOYEES.—The Secretary of Defense shall notify persons employed after the date of the enactment of this section that, as a condition of employment by the Department of Defense, the person may be required to submit to mandatory random drug testing under the expanded drug testing program required by this section.”

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1581 the following new item:

“1582. Random testing of employees for use of illegal drugs.”

(b) FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated on account of the amendment made by subsection (a). The Secretary of Defense shall carry out the expanded drug testing program for civilian employees of the Department of Defense under section 383 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), using amounts otherwise provided for the program.

Amendment to be offered by Mr. EVERETT:

At the end of title XII (page ____, after line ____), insert the following:

SEC. ____. TRANSFER OF EXCESS UH-1 HUEY HELICOPTERS AND AH-1 COBRA HELICOPTERS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 153 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2581. Transfer of excess uh-1 huey helicopters and ah-1 cobra helicopters to foreign countries

“(a) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall make all reasonable efforts to ensure that any excess UH-1 Huey helicopter or AH-1 Cobra helicopter that is to be transferred on a grant or sales basis to a foreign country for the purpose of flight operations for such country shall meet the following requirements:

“(1) Prior to such transfer, the helicopter receives, to the extent necessary, maintenance and repair equivalent to the depot-level maintenance and repair, as defined in section 2460 of this title, that such helicopter would need were the helicopter to remain in operational use with the armed forces of the United States.

“(2) Maintenance and repair described in paragraph (1) is performed in the United States.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—The requirements of subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to salvage helicopters provided to the foreign country solely as a source for spare parts.”

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2581. Transfer of excess uh-1 huey helicopters and ah-1 cobra helicopters to foreign countries.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2581 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to the transfer of a UH-1 Huey helicopter or AH-1 Cobra helicopter on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. SOLOMON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Sanibel, Florida (Mr. PORTER GOSS), a very important member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Glens Falls, New York, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot I would like to say about this rule. It is a good rule and deserves Member support. It was carefully crafted. There were many amendments. It is balanced, it is fair, and I urge everybody's support.

The reason I am here with what is left of my voice today is to pay some testimony to the very fine work of the gentleman from South Carolina (Chairman SPENCE) and ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. IKE SKELTON).

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is the crossover Member on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and we have, as everybody knows, on defense authorization close cooperation and coordination with the Committee on National Security.

Things would not work as smoothly as they have without the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and I personally and publicly wanted to thank him, the gentleman from South Carolina (Chairman SPENCE), and the staffs of both committees that who have worked so hard to make sure we have come up with a good product.

I, too, think we have underfunded, but we are doing the best with what we have. I urge support for the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3616, the Department of Defense Authorization Bill for 1999.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my friends Chairman SPENCE and the Ranking Member Mr. SKELTON on delivering the House a sound, bipartisan defense bill that I think all the Members of this body can, and should, vote for. After 14 years of steady decline in the defense budget, they were again handed a request by the Administration that clearly asks our men and women in the Armed Forces to do "more with less." Mr. SPENCE and Mr. SKELTON's efforts, and indeed the outstanding efforts by all members of the National Security Committee, have allowed for the careful crafting of a bill that manages increasing world-wide risk in an era of shrinking forces and budgets. This is no easy task.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this body know, the dollars for the Intelligence Budget Authorization that we here in the House passed on the 7th of May—on a voice vote—are contained in this defense authorization. I can tell you that the close coordination between the National Security Committee and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence—on which, I might add, the distinguished Member from Missouri, Mr. SKELTON, plays a tremendously valuable role as a cross-over member—allowed us to put together a prudent defense intelligence input to this authorization bill. Together, this bill and the intelligence bill focus on the needs of our Nation. H.R. 3616 increases spending on equipment modernization, it increases the funding for National Guard and Reserve modernization not funded in the President's request, it addresses a balanced quality of life investment for our military personnel, and it improves readiness.

