

KOSOVO AND THE INVOLVEMENT
OF U.S. TROOPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the entire hour, but I do want to continue a discussion that I started last evening, a discussion regarding the situation in Kosovo and the involvement of our troops in the air campaign, as well as the potential involvement of our troops in a ground campaign.

I thought it was especially important to continue this this evening, Mr. Speaker, because, as we both know, there are a number of our colleagues who are this evening sitting in their offices signing mail and responding to constituent concerns and at the same time keeping one eye and perhaps one ear on the discussions taking place here.

I think it is important that we look at all the parameters associated with the status of our military today as we hear increased discussions in the city about committing significantly larger amounts of American troops to Kosovo, and committing a significant amount of American resources to the situation and the ultimate defeat of Milosevic.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, I focused on the need to bring Russia in and to basically have Russia, which is on an ongoing basis a significant beneficiary of American tax dollars, to play a vital and direct role in helping to bring Milosevic to the table and to agree to negotiated terms to settle the ethnic unrest that has occurred in Serbia, especially with the Kosovars.

As I said last night, we spend between \$6 hundred million and \$1 billion of taxpayer money on programs to assist Russia. From economic development to stabilization of their nuclear programs to assistance with environmental issues, we are actively engaged in Russia, and I am in the middle of many of those issues as the chairman of the Interparliamentary Commission with the Russian Duma.

Now is the time for us, Mr. Speaker, to let Russia know that we expect, for the assistance that we give them, that they play a significant and vital role in bringing Milosevic, an ally and close confidante of the Russian government and certain Russian leaders, to the table to help us resolve this conflict peacefully.

As I said last evening, I have had discussions with Russian Duma deputies and with leaders in Russia who want to pursue such a course. Make no mistake about it, I think these negotiations should be on our terms, not Russia's. We should set the policy based on the negotiations that we have had with the Contact Group in the past, but Russia has to be part of the process.

I think in the 3 weeks or so that we have been bombing Serbia it is evident that we have not seen Milosevic move,

in terms of coming our way in acquiring a peaceful settlement. What we can in fact do is, in continuing to apply pressure on the government there for the NATO alliance, is bring Russia in and give Russia a more prominent role, and basically allow Russia to play I think the kind of middle position they should be playing in bringing Milosevic and his people to somber discussions about how to resolve this situation peacefully.

I encourage the administration to do that. I am heartened that some feedback I have gotten today is that the administration in fact is looking at these options. I think that is critically important for Republicans and Democrats to continue to press the administration and our allies to look at ways that we can solve this problem to our satisfaction, to the satisfaction of NATO, to the satisfaction of the stability of the Kosovars and Kosovo as a Nation, where people can live freely without ethnic intimidation, but we should do that also without having to resort to inserting ground troops and potentially involving ourselves in a major conflict that could involve the world's two major superpowers as opponents.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I want to use this opportunity to talk about some other factors that Members must consider as we prepare to either support or not support the administration's policy on moving additional troops and operations and personnel and platforms into Kosovo and the surrounding theater.

Before I do that, however, I want to reiterate two important points that I made last evening. The first is that Milosevic understand in no uncertain terms that all of us in this body are united with the President in demanding that he end his reign of terror on the Kosovars, and that he stop and be held accountable for the atrocities that are now unfolding in Kosovo and Serbia, and that we as Americans will follow through in holding him accountable personally. Let there be no mistake about that.

The second key point I want to make and reemphasize from last evening is that we are solidly behind our military; that we in the Congress are doing everything in our power to give them the tools and the resources they need to allow them to continue the operations that have been outlined for them by the Commander in Chief.

But let me get into the meat of what I would like to discuss this evening, Mr. Speaker. That deals with the need for Members of this body and the other body to understand that deploying our troops in Kosovo, sending our pilots in to conduct aerial campaigns, sending our helicopters, our Apaches in to provide safe ways, is not the same as sending inanimate robots into an area.

These are human beings, and these human beings have need, they have wants. We have not been as supportive as a Nation in providing the backup

and financial resources to protect the quality of life and stability of these troops as we should be.

