

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

Appropriations for FY2000: Defense

Updated July 21, 1999

Stephen Daggett
Specialist in National Defense
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Appropriations are one part of a complex federal budget process that includes budget resolutions, appropriations (regular, supplemental, and continuing) bills, rescissions, and budget reconciliation bills. The process begins with the President's budget request and is bounded by the rules of the House and Senate, the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (as amended), the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and current program authorizations.

This report is a guide to one of the 13 regular appropriations bills that Congress considers each year. It is designed to supplement the information provided by the House and Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittees. It summarizes the current legislative status of the bill, its scope, major issues, funding levels, and related legislative activity. The report lists the key CRS staff relevant to the issues covered and related CRS products.

This report is updated as soon as possible after major legislative developments, especially following legislative action in the committees and on the floor of the House and Senate.

Appropriations for FY2000: Defense

Summary

On July 16, the House Appropriations Committee (HAC) approved its version of the FY2000 defense appropriations bill, H.R. 2561, and floor debate is expected on July 21. This is the last of the annual defense bills to come to the floor -- on May 27, the Senate approved its version of the FY2000 defense authorization bill, S. 1059; on June 8, the Senate approved its version of the FY2000 defense appropriations bill, S. 1122; and on June 10, the House approved its version of the authorization, H.R. 1401. The HAC bill does not include \$1.8 billion that the Administration requested to procure six F-22 fighter aircraft, prompting a far-reaching debate about tactical aircraft modernization. Other major issues in the FY2000 defense debate have included whether to approve a new round of military base closures, how much to provide for military pay and benefits, whether to impose constraints on funding for U.S. military operations in Kosovo, how to fund theater missile defense programs, and how to respond to security lapses at Department of Energy weapons labs.

Neither chamber's version of the defense authorization bill approves a new round of military base closures. All of the House and Senate bills provide somewhat larger increases in pay and benefits than the Administration had requested. Although Congress has approved supplemental FY1999 appropriations for Kosovo operations, costs in FY2000 have not been addressed, and the Administration's policy remains controversial. The House removed a provision from the defense authorization bill prohibiting funds to be used for future operations in Kosovo, but only after the Administration agreed to seek supplemental appropriations for a peacekeeping mission. Earlier in the year, both houses approved bills calling for deployment of a nationwide missile defense, but funding for missile defense programs remains a matter of some dispute. The Senate- and House-passed authorizations both include provisions to strengthen security at DOE labs and to regulate relations with China.

The level of defense spending still remains unresolved. The Administration's FY2000 request for national defense totals \$280.8 billion in new budget authority. The main issues in Congress have been, (1) whether and how much to add to the Administration's request and (2) how to fit defense increases within budget limits. On April 15, both the House and the Senate approved a conference agreement on the FY2000 congressional budget resolution, H.Con.Res. 68. Compared to the Administration request, the resolution provides an increase of \$8.0 billion in budget authority for national defense and of \$2.5 billion in outlays. Both the House and Senate versions of the defense authorization provide \$288.8 billion in budget authority, at the budget resolution level. The Senate-passed appropriations bill, however, uses about \$4.9 billion of funds provided in the Kosovo supplemental appropriations bill as an offset for defense increases and provides a total of \$264.7 billion, \$1.4 billion above the request. The HAC bill provides \$268.7 billion in new budget authority for the Defense Department and other agencies, offset by \$2.6 billion in assumed savings from spectrum sales, for total appropriations of \$266.1 billion. The amount available to DOD and other agencies in the bill is \$5.4 billion above the request and \$4.0 billion above the Senate level.

Key Policy Staff

Area of Expertise	Name	CRS Division	Telephone
Acquisition	Valerie Grasso	FDT	7-7617
Arms Sales	Richard Grimmett	FDT	7-7675
Base Closure; Acquisition	David Lockwood	FDT	7-7621
Bombers	Dagnija Sterste-Perkins	FDT	7-7631
Defense Budget	Stephen Daggett	FDT	7-7642
Defense Budget	Mary Tyszkiewicz	FDT	7-3144
Defense Industry	Gary Pagliano	FDT	7-1750
Defense R&D	Michael Davey	RSI	7-7074
Defense R&D	Richard Nunno	RSI	7-7037
Defense R&D	John Moteff	RSI	7-1435
Ground Forces	Edward Bruner	FDT	7-2775
Ground Forces	Steven Bowman	FDT	7-7613
Intelligence	Richard Best	FDT	7-7607
Military Construction	Mary Tyszkiewicz	FDT	7-3144
Military Personnel	David Burrelli	FDT	7-8033
Missile Defense	Robert Shuey	FDT	7-7677
Missile Defense	Steven Hildreth	FDT	7-7635
Naval Forces	Ronald O'Rourke	FDT	7-7610
Nuclear Weapons	Jonathan Medalia	FDT	7-7632
Peace Operations	Nina Serafino	FDT	7-7667
Personnel; Reserves	Robert Goldich	FDT	7-7633
Strategic Forces	Amy Woolf	FDT	7-2379
Theater Aircraft	Bert Cooper	FDT	7-7604
War Powers	Louis Fisher	G&F	7-8676
War Powers	Richard Grimmett	FDT	7-7675

Contents

Most Recent Developments	1
Background	1
Status	2
Major Issues	4
The Defense Budget Debate	6
Increased Military Pay and Benefits	11
Ballistic Missile Defense	13
Military Action in Yugoslavia and Forces in Haiti	14
Base Closures	15
Major Weapons Programs and Military Service Unfunded Priorities Lists	15
Military Readiness	17
Cooperative Threat Reduction	18
Strategic Nuclear Force Levels	19
Emerging Threats	19
Social Issues	20
China Policy	20
Legislation	21
Budget Resolution	21
Missile Defense	21
Supplemental Appropriations	21
Defense Authorization	22
Defense Appropriations	22
For Additional Reading	23
CRS Issue Briefs	23
CRS Reports	23
Other Resources	26
Selected World Wide Web Sites	27
Appendix A: Summary Tables	28

List of Tables

Table 1. Status of FY2000 Defense Appropriations	4
Table 2: Real Growth/Decline in National Defense Funding Under Administration Projections	6
Table 3: Administration Plan for Financing the Defense Increase	8
Table 4: Congressional Budget Resolution Compared to Administration National Defense Budget Plan	10
Table 5: Costs of Administration Pay and Benefits Initiatives	11
Table A1. Defense Appropriations, FY1996 to FY2000	28
Table A2: Congressional Action on Major Weapons Programs: FY2000 Authorization and Appropriations	29

Table A3: National Defense Budget Function by Appropriations Title Under Administration Projections	30
Table A4: Ballistic Missile Defense Funding	31
Table A5: Congressional Action on Defense Authorization by Title	32
Table A6: Congressional Action on Defense Appropriations by Title	32

Appropriations for FY2000: Defense

Most Recent Developments

On July 16, the House Appropriations Committee reported its version of the FY2000 defense appropriations bill, H.R. 2561, and floor debate is expected during the week of June 19. This is the last of the annual defense bills to come to the floor -- on May 27, the Senate approved its version of the FY2000 defense authorization bill, S. 1059; on June 8, the Senate approved its version of the FY2000 defense appropriations bill, S. 1122; and on June 10, the House approved its version of the authorization, H.R. 1401. The HAC bill does not include \$1.8 billion that the Administration requested for procurement of F-22 fighter aircraft. Earlier, on May 18, the House, and on May 20, the Senate, approved a conference agreement on H.R. 1141, a bill providing supplemental appropriations for military and refugee relief operations in Kosovo, military readiness, Central America disaster relief, and other purposes.

Background

Congress provides funding for national defense programs in several annual appropriations measures, the largest of which is the defense appropriations bill. Congress also acts every year on a national defense authorization bill, which authorizes programs funded in all of the regular appropriations measures. The authorization bill addresses defense programs in almost precisely the same level of detail as the defense-related appropriations, and congressional debate about major defense policy and funding issues usually occurs mainly in action on the authorization. **Because the defense authorization and appropriations bills are so closely related, this report tracks congressional action on both measures.**

The annual defense appropriations bill provides funds for military activities of the Department of Defense (DOD) — including pay and benefits of military personnel, operation and maintenance of weapons and facilities, weapons procurement, and research and development — and for other purposes. Most of the funding in the bill is for programs administered by the Department of Defense, though the bill also provides (1) relatively small, unclassified amounts for the Central Intelligence Agency retirement fund and intelligence community management, (2) classified amounts for national foreign intelligence activities administered by the CIA and by other agencies as well as by DOD, and (3) very small amounts for some other agencies. Five other appropriations bills also provide funds for national defense activities of DOD and other agencies including:

- the **military construction appropriations** bill, which finances construction of military facilities and construction and operation of military family housing, all administered by DOD;
- the **energy and water development appropriations** bill, which funds atomic energy defense activities administered by the Department of Energy;
- the **VA-HUD-independent agencies** appropriations bill, which finances civil defense activities administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and activities of the Selective Service System;
- the **Commerce-Justice-State appropriations** bill, which funds national security-related activities of the FBI; and
- the **transportation appropriations** bill, which funds some defense-related activities of the Coast Guard.

The Administration's FY2000 budget includes \$280.8 billion for the national defense budget function, of which \$262.9 billion is requested in the defense appropriations bill.

Status

Congressional action on defense-related legislation began very early this year -- on February 24, the Senate approved S.4, a bill to provide pay raises and improve benefits for military personnel; in March both the Senate and the House approved bills on missile defense policy; and on April 15, both the House and the Senate approved a conference agreement on the annual congressional budget resolution. On May 18, the House, and on May 20, the Senate, approved supplemental appropriations for FY1999; on May 27, the Senate approved its version of the FY2000 defense authorization bill, S. 1059; on June 8, the Senate approved its version of the FY2000 defense appropriations bill, S. 1122; on June 10, the House approved its version of the authorization, H.R. 1401; and on July 16, the House Appropriations Committee ordered reported its version of the defense appropriations bill, H.R. 2561. On May 19, the House Appropriations Committee announced allocations of funds to each of the 13 subcommittees, in accordance with Section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, and on May 25, the Senate Appropriations Committee approved its initial allocations. Both committees have subsequently revised their allocations.

The status of major legislation to date is as follows:

- **Military pay and benefits:** On February 24, by a vote of 91-8, the Senate passed S. 4, a bill to provide pay raises and improve benefits for members of the armed forces. The provisions of S. 4 have now been folded into the Senate-passed version of the defense authorization, and much of S. 4 is included in the House-passed version.