But, Mr. Speaker, this does not mean we are looking at a "fat" bill. While the funding in this bill is consistent with the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, it should be pointed out that the President's defense request—according to the military service chiefs—is under-funded by more than 10 billion dollars. I wish we were spending more on our national security—on our military and our intelligence services. Not seeing the will at this point in the Administration to make this critically important—even if politically difficult—call, I believe H.R. 3616 does what can be done to limit the further "hollowing" out of our defenses. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 3616.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. Norton).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor, at the very least in disbelief, and at most with a sense of outrage, because this bill contains a provision that is so serious and such a departure that at the very least, any responsible legislative body would have wanted it debated.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN MALONEY) and I went to the Committee on Rules yesterday to ask that an amendment to remove a provision of the bill and at least postpone the resegregation of basic training throughout the armed services be made in order. Our amendment would simply have stopped congressional action to segregate the armed services pending the receipt of the report of the Commission on Military Training and Gender-Related Issues, whose members were just appointed in February. This

commission has been authorized by this body to study the very issues this body is due to vote on as part of this bill today.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) asked for a similar amendment. The resegregation now in the bill represents a major structural setback for the services and for women that the Department of Defense and the services strongly oppose.

Yet, we learned this morning that neither the Fowler-Harman nor the Maloney-Norton amendment has been made in order. I am here this morning to announce that the Bipartisan Women's Caucus of this House is not going to take the failure to allow us to even debate this bill sitting down or standing up.

The position I am articulating is the position of the Republican and the Democratic Members who are women of the House of Representatives. It is the position of 55 women strong in this House. I am going to leave this floor and go with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and other women and men of this body to the tarmac in just a moment, where we will be holding a press conference.

Among the participants will be Evelyn Foote, the Brigadier General, U.S. Army Retired, who is Vice-Chair of the Secretary of the Army Senior Review Panel Report on Sexual Harassment. Also with us will be Holly Hempfield, the 1996 chair of the Department of Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services. Both of these women who carry the views of the armed services are with the 55 women of the House of Representatives, saying if you want to set us back, at least hear us out first, do not silence us.

Moreover, we speak for the women of the military, and we are sure that we speak for the women and the men of the military. The Department of Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services, appointed by the Secretary of Defense, met with 1,200 trainees and trainers in a random sample to find what the troops believe about men and women serving together in basic training.

They found the overwhelming sentiment of our troops to be that men and women who fight together must train together. This train-as-you-fight strategy ensures combat readiness goals are met. We are here to make clear that the women of the Congress will never retreat on this issue.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), who is a woman I deeply respect, and she always speaks her mind, and she does so eloquently, but I would just say to her that for those of us who have served in the military, we have to remember that most of the basic training, the men and women that go

through basic training today, are identical to those who went through 10 years ago, 20 years ago, 30 or 40 years ago. They are of ages of 18, 19, 20 years old.

When we look at some of the situations that have occurred in other branches of the service besides the Marine Corps, when we mix young men and women together at that age, many of whom have gone away from home for the first time, we are going to have severe problems.

In the Marine Corps we have managed to train them separately and we have not had any instances that have taken place, and I just hope the gentlewoman understands and respects others' views on this. It is a question of trying to make sure that the young men and women that are going to be serving in our military have adequate training, and later on after they are out of boot camp, they are out of basic training, certainly they can work together, as long as it is not in a combat situation.

There are those of us that are absolutely opposed to women serving in combat. It is just a matter of principle with us. God forbid that women are taken prisoner of war. Situations occur that would not occur to a male, and I just could not do that to my daughters or my granddaughters, so I just hope she understands that there is sincerity on both sides of the aisle on the issue.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I do understand, and I have the most profound respect for the gentleman from New York (Mr. Solomon). I understand the feelings of the gentleman from New York, for whom I have the most profound respect. He served in the armed services when integrated services was unthinkable.

I do want to say only to the gentleman that I know he did not mean to say that the kinds of abuses and sexual harassment which have in fact come forward are anything like representative situations. I do not believe we should step back a giant step because of a few instances of abuse.

I think, on the contrary, that we ought to congratulate the troops for the way in which gender integration has succeeded, and may I say to the gentleman, I was surprised, particularly because I believe he has the votes, that we were not granted the right even to debate this matter for a limited period of time. That is all we asked.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I would tell my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, I was surprised that the Fowler amendment was not in there

today. We had a very close vote in the committee. Also, I further want to advise, the problem that we first had in the sexual problems was not in basic training. Aberdeen was advanced training.