This is an appropriate time for us to outline these concerns, and to use this as part of our discussions as we decide whether or not to move into a phase where ground troops are entered into Kosovo.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the people in America have been convinced that for some reason we are spending so much more money today on our military than at any point in time in the past. The facts just do not bear that out.

When I talk to my constituents back in Pennsylvania, I use a simple analogy. I do not compare what we are spending on defense to Ronald Reagan, as some would perhaps do. Rather, I go back to the time of John Kennedy.

When John Kennedy was president in the sixties, Mr. Speaker, we were spending 52 cents of every Federal tax dollar coming into Washington on the military. Yet, it was a time of peace. It was after Korea and before Vietnam. Fifty-two cents of every tax dollar was spent on the military. Nine percent of our gross national product was spent on defense back then.

In today's budget, we are spending 15 cents of the Federal tax dollar on defense. We are spending 2.6 percent of our gross national product on the military. The numbers have dropped dramatically. In fact, by any accounting standard, we are spending a significantly smaller portion of our Federal allocation that is available on defense and security than we were back when John Kennedy was the President, even though I would argue that was a more stable time and a time of peace throughout the world.

But some other factors have changed. Back when John Kennedy was president we had the draft. Young people were brought into the military. They served a period of 2 years or more. Then they went on with their lives. They were paid next to nothing.

Today we have an all volunteer force. They are well educated. Many are married, they have children, so we have added health care costs, housing costs, travel costs, so a much larger portion of our smaller defense budget is being spent on the quality of life to get those troops, to get those people, to serve in the military and to keep those troops involved and to stay on beyond one tour of duty.

In fact, quality of life is the overriding driving factor of our defense budget process today, to make sure our troops are happy, that they have the best possible quality of life to raise their families and to continue to serve America.

That was not the case back in the sixties. With the draft, we paid the troops a meager amount of money. Most were not married. We did not have all the associated costs with housing, education, health care, and so forth.

Some other things have changed. Back in John Kennedy's era when we were spending 52 cents of every Federal tax dollar on the military, we were not spending a significant portion of our defense budget on environmental mitigation. In this year's defense budget, \$11 billion of the defense budget will go for what we call environmental mitigation. That is money that is not going to provide support for our troops. That is money that is not going to buy new equipment or to replace old equipment, or to repair equipment.

Now \$11 billion out of today's budget for defense environmental mitigation, and zero dollars spent during John Kennedy's era for the similar type of situation, a further change from the nineties as compared to the sixties.

But there is even a more fundamental difference that gets at the heart of our problem in sustaining the readiness of our troops today. That is the issue that I also talked about last evening. This issue, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to drive home to Americans and to our colleagues on a daily basis.

During the time from World War II's ending until 1990 and 1991, under the administration of all the presidents that served during that period, starting with Harry Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower and Richard Nixon and going on through John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, and going on through Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford, and even including Ronald Reagan and George Bush, during all of that time the total amount of deployments by those Commander in Chiefs was 10, 10 deployments in 40 years.

Our troops were only inserted into hostile environments as a measure of last resort by our Republican and Democrat Commander in Chief.

Let us look at the past 8 years, Mr. Speaker. Since 1991, 1990 and 1991, we have had 33 deployments. I had to cross them out, because Kosovo is now the 33rd. There have been 33 deployments of our troops into hostile situations. Each of these 33 deployments, 33 in 8 years, versus 10 in 40 years, each of these deployments cost hundreds of millions or billions of dollars. None of these 33 deployments were budgeted for, not one. None of these deployments were paid for with an up or down vote on the Congress in advance of the deployment of the troops.

The payment of the costs associated with these deployments was made by taking dollars out of an already decreasing defense budget, out of programs of modernizing our aircraft, modernizing our naval fleet, modernizing our platforms, and giving the soldiers, sailors, marines, and corpsmen the kinds of quality of life that they deserve in an era where we have all volunteers.

In fact, the Comptroller of the Pentagon has given us a figure that these 33 deployments cost us \$19 billion of unanticipated expenditures. Many of them were paid with supplementals to

provide the funding to pay for these operations.

In fact, the irony of these 33 deployments, Mr. Speaker, is that we in the Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, joining together each year for the past 4 years, plussed up more money to try to replenish some of these funds that were being eaten away for this rapidly increasing deployment rate.