- **Missile defense policy:** On March 17, by a vote of 97-3, the Senate approved S. 257, the "Cochran-Inouye National Missile Defense Act of 1999," a bill calling for deployment of a nationwide missile defense system as soon as technologically feasible. On March 18, by a vote of 317-105, the House approved H.R. 4, a bill declaring it the policy of the United States to deploy a nationwide missile defense. On May 18, the Senate took up H.R. 4 and substituted the text of S. 257. On May 20, by a vote of 345-17 the House approved the Senate version, thus clearing the bill for the White House.
- **Supplemental appropriations for FY1999:** On March 23, the Senate approved a bill, S. 544, providing supplemental appropriations for FY1999, including funds to respond to damage caused by Hurricane Mitch and Hurricane Georges and aid to Jordan. The House approved its version of the bill, H.R. 1141, on March 24. On May 6, the House approved H.R. 1664, a second emergency supplemental appropriations bill to provide funds for military operations in Yugoslavia and for some other purposes. Subsequently, Senate and House conferees folded Kosovo-related funding into H.R. 1141 and reported a conference agreement on May 13.¹ The House approved the conference report on May 18 and the Senate on May 20. As passed, H.R. 1141 includes funds for a military pay raise and benefit increases and for defense readiness that normally would be included in the regular FY2000 defense appropriations bill.
- **FY2000 concurrent budget resolution:** On March 24, both the House and the Senate approved versions of the FY2000 congressional budget resolution — H.Con.Res. 68 in the House and S.Con.Res. 20 in the Senate. On April 15, both chambers approved a conference report on H.Con.Res. 68.
- **Senate defense authorization bill:** On May 13 the Senate Armed Services Committee approved its version of the FY2000 defense authorization bill, S. 1059, and the Senate approved the bill by a vote of 92-3 on May 27.
- **House defense authorization bill:** On May 19, the House Armed Services Committee approved its version of the FY2000 defense authorization bill, H.R. 2401, and the House approved the bill by a vote of 365-38 on June 10.
- **Senate defense appropriations bill:** On May 25, the Senate Appropriations Committee approved its version of the FY2000 defense appropriations bill, S. 1122, and the Senate approved the bill by a vote of 93-4 on June 8.
- **House defense appropriations bill:** On July 16, the House Appropriations committee approved its version of the FY2000 defense appropriations bill, H.R. 2561, and floor action is expected on July 21.

¹ For a discussion, see Stephen Daggett, *Kosovo Military Operations: Costs and Congressional Action on Funding*, CRS Report RS20161 and Larry Q. Nowels, *Supplemental Appropriations for FY1999: Central America Disaster Aid, Middle East Peace, and Other Initiatives*, CRS Report RL30083.

- **302(b) allocations:** On May 19, the House Appropriations Committee approved its initial allocation of funds to the 13 subcommittees. The allocations provided \$270.292 billion in budget authority and \$261.73 billion in outlays to the defense subcommittee, a total consistent with the amounts allocated to the national defense budget function in the budget resolution. These allocations were subsequently reduced, however, in order to allocate somewhat more money to non-defense appropriations bills. On July 1, the committee announced revised allocations to that provide \$267.692 billion in budget authority and \$259.13 billion in outlays to the defense subcommittee. On May 25, the Senate Appropriations Committee approved its initial allocations, providing \$265.193 billion in budget authority and \$253.104 billion in outlays for the defense subcommittee. These allocations, too, were later reduced -- allocations announced on June 24 provide \$263.722 billion in budget authority and \$254.409 billion in outlays for defense.

Table 1. Status of FY2000 Defense Appropriations

Subcommittee Markup		House Report	House Passage	Senate Report	Senate Passage	Conference Report	Conference Report Approval		Public Law
House	Senate						House	Senate	
7/12/99	5/24/99	7/16/99	—	5/25/99 S.Rept. 106-53	6/8/99 (93-4)	—	—	—	—

Major Issues

In its February budget, the Administration requested \$280.8 billion in new budget authority for national defense in FY2000, and the Department of Defense (DOD) projects modest growth in defense spending in following years. Compared to long-term Defense Department projections last year, the proposal represents a significant increase in funding — as the Administration calculates it, the plan reflects an increase of \$12.6 billion in budget authority for defense programs in FY2000 and a total increase of \$112 billion over the six-year FY2000-2005 period. The main issue in Congress has been how to fit defense increases within overall federal budget constraints.

In addition to debate about the level of defense spending, several other issues arose early in the session, including

- how much to increase military pay and benefits;
- whether to require deployment of a nationwide missile defense; and
- whether to approve military operations against Yugoslavia and how much money to provide for Kosovo-related operations.

With action on annual defense authorization and appropriations bills now underway, several other issues are on the agenda, including —

- Whether to approve one or more additional rounds of military base closures: Neither the House nor the Senate versions of the defense authorization bill approve new base closures.
- Whether to limit peacekeeping operations in Kosovo and Haiti: While operations against Yugoslavia have been funded through the end of FY1999, future costs have not been addressed. The House Armed Services Committee (HASC) version of the authorization included a controversial measure to prohibit use funds authorized in the bill for operations in Kosovo, but that provision was removed in a floor vote after the White House said that it would seek supplemental appropriations to support a peacekeeping mission. The House also voted to remove U.S. forces from Haiti.
- How to structure Theater Missile Defense (TMD) programs: The Senate version of the authorization rejects an Administration plan to combine future funding for high-altitude theater missile defense programs — the Navy Theater Wide program and the ground-based Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system.
- How to allocate additional funds for major weapons programs: All of the defense bills add money for weapons procurement and R&D. Most of the congressional additions to the Administration request are for programs identified in unfunded priorities lists from each of the services. The Senate, however, also added funds for four F-15 aircraft. The House Appropriations Committee rejected the Administration request for \$1.8 billion for F-22 fighter aircraft procurement and allocated the money to several areas, including additional F-15 and F-16 aircraft procurement.
- How to address perceived shortfalls in military readiness: The Kosovo supplemental appropriations bill adds some money for military readiness and recruitment, and both HASC and SASC provided additional funds in their versions of the authorization bill. An unresolved issue, however, is whether improved pay and benefits and added readiness funds get at the root causes of perceived problems.
- Whether to restructure the Cooperative Threat Reduction program with states of the former Soviet Union: HASC reduced support for chemical weapons demilitarization and increased funds for some nuclear weapons projects.
- Strategic nuclear force levels: The SASC bill includes a provision allowing a reduction in the number of deployed Trident submarine from 14 to 18, but the bill also continues a prohibition on reductions of other systems until Russia ratifies the START II treaty. The Senate rejected a floor amendment by Senator Kerrey to repeal the restriction.
- How to coordinate defenses against terrorism and other emerging threats: SASC established a new account in the authorization bill to coordinate funding to cope with terrorism and other emerging threats and increased funding.

- Social issues: Both the House and the Senate rejected amendments to allow privately funded abortions for DOD personnel at U.S. military health facilities abroad.
- China policy/DOE security: Following the release of the report of the House Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China, chaired by Rep. Cox, both the House and the Senate added provisions to their versions of the defense authorization to bolster security at Department of Energy (DOE) labs and to further regulate relations with China.

The following sections review the defense budget debate and then discuss major defense policy issues.

The Defense Budget Debate

The Administration Proposal. The Administration requested a total of \$280.8 billion in new budget authority for national defense in FY2000 and estimated outlays of \$274.1 billion. The Defense Department projects that national defense funding will grow to \$333.0 billion in budget authority and \$331.4 billion in outlays by FY2005.² Adjusted for inflation, this represents a very slow rate of growth — by FY2005, total budget authority for national defense will be about 3.6% greater than in FY1999 in constant, inflation-adjusted prices, a growth rate of 0.6% per year — see **Table 2**.

**Table 2: Real Growth/Decline in National Defense Funding
Under Administration Projections**
(current and constant FY2000 dollars in billions)

	Est. FY1999	Proj. FY2000	Proj. FY2001	Proj. FY2002	Proj. FY2003	Proj. FY2004	Proj. FY2005
Budget Authority							
Current year dollars	276.2	280.8	300.5	302.4	312.8	321.7	333.0
Constant FY2000 dollars	282.6	280.8	293.1	287.7	290.2	290.5	292.7
Real growth/decline	-0.1%	-0.6%	+4.4%	-1.8%	+0.9%	+0.1%	+0.8%
Outlays							
Current year dollars	276.7	274.1	282.1	292.1	304.0	313.8	331.4
Constant FY2000 dollars	283.0	274.1	275.2	277.9	282.0	283.4	291.4
Real growth/decline	+1.1%	-3.2%	+0.4%	+1.0%	+1.5%	+0.5%	+2.8%

Source: Office of Management and Budget and Department of Defense figures for current year dollars; constant dollars calculated using deflators from the Department of Defense Comptroller.

² The Defense Department operates on a biennial budget cycle — it prepares a six-year budget plan at the start of the cycle, which then becomes a five-year plan the next year. Most other government agencies prepare only a five-year plan, so the defense plan this year extends one year further than most other federal budget projections.

Although the projected rate of growth in defense spending is modest, the plan represents an end to the decline in military funding that has been underway since the mid-1980s — the turnaround under Administration projections does not begin until FY2001, but this is mainly an artifact of the way the Administration has proposed financing military construction projects in FY2000 (see below for a discussion). The projected growth in spending is particularly substantial in weapons procurement — under the Administration plan, purchases of new weapons will climb from \$49 billion in FY1999 to \$75 billion in FY2005. The long-term decline in funding for weapons acquisition has been a particular focus of congressional concern for some time, so the upturn in procurement is noteworthy. **Table A3** in the Appendix shows the Administration's long-term plan broken down by appropriations title.

Officials have broken down the \$112 billion six-year increase into three components:

- \$35 billion for improvements in pay and benefits for military personnel, including across-the board pay raises of 4.4% in FY2000 and 3.9% per year thereafter; pay table reform to provide higher raises in the upper grades; changes in retirement benefits; and increased bonuses and special pay;
- \$49 billion in operation and maintenance accounts, of which about \$10 billion is to cover higher pay raises for civilian Defense Department employees;
- \$29 billion for weapons modernization and facilities repair and replacement.

When the budget was being prepared, DOD officials say, the chiefs of the military services requested about \$148 billion in increased funding over the six-year period. The \$112 billion addition, they say, includes all that the chiefs requested for personnel and readiness and about half of the amounts requested for weapons acquisition and facilities.