Let me just tell the Members this. My problem, and I said it right in the committee, I do not know enough what is right and wrong now. It should not be up to me to decide. I called every chief of the service the morning of the vote, and every one of them, every one of them, said we want to integrate the training in basic training, with the exception of the Marine Corps.

I said fine. If the Marine Corps wants to do it differently, let them do it differently. If the Navy wants to do it differently, let them do it. We should not impose ourselves on that. This is a very important issue, I would tell the chairman. I am going to vote for the rule, because I am anxious to get this thing going, but I must say, I am very disappointed that this amendment was not in there.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Jacksonville, Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), a member of the committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my appreciation to the Committee on Rules, first for making one of my amendments in order, and my disappointment that the other was not. I believe, as I walked in, I think the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY) must have been talking to this issue, also.

But with my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JANE HARMAN), I have put forward an amendment in the committee to retain current policies regarding integration of male and female soldiers, sailors and airmen at the unit level during basic training. Unfortunately, this amendment was not made in order under this rule.

Our amendment would have stricken section 521 of the bill, which requires gender segregation at the small unit level throughout basic training, and the housing of male and female recruits in separate barracks.

Instead, our amendment would have required the Congressional Commission on Military Training and Gender-Related Issues, which this Congress established only last year at a cost of \$2.2 million, to specifically study the recommendations of the Kassebaum-Baker Commission before any action on this matter could proceed.

While I have the highest regard for my good friends, Senators Kassebaum and Baker, the methodology that was employed by that panel has been criticized by the GAO. The Fowler-Harman amendment also would have promoted privacy by gender in living spaces to the maximum extent practicable, without a specific requirement to separate by barracks.

□ 1130

I would note that the Army, Navy and Air Force chiefs oppose section 521 on the grounds that it removes their discretion for training as they fight. I would note that according to General Lezy, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Personnel Policy, section 521 would require the Army to spend \$159 million in fiscal year 2000 to build new barracks to segregate its recruits. The Army has not budgeted for this requirement. When 64 percent of the Department of Defense family housing is unsuitable, I believe there are better ways to spend this money.

Mr. Speaker, the commission appointed by Congress will use objective standards to evaluate the value of gender-integrated or segregated basic training and report to us. We ought not prejudge their findings. I will be working in conference to eliminate section 521, and would appreciate the support of many of my colleagues in this regard.

I do support the rule on this bill. This is an extremely important bill to the defense of our country. There are many other issues than this one in this bill. This is a good rule overall. It is a good bill. It is greatly needed for our young men and women that are serving in the armed services of our country. I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule and then to support the bill later today.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from San Diego, California (Mr. HUNTER), a stalwart advocate of our Nation's military.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say he has gotten beaten up a little bit over this rule. Let me tell Members something that the chairman did insist on that was very important from a national security standpoint. That is that he has allowed and the committee has allowed, and should be commended for letting us put in four amendments that have to do with the transfer of satellite technology, which is at this point a very critical issue for national security.

Most people now know that China has been launching American satellites with their Long March rockets, which are essentially the same rockets that are aimed with nuclear-tipped warheads at cities in the United States. We have an interest, obviously, in not accuratizing those missiles or making them more reliable. Unfortunately, after a failed launch in 1996, it has been alleged that Loral and Hughes, two of our satellite companies, engaged with the Chinese scientists after one of the satellites had gone down, and it was a \$200 million package, engaged with the Chinese scientists and engineers and showed them what they were doing wrong with respect to these Long March rockets, which have nuclear-tipped missiles which are aimed at the United States.

The Department of Defense issued a statement that said American security interests have been harmed. That is the Department of Defense for the Clinton administration, very serious statement. It is clear that our policy with respect to transferring satellite technology to China has been detrimental to the United States. There may have been criminal activities, and we need to further explore this issue. But today we have several amendments that have been allowed.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) have an amendment that expresses the sense of Congress that business interests must not be placed over United States security interests and that the United States should not agree to a variety of initiatives at the upcoming presidential summit in China, including support for Chinese membership in the missile technology control regime, a blanket waiver of Tiananmen Square sanctions, an increase in space launches from China, agreeing to unverifiable arms control initiatives, increasing the level of military to military contacts, and entering any new agreements involving space or missile related technology.