In fact, 4 years ago we gave the Pentagon \$10 billion more than what the President asked for. Three years ago we gave the Pentagon \$6 billion more than what the Pentagon asked for. Two years ago we gave the Pentagon \$3 billion more than what the President asked for.

In each of those years, as we in the Congress tried to replenish the funds to replace money that was being used for these deployments, the President and the administration criticized the Congress for giving the Pentagon more money than they asked for.

□ 1930

Finally this year, the Pentagon leaders have spoken up and said, "We can take this no longer. The funding problem is so severe in the Pentagon that we have to tell you candidly that we need more money in next year's budget."

The service chiefs came in and testified before the House committees and the Senate committees and said, at a minimum, they need \$19 billion more than what President Clinton asked for in the fiscal year 2000 budget.

The President said he would make \$11 billion of new funding available. It was a great speech. But when we cut away all of the rhetoric, the actual new money put in by the President in his budget for the next fiscal year is \$3 billion. In fact, one of the gimmicks they used was to take \$3 billion out of R&D for defense, shift it into acquisition, and call that a \$3 billion plus-up in defense spending.

The problem we have today is that the readiness of our troops, the capability to perform in Kosovo, is directly dependent on how much we support our troops. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we have undermined the capability of our military.

Because of the rapidly increasing level of deploying our troops around the world and because of the rapidly decreasing defense budget, we have unfortunately encountered a mismatch that is affecting the quality of life for our troops, that is affecting the ability for our troops to serve this Nation well in Kosovo, let alone the possibility of asking ground troops to go in to fight what could be a massive war.

Mr. Speaker, let me give my colleagues some examples that are very specific. One of our national defense technical media outlets is running a series of stories that, to me, are embarrassing. They have documents, one of which I will enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These are internal

memos of the Army where the Army is discussing the need to replace the survival radio gear that we provide the pilots and crew members on aircraft flying over hostile environments.

This gear and equipment is essential because, if a plane is downed, as we saw with the F-117A, those pilots and those crew members have got to have a way to get a signal back so that we can go in and rescue them.

These documents refer to those systems. Unfortunately in the internal memos of the Army, in discussing the availability of these devices to provide for our planes that are flying, not just over Kosovo, but also over Iraq in the peacekeeping role there and protecting the no-fly zone, this is what the Army is saying to those who are asking for these devices to put on these planes to protect our pilots, and I quote: "We do not have any radios available to fill shortages." We do not have any radios available to fill shortages, referring to these devices that are so critically important for pilots that may be downed in either Iraq or in Kosovo from enemy fire.

They go on to discuss the fact that we need to have some kind of protection for the pilots. So further on in the same memo, these are internal Army memos that I have been given by the medial outlets running these stories, this is a directive that has been issued by the Army, "The pilot in command" of the aircraft "will continue to ensure that not less than one fully operational survival radio is on board the aircraft. This does not preclude crew members from carrying additional radios on board the aircraft as assets become available. In addition, the" pilot in charge "will ensure that crew members without radios have other means of signaling", now listen to this, Mr. Speaker, either a "foliage penetration flare kit and/or a signal mirror."

Can we imagine, Mr. Speaker, that we are sending pilots and crew members into a hostile environment, whether it is over Iraq or Kosovo, and we are telling them, because we do not have enough equipment, that they should make sure that they have a signal mirror; that that is the method they are going to use to tell our rescue crews that they have been downed.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there was another story that ran a week or so ago where one of our Maryland units, I believe it is the 104th Air Reserve Squadron out of neighboring Maryland who is currently flying the missions over Iraq at this very moment, that the commanding officer has been quoted as saying that that unit had to go to local Radio Shack stores and buy GPS devices to give their pilots to carry on board these planes.

Mr. Speaker, this is not some pie-in-the-sky make-believe threatening scenario. This is what is happening today with our military. How can we as the world's most powerful Nation there to provide security and leadership for NATO allow our pilots and their crews

to fly combat missions without the appropriate equipment to guarantee the safety of their lives?

Is it no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the retention rate for our pilots in the Navy and the Air Force is the lowest rate today since World War II? The retention rate for Air Force and Navy pilots flying planes today over Kosovo and Iraq is below 20 percent. In one case, it is 15 percent.