Financing the Administration Plan. The overarching budget issue for FY2000 has been how to cope with rather stringent limits on total discretionary spending while permitting an increase of some magnitude in defense expenditures. Under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1997 (part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, P.L. 105-33), total budget authority for discretionary programs is limited to \$537 billion in FY2000, according to CBO estimates. This amount is substantially below the FY1999 level, though how much below depends on how the FY1999 baseline is defined.³ Any increase in the defense budget will further reduce funds available for non-defense discretionary spending.

The Administration, however, wants to increase both defense and non-defense discretionary spending while technically adhering to the budget limits. The Administration's answer is (1) to propose total discretionary budget authority and outlays considerably above the caps established in the 1997 budget agreement by applying savings in mandatory programs and increased revenues as offsets to increases in the discretionary part of the budget and (2) to use various accounting measures within the FY2000 defense budget to offset increases. **Table 3**, taken directly from

³ For alternative measures, see Congressional Budget Office, *An Analysis of the President's Budgetary Proposals for Fiscal Year 2000*, April, 1999, p. 5.

DOD briefing material, shows how the Administration has explained its proposed financing measures.

Table 3: Administration Plan for Financing the Defense Increase
(DOD discretionary budget authority in billions of current year dollars)*

	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	Total FY2000- 2005
FY1999 DOD Budget	264.1	272.3	275.5	285.2	292.1	299.4	1,688.7
FY2000 DOD Budget	268.2	287.4	289.3	299.7	308.5	319.8	1,773.0
Additional Topline	+4.1	+15.1	+13.8	+14.5	+16.3	+20.5	+84.3
Economic Changes	+3.8	+3.9	+4.1	+4.5	+4.7	+5.1	+26.1
MilCon "Split Funding"	+3.1	-3.1	—	—	—	—	—
Rescissions	+1.6	—	—	—	—	—	+1.6
Total	+12.6	+15.9	+17.9	+19.0	+21.0	+25.6	+112.0

Source: Department of Defense.

***Note:** Reflects discretionary funds for the Department of Defense only — does not include small, negative amounts of mandatory funds.

Questions have been raised about each of the offsets, including,

- Inflation savings:** Of the \$112 billion increase that the Administration is proposing through FY2005, \$26.1 billion is offset by projected inflation savings — savings of \$3.8 billion are assumed in FY2000. The key issue is whether estimated increases in purchasing power are accurate. Defense officials have said that almost all of the projected savings are due to lower inflation in 1998, which established a lower base for price trends in the future — “out-year” inflation projections are only about 1/10th of 1 percent lower than last year. A perennial question is whether decision-makers will agree to add money to the defense budget in the future if inflation accelerates.
- “Split funding” for FY2000 military construction projects:** The Defense Department’s FY2000 military construction/family housing budget plan includes \$8.5 billion worth of projects, but the Administration is requesting only \$5.4 billion in appropriations. The remaining \$3.1 billion is requested as advance appropriations to be scored as new budget authority in FY2001. The request to provide “split funding” for FY2000 projects is not a change in policy, but a one-time exercise done only because of budget rules — the intent is to reduce requested budget authority in FY2000, when caps on discretionary funding will remain in place, and restore the funding in FY2001, when, presumably, the caps will be adjusted upward.
- Rescissions of prior year funds:** The Administration has proposed applying \$1.65 billion of rescissions of prior year defense funds to offset the FY2000 total. While it is quite common for the appropriations committees to make such rescissions, the amount is relatively large. Moreover, congressional committees usually identify such savings toward the end of the budget process and use them to offset unexpected costs or to pay for congressional initiatives.

The Administration has not identified specific rescissions, but this has been common practice in recent years — rather than propose cuts that might aggravate some legislators, the Clinton Administration has preferred to negotiate rescissions with congressional committees.

Congressional Action on the Defense Budget. In Congress, the debate over the level of defense spending has been entwined in the broader debate about the overall federal budget. For their part, members of the congressional defense committees, with considerable support from other legislators, have called for substantial increases to the military budget in addition to the increases the Administration proposed. They have also, however, been critical of the accounting mechanisms that the Administration employed to squeeze additional defense spending under the discretionary spending caps. Meanwhile, Congress has, for the present at least, rejected an increase in the discretionary caps and has dismissed out of hand the offsets to increased discretionary spending that the Administration proposed. Concurrently, there has been a debate about the use of emergency supplemental appropriations for Kosovo as a mechanism to increase funding for defense readiness.

The result has been a rather complicated series of steps in which funds apparently added to the defense budget in one stage of the congressional process have been eroded in following stages. The net effect is that Congress appears to moving toward a very modest increase to the Administration's defense request, some of which will be absorbed by higher pay and benefits increases that Congress has approved. Here is a brief play by play overview of the process to date:

- The congressional budget resolution for FY2000, H.Con.Res. 68, approved by both chambers on April 15, provides \$8.0 billion more in budget authority and \$2.5 billion more in outlays for national defense in FY2000 than the Administration's request (using Administration, not CBO, scoring of the request). Over the five year FY2000-2004 period, the resolution projects \$27.9 billion more in budget authority and \$5.3 billion more in outlays for national defense than the Administration. **Table 4** shows the congressional plan compared to the Administration estimate and to the Congressional Budget Office reestimate of the cost of the Administration projection.⁴ Two points stand out — first, projected increases in defense spending in the later years of the five-year period are not as large as in FY2000, and, second, there appears to be a substantial mismatch in all years between increases in budget authority and projected increases in defense outlays — the mismatch is especially severe according to CBO estimates.
- Between \$3.1 billion and \$5.75 billion of the \$8 billion increase in defense budget authority in the FY2000 budget resolution will go simply to restore money for offsets that Congress has rejected. None of the congressional defense committees have agreed to the proposed \$3.1 billion in split funding for military construction, and neither SASC nor the Senate nor the House

⁴ CBO reestimates of the Administration's defense budget typically involve minor differences in counting budget authority levels, and larger differences in outlays.

Appropriations Committees accepted the proposed \$1.65 billion in offsetting rescissions.

Table 4: Congressional Budget Resolution Compared to Administration National Defense Budget Plan
(current year dollars in billions)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Administration Request										
Budget Authority	280.8	300.5	302.4	312.8	321.7	333.0	—	—	—	—
Outlays	274.1	282.1	292.1	304.0	313.8	331.4	—	—	—	—
President's Budget Reestimated by CBO										
Budget Authority	280.5	300.2	302.0	312.4	321.2	332.6	344.4	357.0	370.0	383.5
Outlays	283.3	285.0	293.7	303.8	313.8	326.1	335.7	346.5	362.1	374.7
FY2000 Congressional Budget Resolution										
Budget Authority	288.8	303.6	308.2	318.3	327.2	328.4	329.6	330.9	332.2	333.5
Outlays	276.6	285.9	291.7	303.6	313.5	316.7	315.1	313.7	317.1	318.0
Difference Compared to Request										
Budget Authority	+8.0	+3.1	+5.8	+5.5	+5.5	-4.6	—	—	—	—
Outlays	+2.5	+3.8	-0.4	-0.4	-0.3	-14.7	—	—	—	—
Difference Compared to CBO Reestimate										
Budget Authority	+8.3	+3.4	+6.2	+5.9	+6.0	-4.2	-14.8	-26.1	-37.8	-50.0
Outlays	-6.7	+0.9	-2.0	-0.2	-0.3	-9.4	-20.6	-32.8	-45.0	-56.7

Sources: House and Senate Budget Committees; Conference Report on the FY2000 Concurrent Budget Resolution, H.Rept. 106- 91; Department of Defense.

- Congress found its own way of adding money to defense in spite of the FY2000 discretionary spending caps by providing extra funds in the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for Kosovo, H.R. 1141. In all, the bill provides \$14.9 billion in supplemental appropriations and makes \$2.0 billion in offsetting rescissions. Of the supplemental funding, about \$11 billion is for the Department of Defense (including funds for Central America disaster assistance and disaster repairs at U.S. facilities), which is \$5.3 billion more than the Administration requested. Much of the added money is for programs that normally would be financed in regular FY2000 defense and military construction appropriations bills, including \$1.8 billion for increased pay and benefits and \$3.1 billion for military readiness-related accounts and for munitions purchases. Most of the added amounts are in “fast-spending” accounts — i.e., accounts in which almost all new budget authority is actually expended as outlays in the first year available. As a result, the added funds in H.R. 1141 will considerably ease the apparent mismatch between budget authority and outlays in the budget resolution.
- The extra \$5 billion for defense in the Kosovo bill, however, is now being tapped in the FY2000 appropriations process as an offset to defense funding

increases. The Senate-passed version of the FY2000 defense appropriations bill, S. 1122, includes increases in various defense programs consistent with the budget resolution and the defense authorization bills but then uses \$1.8 billion provided in the Kosovo bill for personnel and \$3.1 billion in the Kosovo bill for readiness and munitions as offsets for the increases (see **Table A6** in the Appendix). The net effect is that the added emergency defense appropriations provided in the Kosovo bill have been used to provide most of the increase in FY2000 defense spending without counting against the caps on FY2000 discretionary spending, thus freeing up more money for non-defense discretionary programs. On June 8, the House leadership announced plans to take a similar approach, and the allocation of funds to the defense subcommittee was subsequently reduced -- the initial allocation, approved in May, provided \$270.3 billion, and the bill as reported by the full committee on July 16 provides \$266.1 billion, \$4.2 billion lower. Part of the difference, however, is made up by counting anticipated receipts from radio spectrum sales of \$2.6 billion as an offset to defense appropriations, so the amount available to DOD and other agencies in the bill totals \$268.7 billion

- In the longer term, projected increases in defense spending in the budget resolution will mostly be taken up by the growing impact in future years of pay and benefits increases that Congress added to the Administration request.

Increased Military Pay and Benefits

As noted earlier, the Administration proposed a package of pay and benefit improvements for military personnel that will cost about \$35 billion over the next six years compared to earlier Administration plans. The package includes (1) pay raises of 4.4% in FY2000 and 3.9% per year thereafter, (2) “pay table” reform to reward promotions more than longevity, (3) repeal of the “Redux” retirement plan, restoring benefits to 50% of base pay after 20 years of service, and (4) targeted pay and bonus increases for particular skills. **Table 5** shows Administration estimates of the six-year cost. An additional \$10 billion in operation and maintenance accounts is needed to cover comparable pay raises for DOD civilian personnel through FY2005.