Essentially we are saying, you fouled this thing up, you have given away American security interests. We are putting the brakes on until we can sort this thing out. It is an excellent amendment by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) has an amendment that would prohibit U.S. participation in any post-launch failure investigation involving the launch of a U.S. satellite from China. Somebody mentioned that Loral and Hughes were kind of like the engineer who was sentenced to the guillotine by Khomeini, and after the guillotine had failed to work on several other people who would have been executed and they were allowed to go free, the engineer, the American engineer laid under the guillotine and said, I think I see your problem.

At any rate, the Bereuter amendment would prohibit U.S. participation in any post-launch failure investigation involving the launch of an U.S. satellite. We have the Hefley amendment that would prohibit the export or reexport of any missile equipment or technology to the People's Republic of China. And finally, I have an amendment that would prohibit the export or reexport of U.S. satellites, including commercial satellites and satellite components, to the People's Republic of China.

These are very important amendments. I thank the committee and the chairman for allowing them.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is an important rule. This is an important piece of legislation. I support the rule. I would advise the Chair at this point that there will be a Member on our side who will seek a vote on the previous question. I would ask the Chair to recognize that Member at the appropriate time.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor because I want to ensure that the Members that come to vote on this rule understand what happened in the Committee on National Security with regard to the Kassebaum-Baker panel's recommendations. There are no distortions that are out there.

Nancy Kassebaum's panel were 10 individuals of highly diverse background who made a unanimous decision that was overwhelmingly received favorably across the country. Why? Because it gave common sense solutions. It said, separate by gender in the barracks and at the small unit level, that is flights in the Air Force, divisions in the Navy and by platoon in the Army, but then when they go train, it is integrated training.

There are those that are trying to distort this by calling it segregated training. That is completely false. I want Members to understand this is only separating by barracks. Basically we are saying we do not necessarily think that young men and women ought to be sleeping together and we recognize that we have some collateral problems when that occurs. So when Members come to the floor, I want them to be very clear in understanding what exactly this is.

It is the Nancy Kassebaum language on those two issues. And to make sure that the services across the river do not spin this with regard to the Air Force, this takes the Air Force back to the way they were doing it for over 20 years. They used to separate by flight, by gender, until July of last year. So do not let anybody distort this. I want to be very clear with Members. If they have any questions, contact me and I will be very pleased to explain it to them.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing the debate, let me just say that the statement by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) is the exact reason why I took full responsibility for not allowing the Maloney amendment, because if it had come on this floor it would have been a totally political issue and would not have dealt with the merits. I did so after consulting with the administration; this is the Clinton administration. The Clinton administration did not want this issue to come on the floor, nor did they want the Bosnia issue to come on the floor.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I will not yield at this time, Mr. Speaker.

They did not want the Iraq issue to come on to the floor.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we do not interrupt somebody who is closing. They know better than that.

I just wanted to say one last thing, that I also take full responsibility for not allowing any cutting amendments. I have done this for the last several years because I am absolutely outraged to what is happening with our military. We have Members that will come on this floor, they will want to cut a little bit here and a little bit there. Pretty soon we are right back to where we were in 1979.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow that to happen. If Members do not like the funding level, if they think it is too much, come over here and vote "no." But if they want to stand up for the young men and women that are serving in our military today, we want to give them the best procurement in weapons we can give them. We want to give them the best training. We want to give them the best benefits in order to let them undertake an honorable career in the military. It is more honorable than any other career in this country, yet many Members in this House do not seem to give a damn anymore.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I will not yield.

I hope that Members will come over to this body and vote for this rule. We have been as fair as we possibly can. We have made a percentage of Democrat amendments in order compared to what they had asked for. The same thing with the Republicans, we shut out many Republicans in order to try to be fair. That is why everyone should come over here and vote for this rule today.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, today's rule on the FY99 DOD Authorization Act does not include my amendment which would have barred U.S. special forces training of the Indonesian Military in FY99. I am gravely disappointed that the Rules Committee did not see fit to allow the House to consider this issue at such an important juncture in our nation's policy toward Indonesia.