We wonder why these young pilots who we have invested so much money to train do not want to stay in. It is because we are not giving them the equipment they need. It is because their morale is suffering and because they are sick and tired of going from one deployment to the next.

Instead of having time to come back to visit with our families, to visit with our children, they are being dispatched to Haiti, from Haiti to Somalia, from Somalia to Macedonia, from Macedonia to Bosnia, from Bosnia to Kosovo.

The morale is suffering in a dramatic way, and we are seeing the result of that in a level of retention for pilots that we have not seen in the last 50 years. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing it in the ability to recruit new young people in the services.

The Secretary of the Army just 1 month ago, because of shortages in the Army's ability to bring the new recruits, has proposed that we lower the standard of acceptance, that we now take young people in the Army who do not have high school diplomas.

Here is the irony of that, Mr. Speaker, the Army's number one priority right now, which I fully support, is the digitized battlefield, to give the Army warrior of the 21st century an information technology capability second to none, a computer in the backpack so they have visual imaging, a GPS capability so in their goggles they can see what the pilots in our helicopters and our planes and our radar surveillance planes are seeing.

At a time when we are making our soldiers digitized, able to be operating computers, we are having to lower the standard of acceptance in the Army to well below a high school diploma because we cannot fill the billets, because the morale in the services are suffering unlike any time, including 1970s, since World War II.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have ships going out to sea, aircraft carriers short of 600 to 700 sailors from what the required rate of deployment and billets should be for a mission, 600 to 700 sailors short because we cannot provide the number of sailors to man the ships to do the functions that they are required to do in hostile environments.

Mr. Speaker, these are facts. These are not ideas. These are not maybes. These are dependables. These things are happening today. We have a severe problem with our military. We are stretching it to the bone.

Our military was not designed to become the world's police department where every time a conflict occurs, we

send in the American troops. These are not robots. These are human beings with families, with loved ones. They deserve to be treated with dignity and respect.

I appreciate President Clinton today or yesterday going down and speaking to the pilots who are flying our B-52s, real heroes for America and real heroes for the world that we are trying to protect. But I wish the President would have addressed one other thing when he spoke to them.

I wish he would have told those pilots what we all know, that those B-52 bombers are going to be 75 years old before we can retire them, 75 years old and flying because we have undermined the base of financial support to provide new aircraft.

That is what is critical to those pilots in those B-52s and those crews. It is not just enough to say they are American heroes. It also requires us to give them the new equipment, the training, the repairs, the kinds of support they need to do the job they are being asked to do.

We are not doing that, Mr. Speaker. We are not modernizing the military because, over the past 6 years, we have cut program after program to put the money in to paying for these deployments because we do not have the dollars necessary to fund these deployments up front.

This means that marines flying in the CH-46 workhorse helicopter that was built during the Vietnam War will be flying those helicopters when they are 55 years old. Those helicopters were designed to be flown for 20 to 25 years.

The marines will have to fly the 46 when it is 55 years old because we have not replaced the 46 with the aircraft that is designed to take it out of service, because we have taken the money from that program and used it to fund these escapades around the world; and that is what they are, escapades.

Critics would say to me, "Well, wait a minute, Congressman Weldon, you are being critical of this President and this administration for all of these deployments. What about President Bush? Wasn't it President Bush back in 1991 in this 33 deployment rate who sent our troops to Desert Storm, a very large conflict?"

The answer is, yes, it was President Bush who sent our troops into Desert Storm. We did have a full and open debate in this body and the other body before those troops were committed to combat.

We did one other thing, Mr. Speaker, or I should not say "we did". The President did. President Bush felt so strongly about the allied commitment in Desert Storm that he personally went to the major world leaders around the world, and he said something very simple to them. "If you cannot send troops, then you must support this operation financially. But if you can send troops, we want your troops involved."

Desert Storm was the largest multinational force that we have seen cer-

tainly in this decade. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Desert Storm cost the American taxpayer \$51 billion, a huge sum of money. But, Mr. Speaker, President Bush got our allies to reimburse us \$52 billion. There was no net cost to our defense budget.