Table 5: Costs of Administration Pay and Benefits Initiatives
(millions of dollars)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total
New Funding:							
Military Pay Raises	846	1,437	1,995	2,592	3,263	3,932	14,066
Pay Table Reform	196	809	836	868	902	937	4,548
Retirement Reform	796	888	983	1,049	1,082	1,153	5,951
Other Changes	1,170	1,503	1,579	1,521	1,522	1,620	8,915
Total New Funding	3,008	4,637	5,393	6,030	6,770	7,632	33,480
Reapplied Savings	323	321	321	321	321	321	1,928
Total Program Changes	3,331	4,958	5,714	6,351	7,091	7,963	35,408

Source: Department of Defense.

The purpose of the proposed pay and benefit increases is to improve recruitment and retention of military personnel. Both the Army and the Navy suffered recruiting

shortfalls in 1998, and all of the services have fallen somewhat short of retention goals recently. In the past, military pay raises, like pay raises for civilian federal personnel, have been pegged to ½% below the Employment Cost Index (ECI), a measure of overall compensation trends in the economy. As a result, military pay is now about 13% below the level it would have reached if pay raises since 1982 had equaled the ECI. Some refer to this as the military “pay gap,” though it is simply a measure of trends since 1982 — independent comparisons of military pay scales with the civilian economy generally have not confirmed a shortfall of that magnitude. The Administration’s proposed pay raises are 0.1% above the ECI in FY2000 and at the projected ECI in the future.

On February 24, the Senate passed S. 4, a bill entitled the “Soldiers’, Sailors’, Airmen’s, and Marines’ Bill of Right Act of 1999,” that would provide a substantially larger pay and benefits package than the Administration has proposed. The bill would implement the Administration proposals and in addition (1) provide a 4.8% pay raise in FY2000 and peg raises to ½% above ECI thereafter, (2) allow personnel to choose a \$30,000 bonus instead of shifting out of the Redux retirement plan, (3) provide a subsistence allowance of \$180 per month to personnel eligible for food stamps, (4) make uniformed personnel eligible for the Thrift Savings Plan now available to civilian federal employees, and (4) significantly increase Montgomery G.I. Bill educational benefits. According to Congressional Budget Office estimates, S. 4 will cost about \$9 billion more over the FY2000-2005 period than the Administration plan.⁵ While the Senate voted overwhelmingly for S. 4, the House did not act on a military pay and benefits bill as a freestanding measure, and instead pay and benefits improvements have been considered as part of the FY2000 defense authorization bill.

Authorization and appropriations action: House and Senate versions of the defense authorization bill both include larger pay and benefits increases than the Administration requested. The SASC version of the bill included all of the provisions of S. 4 except for GI Bill benefits. In action on the floor, the Senate approved an amendment by Senator Cleland to approve the expansion of GI Bill benefits, as provided in S. 4. Pay and benefit provisions in the HASC version of the authorization were identical to those in the SASC bill with two exceptions: (1) HASC provided for future raises equal to the ECI rather than ½% higher and (2) HASC did not approve providing the Thrift Savings Plan to uniformed personnel but instead required a DOD study of the proposal. On the floor, however, the House approved an amendment by Rep. Buyer, the chair of the HASC military personnel subcommittee, to provide the same Thrift Savings Plan benefits as the Senate. Pay and benefits increases are legislative matters to be considered in the defense authorization bill, not in appropriations measures, though the amount of money provided for military personnel in the appropriations bill is directly affected by any changes. The Kosovo supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 1141, provided \$1.838 billion for FY2000 pay and

⁵ See testimony of Christopher Jehn, Assistant Director, National Security Division, Congressional Budget Office, before the Senate Armed Services Committee Personnel Subcommittee, March 3, 1999. CBO estimates the cost of the Administration plan as \$14 billion over five years and the cost of S. 4 as \$23 billion, compared to a baseline that assumes raises equal to the ECI.

benefits increases, enough to cover the Administration estimate of the costs of the Administrations 4.4% pay raise, pay table reform, and retirement reform. Later, the regular FY2000 defense appropriations bills, as approved in the House and the Senate, have sufficient funding for the larger congressional pay and benefits packages.

Ballistic Missile Defense

The Administration's FY2000-2005 long-term defense plan includes several important initiatives on missile defense policy, including (1) a decision to provide a total of \$10.5 billion, an increase of \$6.6 billion, over the FY1999-2005 period to fully fund preparations to deploy a national missile defense (NMD) system beginning as early as 2003-2005; (2) a decision to accelerate the Navy Theater Wide (NTW) system to allow it to compete with the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system for the "upper tier" theater missile defense (TMD) role for deployment as early as 2007; and (3) a decision to restructure the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) to limit costs. In announcing these decisions on January 20, Secretary of Defense Cohen acknowledged that the threat of long-range missile attack on U.S. territory appeared to be materializing sooner than earlier intelligence assessments had estimated. In particular, Secretary Cohen cited North Korea's test last year of a multistage missile as evidence of the danger, and he endorsed the findings of the Rumsfeld Commission, which reported last August that rogue states could threaten the United States directly with long-range missiles within the next five years and without much advanced warning.

The change in the Administration's threat assessment was ultimately reflected in its decision not to oppose an amended version of S. 257, a bill sponsored by Senators Cochran and Inouye that calls for deploying a nationwide missile defense as soon as technologically possible. Last year, the Administration opposed an essentially identical bill, and the Senate twice narrowly rejected cloture motions to bring it to a vote. This year, the Administration relented after amendments were added, including a statement of policy that the United States seeks continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces and a provision that the Secretary of Defense must determine that the system will be operationally effective. The Senate passed the bill by a vote of 97-3 on March 17. On March 18, by a vote of 317-105, the House passed H.R. 4, a bill stating simply that it is U.S. policy to deploy a nationwide defense. On May 18, the Senate took up H.R. 4 and substituted the text of S. 257. On May 20, by a vote of 345-17 the House approved the Senate version, thus clearing the bill for the White House, and the bill was sent to the President on July 12.

Although the Administration no longer opposes these measures, officials insist that policy remains what it was — to decide by mid-2000 whether to deploy a system and, if a decision to deploy is made, to pursue deployment as the technology permits. Officials had said that deployment could begin as early as three years after a decision is made to go ahead — i.e., by 2003 — but it now appears more likely that deployment could begin in 2005 at the earliest. Moreover, the Administration still argues that the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty remains critically important to U.S. security. Senior officials have said that they will endeavor to negotiate changes in the Treaty with Russia to permit deployment of a nationwide defense. Many Members of Congress, however, oppose continued adherence to the ABM

Treaty as an unnecessary constraint. There also continues to be some debate in Congress about missile defense technology. Some legislators support a Heritage Foundation proposal to deploy a sea-based nationwide defense. Defense officials have said that such a system would be too costly. Also, a sea-based system would clearly be incompatible with continued adherence even to an amended version of the ABM Treaty.

Authorization and appropriations action: With the passage of H.R. 4, and its likely signature by the President, Congress has officially committed the nation to deploy a national missile defense (NMD) system, though the policy remains a matter of some contention. Theater Missile Defense (TMD) programs have been the main focus of debate in action on FY2000 defense funding bills. The Senate-passed authorization bill includes a legislative provision that rejects the Administration plan to combine the Navy Theater Wide and THAAD programs in the future, requiring, instead, that the programs remain separately funded. Both the House and the Senate bills add funds for PAC-3 system R&D and for international cooperative programs. The Senate authorization also adds funds for the related Space-Based Infrared System — High (SBIRS-High), while the House bill transfers most funding for SBIRS from the Air Force to the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization. These steps reflect congressional displeasure with Air Force plans to slow the SBIRS-High development program. The Senate authorization also mandates specific tests of the Airborne Laser system, a sign of the SASC's continued doubts about the program. **Table A4** in the Appendix provides a detailed list of missile defense programs, requested funding, and congressional action. In floor action, the Senate reduced funding for National Missile Defense by \$50 million from the SASC-approved level as an offset for F-15 procurement.

Military Action in Yugoslavia and Forces in Haiti

During the week of May 17, both the House and the Senate approved H.R. 1141, providing supplemental appropriations for military operations against Yugoslavia through the end of the fiscal year on September 30. DOD officials have said that the amounts provided in the bill will be sufficient to cover the costs of the 78 days of the air campaign plus peacekeeping costs through September 30, though money may have to be reprogrammed to reflect the changing nature of the military mission. The Administration has not provided revised estimates of the costs since the air campaign ended, nor has it yet provided estimates of possible future costs of Kosovo-related peacekeeping operations. Costs of U.S. participation in a peacekeeping mission could well exceed \$2 billion a year.

Authorization and appropriations action: The HASC version of the defense authorization included a controversial provision that would prohibit the use of any funds in the bill for operations in Yugoslavia and that would direct the Administration to request supplemental funds if operations continue into FY2000. There was extensive debate about this provision during the HASC markup of the bill, and opponents said they would offer a floor amendment to delete the provision. Subsequently, the White House sent a letter to the House Speaker explicitly threatening to veto the measure if it included the provision. The House Rules Committee then ordered the provision removed in the version

of the bill to be considered on the floor. Several Members opposed this decision, however, and their opposition was one factor in the leadership's decision to withdraw the proposed rule on May 27. Subsequently, the authorization was brought to the floor with a revised rule. On June 9 the House approved an amendment by Rep. Skelton to remove the provision, but only after the Speaker received a letter from the White House promising to seek additional supplemental funding for peacekeeping operations in Kosovo. Operations in Yugoslavia were also an issue in the Senate. In a key vote on May 25, by 52-48, the Senate tabled an amendment to the authorization bill by Senator Specter to direct the President to seek approval from Congress prior to the introduction of ground troops in Kosovo except for peacekeeping purposes. And in a second key vote on May 26, the Senate rejected by a margin of 77-22 an amendment by Senator Bob Smith to cut off funding for operations on Oct. 1, 1999, unless Congress authorizes continued spending. The House Appropriations Committee version of the defense appropriations bill provides \$1.8 billion for operations in the Persian Gulf and Bosnia, but the committee did not act on funding for Kosovo peacekeeping operations. The HAC funding is \$575 million below the request, reflecting, says the Committee report, the end of the Kosovo-related air operation and a slower pace of air operations over Iraq.

The U.S. troop presence in Haiti was also an issue in the House. On June 9, the House approved an amendment to the authorization bill by Rep. Goss prohibiting the continuous deployment of U.S. forces in Haiti.