Today, Indonesia is entrenched in an unprecedented political and economic crisis. Recent reports of student deaths at the hands of Indonesian police opening fire on demonstrations is just one example of the violence and terror that have become routine within the Suharto regime.

This type of repression is just the latest chapter in the Suharto regimes' transgressions against its own people. No where is that more apparent than in the conduct of the Indonesian military. The use of the Indonesian military in the intimidation, torture and murder of both Indonesians and the citizens of East Timor is widespread, documented and undisputed. The brutal massacre of over 270 peaceful demonstrators in an East Timor cemetery by the Indonesian Military at the beginning of this decade led Congress to ban U.S. taxpayer funded IMET training in 1992.

Despite this strong indication by Congress to stop assistance to the Indonesian Military, the Department of Defense continues to provide assistance through the Joint Combined Exchange and Training program. Last September, I wrote Secretary of Defense Cohen requesting detailed information on the training of members of the Kopassus, the elite special forces division of the Indonesian military. The Kopassus is famous for its role as the ruthless "enforcer" of Indonesia's occupation of East Timor.

Several months later, I received a response from Deputy Secretary John Hamre, describing the United States' continued training of the Indonesian military under another program—the JCET. While I recognize that Indonesia's participation in the JCET program is in compliance with U.S. law, I do not support any training of the Indonesian military by U.S. armed services. It is clear to me and several of my colleagues that the JCET program is the Pentagon's loophole to the ban on IMET.

The amendment, which I was to offer with Representatives NITA LOWEY, PATRICK KENNEDY and CHRIS SMITH, would have sent a direct message to President Suharto that the flagrant abuse of power, unmitigated repression and complete disregard for fundamental human rights will not be tolerated. Because the moratorium would have lasted only for the fiscal year, it would have allowed Congress to reassess the merits of providing military training to Indonesia next year.

I hope that we can address this problem later in the session, but I still believe it was an opportunity that this Congress should not have missed. This rule abrogates our responsibility to ensure that our national security policy embodies the very democratic principles it seeks to defend. I believe it is unfortunate and does not reflect well on this institution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, 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 agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 281, nays 134, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—281

Abercrombie	Baldacci	Barton
Aderholt	Ballenger	Bass
Allen	Barcia	Bereuter
Archer	Barr	Billbray
Bachus	Barrett (NE)	Billrakis
Baker	Bartlett	Bishop

Engel	Kucinich	Rangel
Eshoo	LaFalce	Rivers
Etheridge	Lantos	Rodriguez
Evans	Lee	Roybal-Allard
Fattah	Levin	Rush
Filner	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Frank (MA)	Lofgren	Sawyer
Furse	Lowey	Schumer
Gallely	Luther	Serrano
Gejdenson	Maloney (NY)	Shays
Gephardt	Matsui	Skaggs
Green	McDermott	Stokes
Gutierrez	McGovern	Strickland
Hamilton	McKinney	Stupak
Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Thompson
Hilliard	Meehan	Thurman
Hinojosa	Miller (CA)	Tierney
Hooley	Minge	Torres
Jackson (IL)	Moakley	Velazquez
Jackson-Lee	Nadler	Vento
(TX)	Neal	Watt (NC)
Johnson (WI)	Oberstar	Waxman
Johnson, E. B.	Obey	Wexler
Kaptur	Olver	Woolsey
Kennedy (MA)	Owens	Yates
Kind (WI)	Poshard	
Klecza	Rahall	

NOT VOTING—20

Andrews	Ewing	Meeks (NY)
Arney	Gonzalez	Paxon
Bateman	Goodling	Payne
Burr	Harman	Riley
Carson	Hinchee	Stabenow
Clay	Manton	Thomas
Crane	McCrery	

□ 1212

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, due to unavoidable circumstances, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 166. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" in favor of the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Pursuant to House Resolution 440 and rule XXIII, 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. 3616.

□ 1214

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. 3616) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. CAMP in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Tuesday, May 19, 1998 pursuant to House Resolution 435, all time for general debate had expired. Pursuant to House Resolution 441, no further general debate is in order.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999".