Each of these deployments, the reverse has occurred. Not only are the allies not reimbursing us for our costs, in places like Haiti, we are subsidizing the cost of other nations sending their troops in along with us. In fact, we are using American defense dollars to fund the support, the housing, the food, and the subsidization of other nations to bring their militaries into these deployments that we have become involved with.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is getting grave. We on the Committee on Armed Services are getting ready to mark up our defense authorization bill. We have very serious problems. The Joint Chiefs have said publicly they need \$19 billion more than what the President has in fact allocated.

That does not include a pay raise for all the service personnel. That does not include service-wide adjustments to the retirement system that are needed. That does not include missile defenses, which are one of the fastest growing threats that we see emerging in the 21st Century.

The estimate we have come up with is that we are short approximately \$25 billion in the next fiscal year just to take care of our ongoing commitments. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because Kosovo has already cost us \$2 billion. Where did that money come from? It came out of an already decreasing defense budget. Every major operation in the country has had to put dollars on the table to help fund the Kosovo deployment.

We are going to have to pass a massive supplemental. I saw the report today where the long-term projected cost of Kosovo could exceed \$10 billion to \$15 billion alone. Mr. Speaker, I ask the question of our colleagues, where is that money going to come from? Where are we going to find that additional \$10 billion to \$15 billion when we cannot even fund the \$19 billion to \$25 billion shortfall that has been identified before Kosovo became an issue.

□ 1945

We are in a massive crisis. In fact, Mr. Speaker, as I have spoken around the country, I have made the statement that this period of time, the 1990s, will go down in history as the worst decade in undermining our national security because of our increasing rate of deployment and our massive decreases in defense allocations. The two run in a diametrically opposite way, and we are feeling the crunch today.

With all of these deployments, the Navy is being asked to do more and more assignments around the world. We are now dispatching another carrier over to the Kosovo theater; to the

Balkan theater. The Navy at one time had 585 ships. If we listen to our Navy experts today, we are having trouble keeping our Navy at 300 ships, in spite of these massive increases in deployments around the world.

Our fighter squadrons. We have fighter squadrons today, Mr. Speaker, where up to one-third of the planes are grounded because we are using them as spare parts to keep the other two-thirds in the air flying.

Mr. Speaker, how long can this go on before the American people sense that something is terribly wrong? Is it going to take a massive loss of life? Are we going to have to see another case where soldiers are killed, as we saw 28 young Americans killed in 1991 when that low-complexity SCUD missile hit the barracks in Saudi Arabia that we could not defend against and we brought them home in body bags?

It is a real fact, Mr. Speaker, that 8 years after that attack on our soldiers in Saudi Arabia with that SCUD missile that we have no highly effective system today to deal with the medium-range missiles that Iran and Iraq both now have, that North Korea has now deployed that threatens our troops in South Korea and threatens our troops in Japan. The growth of missile proliferation is providing threats to our troops that we do not have the money to build systems to defend against.

The threat of weapons of mass destruction has caused the President to ask for billions of dollars of additional money to deal with the threats of the potential use of chemical, biological and small nuclear weapons, and I agree with his assessment of the threat. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not have the money.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the greatest threat, the threat of cyber terrorism, the use by a rogue nation or rogue group with high-performance computers to compromise our smart weapons and our civilian information systems, is requiring a massive increase in new dollars to deal with information warfare, and we do not have the money to put into that process.

Mr. Speaker, I recite these facts because as we, my colleagues and I, are being asked to assess whether or not our troops should be deployed, both our helicopters which are already there and the troops that support them that are already there, and the potential follow-on of a larger group of troops going into Kosovo, we had better consider one very important thing: We had better be prepared to provide every ounce of support for those men and women that they need.

That is going to require a significant new investment of money. That is going to require an effort that breaks the budget caps. It is going to require us to significantly increase the support to replace the Tomahawk cruise missiles, the guns and ammunition, the fuel, the lodging costs, and all those other associated costs that currently are in excess of \$2 billion for the Kosovo deployment.

Mr. Speaker, we better be prepared for one other debate as well. If we cannot sustain the level of our troop strength that we need, if we cannot reverse the decline in the retention of our pilots, especially Navy and Air Force pilots, if we cannot turn around the Army's problem of recruitment, the Navy's problem of filling its billets, if we cannot solve those problems, Mr. Speaker, I believe all my colleagues know what that means we will have to debate. That means we have to debate whether or not to consider reinstating the draft. Boy, all of a sudden does that raise eyebrows across the country.