Base Closures

This year the Defense Department has once again urged Congress to approve two more rounds of military base closures, one in 2001 and the second in 2005. Officials argue that cuts in the defense infrastructure have lagged far behind cuts in the size of the force, and that funding for major weapons programs in the future depends on improving efficiency over the next few years. For the past two years, Congress has rejected additional base closure rounds. In part, opponents have complained that the White House politicized the base closure process in 1995 when it acted to keep aircraft maintenance facilities in Texas and California open as privately run operations after the Base Closure Commission had recommended their closure.

Authorization and appropriations action: Neither the HASC nor the SASC version of the authorization approves additional base closures. SASC narrowly rejected an amendment in the committee markup by Senators Levin and McCain to establish one more round in 2001, and the full Senate rejected their amendment on May 26 by a vote of 60-40.

Major Weapons Programs and Military Service Unfunded Priorities Lists

The House Appropriations Committee version of the defense appropriations bill eliminates \$1.8 billion requested to procure six F-22 fighter aircraft, though it approves \$1.2 billion to continue F-22 development. The committee report provides

an extensive rationale for a “procurement pause” in the F-22 program -- that the Air Force has been financing the F-22 while suffering from severe and worsening shortfalls in many other areas; that the F-22 has been experiencing technical problems; that F-22 affordability is questionable, that costs have not been controlled, and that future cost growth is likely; that the United States has an overwhelming numerical advantage in advanced fighters without the F-22; and that there are many alternatives to the F-22, particularly upgrades of the current generation F-15. In lieu of F-22 procurement, the committee proposed increased funding for Air Force personnel recruitment and retention, for aircraft spare parts, for upgrades of a number of aircraft programs, and for procuring 8 F-15E aircraft, 5 additional F-16s, and 8 KC-130-J cargo aircraft for the Marine Corps. In statements to the press and in the full committee markup of the defense bill, subcommittee leaders expressed a hope that the F-22 decision will open a far-reaching discussion of long-term Air Force requirements and priorities. For its part, the Air Force has begun a vigorous defense of the F-22, arguing that even some currently available fighters in the world are more capable than the F-15, that some future aircraft will be more capable still, and that a temporary delay in F-22 procurement will increase program costs by \$6 billion if suppliers are forced to shut down and must restart production later. In the full committee, Rep. Kingston offered and then withdrew an amendment to restore F-22 procurement funds, and his amendment or a similar one may be proposed on the floor. Assuming the full House does not overturn the HAC decision, F-22 production will be a major issue in conference with the Senate.

Other weapons issues this year have been relatively muted. In response to a request from the House Armed Services Committee, each of the military service chiefs prepared a list of priority programs that are not funded in the Administration’s FY2000 request and FY2000-2005 plan. The unfunded priorities amount to \$8.7 billion in FY2000 and \$45 billion over the FY2000-2005 period.⁶ This total is somewhat higher than the \$36 billion in unfunded requests that senior civilian DOD officials acknowledged, reflecting changes since the budget review was completed. In recent years, Congress has used similar lists from the services as a guide in allocating additions to the Administration defense request. Of the \$8.7 billion total for FY2000, about \$3.9 billion is for weapons procurement and R&D, including about \$760 million for the Air Force, \$1.2 billion for the Army, \$960 million for the Navy, and \$940 million for the Marine Corps.

Authorization and appropriations action: Both HASC and SASC approved Administration funding requests for major tactical aircraft and ship-building programs largely intact. While both committees added some funds for R&D on B-2 bomber upgrades, these amounts were included in the Air Force list of unfunded priorities, and procurement of additional aircraft is no longer an issue.

There may be some controversy, however, about some proposed additions to the Administration request. In all SASC added \$2.9 billion for procurement and \$1.5 billion for R&D to the Administration request; HASC added \$2.6 billion for procurement and \$1.5 billion for R&D; and the Senate Appropriations Committee added \$2.7 billion for procurement and \$2.1 billion for R&D, though

⁶ The lists are reprinted in *Inside the Pentagon*, March 4, 1999, pp. 1, 12-23.

the procurement total was reduced by an unspecified amount to reflect funds provided in FY1999 supplemental appropriations bills. See **Tables A5 and A6** in the Appendix for a breakdown of committee action by title. Almost all of the major additions are for items that are on service priority lists or that are included in future service acquisition plans. All of the committees added funds for two programs that have been matters of some debate in the past, C-130J aircraft and LHD amphibious ship procurement. The Marine Corps included funds for two KC-130Js in its unfunded priorities list; the Senate authorization adds funds for two KC-130Js, the Senate appropriations adds funds for one KC-130J and one EC-130J, and the House authorization added funds for 4 KC-130Js. As noted, the HAC bill adds funds for 8 KC-130s.

The Senate provided \$375 million and the House \$15 million for advance procurement of a new LHD-1 class amphibious ship. This ship, LHD-8, is, however, included in the Navy's long-term shipbuilding plan for purchase in FY2005. The SASC approach, which Congress has used in the past, is to provide about 25% of the cost initially and the remainder next year. This will accelerate procurement and, according to proponents, could lower the cost of the ship, now estimated at about \$1.75 billion, by about \$200 million.

Other major additions include (1) funds for 9 additional UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters in the SASC bill and for 3 additional aircraft in the HASC bill and (2) funds for 2 additional V-22 tilt rotor aircraft for the Marine Corps in the SASC bill and for 1 more aircraft in the HASC bill. Significantly, neither the House nor the Senate version of the defense authorization endorses additional funds for F-15 aircraft procurement, but the Senate approved an amendment to the defense appropriations bill by Senator Bond to allocate \$220 million to purchase 4 F-15Es, and the HAC bill provides \$440 million for 8 F-15s. Initially, this became an issue because Boeing has announced plans to shut down the production line in St. Louis unless additional orders for the aircraft appear, either from foreign governments or from the Air Force.

In one of the few ongoing debates over major weapons programs other than the F-22, Senator Feingold offered two amendments to the defense authorization bill on the F/A-18 E/F program. One, to ensure compliance with contract specifications prior to the start of full-rate production, was approved by voice vote on May 27. A second amendment, to place a cost cap on the program, was rejected by a vote of 87-11 on May 27.

See **Table A-2** in the appendix for a summary of congressional action on selected major weapons programs.

Military Readiness

Perceived shortfalls in levels of military readiness have been a major impetus to Administration and congressional support for higher levels of defense spending. Secretary of Defense Cohen and all of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have acknowledged some readiness problems, including shortfalls in meeting recruiting targets; problems in retaining skilled personnel; shortages of spare parts, training munitions, and some other equipment; and, in general, strains caused by the ongoing

post-Cold War pace of military operations. There remains, however, much debate about the extent of the problems and the adequacy of Administration and congressional efforts to address them. One rationale for adding unrequested funding for pay and benefits and for military readiness to the Kosovo supplemental bill (H.R. 1141), was to provide encouragement to troops and to bolster readiness accounts beyond amounts likely to be available within constraints on discretionary spending in the 1997 budget agreement.

Authorization and appropriations action: In addition to some \$2.25 billion in the Kosovo supplemental for readiness-related budget accounts, both the HASC and the SASC authorization bills add more funds — HASC provides \$2.8 billion and SASC \$1.2 billion more for operation and maintenance (O&M) accounts than was requested. The Senate Appropriations Committee, however, approved an increase of just \$626 million in the FY2000 appropriations bill, and the total is to be reduced by amounts provided earlier in supplemental appropriations. In contrast, the HAC bill provides \$2.4 billion more than requested for O&M and does not propose an offset. The main readiness-related issue this year has been whether higher pay and benefits would adequately improve recruitment and retention. Considerable debate remains about the state of readiness and the likelihood that increased pay and benefits and added operating funds will solve underlying problems. Neither the House nor the Senate has systematically addressed factors that have led to a relatively high operational tempo in parts of the military force. Unresolved issues include whether and how to limit the number of overseas operations, forward presence requirements, and the organizational ability of each of the services to respond to post-Cold War deployments.

Cooperative Threat Reduction

The Administration requested \$475.5 million for the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program, which provides assistance to states of the former Soviet Union in safeguarding nuclear materials, dismantling missiles and other weapons, and in other demilitarization measures. Although the basic goals of the program have been widely supported, there have, in the past, been disputes about the size of the program, the pace of funding obligations, and particular programs to be funded. In general, the House has been more critical of the program than the Senate.

Authorization and appropriations action: SASC approved the Administration CTR request without change, though it trimmed funds for two related programs in the Department of Energy, cutting the Initiative for Proliferation Prevention from \$30 million to \$25 million, and the Nuclear Cities Initiative from \$30 million to \$15 million.. HASC reduced CTR funding for chemical weapons demilitarization assistance dramatically, providing \$24.6 million, \$105.8 million below the request. The CTR chemical weapons program, HASC said, should not be directed at the expensive task of destroying weapons stocks, but instead should support Russian efforts to ensure stockpile security. This mandate was based in large part on a General Accounting Office evaluation of the CTR

program.⁷ HASC also proposed language making into permanent law various restrictions on the program that have been inserted in annual bills, including prohibitions on the use of funds for peacekeeping, housing, environmental restoration, defense conversion, or job retraining. HAC followed the House authorization with one exception -- it proposed adding \$12 million for biological weapons proliferation prevention.

Strategic Nuclear Force Levels

In defense authorization bills since FY1996, Congress has included a prohibition on the retirement of strategic nuclear delivery systems below levels established by the START I treaty until Russia ratifies the START II agreement. While there has been some sentiment in the Defense Department for making further force reductions, the cost of maintaining START I force levels has been relatively modest, so there has been little opposition to the congressional mandate. This year, however, the Navy has requested permission to plan for a reduction from 18 to 14 Trident ballistic missile submarines in order to avoid costs of a refueling overhaul of the oldest vessels.

Authorization and appropriations action: The SASC bill includes a provision allowing a reduction in the number of deployed Trident submarines from 18 to 14, but the Senate rejected a floor amendment by Senator Kerrey to repeal the provision prohibiting the retirement of additional strategic nuclear forces until Russia ratifies the START II treaty. The HASC bill includes a provision that would permanently codify limits on the retirement of strategic systems unless START II is approved, but would allow the President some flexibility to reduce total force levels — the President would be allowed to restructure forces provided the total force includes at least 98% of the 6,000 warheads allowed by START I.

Emerging Threats

In recent years, more and more attention has been focused on new threats to U.S. security, and especially on challenges that may directly endanger the U.S. homeland. Earlier this year, the Senate Armed Services Committee established a new subcommittee on emerging threats and capabilities to focus on new challenges to U.S. security.