SEC. 2. ORGANIZATION OF ACT INTO DIVISIONS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *DIVISIONS.—This Act is organized into three divisions as follows:*

(1) *Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations.*

(2) *Division B—Military Construction Authorizations.*

(3) *Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations.*

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:*

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Organization of Act into divisions; table of contents.

Sec. 3. Congressional defense committees defined.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 101. Army.

Sec. 102. Navy and Marine Corps.

Sec. 103. Air Force.

Sec. 104. Defense-wide activities.

Sec. 105. Reserve components.

Sec. 106. Defense Inspector General.

Sec. 107. Chemical Demilitarization Program.

Sec. 108. Defense health programs.

Sec. 109. Defense Export Loan Guarantee Program.

Subtitle B—Army Programs

Sec. 111. Multiyear procurement authority for Longbow Hellfire missile program.

Sec. 112. MIA2 System Enhancement Program Step 1 Program.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

Sec. 121. Multiyear procurement authority for the Department of the Navy.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Sec. 141. Funding, transfer, and management of the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment Program.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 202. Amount for basic and applied research.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

Sec. 211. Management responsibility for Navy mine countermeasures programs.

Sec. 212. Future aircraft carrier transition technologies.

Sec. 213. Manufacturing technology program.

Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense

Sec. 231. National Missile Defense policy.

Sec. 232. Limitation on funding for the Medium Extended Air Defense System.

Sec. 233. Limitation on funding for cooperative ballistic missile defense programs.

Sec. 234. Limitation on funding for counterproliferation support.

Sec. 235. Ballistic Missile Defense program elements.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 301. Operation and maintenance funding.

Sec. 302. Working capital funds.

Sec. 303. Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Sec. 304. Transfer from National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund.

Sec. 305. Refurbishment of M1-A1 tanks.

Sec. 306. Operation of prepositioned fleet, National Training Center, Fort Irwin, California.

Sec. 307. Relocation of USS WISCONSIN.

Sec. 308. Fisher House Trust Funds.

Subtitle B—Information Technology Issues

Sec. 311. Additional information technology responsibilities of Chief Information Officers.

Sec. 312. Defense-wide electronic mail system for supply purchases.

Sec. 313. Protection of funding provided for certain information technology and national security programs.

Sec. 314. Priority funding to ensure year 2000 compliance of mission critical information technology and national security systems.

Sec. 315. Evaluation of year 2000 compliance as part of training exercises programs.

Subtitle C—Environmental Provisions

Sec. 321. Authorization to pay negotiated settlement for environmental cleanup at former Department of Defense sites in Canada.

Sec. 322. Removal of underground storage tanks.

Subtitle D—Defense Infrastructure Support Improvement

Sec. 331. Reporting and study requirements before change of commercial and industrial type functions to contractor performance.

Sec. 332. Clarification of requirement to maintain Government-owned and Government-operated core logistics capability.

Sec. 333. Oversight of development and implementation of automated identification technology.

Sec. 334. Conditions on expansion of functions performed under prime vendor contracts.

Sec. 335. Clarification of definition of depot-level maintenance and repair.

Sec. 336. Clarification of commercial item exception to requirements regarding core logistics capabilities.

Sec. 337. Development of plan for establishment of core logistics capabilities for maintenance and repair of C-17 aircraft.

Sec. 338. Contractor-operated civil engineering supply stores program.

Sec. 339. Report on savings and effect of personnel reductions in Army Materiel Command.

Subtitle E—Commissaries and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities

Sec. 341. Continuation of management and funding of Defense Commissary Agency through the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Sec. 342. Expansion of current eligibility of Reserves for commissary benefits.

Sec. 343. Repeal of requirement for Air Force to sell tobacco products to enlisted personnel.

Sec. 344. Restrictions on patron access to, and purchases in, overseas commissaries and exchange stores.

Sec. 345. Extension of demonstration project for uniform funding of morale, welfare, and recreation activities.

Sec. 346. Prohibition on consolidation or other organizational changes of Department of Defense retail systems.

Sec. 347. Authorized use of appropriated funds for relocation of Navy Exchange Service Command.

Sec. 348. Evaluation of merit of selling malt beverages and wine in commissary stores as exchange system merchandise.