It is easy to say put the troops in. It is easy to say put American kids in harm's way. It is easy to say send planes over. But, Mr. Speaker, we need men and women to fly those planes, to fly those helicopters, to feed those troops. And if morale becomes such a problem because of our lack of support financially for our troops, what then do we do?

If we cannot convince young people to voluntarily serve their country, and that is where we are heading, then, unfortunately, if we are going to see the administration keep this level of deployment up, we have got to find a way to get young people to fill those billets, to sail those ships, to man those helicopters, to fly those B-52s, to fly those F-117As. And if we cannot do that voluntarily, Mr. Speaker, that means we have to force people to serve our Nation to complete these operations that our commander-in-chief has gotten us into.

These are not easy decisions. These are not easy circumstances where we can, sitting in our armchair, decide to send more robots into a theater and risk their lives. We have a problem with our military because we have not funded readiness, we have not funded modernization, we are not even giving the pilots the remote sensing gear they need if they are shot down.

And if we cannot provide the support to keep those volunteers serving our country, then those Members of Congress who are standing before the national media, who are talking about putting our troops in harm's way, who are talking about sending tens of thousands of new troops into Kosovo, they better be prepared to address the issue of where do these young people come from. Because if we cannot provide the bodies, then we have to force young Americans to do what they did prior to the Vietnam War, and that is serve their country as a part of a national conscription effort.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to do that. I do not think we should be thinking about restoring the draft, but I also understand the reality of the situation we are in. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot deploy our troops 33 times, we cannot keep young people in Haiti, Macedonia, Somalia, the Balkans, in Bosnia, and put them in Kosovo, and have them handle floods and tornadoes and earthquakes and un-

rest in Central America, and rebuilding in Central America, and at the same time not have the bodies to fill those slots. It does not work that way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have never heard this President deal with these issues. He has not talked about the need to provide additional support for our troops. He does not want to break the budget caps. He does not want to put the kind of money in that the Joint Chiefs have said publicly they need this year. And he is not willing to talk about the morale problems in the military. These are issues that we in the Congress cannot run away from.

Defense is not a partisan issue. I am the first to admit publicly, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats in this body have been as supportive of defense as have Republicans, and some of our leading supporters of the military are Members of the Democrat party. An overwhelming number of our Republicans are strong supporters of our military.

I want to speak to those other Members of the Congress who want to put our troops in harm's way but who want to cut the defense budget even further than what it is now. Mr. Speaker, we cannot let that happen. Every one of those Members of Congress who goes on national TV, who stands in the well of this body and talks about committing our troops, talks about humanitarian efforts, talks about saving lives and taking people out of wheelbarrows to give them homes, they better be prepared to vote for the money and the support to deal with the morale problems, the readiness problems, the modernization problems that we have in the military today. Because that is what this debate needs to focus on. This is not about undermining the leadership of our country. This is about giving those men and women asked to go into harm's way the tools they need to do their job.

We need to have this debate across America, and I hope, as we get closer to a decision on how to proceed with Kosovo, we continue to understand that every day we are there is costing us, by one estimate I saw, \$30 million an hour. Thirty million dollars an hour of U.S. tax money that we do not know where it is coming from. Thirty million dollars an hour that the U.S. is putting up, that we are shouldering the bulk of the responsibility for.

These costs have to come from somewhere, and this body needs to find a way to provide the additional resources to pay for those operational costs and not rob other accounts that force us to fly aircraft well beyond their life expectancy, that forces morale to continue to drop, that forces our pilots to want to get out and make money in the private sector, and that forces those people flying those bombing missions and those security missions over Iraq and Kosovo at this very hour to not have the necessary equipment so that if they are shot down they can alert our rescue crews to come in and know where they are to get them out quickly and safely.

Mr. Speaker, the challenges before us are great. This country needs to understand all the dimensions of the Kosovo deployment. This country needs to understand that we cannot afford to be fair weather friends of the brave men and women who serve this country. It is not just enough to stand up and wave the flag and say "I am behind the troops." We must be prepared to take care of all the extra costs that are associated with these 33 deployments, many of which our troops are still involved with around the world today.