Authorization and appropriations action: SASC established a new budget account in the operation and maintenance title for “combatting terrorism.” The purpose of the account is to consolidate funding for counter-terrorism programs and increase their visibility. SASC provided \$1.954 billion for the account, adding about \$120 million to amounts requested in various other parts of the budget. HAC provided \$50 million extra for counter-terrorism programs in a general provision.

⁷ General Accounting Office, *Weapons of Mass Destruction: Effort to Reduce Russian Arsenals May Cost More, Achieve Less Than Planned*, Report Number NSIAD-99-76, Apr. 13, 1999.

Social Issues

Social issues, such as abortion, gays in the military, and the role of women in the armed forces, have frequently been matters of debate in defense funding bills in recent years. Last year, gender integrated training was a major issue. This year, a congressionally mandated commission recommended that each of the military services retain the authority to determine the level at which gender integrated training be carried out, and the report appears to have quelled debate.

Authorization and appropriations action: HASC approved a measure to permit abortions at military hospitals for women who are victims of rape or incest. An amendment during the markup, however, requires that women must have filed sexual abuse charges to make such a claim. Current law permits the use of appropriated funds for abortions only if the life of the woman is in danger. On May 26, the Senate rejected by 51-49 an amendment by Senators Murray and Snowe to repeal the current law that prohibits U.S. military health care facilities overseas from providing abortions for U.S. military personnel at private expense. On June 9, the House rejected a similar amendment by Rep. Meek.

China Policy

Last year, Congress included several measures in the defense authorization bill to limit technology transfers to China, including a provision transferring responsibility for reviewing licenses for satellite exports from the Commerce Department to the State Department. Policy toward China continues to be a matter of great concern in Congress, especially in view of recent evidence of Chinese spying at nuclear weapons labs. The House Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns, chaired by Rep. Cox, released its report publicly on May 25. The Committee recommends several measures to tighten restrictions on technology exports to China.

Authorization and appropriations action: The HASC bill included limits on military-to-military contacts with China and establishes a Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs at the National Defense University. The SASC bill included measures to tighten security at Department of Energy labs. Several significant amendments were proposed to the authorization bills in both the House and the Senate in the wake of the Cox committee report. On May 27, the Senate approved a Lott amendment to increase monitoring of the export of advanced satellite technology, to require annual reports about Chinese military capabilities against Taiwan, and to further strengthen security and counterintelligence at Department of Energy facilities. The House added several amendments, including a Cox/Dicks amendment codifying improvements in DOD security and counterintelligence programs and a DeLay amendment limiting the substance of U.S.-China military-to-military contacts. The House rejected a Ryun amendment that would have imposed a two-year moratorium on the DOD foreign visitors programs. Significantly, Rep. Spence did not offer an amendment that the Administration strongly opposed to transfer responsibility over nuclear weapons programs from the Department of Energy to the Department of Defense. Oversight of DOE weapons programs remains a major,

unresolved issue, however, and conferees on the authorization bill may take further action on the matter.

Legislation

Budget Resolution

H.Con.Res. 68 (Kasich)

A concurrent resolution 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. Ordered to be reported, March 18, 1999, and reported by the House Budget Committee (H.Rept. 106-73), March 23, 1999. Approved by the House (221-208), March 25, 1999.

S.Con.Res. 20 (Domenici)

An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 2000 through 2009. Reported by the Senate Budget Committee (S.Rept. 106-27), March 19, 1999. Approved by the Senate, with amendments, (55-44), March 25, 1999.

Missile Defense

H.R. 4 (Weldon)

A bill to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense. Reported by the House Armed Services Committee, (H.Rept. 106-39, Part I) and discharged from the House Committee on International Relations, March 2, 1999. Approved by the House (317-105), March 18, 1999. Senate took up H.R. 4 and substituted the text of S. 257, May 18, 1999. House approved the bill as amended by the Senate (345-17), May 20, 1999.

S. 257 (Cochran)

A bill entitled, "The Cochran-Inouye National Missile Defense Act of 1999," stating that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a nationwide missile defense as soon as technically feasible. Reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee (S.Rept. 106-4), February 13, 1999. Considered in the Senate, March 11, 15, 16, and 17, 1999, and approved, with amendments (97-3), March 17, 1999. Senate took up H.R. 4 and substituted the text of S. 257, May 18, 1999.

Supplemental Appropriations

H.R. 1141 (Young, C.W. Bill)

A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. Reported by the Committee on Appropriations (H.Rept. 106-64), March 17, 1999. Approved by the House. Senate called up the bill, substituted the text of S. 544, and passed the amended bill (by unanimous consent), March 25, 1999. Conference report filed (H.Rept. 106-143), May 14, 1999. House agreed to conference report (269-158), May 18, 1999. Senate agreed to conference report (64-36), May 20, 1999.

S. 544 (Stevens)

A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions for recovery from natural disasters, and foreign assistance, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. Reported by the Committee on Appropriations (S.Rept. 106-8), March 4, 1999. Considered in the Senate, March 17, 18, 19, 22, and 23, 1999. Approved by the Senate, March 23, 1999. Senate took up H.R. 1141, substituted the text of S. 544, and passed H.R. 1411, as amended, March 25, 1999.

H.R. 1664 (Young, C.W. Bill)

A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for military operations, refugee relief, and humanitarian assistance relating to the conflict in Kosovo, and for military operations in Southwest Asia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. Reported by the Appropriations Committee (H.Rept. 106-125), May 4, 1999. Passed by the House, with amendments (311-105), May 6, 1999.

Defense Authorization**H.R. 1401 (Spence)**

Authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes. Ordered to be reported by the House Armed Services Committee (H.Rept. 106-162), May 19, 1999. Rules Committee Resolution, H. Res. 195, reported to the House but then withdrawn, May 27, 1999.

S. 1059 (Warner)

Authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes. Ordered to be reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee, May 13, 1999. Report filed (S.Rept. 106-50), May 17, 1999. Considered by the Senate, May 24, 25, 26, and 27, 1999. Approved by the Senate, with amendments (92-3), May 27, 1999.

Defense Appropriations**S. 1122 (Stevens)**

A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. Ordered to be reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (S.Rept. 106-53), May 25, 1999. Considered by the Senate, June 7-8, 1999. Approved by the Senate, as amended (93-4), June 8, 1999.

H.R. 2561 (Lewis, Jerry)

A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. Ordered to be reported by the House Appropriations Committee (H.Rept. 106-244), July 16, 1999.

For Additional Reading

CRS Issue Briefs

CRS Issue Brief 98018. *China-U.S. Relations*, by Kerry B. Dumbaugh.

CRS Issue Brief 10022. *Defense Research: DOD's Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Program*, by John D. Moteff.

CRS Issue Brief 97002. *The Department of Energy's Tritium Production Program*, by Richard E. Rowberg.

CRS Issue Brief 92035. *F/A-18E/F Aircraft Program*, by Bert H. Cooper.

CRS Issue Brief 87111. *F-22 Aircraft Program*, by Bert H. Cooper.

CRS Issue Brief 98041. *Kosovo and U.S. Policy*, by Steven Woehrel and Julie Kim.

CRS Issue Brief IB10027. *Kosovo: U.S. and Allied Military Operations*, by Steven Bowman.

CRS Issue Brief 93103. *Military Medical Care Services: Questions and Answers*, by Richard A. Best.

CRS Issue Brief 85159. *Military Retirement: Major Legislative Issues*, by Robert L. Goldich.

CRS Issue Brief IB10034. *National Missile Defense: Issues for Congress*, by Steven A. Hildreth and Amy Woolf.

CRS Issue Brief 92115. *Tactical Aircraft Modernization: Issues for Congress*, by Bert H. Cooper.

CRS Issue Brief 98028. *Theater Missile Defense: Issues for Congress*, by Robert D. Shuey.

CRS Issue Brief 86103. *V-22 Osprey Tilt-rotor Aircraft*, by Bert H. Cooper.

CRS Issue Brief 81050. *War Powers Resolution: Presidential Compliance*, by Richard F. Grimmett.

CRS Reports

CRS Report RL30056. *Appropriations Supplemental for FY1999: Emergency Funding in P.L. 105-277 for Agriculture, Embassy Security, Y2K Problems, Defense, and Other Issues*, by Larry Q. Nowels.

CRS Report 97-719. *The Army Reserve Components: Strength and Force Structure Issues*, by Robert L. Goldich.

- CRS Report RS20031. *China and U.S. Missile Defense Proposals: Reactions and Implications*, by Robert G. Sutter.
- CRS Report 97-933. *China: Major Legislation in the 105th Congress*, by Kerry B. Dumbaugh.
- CRS Report 98-802. *China: Recent Policy Priorities -- Implications for U.S. Interests and Policy Goals*, by Robert G. Sutter.
- CRS Report RL30220. *China's Technology Acquisitions: Cox Committee's Report -- Findings, Issues, and Recommendations*, by Shirley A. Kan.
- CRS Report 95-1126. *Congressional Use of Funding Cutoffs since 1970 Involving U.S. Military Forces Withdrawals from Overseas Deployments*, by Richard F. Grimmett.
- CRS Report 98-756. *Defense Authorization and Appropriations Bills: A Chronology, FY1970-1999*, by Gary K. Reynolds.
- CRS Report RL30061. *Defense Budget for FY2000: Data Summary*, by Mary Tyszkiewicz and Stephen Daggett.
- CRS Report RL30002. *A Defense Budget Primer*, by Mary Tyszkiewicz and Stephen Daggett.
- CRS Report 97-316. *Defense Research: A Primer on the Department of Defense's Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) Program*, by John D. Moteff.
- CRS Report 98-873. *Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccination Program*, by Steven R. Bowman.
- CRS Report RS20203. *The Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative for the Former Soviet Union: Administration Proposals for FY2000*, by Amy Woolf and Curt Tarnoff.
- CRS Report RL30172. *Instances of Use of United States Armed Forces Abroad, 1798-1999*, by Richard F. Grimmett.
- CRS Report RS20125. *Kosovo: Issues and Options for U.S. Policy*, by Steven J. Woehrel.
- CRS Report RS20161. *Kosovo Military Operations: Costs and Congressional Action on Funding*, by Stephen Daggett.
- CRS Report 95-409. *Long-range Bomber Facts: Background Information*, by Jason Woolwine and Dagnija Sterste-Perkins.
- CRS Report RL30051. *Military Base Closures: Time for Another Round?*, by David E. Lockwood.

CRS Report 98-823. *Military Contingency Funding for Bosnia, Southwest Asia, and Other Operations: Questions and Answers*, by Nina M. Serafino.

CRS Report RL30184. *Military Interventions by U.S. Forces from Vietnam to Bosnia: Background, Outcomes, and "Lessons Learned" for Kosovo*, by Nina M. Serafino.

CRS Report 98-764. *Military Pilot Retention: Issues and Options*, by Michael C. Ryan.

CRS Report 97-866. *Military Readiness: Background to Congressional Debate over Tiered Readiness*, by Michael A. Longoria and Michael C. Ryan.

CRS Report 98-41. *Military Readiness, Operations Tempo (Optempo) and Personnel Tempo (Perstempo): Are U.S. Forces Doing Too Much?*, by Michael C. Ryan.

CRS Report 98-765. *Military Youth Programs: ChalleNGe and STARBASE*, by Lawrence Kapp.

CRS Report 98-751. *Missile Defense: Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) Flight Testing*, by Steven A. Hildreth.

CRS Report 98-955. *National Guard & Reserve Funding, FY1990-1999*, by Mary Tyszkiewicz.

CRS Report RS20062. *National Missile Defense and the ABM Treaty: Overview of Recent Events*, by Amy F. Woolf.

CRS Report 97-862. *National Missile Defense: Status of the Debate*, by Robert D. Shuey.

CRS Report RS20052. *National Missile Defense: The Alaska Option*, by Steven A. Hildreth.

CRS Report RL30045. *Navy Attack Submarine Programs: Background and Issues for Congress*, by Ronald O'Rourke.

CRS Report 98-359. *Navy CVN-77 and CVX Aircraft Carrier Programs: Background and Issues for Congress*, by Ronald O'Rourke.

CRS Report 97-700. *Navy DD-21 Land Attack Destroyer Program: Background Information and Issues for Congress*, by Ronald O'Rourke.

CRS Report 97-981. *Navy/DoD Projected Long-range (FY2004-FY2015) Ship Procurement Rate: Background and Issues for Congress*, by Ronald O'Rourke.

CRS Report 97-1027. *Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs: Issues for Congress*, by Amy F. Woolf.

CRS Report RL30231. *Technology Transfer to China: An Overview of the Cox Committee Investigation Regarding Satellites, Computers, and DOE Laboratory Management*, by Marcia Smith, Glenn McLoughlin, and William Boesman.

CRS Report 98-767. *U.S. Military Participation in Southwest Border Drug Control: Questions and Answers*, by Nina M. Serafino.

Other Resources

Congressional Budget Office, *An Analysis of the President's Budgetary Proposals for Fiscal Year 2000: A Preliminary Report*, March 1999.

Congressional Budget Office, "Military Pay and Benefits," Statement of Christopher Jehn, Assistant Director National Security Division, before the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, February 25, 1999.

Congressional Budget Office, "Modernizing Tactical Aircraft," Statement of Christopher Jehn Assistant Director National Security Division before the Subcommittee on Airland Forces, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, March 10, 1999.

Congressional Budget Office, *Paying for Military Readiness and Upkeep: Trends in Operation and Maintenance Spending*, by Amy Belasco, September 1997.

Congressional Budget Office, *Review of "The Report of the Department of Defense on Base Realignment and Closure"*, July 1998.

U.S. General Accounting Office, *DOD Competitive Sourcing: Questions About Goals, Pace, and Risks of Key Reform Initiative*, Report No. NSIAD-99-46, Feb. 22, 1999.

U.S. General Accounting Office, *F-22 Aircraft: Issues in Achieving Engineering and Manufacturing Development Goals*, Report No. NSIAD-99-55, Mar. 15, 1999.

U.S. General Accounting Office, *Future Years Defense Program: How Savings From Reform Initiatives Affect DOD's 1999-2003 Program*, Report No. NSIAD-99-66, Feb. 25, 1999.

U.S. General Accounting Office, "Military Retirement: Proposed Changes Warrant Careful Analysis," testimony of Mark E. Gebicke, Director of Military Operations and Capabilities Issues, before the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, House Committee on Armed Services, Report No. T-NSIAD-99-94, Feb. 25, 1999.

Selected World Wide Web Sites

Information regarding the defense budget, defense programs, and congressional action on defense policy is available at the following web or gopher sites.

Congressional Sites/OMB

House Committee on Appropriations
[<http://www.house.gov/appropriations>]

Senate Committee on Appropriations
[<http://www.senate.gov/~appropriations/enter.htm>]

House Armed Services Committee
[<http://www.house.gov/hasc/>]

Senate Armed Services Committee
[http://www.senate.gov/~armed_services/]

CRS FY2000 Appropriations Products
[<http://www.loc.gov/crs/products/apppage.html>]

Congressional Budget Office
[<http://www.cbo.gov>]

General Accounting Office
[<http://www.gao.gov>]

Office of Management & Budget
[<http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/EOP/OMB/html/ombhome.html>]

FY2000 Federal Budget Publications
[http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/budget/index.html]

Defense Department and Related Sites

Defense LINK
[<http://www.defenselink.mil/>]

Defense Issues (Indexed major speeches)
[<http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/>]

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) FY2000 Budget Materials
[<http://www.dtic.mil/comptroller/FY2000budget/>]

Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management & Comptroller) Budget
[<http://www.asafm.army.mil/budget.htm>]

Army Link — the U.S. Army Home Page
[<http://www.army.mil/>]

Navy On-Line Home Page
[\[http://www.navy.mil/index-real.html\]](http://www.navy.mil/index-real.html)

Navy Budget Resources Directory
[\[http://navweb.secnaw.navy.mil/budget\]](http://navweb.secnaw.navy.mil/budget)

Navy Public Affairs Library
[\[http://www.navy.mil/navpalib/.www/subject.html\]](http://www.navy.mil/navpalib/.www/subject.html)

United States Marine Corps Home Page
[\[http://www.usmc.mil/\]](http://www.usmc.mil/)

AirForceLINK
[\[http://www.af.mil/\]](http://www.af.mil/)

Air Force Financial Management Home Page
[\[http://www.saffm.hq.af.mil/SAFFM/\]](http://www.saffm.hq.af.mil/SAFFM/)

Appendix A: Summary Tables

Table A1. Defense Appropriations, FY1996 to FY2000
 (budget authority in billions of current year dollars)^a

Actual FY1996	Actual FY1997	Actual FY1998	Estimate FY1999	Request FY2000
242.6	244.3	250.7	255.0	262.9

Sources: Office of Management and Budget, *Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2000*, Feb. 1999, and prior years.

^a. These figures represent current year dollars, exclude permanent budget authorities and contract authority, and reflect subsequent rescissions and transfers.

Table A2: Congressional Action on Major Weapons Programs: FY2000 Authorization and Appropriations
(amounts in millions of dollars)

	FY1999 Estimate			FY2000 Request			House Authorization			Senate Authorization			House Appropriations			Senate Appropriations		
	#	Proc.	R&D	#	Proc.	R&D	#	Proc.	R&D	#	Proc.	R&D	#	Proc.	R&D	#	Proc.	R&D
Army																		
Apache Longbow Upgrade	--	608.9	--	--	765.2	--	--	810.2	--	--	810.2	--	--	810.2	--	--	753.5	--
Comanche Helicopter	--	--	364.8	--	--	427.1	--	--	427.1	--	--	483.1	--	--	427.1	--	--	483.1
Blackhawk Helicopter	29	271.6	--	8	102.8	--	11	129.5	--	17	192.8	31.4	19	223.8	--	19	223.8	15.0
M1A2 Abrams Tank Upgrade	120	683.0	9.4	120	636.4	12.1	120	636.4	12.1	na	664.0	12.1	120	636.4	20.1	120	636.4	26.5
Bradley FVS Base Sustainment	--	363.2	70.4	--	336.4	3.2	--	415.5	3.2	--	417.7	3.2	--	420.4	3.2	--	342.4	3.2
Crusader	--	--	313.6	--	--	343.9	--	--	343.9	--	--	--	--	--	343.9	--	--	343.9
Navy/Marine Corps																		
AV-8B Harrier Aircraft	12	333.8	30.8	12	291.3	38.6	12	291.3	38.6	12	291.3	38.6	12	291.3	38.6	12	291.3	38.6
F/A-18E/F Hornet	30	2,870.6	206.5	36	2,854.2	142.6	36	2,854.2	142.6	36	2,854.2	142.6	36	2,854.2	182.6	36	2,858.2	142.6
V-22 Osprey Aircraft	7	683.9	345.8	10	916.9	182.9	11	1,016.9	182.9	12	1,039.9	182.9	11	976.9	182.9	12	1,039.9	191.9
DDG-51 Destroyer	3	2,659.0	155.9	3	2,681.7	176.0	3	2,681.7	176.0	3	2,681.7	176.0	3	2,681.7	176.0	3	2,681.7	176.0
New Attack Submarine (NSSN)	1	1,995.5	358.4	--	748.5	357.2	--	753.5	382.2	--	748.5	367.2	--	748.5	367.2	--	748.5	367.2
LPD-17 Amphibious Transport	1	636.9	1.3	2	1,508.3	2.6	2	1,508.3	2.6	2	1,508.3	2.6	2	1,508.3	2.6	2	1,508.3	2.6
LHD-8 Advance Procurement	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	15.0	--	1	375.0	--	--	--	--	--	500.0	--
ADC(X) Auxiliary Cargo Ship	--	--	--	1	440.0	--	1	440.0	--	1	440.0	--	1	440.0	--	1	440.0	--
Air Force																		
B-2 Bomber Post-Production	--	238.6	131.0	--	167.4	201.8	--	202.4	353.8	--	167.4	238.8	--	136.0	344.2	--	167.4	238.8
C-17 Airlift Aircraft	13	1,891.0	118.2	15	3,385.0	170.7	15	3,388.5	170.7	15	3,385.0	170.7	15	2,972.7	--	15	3,385.0	170.7
C-130 Aircraft (incl. other services)	7	493.5	--	--	42.9	--	4	294.9	--	2	226.9	--	8	774.8	43.6	2	219.8	--
E-8C Joint Stars Aircraft	2	495.5	100.5	1	280.3	130.5	1	326.3	160.5	1	326.3	185.7	2	468.5	162.0	1	326.3	130.5
F-15 Aircraft	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	375.0	--	8	440.0	152.7	4	220.0	--
F-16 Aircraft	1	67.0	139.6	10	282.6	112.5	10	280.1	112.5	10	282.6	126.9	15	404.6	127.5	12	356.6	118.5
F-22 Aircraft	2	769.1	1,571.0	6	1,852.1	1,222.2	6	1,852.1	1,222.2	6	1,852.1	1,222.2	0	0.0	1,222.2	6	1,852.1	1,222.2
Joint/Defense-Wide																		
Airborne Laser (AF)	--	--	257.3	--	--	308.6	--	--	308.6	--	--	308.6	--	--	308.6	--	--	308.6
Joint Strike Fighter (AF, Navy)	--	--	923.3	--	--	476.9	--	--	506.9	--	--	491.9	--	--	576.6	--	--	491.6
Ballistic Missile Defense (BMDO)	--	311.4	3,294.3	--	355.9	2,944.5	--	300.9	3,311.0	--	415.9	3,283.6	--	355.9	2,970.0	--	360.9	3,405.6
Space-Based Infrared System (AF)	--	--	731.6	--	--	557.7	--	--	557.7	--	--	649.7	--	--	557.7	--	--	699.7
Guard & Reserve Equipment*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	60.0	--	--	--	--	--	130.0	--	--	--	300.0

*Notes: All amounts exclude initial spares and military construction. For Ballistic Missile Defense, the military construction request is \$1.4 million, which is often reported as part of the total elsewhere. For a full breakdown of Ballistic Missile Defense funding, see **Table A4**.

**Table A3: National Defense Budget Function by Appropriations Title
Under Administration Projections**
(budget authority, current year dollars in billions)

	Est. FY1999	Proj. FY2000	Proj. FY2001	Proj. FY2002	Proj. FY2003	Proj. FY2004	Proj. FY2005
Military Personnel	70.9	73.7	76.3	78.4	80.9	83.7	86.7
Operation & Maintenance	98.1	103.5	103.9	105.0	107.8	111.2	114.4
Procurement	49.0	53.0	61.8	62.3	66.6	69.2	75.1
RDT&E	36.6	34.4	34.3	34.7	34.5	35.0	34.2
Military Construction	5.1	2.3	7.1	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.8
Family Housing	3.6	3.1	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.9
Other	-0.7	-2.9	-0.8	0.1	0.9	0.1	-0.3
Subtotal, DOD	262.6	267.2	286.4	288.3	298.7	307.6	318.9
Atomic Energy Defense Activities	12.5	12.4	12.9	12.9	12.9	12.8	12.8
Other Defense-Related Activities	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3
Total, National Defense	276.2	280.8	300.5	302.4	312.8	321.7	333.0

Source: FY1999-2004 from Office of Management and Budget, *Historical Tables: Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2000*, Feb. 1999; FY2005 from Department of Defense.

Table A4: Ballistic Missile Defense Funding

(millions of dollars)

	FY1999 Est.	FY2000 Req.	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Con- ference Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Con- ference Approp.
Procurement								
Patriot PAC-3	245.5	300.9	300.9	360.9	--	300.9	360.9	--
TMD Battle-Management & C3	22.8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Navy Area Defense	43.2	55.0	0.0	55.0	--	55.0	0.0	--
TOTAL Procurement	311.5	355.9	300.9	415.9	--	355.9	360.9	--
RDT&E:								
Applied Research								
62173C Support Technologies	97.4	65.3	95.3	84.3	--	80.3	90.3	--
Advanced Technology Development								
63173C Support Technologies	272.8	173.7	198.7	213.7	--	196.3	215.7	--
Demonstration and Validation								
63861C THAAD Dem/Val	433.9	34.1	34.1	19.1	--	527.9	527.9	--
63868C Navy Theater Wide	364.3	329.8	329.8	449.8	--	419.8	379.8	--
63869C MEADS Concepts	9.9	48.6	48.6	48.6	--	0.0	48.6	--
63870C Boost Phase Intercept	6.4	--	--	--	--	--	20.0	--
63871C National Missile Defense*	1,533.5	836.6	835.9	836.6	--	761.6	986.6	--
63872C Joint Theater Missile Defense	200.1	195.7	195.7	200.7	--	200.7	215.7	--
63873C Family of Systems Eng. & Integration	95.7	141.8	141.8	141.8	--	141.8	136.8	--
63874C BMD Technical Operations	184.8	190.7	200.7	193.7	--	200.7	193.7	--
63875C International Cooperative Programs	58.9	36.7	61.7	51.7	--	36.7	78.7	--
63876C Threat and Countermeasures	23.3	16.5	16.5	16.6	--	16.5	20.5	--
63xxxC Space-Based Infrared Architecture	--	--	110.0	--	--	--	--	--
Engineering & Manufacturing Development								
64218C Upper Tier	--	--	90.0	--	--	--	--	--
64861C THAAD EMD	--	577.5	472.5	577.5	--	0.0	0.0	--
64865C Patriot PAC-3 EMD	320.8	29.1	77.6	181.1	--	77.6	181.1	--
64867C Navy Area Defense EMD	242.6	268.4	323.4	268.4	--	310.2	310.2	--
64xxxC Space-Based Infrared System -- High	--	--	168.7	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL RDT&E	3,844.6	2,944.4	3,401.0	3,283.5	--	2,970.0	3,405.6	--
Military Construction	10.0	1.4	1.4	1.4	--	1.4	1.4	--
TOTAL Ballistic Missile Defense Organization	4,166.1	3,301.7	3,703.3	3,700.8	--	3,335.9	3,767.9	--
Related Programs								
12419A Aerostat Joint Project Office	14.6	24.9	24.9	24.9	--	24.9	24.9	--
63319F Airborne Laser Program	265.7	308.6	308.6	308.6	--	308.6	308.6	--
63876F Space-Based Laser	--	63.8	63.8	88.8	--	35.0	73.8	--
63441F Space-Based Infrared Architecture	--	151.4	41.4	151.4	--	0.0	151.4	--
64441F Space-Based Infrared System -- High	539.4	328.7	160.0	420.7	--	328.7	420.7	--
64442F Space-Based Infrared System -- Low	33.2	77.7	77.7	77.7	--	229.0	127.7	--

Sources: Department of Defense, *RDT&E Programs (R-1): Fiscal Year 2000*, February 1999; S.Rept. 106-50; H.Rept. 106-162; S.Rept. 106-53.

Notes: *NMD total for FY1999 includes \$1 billion in supplemental funding provided in the Omnibus Appropriations Act for FY1999 (P.L. 105-277). These funds will actually be allocated over 3 years, through FY2001. Senate total for NMD reflects a \$50 million reduction in a floor amendment.

Table A5: Congressional Action on Defense Authorization by Title
(budget authority in millions of dollars)

	HASC	HASC	Versus	SASC	SASC	Versus
	Request*	Auth.	Request	Request*	Auth.	Request
Military Personnel*	73,723.3	72,115.4	-1,607.9	73,723.3	73,531.1	-192.2
Operation & Maintenance	103,532.4	106,343.4	+2,811.0	103,548.4	104,721.7	+1,173.3
Procurement	53,020.5	55,598.5	+2,578.0	53,020.5	55,949.4	+2,928.9
Research & Development	34,375.2	35,835.7	+1,460.5	34,375.2	35,839.7	+1,464.5
Military Construction	2,298.2	4,963.5	+2,665.3	2,322.8	5,150.7	+2,827.9
Family Housing	3,140.2	3,626.8	+486.5	3,115.7	3,638.7	+523.0
Revolving & Management Funds	388.0	396.0	+8.0	372.0	340.0	-32.0
Offsetting Receipts	-1,888.0	-1,888.0	0.0	-1,888.0	-1,888.0	0.0
Allowance for Rescissions	-1,650.0	-1,650.0	0.0	-1,650.0	0.0	+1,650.0
Total Department of Defense	266,939.9	275,341.3	+8,401.3	266,939.9	277,283.3	+10,343.4
Dept. of Energy Defense-Related	12,360.4	12,284.8	-75.5	12,360.4	12,190.4	-170.0
Defense-Related Activities	1,222.3	1,172.7	-49.6	1,222.3	1,172.7	-49.6
Kosovo Supplemental Offset*					-1,838.0	-1,838.0
Total National Defense	280,522.6	288,798.7	+8,276.2	280,522.6	288,808.3	+8,285.8

Sources: H.Rept. 106-162; S.Rept. 106-50.

***Notes:** Request is shown differently by each committee, but in each case reflects the Congressional Budget Office reestimate of the Administration proposal. HASC included a \$1.838 billion offset from the Kosovo supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 1141, P.L. 106-31) in the Military Personnel account, while SASC showed the offset separately. Amounts do not reflect floor action.

Table A6: Congressional Action on Defense Appropriations by Title
(budget authority in millions of dollars)

	FY1999		HAC	Versus	Senate	Versus
	Enacted	Request*	Approp.	Request	Approp.	Request
Military Personnel	70,607.6	73,723.3	72,012.0	-1,711.3	73,855.1	+131.8
Operation & Maintenance*	84,042.8	91,268.2	93,688.8	+2,420.5	91,894.3	+626.1
Procurement	48,590.4	51,851.5	53,031.4	+1,179.9	54,532.0	+2,680.5
Research & Development	36,756.7	34,375.2	37,167.6	+2,792.4	36,455.7	+2,080.5
Revolving & Management Funds	802.9	512.0	820.0	+308.0	512.0	0.0
Defense Health & Other*	11,797.7	12,932.6	12,884.0	-48.6	13,262.0	+329.4
Related Agencies	358.6	381.5	376.5	-5.0	401.5	+20.0
General Provisions*	-2,436.1	-1,778.5	-1,318.6	+459.9	-6,219.6	-4,441.1
Total Department of Defense	250,520.5	263,266.0	268,661.7	+5,395.7	264,693.0	+1,427.1

Sources: S.Rept. 106-53. House Appropriations Committee, "Committee Print" of bill report, July 16, 1999.

***Notes:** Request reflects the Congressional Budget Office reestimate of the Administration proposal. SAC general provisions include offsets from FY1999 supplemental appropriations of \$1.838 billion applied to the military personnel account and \$3.1 billion applied to the operation and maintenance and procurement accounts. The amounts shown for the operation and maintenance account in the appropriations bills differ from amounts shown in the authorization bills because of several differences in where funding for various programs is provided in the bills. The main difference is that the appropriations bills show funding for defense health in a separate title, while the authorization bills include defense health funding in operation and maintenance.