I ask my colleagues to consider these facts as we move further into a very nasty and dangerous situation far away from the homes and the towns where these brave Americans live.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0018

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE) at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes a.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 68, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. KASICH submitted the following conference report and statement on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106-91)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68), establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009, do pass with the following, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the resolution and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.

(a) **DECLARATION.**—Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001 through 2009 as authorized by

section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Social security.

Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

Sec. 104. Reconciliation of revenue reductions in the Senate.

Sec. 105. Reconciliation of revenue reductions in the House of Representatives.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

Sec. 201. Safe deposit box for social security surpluses.

Sec. 202. Reserve fund for retirement security.

Sec. 203. Reserve fund for medicare.

Sec. 204. Reserve fund for agriculture.

Sec. 205. Tax reduction reserve fund in the Senate.

Sec. 206. Emergency designation point of order in the Senate.

Sec. 207. Pay-as-you-go point of order in the Senate.

Sec. 208. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 209. Establishment of levels for fiscal year 1999.

Sec. 210. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to foster the employment and independence of individuals with disabilities in the Senate.

Sec. 211. Reserve fund for fiscal year 2000 surplus.

Sec. 212. Reserve fund for education in the Senate.

Sec. 213. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS, HOUSE, AND SENATE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Sense of Congress Provisions

Sec. 301. Sense of Congress on the protection of the social security surpluses.

Sec. 302. Sense of Congress on providing additional dollars to the classroom.

Sec. 303. Sense of Congress on asset-building for the working poor.

Sec. 304. Sense of Congress on child nutrition.

Sec. 305. Sense of Congress concerning funding for special education.

Subtitle B—Sense of the House Provisions

Sec. 311. Sense of the House on the Commission on International Religious Freedom.

Sec. 312. Sense of the House on assessment of welfare-to-work programs.

Subtitle C—Sense of the Senate Provisions

Sec. 321. Sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should not invest the social security trust funds in private financial markets.

Sec. 322. Sense of the Senate regarding the modernization and improvement of the medicare program.

Sec. 323. Sense of the Senate on education.

Sec. 324. Sense of the Senate on providing tax relief to Americans by returning the non-social security surplus to taxpayers.

Sec. 325. Sense of the Senate on access to medicare services.

Sec. 326. Sense of the Senate on law enforcement.

Sec. 327. Sense of the Senate on improving security for United States diplomatic missions.

Sec. 328. Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the National Institutes of Health.

Sec. 329. Sense of the Senate on funding for Kyoto protocol implementation prior to Senate ratification.

Sec. 330. Sense of the Senate on TEA-21 funding and the States.

Sec. 331. Sense of the Senate that the one hundred sixth Congress, first session should reauthorize funds for the farmland protection program.

Sec. 332. Sense of the Senate on the importance of social security for individuals who become disabled.

Sec. 333. Sense of the Senate on reporting of on-budget trust fund levels.

Sec. 334. Sense of the Senate regarding South Korea's international trade practices on pork and beef.

Sec. 335. Sense of the Senate on funding for natural disasters.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 2000 through 2009:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,408,082,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,434,837,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,454,757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,531,512,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,584,969,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,648,259,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$1,681,438,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$1,735,646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$1,805,517,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$1,868,515,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$0.

Fiscal year 2001: -\$781,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: -\$53,519,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: -\$31,806,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: -\$49,180,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: -\$62,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: -\$109,275,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: -\$135,754,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: -\$150,692,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: -\$177,195,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,426,720,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,455,785,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,486,875,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,559,079,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,612,910,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,666,657,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$1,698,214,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$1,753,326,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$1,814,537,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$1,874,778,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,408,082,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,434,837,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,454,757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,531,512,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,583,753,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,639,568,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$1,667,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$1,717,042,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$1,781,865,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$1,841,858,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS OR SURPLUSES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits or surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$0.

Fiscal year 2001: \$0.

Fiscal year 2002: \$0.

Fiscal year 2003: \$0.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,216,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$8,691,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$13,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$18,604,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$23,652,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$26,657,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows: