consideration of the bill H.R. 2126 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 205 shall also be governed by the following order:

Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the following amendments—identified by their designation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII—each of which may be considered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member—or one of the Members—specified, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, may amend portions of the bill previously amended, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable as specified, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and shall not otherwise be in order during further consideration of the bill for amendment: One of the amendments numbered 10, 11, 18, 34, or 56, by Representative KASICH or Representative OBEY, to be debatable for 60 minutes, with 10 minutes controlled by Representative KASICH, 10 minutes controlled by Representative DELLUMS, 10 minutes controlled by Representative OBEY, 15 minutes controlled by Representative DICKS, and 15 minutes controlled by Representative YOUNG of Florida; one or more of the amendments numbered 37, 58, 59, or 61, by Representative OBEY, to be debatable in the aggregate for not more than 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and one of the amendments numbered 3 or 15, by Representative DORNAN, together with the amendment numbered 48 as a substitute therefor, by Representative DELAURO, to be jointly debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by Representatives DORNAN and DELAURO.

□ 1115

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 205 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2126.

□ 1116

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. SENSENBRENNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, July 31, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] had been disposed of and title III was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further consideration of the bill for amendment in Committee of the Whole may not exceed 5 hours, exclusive of time consumed by recorded votes and proceedings incidental thereto.

Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the following amendments—identified by their designation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII—each of which may be considered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member—or one of the Members—specified, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, may amend portions of the bill previously amended, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable as specified, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and shall not otherwise be in order during further consideration of the bill for amendment: One of the amendments numbered 10, 11, 18, 34, or 56, by Representative KASICH or Representative OBEY, to be debatable for 60 minutes, with 10 minutes controlled by Representative KASICH, 10 minutes controlled by Representative DELLUMS, 10 minutes controlled by Representative OBEY, 15 minutes controlled by Representative DICKS, and 15 minutes controlled by Representative YOUNG of Florida; one or more of the amendments numbered 37, 58, 59, or 61, by Representative OBEY, to be debatable in the aggregate for not more than 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and one of the amendments numbered 3 or 15, by Representative DORNAN, together with the amendment numbered 48 as a substitute therefor, by Representative DELAURO, to be jointly debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Representatives DORNAN and DELAURO.

Are there any amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KASICH

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KASICH: Page 23, line 17, strike ''$7,162,603,000'' and insert ''$6,669,603,000''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement previously agreed to, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 10 minutes, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 10 minutes, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 10 minutes, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Well, we have been through this so many times now, it is kind of hard to bring additional facts to the table, but it seems as though every day we turn around in regard to the B–2 bomber there is another interesting development.

In this morning's Wall Street Journal, the head of the Air Force procurement program, the Air Force general in charge of the procurement programs for the Air Force, so Members of Congress, if you are concerned about the C–17, if you are concerned about any of the acquisition programs of the Air Force, General Muellner, said despite the wishes of many in Congress, quote, the Air Force cannot afford to buy more than 20 B–2 stealth bombers. The bottom line is the budget will not support it, he said. I really believe that.

I mean when we have no one in the Pentagon that wants this airplane, when we have the General Accounting Office talking about the performance problems and performance issues associated with the aircraft, when the cost of the airplane is not affordable, and I ask Members how they can go home and defend the billion dollar airplane while at the same time we are trying to squeeze savings out of this Federal budget, and at a time when the mission of this airplane, which was to invade the Soviet Union in the middle of the nuclear war is over, how the heck can we go forward and tell the Pentagon to buy more?

I will say to my Republican colleagues one of the criticisms that many I have encountered over the break is how is it that we want to squeeze down funding for certain programs but yet we want the Pentagon to spend $7 billion more than what they have asked for. Now, some people say that generals do not tell the truth any more, that they are all political. Well, it is interesting, in the last administration the generals' words were good. Now the generals are all political.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit to Members that as one who has questioned aggressively the brass in the Pentagon and the civilians in the Pentagon, I have never yet seen the Pentagon come to Capitol Hill and ask for less spending. It blows my mind that the Pentagon could come and ask for less spending and we keep telling them we know better.

When the general in charge of acquisition for all the major weapon systems for the Air Force says we do not want the plane, we cannot afford the plane, folks, it is time to come to the floor and make a big chop out of the stack of wood labeled corporate welfare and adopt this amendment and abide by the

agreement we made several years ago to limit this plane at 20.

The issue that if you have the B–2 you will not need these other planes to carry out the mission is an argument that is also beyond my understanding for this reason. No one is suggesting we retire the F–15's or the F–16's. No one is suggesting that that whole list of aircraft that are supposed to be used will not be used or be retired. In fact, there are additional costs associated with the B–2, including the cost of forward funding, protecting the planes, additional tankers.

Mr. Chairman, the simple fact of the matter is, in a nutshell, and it is kind of hard to lay much more out there, if the guys in the Pentagon, if the guys in the field who are running the military of the United States do not want this plane, if the Pentagon does not want it, if the mission has evaporated, if we are in tough budget times, now is the time to live up to the deal and limit the acquisition to 20. Support the Kasich-Dellums-Obey amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I want to speak against the amendment. On January 4, 1995, seven former Secretaries of Defense, Mel Laird, Jim Schlesinger, Donald Rumsfeld, Harold Brown, Caspar Weinberger, Frank Carlucci, and Dick Cheney wrote the President of the United States a letter and said in their experience that stopping the B–2 at 20 was a serious mistake in judgment.

I think those seven former Secretaries of Defense, six of which were Republicans, and Harold Brown, who was the man who started this program, should be given serious consideration by this Congress. This line is open now. If we could procure the planes now, we can save the taxpayers a considerable amount of money.

Mr. Chairman, this is the most important defense issue that we are going to consider in this decade. The F–117 stealth attack aircraft worked effectively in the gulf. It showed that we could operate autonomously without support aircraft. The B–2 is a bigger and better version of that aircraft.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes and 30 seconds.

Members, I find this whole debate absolutely mind boggling. For the last month, the Congress has passed appropriation bill after appropriation bill and we have cut education, we have cut student loans, we have cut low-income heating assistance programs for poverty-ridden senior citizens, we have cut science budgets, we have cut virally everything you can think of on the domestic side of the ledger, and yet some of the same people who enthusiastically embraced those cuts are now saying, oh, but we have to have more spending on this turkey of a B–2 bomber.

We are now being asked to spend money to buy more B–2's than the Pentagon itself is asking for, more than the President is asking for, and we are told that because some former Secretaries of Defense would like us to buy some of these toys, that we ought to do it. I would suggest the right people to ask are not former Secretaries of Defense but the former Directors of the Office of Management and Budget, because I will bet you, if you ask any of them, they will tell you that we simply cannot afford this plane, either militarily or fiscally.

Now, we can get into all of the discussions we want about whether or not this money would be better spent on the domestic side of the ledger than the defense side of the ledger. Let us say it is not going to be. I would submit that we still have to face the fact, and this Congress must face the fact, that we cannot afford to buy the items that we are already promising to buy in the Pentagon budget. We cannot afford to buy the items that we are listing in the Pentagon budget unless we eliminate the additional purchases of the B–2 plus one other major weapon system at least.

Mr. Chairman, while in the near years, the congressional Republican budget would be higher than the President's budget on defense, after 7 years this budget is lower than the President's budget, and we simply do not have the room in the defense budget to buy every little item we would like to buy.

□ 1130

I just want to put this in context for those who think we can afford this. We have some tough choices we have to make. The cost of one of these bombers would pay for the cost of tuition for every single student at the University of Wisconsin for the next 11 years. That is all. The cost of these bombers, which is highly disputable to begin with, because we have three different estimates of what they are likely to cost, but no matter how we slice it, we cannot afford the cost when measured against domestic priorities, we cannot afford the cost when measured against other military priorities, and we ought to pass this amendment and turn down this ridiculous spending today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to express my deep appreciation to my colleagues who have worked so hard on this matter, a very critical issue to America's future ability to not just defend itself, but to represent freedom and peace in the free world. I especially want to stress my appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from California [BUCK MCKEON] who has taken the lead on this work from our perspective, and has done a fantastic job of finding out where the votes really are.

The issue before us will close the B–2 line forever, Mr. Chairman. That is the heart of my concern. I strongly oppose this effort. The advent of stealth has revolutionized the way we think about air warfare, an important facet of our Nation's defense. The B–2 is far and away the most advanced weapon system this world has ever seen. The value of this new stealth capability was evident in the gulf war with the F–117. The F–117 production line is already closed. The B–2 bomber takes this technology one major step further.

The B–2 can fly six times farther than the F–117, carry eight times more precision payload, and destroys targets with greater accuracy than any other aircraft that the world has ever seen. For example, a force with 30 B–2's loaded with modern weapons could have engaged as many targets on the first day of the Persian Gulf war as the 1,263 aircraft that were used. This is an amazing fact. The B–2 will save lives as well as money. It will conserve resources in the long run and will create a capability that the U.S. military forces alone will have, and that we desperately will need.

This body has always followed the philosophy that U.S. soldiers, sailors, and airmen must be sent in harm's way fully prepared and equipped for victory. Now is not the time to reverse that philosophy. The citizens of our Nation will not stand for more Scott O'Gradys.

As we continue to close bases around the world, we need the power projection which the B–2 gives us. The B–2 can be almost anywhere in the world in 12 hours.

Several opponents have cited a severely flawed GAO study, stating that the B–2 can't operate in a rainstorm or is not as stealthy as reported. I was pleased to see Secretary Kaminski strongly refute each point in that study. We heard that the draft was not even reviewed by the GAO's chief scientist before it was leaked to the press.

Secretary Kaminski stated in his rebuttal:

> The radar is performing in rain as expected during this stage of its development. There is no indication that the radar's performance while flying through rain will not fully meet requirements.
>
> Testing to date has not identified any areas that will prevent the B–2 from meeting its operational stealth requirements.
>
> The detectability and survivability testing completed to date has been entirely successful in confirming expected B-2 performance.

Even General Horner who was in charge of air operations during the Persian Gulf war states that the "delivered B–2 aircraft have demonstrated, without qualification, that the B–2 is a superb weapon system—performing even better than expected."

As a member of the Intelligence Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee that handles Defense, I could never in good conscience vote to close the only bomber production line in this country, especially one as advanced as the B–2.

Proponents of this amendment state that we can't afford to keep the only bomber production line in this Nation open. Let me assure you, for our sons and daughters, our grandchildren and great-grandchildren, for pilots like Scott O'Grady, we can't afford not to. Vote "no" on the Obey-Dellums-Kasich amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, let us look at the cold hard facts.

The budget resolution conference report contains significantly less money for defense than the House Defense authorization bill that was passed earlier. The House appropriations ceiling for defense has since been adjusted accordingly. The result is that the B–2 is now even less affordable.

Simply put, the enormous outyear ''tail'' of the B–2 was not budgeted to begin with, and now there is even less money than was believed available at the time of the B–2 authorization vote. The fiscal arguments against the B–2 are now stronger than ever.

The results of the heavy bomber industrial capabilities study have been released. It contradicts assertions that new B–2's are needed to keep a bomber industrial base alive. The study states that, first, there is no distinct bomber industry and that bomber production efficiently shifts between prime contractors over the years, and second, a restart of the production line, if necessary, would not be costly nor present any technical difficulty.

Finally, the General Accounting Office has completed a report on the current status of the B–2 cost, development, and production efforts which is highly critical of the program.

The report states the aircraft has not passed most of its basic tests, is not as ''stealthy'' as advertised, and its new, next-generation terrain following/terrain avoidance radar cannot distinguish the difference between a rain cloud and a mountain. Furthermore, the GAO warns of persistent technical and production problems that will directly translate into cost growth. Indeed, B–2 proponents found it necessary to write into the Defense authorization bill a repeal of the cost cap—a cap of $44.4 billion on the original 20 aircraft.

The case against additional procurement is clear. Support sound fiscal policy. Support sound defense spending. Support the Kasich amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my classmate and good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Mr. IKE SKELTON, one of the truly outstanding defense experts in the House of Representatives.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I speak today to keep this House of Representatives from making a mistake. This House made a mistake in the past. In 1939 it sent a message when it failed to spend those dollars necessary to upgrade the harbor at Guam, telling the Japanese Empire that we would not defend the Pacific.

If we turn down additional B–2's and adopt this amendment, we will be sending a message that deterrence does not count. We will be sending a message that we will not take the best advantage of our technological superiority and put it into the defense of our wonderful Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. Today's debate will shape the future not only of our United States Air Force, but of our national defense. It is a debate affecting American air doctrine and a debate about our ability to meet the basic requirements of our national military strategy. Additional B–2's are important for modernizing our aging fleet, and it is aging; maintaining our technological edge, for which America has always been in the forefront; and maintaining within the Air Force an ability to project force against an enemy from a great distance.

Our Nation's strategic position is unique. The national military strategy requires our Armed Forces to prepare for nearly two simultaneous major regional contingencies, and we should keep in mind that we came within a gnat's eyelash, a gnat's eyelash, of conflict three times last year: in Haiti, in North Korea, and again with Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Chairman, an effective long range bomber force is essential to meet the requirements of our strategy. We must continue this line. Over the past 70 years, air power has lifted from our soldiers and sailors the burden of maintaining peace, alone; this is an additional weapons system of deterrence.

The gulf war ushered in a new chapter of air power. As the deep strike mission complemented our air forces at sea and on the ground, a new level of performance was reached. In the first 48 hours of Desert Storm, American air power crippled Iraqi air defense, wrecked major command centers, destroyed military communications, prevented Saddam Hussein from broadcasting by radio or television. This was done by the stealth technology. What this B–2 does is add stealth technology to long-range capability. It is a necessary step for our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notes that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], as manager of the bill, has the right to close on this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I note the applause for the last speaker, and I certainly share the House's affection for him, but let us stop the hyperbole and look at the realities. We are told by the last speaker that if we do not fund the B–2 that we are not interested in deterrence. What a line of baloney. What a line of baloney.

This chart demonstrates what has happened to Russian military budgets, in red, since 1989 versus what has happened to the United States defense budget. As we can see in the blue, the United States budget has dropped in minor ways. The former Soviet Union budget has dropped precipitously. The Russian military budget has been cut by some 70 percent. As we can see, the U.S. military budget cuts are markedly less than that. So much for the idea that we are not engaging in deterrence.

People will say, ''Well, but you have some of those rogue states out there. We have to be prepared to deal with them.'' OK. Let us take a look at the potential enemies list. If we take a look at what the United States spends as a portion of the world's military budget, and then if we take a look at what all of the rogue states spend—down here on the chart—excluding for the moment China and Russia, we have the lion's share of military expenditures in comparison to that tiny little sliver for the rogue states, and if we add into it every dime being spent by China or by Russia, it demonstrates that the United States still has overwhelming superiority, not just in military quality but in military budgets.

These two charts would show the United States dominance in terms of military spending and would show a clear and substantial excess of United States defense spending over Russian spending. To argue that that demonstrates that we are not providing military deterrence is patently laughable. If we want to argue the specifics of the B–2, go ahead, but do not for 1 minute suggest that the United States security is threatened by not buying that flying turkey. The only thing that is threatened are the corporate budgets of the people who build that plane.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of really dollars; it is do we want to defend this country or do we not? The question is, do we want an aircraft that is capable, or do we not? The B–52, which they say can be extended way out there, cannot be. That airplane helped get me out of Vietnam when I came within 2,500 feet of us, scared the Vietnamese to death, and ended the war. However, they are old.

I got a chance to fly one at Seymour Johnson in Goldsboro, NC, when I came back from the very outfit that had bombed Hanoi, and I will tell the Members, when I flew that airplane it scared me to death, because I looked at it and the skin is all wrinkled, the airplane is old. They are hard to maintain. You did not know if they are hard to maintain. You did not know if they were going to fly. Just recently, this picture illustrates what happened to one of our B–52's. Members may have read about it in the paper. Two of the engines fell off of the thing. That is how old they are. Not only that, but they damaged the wing, which we can see there on the left, and damaged one of the other engines. They could not even jettison their fuel, which newer aircraft can. They could not land immediately. They had to fly around until they got some of their fuel out in a bad airplane.

You are asking us to extend the life of this aircraft 30 more years. That is absolutely ludicrous, asking our military to fly in a piece of junk, and that is about what the B–52's are today. For 30 more years, risking the lives of our

men, our servicemen, is against the will of the Nation, I believe.

It is time to buy new aircraft and it is time to keep the B–2 line open. It is a superb airplane. It can do the job. It has been proven that it gives our military and added capability that is immeasurable, and it is a program we cannot do without.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], one of our leaders.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

The B–2 is an essential component of our overall national defense capability. We live in an increasingly dangerous world, and a significant bomber capability is needed to ensure military preparedness and to protect our national interests.

The events of the last few years since the wall came down in Berlin and the Soviet empire began crumbling have vividly demonstrated that the world continues to be one where hazards abound. The Persian Gulf war certainly emphasized the point that the U.S. can never let down her guard, and that threats to our security interests may pop up at any time throughout the world.

The B–2 is an incredibly powerful and effective aircraft. Just one B–2 plane is needed to carry out a military mission that would normally require an entire squadron of planes. Thus, for a given military operation, only 2 pilots' lives will be put at risk when the B–2 bomber is used.

It's imperative that we maintain all aspects of our military readiness in order to respond to threats. And maintaining readiness requires that we continue to modernize our bomber fleet with the best, most up-to-date equipment we can. The B–2 is a quality aircraft that provides stealthiness, long-range flying capability, and the ability to deliver large payments, on target.

Mr. Chairman, the B–2 provides our Nation with important security. I urge my colleagues to reject the Kasich amendment, and support the B–2 bomber.

□ 1145

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the chairman of the Democratic Caucus in the House of Representatives and one of the most knowledgeable Members on defense matters in this House.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, despite the comments of my colleague from New York, let me proceed briefly in opposition to the Dellums-Kasich amendment.

I rise in opposition to the Dellums-Kasich amendment to the Defense appropriations bill, and I urge my colleagues to support continued long-lead funding for the B–2 stealth bomber.

We live in uncertain times. Although we cannot predict the course of international events, we can ensure that we have, at our disposal, the resources to protect our vital, national security interests.

Recent events in Bosnia provide just one example of our continued need to maintain a flexible, advanced fighting force.

The B–2 stealth bomber is an integral component of the fighting force of the future. It is the tactical component of our commitment to military readiness.

But it is more than that.

With the aid of a revolutionary design, the B–2 is ready to strike for freedom at a moment's notice, across vast distances, with deadly accuracy.

As we bring our troops home from forward bases overseas, we are compelled to consider our ability to initiate military operations from American soil. The B–2's long-range capabilities make this necessity a reality.

While evading the world's most advanced air defense systems, the B–2 can hit its targets with precision, and return safely home.

Most importantly, our mission can be accomplished without placing the lives of tens of thousands of U.S. soldiers in jeopardy.

The B–2 allows us to react quickly, and with resolve, to regional or multi-regional conflicts around the globe.

From a technical standpoint, the B–2 represents an unparalleled achievement.

In the past, we augmented our fighting forces with a entire battalion of escorts, radar jammers, and suppressors.

''The B–2,'' according to former Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Merrill A. McPeak, ''offers a much more satisfying and elegant solution: avoid detection, and tip the scales back in favor of flexibility and offensive punch.''

In light of our renewed commitment to fiscal responsibility and deficit reduction, some have questioned our ability to continue investing in this program. We are right to reassess our priorities, and subject the defense budget to the same careful scrutiny we bring to other segments of the Federal budget.

But, for the sake of short-term fiscal expediency, we should not sacrifice our long-term national security interests. The B–2 program is the capstone of a $45 billion investment.

If we back down now, we will undercut this Nation's advanced technology base and risk tying our hands in the event of future conflict.

I would also like to point out that the B–2 represents a way for us to leverage our resources. Just one B–2 can pack the same punch as a much larger conventional force—some estimates suggest a force as large as 75 aircraft.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I realize that while Republicans continue to make devastating cuts in education and other important programs, it is difficult to support more B–2's.

But I caution my colleagues to remember that if the B–2 is defeated, that will only mean more wasted money on Star Wars and larger unwarranted defense budgets in the future.

So, I would ask my colleagues to support the B–2 and defeat the Dellums–Kasich amendment.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, there have been two major studies, one by Rand and one by Jasper Welch. I even asked Colin Powell, ''What did you recommend to Dick Cheney?'' He answered 50. The numbers in the two studies are somewhere between 40 and 60 B–2's are what are required to give our Nation a deterrent force for the next 30 years.

The idea that we are going to rely on planes that are today on the average 35 years old I think is a serious mistake in judgment. Stealth is a revolutionary technology. When combined with precision-guided munitions and its range, it gives us a whole new kind of capability.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON].

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, today we will hear a lot of facts and figures from proponents and opponents of the B–2 program. However, I believe that we should look back in history when we consider whether to continue production of the B–2.

Let me first go back 3 months ago when Capt. Scott O'Grady was shot down in a mission over Bosnia. As we remember, our whole Nation was focused on the fate of this young pilot, and we did not even know his name or anything else about him at the time.

The fact today is that the American people are unwilling to accept large war casualties, and I support them in that. In order to minimize American casualties, we need to ensure that our military forces are equipped with the means necessary to defend U.S. interests in an environment where many nations possess deadly offensive weapons.

Let me go back a little further in history. Every time, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] pointed out, that we have redirected defense spending to nondefense programs, we have had to eventually build up our military forces. I realize this money for the B–2 can be used on a number of other programs but can proponents of those other programs guarantee to me, to this body and to the American people that the United States will not need a bomber force in the future?

We have 15 years invested in this and over $40 billion, and now when they can build the planes cheaper, when the production line is there, we are talking about cutting it. That just does not

make sense. I do not think that they can guarantee that, and the real issue is, if B–2 production is capped, our ability to produce modern bomber aircraft will vanish quickly. History has demonstrated that it will again be necessary to produce these aircraft, which will then require a massive expenditure in the future.

I have been to the floor. I have seen where these planes are made. I have talked to the people that are building these planes. To lose this capability and this ability is something that we should not even be talking about here today. It is important for us for our future. I urge support of this bill and opposition to the Obey–Dellums–Kasich amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. I want to compliment the gentleman for his statement. He has become one of the most knowledgeable Members about the B–2.

There is one other item that I would like to mention. B–2's and F–117's save American lives. When we send a bomber or that F–117 in harm's way, they are going to come back because they are stealthy.

Captain O'Grady got shot down in an F–16, and the French Mirage was shot down. Why? Because they are not stealthy airplanes. We in this Congress have a responsibility to put the young men and women serving in our military in the best airplanes we have got.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a distinguished member of both the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, let me first congratulate Chairman YOUNG and the ranking member, Mr. MURTHA, for writing a responsible spending bill that improves quality of life for our troops, but recognizes that we must pick carefully among competing programs to select those that yield the best results for our national security interests. Our resources are not unlimited, and this bill acknowledges that reality.

It is in that spirit that I rise in support of the Kasich amendment to eliminate funding earmarked for production of additional B–2 bombers. Set aside the fact that Air Force Chief of Staff, General Fogleman, has concerns about the fiscal ramifications of producing more B–2's. And set aside the DOD commissioned study by the Analytical Sciences Corp. that concluded that the United States does not need to keep producing Stealth bombers to preserve bomber-manufacturing capabilities. But do not set aside the basic issue—and that is status of our strategic nuclear force structure and our ability to project nuclear force. That is the proper focus of this debate.

Our nuclear triad depends not just on the B–2, of which we will have 20 by fiscal year 2000, but on our *Ohio*-class strategic submarines, land-based ICBM's, and B–52 bombers. Will our nuclear posture crumble without additional B–2 procurement? The answer is clearly, decisively, ''no.''

This is a time we are making difficult choices in all Federal agencies and programs. We must also look to our defense establishment for budgetary savings—but only when it is entirely consistent with our national security interests. Military leadership has told Congress that additional procurement of the B–2 is a luxury we cannot afford in future fiscal years, I am not willing to sacrifice other badly needed weapons systems which will become available in future years, nor sacrifice continued readiness on the altar of additional B–2 procurement.

I urge my colleagues to support the Kasich amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER].

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kasich amendment, and I want to respond to some of the arguments that have been made.

The statement has been made that we are cutting everything else except defense. Well, I think the American people want us to find budget savings. I think they want us to balance the budget. We spend a lot of money on worthwhile projects in this Federal Government, but not all of them are absolutely essential to our survival as a nation.

National defense, on the other hand, is a constitutional responsibility that only the Federal Government has. Providing for the common defense is right there in the preamble to the Constitution, and if the U.S. Congress does not provide those funds, they will not be provided by anyone else.

When 7 former Secretaries of Defense write to the President of the U.S. and say that the B–2 bomber is central to meeting the challenge to U.S. security over the next decades, then we as a Congress ought to sit up and take notice of that.

I urge Members to defeat the Kasich amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend from Florida, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, yielding me the time.

The gentleman from Ohio has asked how we can defend spending money on the B–2's. It is very simple. The B–52's are 35 years old now. We have to plan for the threat 30 years out. They will be 65, 70 years old by the time a far envelope threat might arise.

The 117's did a great job. They were stealthy. They worked in Desert Storm. But they are fighter planes. They cannot deliver the munitions. The B–1's are not stealthy. They cannot perform the mission of the B–2's.

The B–2's can perform, they can be there, they can project American power anywhere in the world from the continental United States. They do not have to be based all over the world. We have pulled back our troops, we have pulled back our Navy, we have pulled back our Air Force. We are becoming more and more isolated and internalized. The B–2's can project power, awesome power, quickly and silently and deadly, in the areas to which we might need to project American presence in the future.

It is silly to cut off our own hands at this time. We should not do it. We sill not be able to project that force if we do not continue the line on the B–2's. I urge defeat of the Kasich-Dellums amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD a letter from General Horner.

SHALIMAR, FL, *August 23, 1995.*

Hon. BOB LIVINGSTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This year, as we celebrate the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II, I am struck by the similarities between the challenges America faced fifty years ago, and those we face today.

Having just won a great and very costly victory, the nation rushed to demobilize and draw down its armed forces. But our relief was short-lived and we soon faced a new, largely undefined military threat. The post cold war draw down of our military forces has been accomplished in like fashion—without sufficient critical debate.

Today, some argue that the international environment allows us to safely abandon military forces in favor of other investments. While this is not an unfamiliar argument, others suspect that we have already gone too far in dismantling our defenses. They are wary of our hasty reductions, for they remember Korea well and how America paid for its lack of military strength with the lives of our men and women. And they remember Desert Storm, where our well trained and properly equipped forces brought a swift victory with a minimum of casualties.

We are now searching for a new national security policy—much as we did after World War II. It took years to define the Containment and Deterrence policies that dictated our decisions about building military forces and led the Free World safely through a forty year struggle. The radical change in the world security environment since the end of the cold war, has been accompanied with an equal change in military affairs. The world has become uncertain, even more dangerous as the nuclear secrets, which the superpowers guarded so carefully in the past are bought, stolen or discovered by an alarming number of nations around the globe.

The revolution in military affairs created by new technologies was displayed over Iraq in 1991. Surveillance of the battlefield by AWACS, Joint STARS, and satellites is now augmented by a host of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles. The computing power needed to make sense of all the information being gathered is rapidly growing, decreasing in cost, and increasing in availability. The newest Joint STARS aircraft uses commercial computers giving it eight times the power at lower cost than the ones used in Desert

Storm. All of this is now coupled with communications of astounding capacity. This means we know more, are able to make better decisions, and implement them in seconds rather than days as required in the past.

So what good is all of this surveillance, computing and communications if you can't hit the target? That's the other lesson of the Gulf War—the importance of stealth and precision guided munitions in modern warfare. There is no doubt about the potential offered by stealth, precision guided munitions and information technologies. We must build a force with these capabilities and that is precisely why we need B–2 bombers.

In battle, commanders will know where they need to strike rapidly and accurately to speed victory and protect American lives. The B–2 provides that capability. It can hit targets anywhere throughout the region of conflict with low cost weapons and survive. We saw how the O'Grady shot down in Bosnia drove our air power out of the area until we deployed aircraft to jam and attack ground-based radar and anti-aircraft missiles. The B–2 will not have to wait until a protective armada of support aircraft suppresses enemy air defenses. It carries programmable precision munitions costing significantly less than the long range stand-off weapons carried by other platforms. Because the B–2 can safely release its weapons over the target, its munitions don't need the guidance and propulsion system used by costly standoff weapons to achieve the same level of safety for our military forces. Cost of munitions is important. In fact, during the Gulf War, we were told to quit using the Tomahawk standoff missile because it was too expensive—over a million dollars a shot.

The utility and effectiveness of the B–2 in terms of range, payload, limiting collateral damage, cost of operations and survival of our military men and women are clear and understandable. It is exactly the right military capability needed to fight the next war. So why the reluctance to build that force?

Sticker shock. At over a half a billion dollars each, the B–2 seems unaffordable. But the fact is, the B–2 is actually a bargain. For one thing, the very expensive research and development costs to develop such a superior weapon have already been paid. Even more important, the B–2 does more than any other combat system. Compare it with a half dozen F–117s—the superstars of Desert Storm—which cost about as much as one B–2. But, with the B–2 you get eight times the payload and five times the range. And the B–2 requires much less expensive support to safely perform its mission. Consider that each time we send out a B–52 force with the expensive standoff munitions required to survive, we could send a comparable force of 15 B–2s—the resulting savings would pay for a brand new B–2.

The bottom line is that the price tag of military capabilities have gone up, and we had better spend our money wisely or we will pay for our mistakes. And we will pay in a currency far more precious than mere dollars—the lives of our military men and women.

How many B–2s do we need? No one knows for sure, but we are certain that the currently contracted force, which will yield slightly over a dozen operational aircraft, is too few. By any measure 20 B–2s are not enough. Unless we expand that plan, we will not achieve the potential of these revolutionary new capabilities—stealth, precision munitions and information technologies. We will not be able to achieve increased military capabilities with greater efficiency, less cost and reduced danger to U.S. forces. The current plan is simply too few.

As we develop clarity in our new national defense policies and strategies, we can more accurately define the exact numbers of modern systems required. That is precisely why we need to keep our options open now. A force of 40 or more B–2s is a reasonable estimate. It is obvious we will need to replace our aged fleet of B–52s as they become more and more costly to maintain and less survivable over the modern battlefield. To ignore the B–2 today, and end up building a new bomber after we find ourselves in the same position as when the Korean war started, will cost added tens of billions and take tens of years. Even if we have the money, we surely won't have the time.

We can debate whether or not we need our military forces in this post cold war world. To me a more reasonable discussion would be how the Washington Redskins are going to win next year's super bowl. But if we decide we will need military forces, and if we study recent history, we must conclude the B–2 will be a vital element of that force. When we look at all the factors—cost of targets destroyed, adaptability to the new way wars will be fought by the United States, and our desire to limit the suffering of nonbelligerents and our own causalities—then the B–2 is the answer and a bargain to boot. We must keep the B–2 line open at a minimum rate as we define our security policies for the future and build the military forces required.

And we must seize the opportunity brought to us by America's technological genius. We can have a stronger, smaller and more efficient means to winning the next inevitable conflict—no matter when, where or how quickly it arises. That is exactly what the B–2 can do for us.

The B–2 presents us with an opportunity to ensure that future conflicts look like Desert Storm rather than the Korean War. Can we—in good conscience—do otherwise?

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. HORNER,
General, USAF (Ret.).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON].

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. It is rather rare that I come to speak on any issue from this well, but listening to this debate, Mr. Chairman, I cannot sit idly by and allow us one more time to start to plan something and tear it down in order to start again. We cannot sacrifice the defense of our Nation. We simply must do things in a way that they must be done in this day.

Back when Desert Storm came about, 1,200 planes were sent. If we had the B–2, we could have only sent 32. We would have saved lives. This investment saves dollars because it is the most cost-effective measure of defending our shores the way we have the military organized this day.

The other thing, we cannot continue to ask companies to organize to produce and then change and tear down that capability.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dellums-Kasich amendment and in support of the B–2.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], a long time member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and a person who is extremely knowledgeable about this particular program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kasich amendment and in support of the funding for further production of the B–2 bomber included in H.R. 2126.

I recognize that this is not an easy issue for many members, particularly for those of us who opposed the severe reductions in domestic spending included in previous appropriations bills.

I would be less than candid if I said that I was comfortable with the status of our national priorities as represented in House spending bills.

However, we cannot afford to be caught up in a zero-sum budget game that pits our national security needs against our domestic needs.

Let's be clear: If we cut the funding contained in this bill for the B–2, that money will not go to educate our children, or to train our unemployed. Cutting funds for the B–2 will not translate into increased spending for other important programs.

What it may do is unnecessarily harm the Nation's military preparedness; further erode the economies of areas already suffering from defense downsizing; and undermine potential technological advancements possible with a strong Stealth industrial base.

If we have learned anything in the short period which we refer to as ''post cold war,'' it is that there is little we do know about the military contingencies we may face in the future.

We have essentially traded in an ERA where we knew who the enemy was and what the Nation's military might be called on to do, for an era of increasing complexity and changing dynamics.

Opponents and supporters of the B–2 will continue to argue about swing strategies, fighting two simultaneous conflicts at once, and the value of long range bombers over precision guided munitions. But as we debate these issues our ability to continue production of a technologically advanced bomber grinds to a halt.

Should we take a chance and lose the capability to quickly respond to unforeseen challenges?

We know that in the B–2 we have a bomber with: Revolutionary stealth technology; precision weapons capability; long range; large payload; and a bomber that is the only weapons system available to respond anywhere from the United States on the first day of conflict.

We also know that the bomber's industrial base—the only heavy bomber production line still active—is rapidly facing a final shutdown.

And we know that by 2010, any surviving B–52's will be 50 years old and probably retired, and that the B–1B will be 23 years old.

The B–2 is not cheap. But the costs of being unprepared in an increasingly dangerous world pale in comparison. In the midst of so much uncertainty in

the world, can we really afford to close the B–2 industrial base in the hope that we may not need it later? I think not.

For those of us representing regions whose economies have been driven by the defense and aerospace industry, there are certainly other factors motivating our support for the B–2.

Thirty years ago, the State of California was the cradle of the aerospace industry.

Southern California has provided the core of this technological effort with a skilled and motivated work force of highly dedicated men and women.

In a very short time, we have seen a major erosion of this industrial base, as California's aerospace industry has suffered a major decline: 133,000 direct aerospace jobs lost between 1988–93; 37,000 more will be gone by 1996; and 200,000 additional indirect jobs lost in the service industries supporting the aerospace work force.

Today, the only remaining combat aircraft in production in the region is the B–2 Stealth bomber.

The B–2 program has been essential to California's high technology aerospace industry. Thousands of subcontractors have been involved in development of this technology.

The B–2 industrial base in California and throughout the nation needs to be sustained. Not only for the sake of continued production of the bomber, but also for potential advances in technology that only a strong industrial base—and the men and women it employs—can support.

If we take together what we don't know about the future military threats the Nation may face, and what we do know about the vast capabilities of the B–2, it seems to me that we cannot afford to take a chance on the erosion of our bomber industrial base. I urge the defeat of this amendment.

□ 1200

Mr. OBEY Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saluting the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], who I have worked with a number of times in support of deficit-reduction measures in a bipartisan way. And though I oppose the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], I do not think there is a Member of Congress who knows more about the technology and the minutia involved than the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, with that in mind, we are saying as 535 Members of Congress today, since the Senate did not put this in their bill, we have the opportunity to save the taxpayers one-half billion dollars, and $20 billion over the course of the next 10 years, by voting for the Kasich-Dellums amendment.

We are also saying that we are going to look at every corner of deficit reduction in Federal spending, but not in defense and not on the B–2 bomber. That is exempt. We are saying to the Secretary of Defense, we know more than you do about the B–2 bomber. You do not want it, Mr. Secretary, but we are going to make you buy 20 more.

Please vote for the Kasich-Dellums amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, some of my colleagues are concerned, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], that this gentleman is maintaining 10 minutes. I am going to take the 10 minutes, because to tell the truth at any given time, it is still the truth.

Mr. Chairman, let us start off remembering where we ended in August. We ended in August talking about balancing the budget and we cut programs and wreaked havoc and extended pain to millions of American people in this country.

We cut programs for the children in this country; our future. We cut programs that affected the farmers; the people who feed us in this country. We cut programs for the veterans, for the senior citizens, for urban, rural, and suburban America.

So, we come back from the August break; now we are on the defense appropriations bill. The first amendment, B–2. And, suddenly, all these people who were willing to inflict pain on the American people cannot inflict pain upon the Pentagon. I hear the sizzle of pork and I will talk about it, but I will also talk about the substance, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

One of my colleagues said we should be talking about what is essential and I will argue that the B–2 is not essential, it is not needed, it is not affordable, and there are alternatives.

Mr. Chairman, one of my colleagues from California said, Well, the rationale for buying 20 more B–2's is the money will not go for domestic programs. Hogwash. This program will cost us minimally $31.5 billion, not million. $31.5 billion. We are only going to appropriate a measly $500 million this year, but that is the camel's nose under the tent. So, we will not be able to argue next year, the year after that, the year after that, and the year after that, Mr. Chairman, for priorities that speak to the highest and the best of our people in this country who are suffering.

B–2 bomber. Mr. Chairman, we already spent $44 billion for the first 20. It will cost us $19.7 billion in production. Add that together and that is in excess of $63 billion. Operation and maintenance is $11.7 billion for the next 20. Multiply that twice for the first 20 and the second 20 and we are up to 80-some billion to maintain 40 aircraft.

It will cost $65 billion for 40. That is not a billion-dollar plane. That is a 1.5-billion Batmobile we do not need.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, these costs are conservative. I have been here nearly 25 years and not one program has ever gone as the contractor said it would go. Mr. Chairman, $31.5 will be cheap for the next 20.

Second, they say seven Secretaries have indicated their support for the B–2. The important point is the present Secretary charged with the significant national defense concerns of this Nation says we do not need it. And, incidentally, he was the father of B–2.

Secretary Cheney sends a letter out to the majority leader in this Congress and said, I had to acquiesce to 20 B–2's because the Congress said do it. That is fallacious and I can document it, Mr. Chairman.

From Department of Defense Press Release numbered 29–92 in January 29, 1992, so check it out, it is objective, here is what Secretary Cheney said:

> We can now afford to be more deliberate in the pace at which we modernize our armed forces. And the emergence of democratically inspired reformers in the republics of the former Soviet Union presents an historic opportunity to make further reductions in the world's strategic arsenal, as the President proposed last night in his State of the Union address.
>
> Secretary Cheney said he will therefore stop the Air Force's B–2 stealth bomber program after the 20th aircraft is produced.

January 1992, before the Congress of the United States even got the budget. That is the facts.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] argues that if we had had B–2, the gentleman would not have been shot down in the F–16, or he spoke to the Mirage. Mr. Chairman, let us talk about facts. The F–16 and the Mirage are fighter aircraft. Do my colleagues know what the response to the F–16 and the Mirage on a stealthy basis is? It is the F–22, not the B–2. Does my colleague think somebody is going to fly this big B–2 around?

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the B–2 bomber at this point cannot even tell if it is flying in the rain or flying in the mountain range. It cannot be flown in the daytime. It can be seen. Stealth does not mean invisible. There are several ways to detect a plane. One of them is infrared, the other is optical. You can see it. You can detect it with infrared. That is real, Mr. Chairman.

Next point: Where on this Earth do we need to fly more than 20 B–2 bombers? Against a Third World country? We talk about integrated air defenses. Mr. Chairman, there is not one nation in the world at this point with an integrated air defense. Not one. No one tells you that.

The closest that the world ever came to that was the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. Integrated air defense means comprehensive, interrelated, and synergistic. If my colleagues do not understand those words, look them up in a dictionary and find out.

A B–1 bomber can fly against any air defense that exists in the world today. There are no crackpots on this earth, there is no Third World country on this Earth, neither can the Soviet Union or the United States at this moment, given the incredible financial problems

that plague this Nation and plague this world, that have the capacity to develop an integrated air defense.

Next point: One B–2 bomber is equivalent to 75 tactical aircraft. Mr. Chairman, those 75 aircraft already exist in the inventory. We paid for them. None of these 20 B–2 bombers are programmed in next year's budget, or the year after that, or the year after that. So that whole chart business is phony and was supplied by the contractor anyway and ought to be dismissed for self-interest.

Let us talk about the jobs. Mr. Chairman, Members of the committee, we already lost 20-some-thousand in the B–2, and there are 8,000 people working. They have not built all but 20 yet. There are 7 more to deliver, so people have got to work on it. Because not one B–2 looks like the next B–2, because they keep changing it each time, 18 of the 20 will have to be retrofit and standardized. Somebody has got to do the work.

Finally, in the contract, the contractor must maintain depot maintenance into the year 2005. Somebodys got to do the work.

Mr. Chairman, I understand jobs, but to the tune of $31.5 billion to build a plane that the Pentagon says they do not want, they do not need, and there are alternatives, is a sham. It is a shame. You give me $31.5 billion; I will put a hell of a lot more than 8,000 people to work; $31.5 billion is an incredible amount money.

Mr. Chairman, the people that are charged with the responsibility of fighting the war, this is not talking about them. Charged with putting their lives on the line, and not speaking ''Will the gentleman yield about it,'' they do not want this plane.

Mr. Chairman, for those budget people who argue, well, this will not go to the deficit, the only way that can be true is you have got to have a tradeoff. If the people who are the proponents of B–2 and are also budget cutters, because they go home and tell their community that, why do they not tell them they are prepared to cut all of these other programs? Cut the F–22, cut all the C–17's and what have you. But look at their voting record. They are going to back up to the voting record and they are going to vote for all those programs as well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this turkey. It is not needed.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, we have kept our promises to the American people. We have made the hard cuts in spending, while we are maintaining a strong defense for our Nation. Keeping our Nation strong means having a vision into the future defense of this country and having the ability and the technology to carry out our Nation's objectives.

We have heard many arguments for and against the B–2. We have heard about the cost benefits and the strategic benefits. We have heard about capabilities, performance, and jobs. But the B–2 is about people. It is about our men and women who serve this country in uniform. It is about giving them the equipment and technology to defend and protect our Nation and its principles in time of conflict.

We have that technology today. Here it is. Technology that allows our Department of Defense to risk the fewest American lives in time of conflict. The B–2 stands ready as a system designed to protect this Nation from threat of war and minimize the loss of life. Let us face it, that is what we are really talking about here is lives.

Is it a difficult choice? Of course, it is. Most likely, one of the most difficult votes a Member will have to cast this year. But this is a vote which carries with it a vision for the future; the future of this Nation's defense posture and the task of keeping America strong.

Someone once said: A task without a vision is drudgery. A vision without a task is a dream. A task with a vision is victory.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues today that the B–2 is that vision, the keystone in keeping our Nation's defense strong. The American people sent us here to make changes. Those who believe in the status quo never thought we could make serious cuts while keeping our military strong. Let us send a message back to the American people. Vote against this cutting amendment.

□ 1215

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from southern California [Ms. HARMAN], a member of the Committee on National Security.

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am often a supporter of the initiatives offered by the sponsors of this amendment—and always an admirer—but on this issue of striking the B–2 funding, I rise in strong opposition.

In my view, the B–2 saves lives, saves money, and saves a critical asset—our bomber industrial base.

As a mother of two draft-age children, my first question about any defense acquisition program is, ''Will it saves lives?'' The answer is a resounding yes.

Many arguments have been made in favor of this incredible aircraft, but I want to emphasize one:

We can afford to buy more B–2's and we should. Within the budget resolution profile, money is available as we: First, retire the expensive, aging B–52 fleet, second, buy the cheaper munitions the B–2 uses, and, third, reap savings from acquisition reform.

Much of the argument against more B–2's assumes the B–52 will remain combat capable through the year 2030. The last B–52H was produced in the early 1960's, so the aircraft will be almost 70 years old in 2030.

If the B–52 were a person at that time, it would be collecting Social Security. Do we want to send our sons and daughters to war in a 70-year-old bomber? I don't think so. I think we want to use the most survivable aircraft possible, an aircraft we have in production right now—the B–2.

The cost of the aircraft is a concern to us all. But it is half the cost its opponents estimate.

The B–2 saves us money by using cheaper weapons. The old B–52 and the B–1 use expensive guided missiles and bombs to fly in from standoff orbits. Since the B–2 can go right to even the most heavily defended target, it can use cheaper laser and gravity bombs, which cost about one one-hundredth the cost of the B–52's weapons.

The new Deputy Defense Secretary testified this May 18 before the Senate Armed Services Committee that:

> If I do not have any carriers available for 15 days and I do not have any tactical aircraft in theater and I do not have any means to get tactical aircraft in theater and we have to continue with this MRC scenario, then I am going to need a lot more bombers than I have in the current force.

That means B–2's.

We can find further savings in acquisition reform. Last year, Secretary Perry testified that as much as $30 billion could be saved by downsizing and procurement reform over 5 years. Those savings would kick in just when they are needed most. They would provide more than enough funds for the B–2 within the budget resolution profile.

As the mother of the lockbox, no Member is more committed to deficit reduction than I am. But this is not the way to get smart, prudent deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, as a parent, I am convinced that we must field and fully fund the most effective and survivable weapons systems. The most precious resource this country has is our children. Today, in this House, let us choose the best defense for our children and the men and women who will defend them. Vote against the Kasich-Dellums amendment. We need the B–2.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor I rise in support of the Dellums-Kasich amendment. There are only three problems with the B–2 bomber. First, it does not work. It cannot tell the difference between a rain cloud and a mountain. Second, it costs a fortune, $2.2 billion per airplane. Third, we do not need it. What we have been told by the Pentagon, the people who beg us for military expenditures, is do not put any more money into this airplane, we do not need it, and yet today we find that the wind beneath the wings of the B–2 bomber is not national security, it is the clout of defense contractors which stand to bank billions of dollars if Congress will approve this unnecessary boondoggle.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when this Congress is cutting Medicare, Medicaid, education, and health care, it is unconscionable that we would spend up to $30 billion for an airplane that does not work, that costs $2.2 billion a copy, and one that military experts tell us is totally unnecessary.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], the ranking Democrat member of the Subcommittee on National Security, and our former longtime chairman.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, let me talk about the practical aspects of the B–2 bomber.

One of the things that we try to make decisions on is which weapon system will be the most important to the national security depending on the threat to the Nation. The most effective weapon system we can buy is the one that deters war, that is never used in a war, and I think the B–2, with the amount of money we have available to us, it is certainly not the time to stop it. For instance, if we had less money, it would be a tougher decision, but, with the amount of money that the Committee on the Budget allocated to the defense subcommittee, it certainly would be a mistake for us to cut out the B–2 at this stage.

Mr. Chairman, what I recommend to the Members, and I have been involved in the B–2 for years; as a matter of fact, I was willing to jump over the B–1 and go with the B–2 because of the technology, because of the ability of the B–2 to penetrate defense systems: Now, even though we do not have the threat now, what we want is an airplane that will deter an enemy from attacking us, and I think the B–2 is that airplane.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members of Congress to allow us to go forward, to go to conference. Hopefully we will have a good allocation in conference and we will be able to continue the B–2. The big expense for the B–2 comes next year. But I am confident that, as the threat continues, as the threat changes, this Subcommittee on Defense will make the appropriate decision on the B–2, and I think at this point the Members should feel confident to vote for this with the amount of money available.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to strongly support the B–2 as we move forward to conference.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, the debate is about the future.

Do my colleagues know what this is? Tomahawk missile. I say to my colleagues, ''If you launch this either from a ship or from the B–52, which the generals and the Pentagon want to maintain along with 95 B–1's and 20 B–2's, you know what? Your pilot is not in danger.'' See, it is about the future.

The Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs has a big platform outside of this office. That platform can be used to replace the aircraft carrier. We can land C–17's on this platform. See, it is about the future.

The B–2; that is a 1970's–1980's plane.

F–22? Uses elements of stealth, but also uses maneuverability and speed. See, it is about the future, it is about effectiveness.

And who can we go to learn about effectiveness? Do my colleagues know who we go to if we do not want to trust the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs that does not want the plane, or the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs? Do my colleagues know who we go to? The commanders in the field who have to carry out the mission. Not one single ground commander, not one single CINC, the commanders in charge of our troops in the field, not one of them want to buy B–2 bombers, not one of them.

Do my colleagues know why? Because they are looking for an effective and efficient defense to protect our soldiers in the future, and, as the general in charge of acquisition in the Air Force said, ''If you buy the B–2, you prevent us from being able to buy the things that we really need to secure the defense of this Nation.''

See, this debate really is about the future. It really is about what is the most effective way to meet the threat in this world, and, when we got the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, who has taken the navy on himself, arguing about more effective and efficient ways to project power, who has written letter after letter and made speech after speech saying, ''End this system at 20,'' my colleagues coming to the House floor, we have got to vote for the most efficient, effective defense.

Vote for the Kasich-Dellums amendment. Make the commonsense choice.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] in support of the B–2, a senior member of the Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the current events in the world are absolute proof to us that we must always maintain the very highest degree of technology and the very most effective forces for our armed services. Now is not the time to take a step back. Now is the time to take a step forward. The B–2 is in my opinion absolutely essential and in many ways enhances the fighting capability of our forces.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining minute and a half.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] just stepped on a landmine. What he forgot to tell us with the standoff cruise missile is that it costs $1.2 million a copy. That is a lot of money compared to $20,000 for the JDAMS.

Second, a standoff cruise missile has no capability against mobile targets. Rand did a study. Three B–2s interdicting Saddam's division moving into Kuwait with the sensor-fused weapon, a smart submunition, knocked out 46 percent of the mechanized vehicles in that division. The B–2 also, with the block 30 upgrade, will have an ability to go after the launchers for the Scud missiles. We might have been able to prevent the war, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] said.

Conventional deterrence is in our grasp if we have an adequate number of B–2's. Every expert, Rand, Colin Powell, Jasper Welch, say the right number is somewhere between 40 and 60. Let us not end this program now. The line is open. We should buy these bombers. We can get 20 additional B–2's for $15.3 billion. We can retire other planes in order to make room for life-cycle costs.

The B–2 is the right weapons system for the future. It will have American lives. Our kids will not get shot down like Captain O'Grady got shot down, and this is the most important issue. To kill this program I think would be a tragedy for the American people and a tragedy for our future military capability. If we have to come back, we are going to have to spend $10 billion just to reopen the production line.

We must keep the B–2 line open. The weapons for the B–2 are very cheap. This is a revolutionary conventional capability.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kasich-Dellums amendment.

We should not spend money we don't have on planes we do not need. Twenty more B–2 bombers will not help our children, our sick, our elderly, or national security. Buying more will not make our world a safer place.

President Eisenhower warned us of this day. He said: ''every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.''

This is the choice we make today. The time must come for a great nation to have the courage, the raw courage, not to spend millions and billions of dollars on weapons of mass destruction.

The time has come. Look in our hearts. Gather the courage to do what is right. Say "no" to more B–2's. Say "yes" to our children, our people, our future.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], a distinguished member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for yielding me this time. My colleagues, we are close to this vote, and what we are doing today is going down the path that we commenced after Vietnam because during Vietnam we lost 2,200 aircraft, mostly to SAM missiles. We lost aircraft that had pilots from every congressional district in this Nation.

The smartest people in this country got together at our request, Congress and the President, and we asked, ''Is there any way to avoid radar so we can protect our pilots?'' Then, lo and behold, the great American technological base came up with stealth, with the ability to avoid radar.

Now probably radar, the invention of radar, was the greatest military invention of this century. I would say the ability to avoid radar is probably the second greatest invention of this century.

If we do not go with the B–2 bomber, we are going to see pilots go down just like Mr. O'Grady went down. Do not reject this technology. Protect our pilots.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 1 minute, 20 seconds exactly.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] says that the studies show that we need to have 40 B–2 bombers rather than 20. That is not true. The major study done, the Kaminski study which reviewed 17 other studies, indicated that the best buy for the United States was not 40 B–2's, but 20. Everybody knows it.

Second, if we are talking about tradeoffs, just from the cost of the additional two B–2 bombers he wants to buy this year we could help 1,100,000 more kids under chapter 1, we could help 600,000 or 6 million families to receive low-income heating assistance, which we just cut out of the budget. We would still have enough left to provide summer youth jobs for 300,000 kids.

□ 1230

You talk about comparative defense expenditures. The red lines on this chart indicate the Soviet Union has reduced its budget by 70 percent, its military budget. Our budget has hardly moved in comparison to that. There is no question of where the major threats come from.

Mr. Chairman, if you take a look at how our budget compares to potential enemies, we are spending militarily about 2.5 times as much as all of them combined, including all of the rogue states that are talked about. This is a flying turkey. It will primarily benefit defense contractors, not the defense posture of the United States. We ought to pass this amendment and save the money.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of every young man and woman, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, all of us hope and pray that in the future that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] referred to, Americans never have to go to war again, whether on the ground or in the air or under the sea or on the sea. But the way the world looks, it does not look like that is going to be a real choice.

Mr. Chairman, while we were on recess, there were major bombing campaigns taking place in which the United States is by far the major player in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We do not know when or where we may be called upon to deploy military forces. If and when we do, I believe this Congress under our constitutional mandate has the responsibility to provide those people that we send to war the best training possible and the best equipment possible and the best technology possible to let them accomplish their mission, do their job, and give themselves a little protection while they are doing it.

This type of stealthy technology may not be ready to fly today. It is in a development process still, as every other airplane program has been and every future airplane program will be. But when this airplane flies, it will give our troops protection from the air that they would love to have. If you do not believe it, check with anybody who served in Desert Shield-Desert Storm when the F–117 stealthy airplane flew into Baghdad and disrupted Saddam's ability to conduct the war, and they did so without any casualty, without any loss of aircraft, because of the technology that we had invested in.

Mr. Chairman, on the question of the F–117 and the technology, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] wants me to remind everyone about the former Secretaries of Defense who supported the B–2. They also supported the F–117, except to a point about 10 years ago when the Department of Defense decided they did not need any more F–117's, and in fact they suggested we cancel the program. It was our subcommittee and this Congress who decided that, regardless of their objection, we would not terminate the F–117 program. Where is there a better success story today?

The Congress was right. We filled out the squadrons of the F–117's. We gave the pilots who flew those airplanes the technology to do an effective job against Saddam Hussein and to protect their lives while they were doing it.

So again, join me; hope and pray that we never have to send an American into combat again. But today, Americans are flying combat missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, so we cannot guarantee that they never have to go again. But if they do, let us have our conscience clear, that we did the best job that we could to make sure they had the technology necessary, the training, and the ability to do their job as they protect their lives.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, while I respectfully understand the concerns of my colleague and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I am pleased that the committee has appropriated research and development funds in fiscal year 1996 for the F–22 advanced tactical fighter. In fact, the committee reports that additional funding will enable the Air Force to maintain original production and capability schedules—resulting in an overall savings of $350–400 million over the life of this program.

The F–22 will serve as our Nation's next generation premier fighter replacing the successful F–16. It will be designed to have both air-to-air and air-to-ground fighter capabilities and operate at supersonic, super-cruise conditions for significant periods of time. The F–22 advanced tactical fighter will be more survivable and stealthier than any fighter jet currently before us.

Earlier this year, this aircraft sucessfully passed its preliminary design review, which, as many of you know, signals the near completion of its design. With the growth of advanced surface-to-air and air-to-air missiles, with the increase in technological development in military forces around the world, the need for the F–22 becomes clearer each day. Furthermore, as we continue to reduce our military forces and shift defense dollars, the need for a fighter that requires less maintenance, less support, and less manpower grows stronger.

The F–22 represents only 3 percent of the Pentagon's research, development, and procurement accounts. This is a very small investment that will provide dominance in the skies. Reliance on air superiority has taken us through several conflicts in recent years and it is improbable that we could ever win a war without it. Our decision today has that kind of potential impact. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Obey amendment.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I am outraged at the way defense contractors make public policy around here. I thought we Members of Congress were sent here to think for ourselves but, unfortunately, I have learned otherwise.

The July 31 issue of Defense Week details contributions by Northrup Grumman's political action committee and the June vote for more B–2's. Northrup donated $167,850 to House Members between January and June 30 and 96 percent of the money went to Members who voted for the extra B–2's.

In June alone, Northrup donated $75,200 to House Members. Of that $75,200, 97 percent went to 47 Members who voted for more B–2's.

Is the B–2 being promoted because it is an absolute necessity for our Nation's defense—or could it be because a contractor has deep pockets?

I want to quote DOD Deputy Secretary White who told us last month, ''The Department cannot support procurement of additional B–2's,'' and ''The Department loses approximately $3 billion per year in purchasing power for higher priority programs.''

The Department of Defense doesn't want more B–2's, the B–2 has difficulty distinguishing between a raincloud and a mountain, and we cannot afford to spend $31 billion on 20 more of them.

It only makes people more cynical about Washington to see money talk and carry out the contractors' wishes. I hope my colleagues won't vote to throw $31 billion at a plane we don't need.

[From Defense Week, July 31, 1995]

NORTHROP GRUMMAN'S '95 CONTRIBUTIONS SEEM TIMED FOR B–2 ACTION

(By Tony Capaccio)

Illustrating the synergy between legislation and campaign contributions, of $167,850 the Northrop Grumman Corp. political action committee (PAC) donated to House lawmakers between January and June 30, all but $7,400 went to members voting last month to provide additional B–2 funding.

In June alone, the corporate PAC donated $75,200 to House lawmakers, of which $73,200 went to 47 members who voted June 13 to defeat an amendment stripping $553 million in added B–2 money.

It was added to the fiscal 1996 defense authorization.

Another vote to cut the funding is scheduled for later this week as the House debates the fiscal 1996 $244.1 billion appropriations bill.

The dollars and cents aspect is just one—and totally legal—facet of the aggressive Northrop Grumman Corp. campaign to keep open its B–2 production line. Spokesman Tony Cantalio declined to discuss any aspect of Northrop's contributions policy after Defense Week posed written questions.

Detailing which B–2 supporters received Northrop Grumman contributions this year in no way is meant to imply that their votes were ''bought,'' only that the corporation is not bashful about assisting members who acknowledge and agree with its point of view.

In fact, a handful of members who received contributions voted against added funding. They include: Reps. Paul McHale (D–Pa.) $1,000; Patrick Flanagan (D–Ill.), $500; Rick Lazio (R–N.Y.) $850; and Reps. Frank Pallone (D–N.J.), Jack Quinn (R–N.Y.) and Frank Riggs (R–Calif.), who received $500 each this year.

But coming as they have in the course of the B–2 debate, the donations no doubt assure access and give Northrop Grumman officials an advantage in getting their story heard. Where once 40,00 workers nationwide assembled B–2 parts and aircraft at the height of production in 1992, according to spokesman Ed Smith, now 16,500 workers are directly employed as the last four of 20 bombers on order are in final assembly.

Aspects of the Northrop Grumman B–2 campaign and political contributions were detailed in a report released last month by the Center for Responsive Politics, a liberal, Washington, D.C.-based public interest group.

The group's campaign figures went to April 30. Defense Week reviewed donations made in May and June. The June donations were made primarily in three clusters, on June 2, June 26 and June 29. The House vote was June 13.

The Northrop Grumman donations consist mainly of $500 amounts. The largest figures have gone to members of the congressional B–2 ''core'' support group: Reps. Ike Skelton (D-Mo.), Norman Dicks (D-Wash.), Duncan Hunter (R-Calif.), Jane Harman (D-Calif.), Jerry Lewis (R-Calif.), Buck McKeon (R-Calif.) and House Majority Leader Dick Armey (R-Texas).

The maximum PAC donation each could receive under campaign spending laws is $5,000 per election and primary.

Armey, for example, received the maximum donation on March 9. During the June debate he praised the bomber—still only 50 percent through its testing—as a ''flying miracle.'' House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) did not vote last month but will likely support the bomber when the debate begins this week. Northrop Grumman on June 26 donated $1,000 for his 1996 primary, adding to a $2,000 St. Patrick's Day contribution.

Since its merger with Grumman, Northrop has more clout with the New York delegation and has adjusted its contribution patterns accordingly.

New York Reps. Gary Ackerman (D), Ben Gilman (R), Gerry Solomon (R) and Maurice Hinchey (D) co-authored a June 7 ''Dear Colleague'' soliciting B–2 support. They wrote that New York, ''with over 225 of its companies having supported B–2 production at various times since 1987, will lose significant economic activity'' if production ends.

Ackerman had received a $500 contribution in March. Solomon and Hinchey received $1,000 and $500 donations respectively on May 16. Gilman received a $750 contribution June 2.

B–2 supporters who received the largest Northrop Grumman donations in June either before or after the vote were:

McKeon, who received $500 on June 2 and $4,000 June 26. He told Defense Week earlier this year that one of his primary reasons for seeking a seat on the House National Security Committee was to fight for retention of the B–2 production line.

Harman, a debate floor manager, who received $5,000 June 28.

Vic Fazio (D-Calif.), who made a floor speech defending additional funding, received $500 on June 2 and $4,500 June 26.

Rep. Jerry Lewis (R-Calif.), a key B–2 supporter organizing this week's floor debate and who issued a stinging rebuttal to the recent critical General Accounting Office draft report, received $4,500 on June 26.

Rep. Randy Cunningham (R-Calif.) had received $3,500 between January and May from Northrop Grumman, took in another $500 on June 2 and $1,500 June 26.

Members who voted to retain added B–2 funding and received their first Northrop Grumman contributions after the vote included: Joe McDade (R-Pa.), $2,000 on June 14; Robert Walker (R-Pa.), $1,000; Reps. Henry Bonilla (D-Texas), $1,000; Wayne Allard (R-Col.), $1,000; Bob Matsui (D-Calif.), $500; Michael Forbes (R-N.Y.), $500; John Doolittle (R-Calif.), $500; Helen Chenoweth (R-Idaho), $500; Gary Franks (R-Ct.), $500, and Alan Mollohan (D-W.V.), $500.

Charles Wilson (D-Texas), who did not vote on June 13, received a $5,000 contribution 11 days earlier.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich-Dellums-Obey amendment to cut $493 million from advanced Air Force procurement for additional B–2 bomber funding.

My opposition to additional B–2 funding is based largely on the great fiscal constraints facing our Nation and the reality that these budget limits may eventually require that we revise our adherence to the current two-war strategy. The most pressing problem facing the Federal Government is the $5 trillion national debt and the need to balance the budget. Given the pressing need to reduce the deficit, it will be very hard to maintain current defense spending, much less increase it significantly. Therefore, I believe it will be very difficult to properly fund our current strategy to fight two major wars simultaneously. I agree we would need closer to 30–40 B–2's for this strategy,but given a lack of an imminent global challenge from a competing superpower, let alone a likely scenario under which we would have to fight two major concurrent wars, I cannot at this time support additional funding.

I am also swayed by two 1995 studies commissioned by the Department of Defense at the direction of Congress, which found that there are other, more cost-effective options for improving U.S. military capabilities than buying additional B–2's at this time. According to these credible reports, the currently planned bomber force can meet military requirements for fighting two major regional conflicts through a mix of B–52's, B–1's, and B–2's. It would be more cost effective to buy additional precision-guided munitions for the bomber force and to upgrade B–1's than to build more than 20 B–2;s.

Lastly, my opposition to additional B–2 funding is not based on the supposition that we may never need to use them. Indeed, we might. It rests more in part on the notion that we need a better understanding of the military capabilities of the different blocks, or types, of B–2's. The recent General Accounting Office report on the B–2 claiming unsolved technical shortcomings concerns me greatly. And while Pentagon Acquisition Chief Paul Kaminski rebutted the report, he did not advocate the purchase of more B–2's.

While we might be able to afford the additional funds the Appropriations Committee has proposed this year, as we move down the road to the year 2002, and toward a balanced budget, agreeing to further funds to procure twenty more B–2's—at a potential total cost of close to $40 billion—will most certainly be a budget buster. Funding more B–2's this year could lead us unwillingly toward procurement of further B–2's in future defense budgets that cannot support them without cuts in funding for the operation and maintenance of our troops and other weapons systems. Funding more B–2's while we are trying to balance the budget could also result in unfair cuts in other areas of the budget as well.

Althouh I am a strong support supporter of a robust and fully well-rounded defense posture, at this time of fiscal restraint, I find it hard to justify such an expenditure. The billions of dollars required to sustain such an effort is not a necessity and is not affordable.

I have great respect for those who support the B–2. To be sure, it is an awesome aircraft that I am sure will contribute greatly to our defense needs. But given the aforementioned factors that are weighting on me, at this time I cannot support additional funding.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment being offered by my distinguished colleagues Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. KASICH. My comments today are straightforward: The B–2 is no longer needed, it does not work property, and the scarce American dollars that fund it should be better spent.

The B–2 bomber belongs in a museum. It was designed as a long-range bomber to attack the Soviet Union after a nuclear war. It is nothing short of a travesty that the threat to our wallets has not subsided along with the demise of our cold war adversary. The proposed 20 additional B–2's will cost an astounding $31 billion according to the Air Force. The 20 planes already being built are expected to cost $44 billion, but this years Defense authorization bill lifted the cap in the expectation they will cost even more. This all for a plane that the Air Force now says it does not even want.

I rise to tell you the taxpayers of Detroit do not want this plane either. They want their star schools funding back because they would rather put computers in a classroom than in a

flying turkey. The taxpayers also want their low-income home energy assistance back. And most of all, they want their jobs back but they will not even get that because the cuts in job training made last month will keep the 14,000 eligible Michigan job-seekers from receiving training.

According to the General Accounting Office, the B–2 has failed many of its basic tests and although I know we are talking about a bomber and not a weather plane, it is important to mention that it cannot tell the difference between a raincloud and a mountain. That does not sound like a plane that costs $2.2 billion apiece.

Many people think that every weapon is worth voting for just because it will create jobs. But a Congressional Research Service study I commissioned a few years ago found that money spent in education, transportation, or construction would create far more job than money spent on defense. The jobs argument makes even less sense for the B–2 because out of the jobs cut in aircraft manufacturing since 1989, 90 percent of them are not needed to build the additional bombers and therefore will not come back. Moreover, the recent heavy bomber industrial capabilities study done for the Pentagon noted that the bomber industry is not a unique industrial base that we need to keep warm in the remote event we ever needed to build bombers in the future.

I urge you to support this crucial amendment in the name of economic security, political responsibility, and just plain reality.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support for the Kasich-Dellums amendment to remove $493 million for advanced procurement for additional B–2 bombers from the national security appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. I feel this amendment represents a sound policy, in terms of both national security and fiscal responsibility.

I recognize that real threats to the national security of the United States exist in the post-cold-war world, and I believe we must provide the armed services with the resources they need to protect American citizens and the U.S. role in world affairs. Today, however, military challenges are very different than they were just a few years ago. We must tailor our military force to meet those challenges, and we must do so within very strict budget constraints.

An independent study recently determined, and the Air Force confirmed, that additional B–2 bombers are not wanted or needed in order to develop a force necessary to meet the challenges of today's world. The Air Force has higher priority programs that may be crowded out by the purchase of additional B–2's—programs such as improving the B–1 and purchasing more smart weapons that can perform many of the functions of the B–2 in a more cost-effective manner. And for instances where the B–2 is clearly the only suitable aircraft, we can rely on the 20 B–2's already purchased by the Air Force and currently under production.

It seems clear to me that the purchase of additional B–2's at this time is unwise policy. As we in Congress strive to change the face of Government spending practices and reduce the deficit, actual costs of this program must be scrutinized. It is true that the bill before us today includes just under $500 million for additional B–2's. The total cost of these planes, however, could exceed $20 billion. The defense authorization bill that this body passed earlier this year removed the spending cap for additional B–2's—as well as for the 20 already purchased—leaving the final purchase price dangling high above us, at a level no one yet knows.

In light of the budget crisis facing this Nation, and in light of projected defense funding shortfalls in the tens of billions of dollars over the next several years, I urge my colleagues to prove to the American people that this Congress is serious about bringing Federal spending under control by supporting the Kasich-Dellums amendment.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, the B–2 bomber truly is an extraordinary aircraft. After 14 years of flunking a whole series of Air Force performance tests, this year the B–2 has evaded detection by Republican budget-cutting radar, overcome Pentagon efforts to end further procurement, and out-maneuvered taxpayer groups working for a balanced budget.

This ''Airborne Edsel,'' however, does seem to have difficulty handling more tangible obstacles like rainclouds and mountainsides. According to a report prepared by the General Accounting Office, the B–2's radar cannot distinguish rain from other obstacles and has fallen short of meeting some of its most important mission requirements. The GAO report indicates that software problems have delayed flight tests, changes in the plane's mission will further increase costs, and the contractor—after 9 years of production—is still delivering B–2's that don't meet Air Force mission requirements.

Originally designed to drop nuclear bombs on the Soviet Union, the B–2 is the plane that time forgot. The cold war's over, Chechnya—not world conquest—preoccupies Russian military thinkers, and the Air Force now places a higher priority on other weapons systems. Still, the call for more B–2's persists.

The Nation's top military officials oppose further procurement of B–2 bombers, including: The Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Air Force Chief of Staff.

An Air Force budget paper makes it crystal clear: ''Given the current threat, there is no military requirement for additional B–2's.'' Let's make the Stealth bomber truly invisible by eliminating funding for more bombers.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 213, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 639]

AYES—210

Abercrombie
Andrews
Archer
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Bilbray
Blute
Bonior
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Burr
Camp
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cremeans
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dickey
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Ehlers
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Heineman
Hilliard
Hoekstra
Houghton
Hutchinson
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Markey
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Moran
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Stark
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Torkildsen
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Wamp
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
White
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—213

Ackerman
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barr
Bartlett
Bateman
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TX)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goss
Graham
Green
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoke
Holden
Horn

Hostettler	Mica	Souder
Hoyer	Mollohan	Spence
Hunter	Montgomery	Spratt
Hyde	Moorhead	Stearns
Inglis	Murtha	Stump
Istook	Myers	Talent
Jefferson	Nethercutt	Tate
Johnson (CT)	Neumann	Tauzin
Johnson, E.B.	Norwood	Taylor (MS)
Johnson, Sam	Ortiz	Taylor (NC)
Jones	Oxley	Tejeda
Kelly	Packard	Thomas
Kim	Paxon	Thompson
King	Peterson (FL)	Thornberry
Knollenberg	Pickett	Thornton
LaHood	Pombo	Thurman
Laughlin	Pomeroy	Tiahrt
Lewis (CA)	Quillen	Torres
Lewis (KY)	Richardson	Torricelli
Lightfoot	Roberts	Traficant
Linder	Rogers	Visclosky
Livingston	Rohrabacher	Volkmer
Longley	Rose	Vucanovich
Lucas	Royce	Walker
Manton	Salmon	Walsh
Manzullo	Saxton	Ward
Martinez	Scarborough	Waters
Matsui	Schaefer	Watts (OK)
McCollum	Schiff	Weldon (FL)
McCrery	Seastrand	Weller
McHugh	Shaw	Whitfield
McIntosh	Skeen	Wicker
McKeon	Skelton	Wilson
Meek	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Metcalf	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Meyers	Solomon	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Allard	McDade	Reynolds
Bishop	McKinney	Sisisky
Cox	Moakley	Tucker
Maloney	Morella	Waldholtz

□ 1254

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Waldholtz for, with Mr. Cox of California against.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the next order of business is the consideration of one or more of the amendments numbered 37, 58, 59, or 60 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, No. 37.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: Page 28, line 11, strike ''$13,110,335,000'' and insert ''$12,110,335,000''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to lose big for a number of reasons, I believe. No. 1, the F–22, which I am trying to delay, is largely built in the home State of the Speaker. Second, there are contracts for this program in 48 States. Under those circumstances, I have infinite confidence in the capacity of this House to make the wrong decision.

Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, I want to urge every single Member, especially those who just voted to keep the B–2, I want to urge them to remember that having just voted to keep the B–2, they have no rational choice if they are serious about retaining the B–2 in the budget. They have no rational choice but to vote to delay the F–22, because if they do not, there simply will not be room in the defense budget for the B–2 or a lot of other things.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, I would especially urge us all to take a look at the votes of those who vote both for the B–2 and the F–22, because they are clearly not serious about sticking to the budget resolution.

This amendment would cut $1 billion out of the $2.3 billion being appropriated for the F–22. It would delay that program by 5 years.

Why do I do that? It is very simple. The F–22 is meant to replace the F–15. This F–15 is the finest fighter aircraft in the world, and right now we have more than 700 of them. The GAO has told us that the F–15 will be fully capable at least to the year 2015, yet the Air Force wants to spend over $70 billion to buy 442 F–22's. The GAO is urging that we have a 7-year delay.

This amendment simply says, ''Let us have a 5-year delay in that program''. It seems to me it is eminently sensible. We will be told that there are new threats out there to our air superiority, because other countries have some fighters that are roughly comparable to the F–15. I would ask Members to remember that some of the countries who have them are Switzerland, Israel, France, Britain, Italy, Argentina, Brazil, hardly countries that represent a threat to us. For the few countries who do, such as Iraq and North Korea, I would suggest they learned in Desert Storm that merely having a few capable aircraft does not at all mean that you can match our military superiority by the time that we take into account our training, our superior manpower, and our additional complementary weapons systems such as the AWACS.

What I would say, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. If we want to save money, if we want to listen to the GAO on how to do so, if we want to avoid buying an airplane probably a decade sooner than we have to do it, we will vote for this amendment. This amendment does not kill the F–22 Program. All it does is delay it for 5 years: it saves $1 billion. It seems to me, given the crunch in both the defense budget and the rest of the budget, it makes eminently good sense. I urge Members to support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have a good friend back home in my district, his name is Bob Schultz. He went ashore with the Marine Corps, the 2d Marine Division, in Tarawa more than 50 years ago. As we have talked about that many, many times, he keeps coming back to the fact that when an American goes ashore on an amphibious landing, what he hopes for is that our troops control the air and not the enemy, so they might have a good chance of surviving the amphibious landing.

One of the Marine Corps Commandants, P.X. Kelly, made the same point in testimony before our subcommittee, that the first thing that a Marine wants is for an American force to control the air. The F–22 is going to be an air superiority fighter.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is correct; the F–15 is an outstanding aircraft. The F–16, the F–15, the F–18 are all good airplanes. However, as the future gets closer and closer, those airplanes get older and older. The technology is not as good today as it will be when the F–22 comes on board. If we take the $1 billion the gentleman from Wisconsin is talking about from this program, we do not cancel the program, we do not stop the F–22, we still going to have the F–22, and the gentleman from Wisconsin concedes that. What we are going to do is add billions of dollars to the cost, because the longer that we drag out the program, the more the program costs.

Members do not have to take my word for it. Look back at every aircraft production program we have had. Every time we delay it or drag it out, it costs more money; we all understand we are going to have the F–22 so how do we get it the most cost-effective way? That is to provide the money now, as the Air Force wants to do, rather than dragging it out for 5 years and adding to the cost and getting nothing for that additional cost.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to the statement made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for whom I have a great deal of respect.

The fact of the matter is that this airplane is designed for the wrong threat. It is the wrong design. We have a situation where this plane was designed to combat the future Soviet air threat. It was designed to combat the serious investment that the Russians were threatening to make in their air defense system. The F–22 is not a plane that can defend against the kinds of attacks that Sean O'Grady faced when he ended up being shot out of the sky, because of the threats posed by SAM missiles.

If we are truly interested in protecting American pilots, the F–22 is simply not the aircraft we ought to build. The truth of the matter is that if we are going to be concerned about the air threat to this country, the F–16 is the

plane that needs to be dealt with. The F–16 is a low technology plane. We own hundreds. It is also a very old aircraft. Sometime, according to the Air Force's own estimate, within the next 5 or 6 years, we are going to have to start replacing them by the hundreds. We do not ever have a design for the replacement of the F–16.

What we have done is gone out and taken a design that was conceived to protect the American people from the Soviet air attack, and we have twisted and cajoled that design into an airplane that is supposed to defend us against the kinds of attacks that we are seeing in Bosnia, in Iran or potentially Iraq, or other countries that potentially threaten the United States today. It is simply not the kind of threat that the F–22 is designed to protect us from.

Therefore, rather than spend good money after bad, that is the argument that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] put forth. That is we have already sunk money into the production. But that does not mean we should continue to spend good money after bad. It means we ought to design a plane that deals with the very real threat that we face as a country in the future.

The first and foremost priority is the replacement of the F–16. The second priority is the high end fighter. The high end fighter must be able to achieve success in attacks coming from ground launched missiles and from air launched missiles. That is not what the F–22 is designed to achieve, so why in God's name are we going to spend $74 billion, after we have just voted to spend an additional $30 billion on the B–2, why would we possibly spend another $74 billion on a design that is not going to meet the real threat we face in the world today?

I think we ought to protect our pilots. I think we have to have a strong national defense. However, I think we ought to take the time to make certain that if we are going to spend $74 billion of the U.S. taxpayers' funds, we spend it on the kind of plane we need. That is simply not what is being accomplished by voting for the F–22.

I would hope that the Congress of the United States does not simply follow in lockstep simply because the dollars have already been appropriated to get this thing to a point where it is close to production. Rather, we would make a fundamental assessment of what the real needs are. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] pointed out we simply do not have the money in the budget to fund both the B–2 bomber and the F–22. I talked to senior people in the Air Force just this morning and they said they simply do not have the funds necessary to accomplish both.

If we have to make a choice, the fact of the matter is that we need to vote against the B–2 aircraft, and we ought to redesign the F–22. Let's make it into the kind of aircraft that meets the types of threats we are going to face in the future, and use the funds we have to increase the capability of the F–15 for the next few years. That will accomplish the goals that I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] is looking to accomplish. The alternative is simply throwing good money after bad, which is what will happen if we build the F–22 as we see it today.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has 8 minutes remaining and the right to close.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], a distinguished member of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the F–22 is about preserving our freedom and liberty well into the next century, this is about air-supremacy.

My colleagues we must never forget that the price of freedom is not cheap. Americans have paid the price on the beaches of Normandy and Okinawa, in the desert heat of North Africa and the frigid cold of Korea, in the jungles of New Guinea and Vietnam. The price we have paid has been very high. Let no one say we cannot afford the F–22. We cannot afford not to have the F–22. An unwise and ill-conceived budget cut today will be paid for with American blood tomorrow. This is a cost none of us should be willing to pay.

The F–22 is a revolutionary weapon. It will guarantee our future security and deter aggression. It will save American lives. The choice should be crystal clear. Air superiority will play a role in America's future security. Air superiority is essential to project American power and minimize casualties. Air superiority will keep the peace. The F–22 is needed. The F–22 is our fighter of the future. We need it.

The amendment's supporters have done a good job presenting their case. They have chosen the right words, the correct arguments, and the proper phrases to demonstrate why we should stop funding the F–22. However, ultimately their words, their arguments, and their phrases fail. We cannot win wars with words, we cannot deter aggression with arguments, and we cannot live securely protected by phrases. We need a strong military; we need the best weapons. We need the F–22. My colleagues please join me in voting for peace, in voting for America's future, please join me in rejecting this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

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

Mr. Chairman, we heard a few moments ago about a GAO report that the F–15 fighter will suffice to maintain air superiority for this great land of ours well into the 21st century. I would challenge GAO, in the year 2015, if they think the F–15, as great a fighter as it is today, will maintain air superiority against the advances in technology that will in fact have come about for our adversaries and potential adversaries, I challenge them to ride in those F–15's in combat missions in the year 2015. I do not think we will find any takers. We will not find any takers because, as magnificent an aircraft as the F–15 is, and I have flown in them, it will not be adequate, neither through its air frame nor through its electronic countermeasures, to sustain air superiority into the year 2015.

We need the F–22, this country needs the F–22, our friends overseas need the F–22. If we stop or delay production, we will pay more for getting less in the years to come. It makes good economic sense. We need it. Vote for it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the other distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS].

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin. By slowing the development of the F–22 we unnecessarily put this Nation's national security at risk. We send the wrong message to the men and women who will be protected by this system in the future, and we will add significant costs to the taxpayer.

As a Member of this body and a first term member of the Committee on National Security, I have taken on a responsibility to this Chamber to assess and respond to the risks posed to the people of this country. To that end, I have come to learn in vivid detail the threats that remain, even in the wake of the cold war. In this critical year when we reevaluate our defense priorities, Members are asked to consider our present state of readiness and to put in place the systems that will ensure our future dominance. Mr. Chairman, the future is the F–22.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that our colleagues send a message to the American people that we will protect your freedom at a price that we can afford. Send the message to our brave servicemembers that ''We are committed to your safety, and we will equip you with the most advanced weapons available.'' I urge the rejection of this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for his remaining 2 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, we are told this amendment to cut $1 billion is going to cost money. The fact is the amendment saves $1 billion. The fact is that the GAO, the General Accounting Office, says we ought to delay the purchase of these planes for 7 years. All this amendment does is delay it for 5.

We have heard a couple of speakers from Georgia, where this baby is going

to be built, tell us that our friends abroad, our foreign friends, need the F–22. I find that argument ironic, because one of the arguments being used by the supporters of the F–22 is that they are saying ''Well, we have to build the F–22 because we have sold so many F–16's to our allies around the world that we now have to buy the F–22 to stay ahead of the threat from our own allies, because we sold too many planes abroad.''

□ 1315

I find that argument coming back and meeting itself. I also find it interesting that the president of Lockheed, the company who is going to build this, has already been saying that he is going to be selling this baby at the Paris Air Show next year.

That tells me this is in the budget for purposes of promoting military sales, to increase the profitability of military contractors, and they have been careful to subcontract this baby over 48 States in the Union. That does not tell me much at all about the need for this in order to maintain U.S. air superiority.

Very clearly we have a huge lead and we have a huge domination over every other military force in the world, and we will continue to do so until well into the next century. There is absolutely no reason to refuse to save $1 billion.

We ought to take the advice of the GAO, delay this program. If you do not do that, you do not understand the rest of the content of the budget. No one who voted to preserve the B–2 can afford to vote to keep this F–22 on purchase schedule, because if you do, there will simply not be any room for it and the vote you just cast did not mean anything.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], a member of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat surprised that we are on the floor today attacking the F–22 Advanced Tactical Fighter Program. The Air Force has said that this is the most sophisticated and yet the best program that it has managed in many, many years.

I have had Darleen Druyun, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, up to the office. She feels, as the contractors also feel, that this program is moving along very, very smoothly. The one thing they are concerned about is, if Congress makes a major reduction in the funding profile for this, that you will have a delay, a major delay, in the contract, and it has already stretched out too far as far as I am concerned.

I believe that you could move this program forward more rapidly. People say, ''Well, we don't have enough money to do this.'' Well, I would take issue with that.

This year and last year, I asked our very able staff on the Defense Subcommittee how much did we cut out just in every line item, going through this budget as we do in enormous detail, and the same number came up, and that is about $3.5 billion. The low-priority items are cut out by the Defense Subcommittee when doing our oversight responsibility.

I believe with that, and if we supplemented the C–17 with a nondevelopmental aircraft, we could not only fund the F–22 but we could also fund the B–2. I also think we have got to make priority decisions. Any administration has to decide what are the most important things for the future.

The Air Force has determined in its judgment that the F–22 is its most important priority. Sometimes I disagree with their priorities, as we noted in the previous vote, but I think this is a program that is going forward very well. It is a model of stealth technology and high technology. It is the kind of weapon that we are going to need in the future.

There are a lot of other systems, by the way, that I would rate as much lower priority, and if we have to make some hard tough decisions down the road, we ought to look at those systems that are basically nonstealthy. The F–22 of course is stealthy and is the best technology for the future.

I would say let us stay with this program, let us keep it moving ahead. I would urge my colleagues to reject the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 293, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 640]

AYES—126

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Coyne
Cremeans
Danner
DeFazio
Dellums
Dixon
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Ehlers
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Hoke
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moran
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Poshard
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Thornton
Torres
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Volkmer
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—293

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Ortiz
Orton
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Shadegg
Shaw

Shuster	Tanner	Walsh
Skaggs	Tate	Wamp
Skeen	Tauzin	Ward
Skelton	Taylor (MS)	Watts (OK)
Smith (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Tejeda	Weldon (PA)
Smith (TX)	Thomas	Weller
Smith (WA)	Thompson	White
Solomon	Thornberry	Whitfield
Souder	Thurman	Wicker
Spence	Tiahrt	Wilson
Spratt	Torkildsen	Wise
Stearns	Torricelli	Wolf
Stenholm	Traficant	Young (AK)
Stockman	Visclosky	Young (FL)
Stump	Vucanovich	Zeliff
Talent	Walker	

NOT VOTING—15

Bishop	McKinney	Reynolds
Cox	Moakley	Sisisky
Dingell	Morella	Towns
Gilman	Nussle	Tucker
Maloney	Oxley	Waldholtz

☐ 1339

Mr. NEAL and Mr. SCOTT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CAMP, VOLKMER, FOX of Pennsylvania, HILLIARD, CREMEANS, and BEILENSON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 639, had I been present I would have voted "no." My pager failed to go off because of a battery failure.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of today, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is entitled to offer amendment 58, amendment 59, or amendment 61 at this time. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin wish to offer any of these amendments?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I can read the handwriting on the wall. I will not be offering the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of today, it is now in order for the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] to offer amendment No. 3 or amendment No. 15 and, if offered, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] to offer amendment No. 48 as a substitute therefor.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 15 offered by Mr. DORNAN: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8107. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer any policy that permits the performance of abortions at medical treatment or other facilities of the Department of Defense, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The text of the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 48 offered by Ms. DELAURO as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DORNAN: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8107. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer any policy that permits the performance of abortions at medical treatment or other facilities of the Department of Defense, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term; or

(2) in the case of a medical treatment or other facility of the Department of Defense located outside the United States, any cost incurred by the United States in connection with such procedure will be reimbursed from private funds.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] each will be recognized for 15 minutes on the amendment and on the substitute.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

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

Today's debate is very simple, Mr. Chairman. In fact, we had this exact same debate on June 15 of this year when the House considered the Defense authorization bill. I had inserted language in that bill to restore the Reagan-Bush policy which prohibited federally funded, overseas military treatment facilities from providing abortions. When the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] offered an amendment to strike that provision, it was defeated by a bipartisan vote of 196 to 230. Today's vote is no different. I repeat, Mr. Chairman. Today's vote is virtually identical to the one we had during debate over the DOD authorization bill.

I understand the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is going to once again attempt to gut my amendment. The DeLauro substitute would codify the proabortion executive memorandum issued by Clinton on his first working day in office, January 22, 1993. Roe versus Wade anniversary. It was on that day that Clinton overturned the Reagan-Bush policy which prohibited federally funded, overseas military hospitals from being used as abortion centers. So if you voted ''no'' on DeLauro during debate over the DOD authorization bill, then you should vote ''no'' on today's DeLauro substitute.

Mr. Chairman, taxpayers who oppose abortion should not be forced to subsidize it. But that is exactly what is occurring when we permit abortions to be performed in military medical facilities. Supporters of the DeLauro substitute will tell you that no Federal money is involved because the procedure is paid for by the woman. What they do not tell you is that military hospitals are federally funded facilities paid for with U.S. tax dollars.

Everything in these facilities, from the electricity to the equipment, even the building itself, is taxpayer financed. And while there has been strong reluctance among military doctors to perform any abortions, the Pentagon has made it clear that they intend to find a way to implement the policy—possibly by hiring civilian ob/gyns to perform the abortion. This raises additional objections regarding the use of taxpayer money to subsidize abortions in the military.

Supporters of the DeLauro substitute will also argue that President Clinton's pro-abortion executive memorandum was intended to ensure that servicewomen, military spouses, and dependents have access to abortion comparable with that of women in the United States. They also argue that Western nations have strict limits on obtaining abortions and that their medical facilities are unsafe and unsanitary. This, Mr. Chairman, is untrue. First, the military must respect the laws of host nations regarding abortion—this includes laws restricting or prohibiting abortion. Second, women seeking an abortion can go where they have been going for years—local facilities, such as those in Germany, which are comparable to United States abortuaries and they kill the fetuses at less expense.

Mr. Chairman, military hospitals are intended to be places that nurture, heal, and protect all patients—born and preborn. I urge my colleagues to vote down the DeLauro substitute and vote in favor of the Dornan amendment that I am offering.

My amendment would restore the Reagan-Bush policy prohibiting the use of funds to administer any policy that permits the performance of abortions at medical treatment or other facilities of the Department of Defense—except when the life of the mother would be in danger. Its enactment would not only save precious lives, it would disassociate taxpayers from the killing business. And while we have already included similar language in the DOD authorization bill, there are no guarantees that Clinton will sign that bill into law. So my amendment today is nothing more than an insurance policy for taxpayers. It would ensure that in fiscal year 1996, American tax dollars are not used in any way to subsidize abortion in the military. So again, I ask my colleagues who voted ''no'' on the DeLauro amendment to the DOD authorization bill to once again vote ''no'' on today's DeLauro substitute. Let's return our military medical facilities to the status of institutions dedicated exclusively to healing. Mr. Chairman, I've just returned from visiting our military folks in Slovenia, Croatia, Macedonia, and Albania, and at our bases at Naples, Aviano, and

Brindisi and when I brought this abortion issue up everyone—every single military man and woman said, ''Please, no money for abortion!'' Please vote ''no'' on DeLauro and vote ''yes'' on Dornan. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes, 5 seconds.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I offer this bipartisan substitute amendment on behalf of myself, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD]. Our substitute amendment restores equal access to safe medical treatment for military servicewomen and military dependents who are stationed overseas. It corrects language in the Dornan amendment which would ban the Department of Defense from using funds in the bill to administer any policy that permits abortions to be performed at medical facilities except when the life of the mother is in danger.

Mr. Chairman, the Dornan amendment is an assault on the woman's right to choose. It jeopardizes access to safe medical care for millions of women who rely on military hospitals overseas. Women who joined the military to protect our rights should not have to check their constitutional rights at the border.

The Dornan amendment offered today mirrors language in the Defense authorization bill that denies access to legal abortion services for all women utilizing medical facilities outside the United States. This is an outrage. Women and their families have a constitutional right to these services, and their constitutional rights should not be thrown aside while they are under the care of military hospitals.

Let me emphasize several points about our substitute amendment.

First of all, the substitute amendment would not allow Federal funds to be used to pay for abortions, not allow Federal funds. The Dornan amendment overturns current policy that allows women to use their own funds.

Let me repeat that. They use their own funds to pay for abortions in overseas military hospitals. These patients are charged the full reimbursement rate for same-day surgery, more than the cost, more than the cost of abortion services at private facilities in this country, in order to ensure that there is no Federal funding involved.

Second, the substitute protects current policy under which no medical providers are forced to perform abortions due to the conscience clause that exists in the military services. No medical personnel would be forced to participate in or perform these services. It preserves the conscience clause.

Third, this is not a new policy. Privately funded abortions were allowed at military facilities from 1973 to 1988, including all, but a few, months of the Reagan administration, and they have been permitted again since President Clinton's executive order of January 19, 1993. The ban that existed from October 1988 to January 1993 was the exception.

The Dornan amendment is a direct attack on the rights of the American women who virtually work in serving our country valiantly and have put their lives on the line for this country ever single day. It is a backward step, and we must not allow it to move forward.

I urge my colleagues to ensure that our female military personnel and their military dependents have access to safe and legal medical care. Vote for our substitute and defeat the Dornan amendment.

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], an Army doctor still active in the Reserve and still actively practicing his profession of delivering babies.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the DeLauro amendment and speak in support of the Dornan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, prior to coming here to the Congress I was practicing medicine in Florida, and prior to practicing medicine in Florida I was in the Army, in the Army Medical Corps. Indeed I was in the Army during the early years of the 1980's when Reagan administration policies went into effect where we were not allowed to provide abortion services in military facilities, and, as a physician, I can say that we like the policy.

Most physicians do not like to get involved with the business of abortion, and that is because the vast majority of physicians become physicians because they want to be healers. They respect human life, and they recognize that performing abortion is a direct contradiction to that principle, a value that actually drew them into medicine. Indeed most physicians still take a Hippocratic Oath where they are asked to do no harm, but performing an abortion is a direct contradiction of that, as well as it is a direct contradiction of the very principle upon which our Nation was founded when Thomas Jefferson said that we are endowed by a Creator with inalienable rights to include the right to life. As a former Army physician, Mr. Chairman, I can tell my colleagues that we very much appreciated the support that we received from the Reagan administration in this area in that we did not have to involve ourselves.

A significant percentage of the American people are very strongly opposed to abortion. They feel that it is morally wrong to use taxpayer funding, even if it is indirect, to support this practice I think is very wrong, and I rise in support of the gentleman from California's position and in opposition to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] for yielding this time to me. I hope everyone votes for her amendment.

Let me tell my colleagues first of all DOD has a conscience clause. DOD has a parental-consent clause that they vigorously enforce. There have been only about 10 abortions that people paid for with their own money in the entire time this was in practice.

When we send people overseas, this is not voluntary. We order them to go overseas, and no one else would tolerate what the Dornan amendment is trying to do. If we said, ''When you go overseas, you can no longer have your free speech, thank you very much; when you go overseas, you can no longer have your freedom of religion, we don't want you practicing religion that would offend anybody, we don't want you to have the right to assemble with different groups, we don't want you * * *,'' people would go crazy. They would say this is our front line of defense defending our rights, and, no matter whether we agree with what they say, or who they assemble with, or what their religion is, we do not want to have that enforced on them just because they are offshore defending our wonderful rights.

Well, that is what my colleagues are doing today. They are doing that to women if they vote for Dornan. Vote ''no'' on Dornan, and vote for the DeLauro substitute.

When we station military personnel overseas, we do not ask them to give up their rights to free speech, to exercise their religion, to assemble. We don't require them to give up their legal protections against illegal searches and seizures. They still have the right to a speedy and public trial, a right to an attorney. The Dornan amendment asks military women and dependents to give up their legally protected right to choose.

This bill does not force anyone to be involved in an abortion against their will. Currently, active duty women stationed overseas are guaranteed the same rights that they would have if they were stationed stateside because they are allowed to pay the costs of an abortion in a military hospital out of their own pocket. Currently, no DOD funds can be used to fund abortions unless the life of the mother is in danger. Currently, no medical personnel are required to perform an abortion if they object to doing so, unless the life of the mother is at risk. Currently, the DOD cannot perform abortions in countries where that procedure is illegal.

The ban on privately paid abortions for military women overseas strips women of the very rights they were recruited to protect. The ban on abortions at military hospitals is unfair, dangerous, and discriminatory to military personnel. The ban doesn't even allow for abortions in cases where the fetus is so malformed that it will not survive birth.

I urge you to oppose the Dornan amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, imagine, if you will, a female captain serving with distinction in the Air Force at Kunsan Air Base, Korea. Brutally raped off-base, she receives medical and psychological treatment there, and may even receive more sophisticated OB/GYN treatment at the United States medical facility at Osan or at Yakota Air Base, Japan.

If, however, she discovers later that she is pregnant as the result of the rape, she will be unable to terminate the pregnancy at the Air Force hospital at Osan or Yakota if the Dornan amendment is adopted. And she'd be endangering her life if she went to a substandard local off-base facility.

In fact, this woman would be treated as a second-class citizen—forced to travel on her own back to the United States to obtain the kind of medical procedure guaranteed under our Constitution to all other American women.

For women, the Dornan amendment makes wearing a uniform a liability. That, indeed, may be the recruiting poster designed by the gentleman from California. ''Abandon your rights, all ye women who enter.''

I strongly support the amendment of my colleague from Connecticut to affirm current policy. Under current policy, neither Federal funds are used nor are health professionals required to perform abortions. Under current policy, expenses are borne entirely by the servicewoman or dependent.

This is a matter of fairness and equal access to medical facilities. Servicewomen and military dependents stationed overseas don't want or expect special treatment or special rights, only the ability to exercise rights guaranteed by Roe versus Wade, at medical facilities convenient to their post.

Remember the female captain stationed in Korea or another country far from the United States. The free exercise of her constitutional rights should not be inversely related to her distance from America's shores.

Vote for the DeLauro amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the DeLauro amendment, which strikes language that bars military women and dependents overseas from purchasing abortion services with their own money. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to reject the Dornan amendment.

The Dornan amendment goes much further than simply limiting the use of Government funds. It actually bars military women and dependents from using their own money to pay for abortion services at military bases, just as they would use their own funds to pay for those services if they were in the United States.

The Dornan amendment also puts the health of our military women at risk. Many of these women are stationed in countries where there is no access to safe and legal abortions outside of the military hospitals. A woman forced to seek an abortion to local facilities, or forced to wait to travel to acquire safe abortion services, faces tremendous health risks.

It is unimaginable to me and to the American people that we would reward American servicewomen who have volunteered to serve this Nation by violating their constitutional right to a safe abortion. I urge you to support the DeLauro amendment and to reject the Dornan amendment.

□ 1400

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Dornan amendment and in strong support of the DeLauro substitute.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Dornan amendment makes women in the military second-class citizens. Our military personnel should not have to risk their health nor sacrifice their civil rights when they serve their country. A ban on women getting abortions in military facilities overseas, even if they pay for it themselves, is discriminatory, and it prohibits women from exercising their legal rights simply because they are stationed overseas. Women stationed overseas are often situated in areas where local facilities are inadequate or they are unavailable.

The DeLauro amendment protects military women's health. We should do no less, Mr. Chairman. We should vote for this DeLauro amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Today, after all the pious speeches about the honor and bravery and sacrifice of Americans who wear the uniform of this great Nation overseas, we have reached one of those defining moments of truth.

The question is, Should brave Americans ready to lay down their lives in the defense of our Nation have the same fundamental rights as all other citizens? Can a woman in the service of her country go to a hospital and pay her own money for a legal and constitutionally protected abortion in a safe and clean American hospital?

It is time to show the voters what we really think of our American servicewomen. Do we genuinely respect and honor them enough to allow them the same rights any civilian has? Or are all our statements of respect and gratitude to our servicewomen just more cheap rhetoric for use during campaign season or when we want the taxpayers to buy a weapons system the Pentagon says it doesn't need?

Let's honor our servicewomen with more than just hollow rhetoric; let's respect their fundamental rights. Vote ''yes'' on the DeLauro substitute.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with regret that this House is once again using important debate time reserved for national security concerns to address the socially divisive issue of abortion. We have been through this same debate several times in committee and on the floor. In fact, the Senate addressed this question and voted to delete the restriction in the Armed Services Committee. I urge my colleagues to do the same by supporting the DeLauro amendment.

The language in this bill relegates our servicewomen and the wives of servicemen to the status of second-class citizens. It also represents congressional tampering at its worst. A women's right to choose is the law of the land—whether we agree or not. Congress has no right to deny a basic law to women simply because they are stationed abroad. The DeLauro amendment would apply current law to the military. Only private money could be used for abortion services, and no Federal money could be used. As a Hyde amendment supporter, I agree with that policy.

I urge my colleagues to reject the social agenda embodied in this language. Support current military policy—vote for the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the last speaker, said we were wasting precious national security time. Mr. Chairman, we lost 618,000 American lives in the Civil War between the States; we lost about 312,000 precious lives in World War II. Together that does not equal 1 million. We kill 1.5 million American babies in their mothers' wombs every year. The death toll, since the fraudulent, based-on-a-lie Roe versus Wade decision, we have killed about 35 million babies.

Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent use of time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we need to be clear about a number of matters with regard to this amendment. The first and most important is no Federal funds will be used to provide these services. The substitute that is being offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut relates only to the use of private funds. No medical providers will be forced to perform this procedure. No one will be forced to perform this procedure. All branches of the military have conscience clause provisions that permit medical personnel who have moral, religious, or ethical objections to this procedure to opt not to perform it. The substitute preserves this clause.

Mr. Chairman, this will keep military servicewomen and military dependents out of back alleys by allowing them access to safe, legal, and comprehensive reproductive services. I urge support of the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Dornan amendment to the Department of Defense authorization bill.

As my colleague from California has accurately pointed out, we have already had this debate and the proponents of forcing taxpayers to pay for overseas abortions came out on the losing end.

The facts today are no different than they were 2½ months ago. There is no reason why the American people—most of whom oppose abortion on demand—should be compelled to pay for abortions overseas and no reason for the U.S. Government to sponsor these abortions.

The Dornan language merely goes back to the more rationale and humane policy that was in place during the Reagan-Bush years. That policy prohibited federally funded, overseas military treatment facilities from providing abortions. Moreover, that policy allowed DOD medical facilities to do what they are supported to do—provide the services necessary to heal the sick and injured.

I urge my colleagues to support the Dornan amendment.

Mrs. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reiterate that there are no public funds involved in this effort. It is the funds, private funds, of the women who serve in our military who serve overseas, no public funding.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the DeLauro amendment to allow women in the armed services access to safe abortions abroad at their own expense.

I respect my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who oppose abortion for moral or religious reasons. But this summer I have witnessed an unprecedented move by moderate Republicans to join with their conservative colleagues in an all-out attack on women's reproductive rights. Members who for years have professed to support the rights to choose have voted to deny entire groups of women—like federal employees—access to safe abortions. Time and time again they have sacrificed women's constitutional rights for political, not moral ambitions.

Allowing military women to pay for their own abortions abroad is not a radical idea. The DeLauro amendment will simply continue to permit women who are voluntarily serving our country to practice the right to choose and to pay for that right themselves.

Please do not continue to sacrifice women's constitutional rights in the Republican fight to maintain control of Congress. Women don't deserve to be the losers in the political battle between Democrats and Republicans in Washington.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER], my distinguished colleague from the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Dornan amendment and in opposition to the DeLauro amendment. Mr. Chairman, in the Defense authorization bill passed earlier this year this Congress placed limits on the use of U.S. military facilities for the practice of abortion. We now face this very same issue in the context of appropriations.

Those who oppose these limits argue that their position is simply a ''matter of fairness.'' Despite my questioning whether we can have any substantive discussion of fairness without including the preborn, and despite my profound disagreement with the Supreme Court's reasoning in the Roe versus Wade decision, I want to concentrate on what I see as the real issue at hand.

The Supreme Court has told us that we have to allow the killing of preborn children. It has not, however, told us that Government has an obligation to provide this service. The DeLauro amendment, I believe, would obligate the United States to make sure abortion services and facilities are available at U.S. military bases.

There are many reasons why we should not obligate the military to provide facilities and services for abortion. For example, despite the assurances from the other side, I believe it is hard to argue there is no subsidy of abortion by U.S. taxpayers in this case. I believe there is a subsidy, though it may be indirect, because everything in our military medical systems is taxpayer-funded—from the doctor's education and availability, to the electricity powering the facility's equipment, to the very building itself.

In addition, abortion—while declared legal by the Supreme Court—remains a very divisive practice, and allowing abortions to be performed on military installations would bring that discord and dissension right onto our military bases, complete with pickets and the like.

Some would also argue that it is especially offensive to make the military—an institution dedicated to preserving innocent life by deterring aggression—the provider of a procedure that ends innocent life.

While it is offensive, I think that the core principle at issue today—whether the Government is obligated to provide a right—goes beyond the unique circumstances of the military. The freedom of the press guaranteed by the first amendment, for example, does not obligate the Federal Government to provide every interested American with a printing press. Pushing this notion further, I ask, should we allow military facilities to be used for prostitution where it is otherwise legal? I think not.

Congress has the clear responsibility under the Constitution to provide for the rules and regulations of the military. We must not make it the policy of the United States to use its military facilities to destroy an innocent preborn life.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I will vote in favor of the Dornan amendment and against the DeLauro amendment. I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government is obligated to honor the constitutional rights of women who serve in the military overseas. The Dornan amendment denies their constitutional rights.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the DeLauro amendment to preserve the right to choose for women who serve our country in the military. And I rise in strong opposition to the Dornan amendment to take away that right.

The Dornan amendment is yet another step in the continuing stealth campaign to take away the right to choose for all women. The anti-choice forces in this House already have voted to take away that right for poor women and for women who work for the Federal Government.

But I find the Dornan amendment to be especially offensive because it takes away the freedom to choose from women who risk their lives to defend all of our freedoms. The Dornan amendment makes a mockery of our Constitution and the right to freedom, fairness, and equality enshrined in it.

Once again, I challenge those who oppose a woman's right to choose to have the courage of their convictions and bring it up for an up-or-down vote.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the saddest debates that we have on this floor, usually twice a year. Since we did away with the draft we asked for volunteers, and of course in the modern era that means we have many women serving in our military. All we are talking about here is protecting and preserving their constitutional right, as has been enumerated by our Supreme Court, to use medical facilities that are clean and safe overseas should they have the tragic requirement of needing an abortion.

Mr. Chairman, this is not public funding. It is their money. The ought to be safe in the assignment of the taxpayers money.

□ 1415

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the DeLauro amendment.

I would like to remind this Congress that the Constitution applies to all Americans, including members of the Armed Forces.

Women soldiers who serve our country overseas have access to a full range of reproductive services. The DeLauro amendment allows them to use their own money in overseas hospitals.

Pass the DeLauro amendment. Protect a military woman's right to choose.

Mr. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, do you think for a moment that if men could get pregnant that we would be spending a moment here to discuss whether our men in the military would have the right to use their own money to go to military hospitals to have one of the most personal, private operations possible performed on their bodies? The answer is no.

Mr. Chairman, we do not know the circumstance of pregnancy of these women. We do not know the health circumstances that are unique to them, and the reality is this ought to be left to them. They have a constitutional right, let us support it.

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] who has just returned from a sterling performance in China.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding time to me.

This vote poses two simple yet fundamental questions: First, when Congress encounters one of those rare questions on which the Federal judiciary has not mandated a proabortion policy, will we have the courage to stand for innocent human life?

Second, is it consistent with the mission of our Armed Forces, a mission that is justifiable only insofar as it is designed to save and protect human lives, to be deeply involved in the enterprise of killing unborn children?

Unfortunately, on January 22, 1993, our military hospitals were turned into abortion mills by the President of the United States when he reversed a well settled prolife policy. Since then, however, and I am glad to say, many of our courageous military obstetricians and nurses and anesthesiologists around the world have refused. I say again have refused to comply with that death order. They understand that their job is to be healers first and always. They regard it as inconsistent and hypocritical to heal innocent people in one room and kill them in the next. They know a house divided against itself will not stand.

By adopting the Dornan language, this House will take its stand with these healers, these true health professionals, and bear witness to their courage and vision. DOD hospitals and health care facilities will once again be institutions exclusively dedicated to healing.

The DeLauro amendment makes a false distinction based not on what happens in an abortion, not on who does the abortion, but on who provides the cash. This amendment says, in effect, that it is moral to tear a child limb from limb as long as somebody else is paying for it. It pretends that the United States is not really taking sides if it turns its hospitals into abortion mills, provided that they break even. This distinction is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of what is at stake here, of what is at stake in every single abortion.

Mr. Chairman, the law has a teaching function. It teaches by example. If the United States chooses to turn its military hospitals into abortion mills, it sends a powerful message to women and girls that abortion is not only a choice that they are allowed under the Supreme Court's decisions, but an acceptable choice. By taking its hospitals out of the abortion business, the United States can send the opposite message—a message of healing, of compassion, of justice for each person, born and unborn.

Each of us is called upon today to take a stand one way or the other: For life or for death. The DeLauro amendment attempts to tell us that we can be neutral on this question, but this is not one of the questions on which we can remain neutral. I urge my colleagues to choose life. Please vote ''no'' on the DeLauro amendment and ''yes'' on the Dornan amendment.

Vote ''yes'' on the Dornan amendment, ''no'' on the DeLauro amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the DeLauro amendment and opposition to the Dornan amendment. This is a very sensitive question and I certainly respect both sides. My wife and I would not choose abortion for our family. We just had a baby. My wife gave birth at age 41, but I wanted to say something. People who are opposed to abortion do not have a right, in my opinion, to force their beliefs on everybody else.

Mr. Chairman, the thing about the United States is that people have individual rights and individual freedoms. If you do not believe in abortion, then it is your right not to have one. Women in the military ought to be treated like every other citizen. They ought to have the freedom to choose.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the DeLauro substitute amendment and in opposition to the Dornan amendment.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, it is patently unfair that American women cannot obtain medical services—medical services that are legal under the American Constitution and American laws—at American medical facilities just because these women are stationed overseas.

Our Government has long advocated the elimination of discrimination and unequal treatment. We have long advocated access to safe and sound medical services. The Dornan amendment is overtly discriminatory; it is overtly unequal and it is overtly unsafe and unsound.

This amendment is not about granting special rights to women stationed overseas. It's about fairness. It's about making sure that American women overseas are not classified as second class citizens by their Government, the Government for which they provide defense from foreign aggression.

I support the DeLauro substitute because I support women as full and equal citizens of this country. To vote otherwise, is to insult the women of America in the worst way possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] has 45 seconds remaining.

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

I would like to emphasize that this amendment is not about public funding and its is not about special treatment, it is about fairness. That is what it is about. The substitute amendment preserves the right to choose and it preserves safe health care for American military women.

Women who serve in the military to protect our rights, to protect our liberty, should not have to check those rights, their constitutional rights, at our border when they go overseas to protect us. They deserve good quality and the best medical care and they have that right under our Constitution. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan substitute amendment and to defeat the Dornan amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, every consultant who has made it to heaven or is in the other place will tell you that the first thing they learn is do not be a flip-flopper, and here is the list of how 230 people voted before. This is not a mockery to the Constitution. The mockery was aging, retired Harry Blackmun finding a right to kill innocent precious human life in the womb. I hope he has a good lawyer when he meets St. Peter.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] is recognized for 1 minute and 15 seconds.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, this is more than a legal or a constitutional question, although it certainly is that. It is a moral question. I do not think anybody who claims to be human can be indifferent to the proposition that a tiny, vulnerable, defenseless unborn life is being crushed, is being destroyed, is being exterminated in an abortion and be indifferent to that. That is the one missing factor in all of the reasoned arguments on the proabortion side.

Mr. Chairman, they talk about women's rights, they talk about safe abortion, but they totally forget the invisible element, the unborn child. That is not a nothing. The term safe abortion is an oxymoron. It is terminal for the unborn child.

What is safe about being sucked out of a mother's womb and thrown away with the trash? Abortions are evil. They are not a benign neutral act. They take a human life that has been guaranteed the right to life in our Declaration of Independence as inalienable. Why is that erased in all of our contemplation?

Do not euphemize reproductive rights. There is nothing reproductive about abortion. That is reproductive denial.

Vote for Dornan against DeLauro.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, the men and women who serve as military doctors in our armed services take an oath to save and defend lives. The majority of doctors in the military do not want to participate in the willful destruction of human life. Despite the great reluctance of doctors to perform abortions—the Pentagon, under the direction of the Clinton administration, is insisting that a way be found to allow abortion on demand at our military facilities. While women seeking an abortion must pay for the procedure—having the procedure take place at a military hospital raises concerns regarding the use of taxpayer money to subsidize abortion-related expenses.

The Dornan language would insure the restoration of a Reagan-Bush policy which stated that overseas U.S. military medical facilities could not be used to perform abortions—except to save the life of the mother. Opponents of the Dornan provision may argue that many nations hosting U.S. military bases may have limits on abortion, making it difficult to obtain this procedure safely. However, the U.S. military is bound to respect the laws of host countries including any restriction on abortions. Furthermore, United States women overseas may continue, as they have for years, to go to Germany and use facilities there that are just as safe as anywhere in the United States.

It is clear that military doctors want nothing to do with aiding the destruction of unborn children and that the majority of the American people do not want their tax dollars to subsidize abortion either directly or indirectly. We have a responsibility to ensure that our military facilities are allowed to be completely dedicated to healing people, not aiding in their destruction. I urge my colleagues to support the Dornan amendment to H.R. 2126.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the underlying Dornan amendment without intervening business or debate.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 224, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 641]

AYES—194

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Moran
Nadler
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Tanner
Thomas
Thompson
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
White
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—224

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Fox
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Bateman
Bishop
Cox
Dingell
Gillmor
Hunter

Maloney
McKinney
Moakley
Morella
Reynolds
Sisisky
Tucker
Waldholtz
Ward
Wilson

□ 1444

Mr. HORN, Ms. DUNN of Washington, and Mr. THOMAS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 641 on H.R. 2126 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted ''aye.'' I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following rollcall vote No. 641.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I ask that a statement appear in the RECORD following rollcall 641 indicating that, though I was recorded as voting ''aye'' it was my intention to vote ''no,'' on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 191, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 642]

AYES—226

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Borski
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Fox
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Klug
Kolbe
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Moran
Nadler
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Tanner
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
White
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop
Blute
Cox
Dingell
Fattah
Flake
Maloney
McKinney
Moakley
Morella
Petri
Reynolds
Sisisky
Tucker
Waldholtz
Waters
Wilson

□ 1452

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. At the conclusion of the debate on the last amendment, 2 hours and 38 minutes are remaining for debate on further amendments to this bill.

Title III is open to amendment at any point.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. SCHUMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 72 offered by Mr. SCHUMER:

Page 16, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to withdraw this amendment, but let me explain to my colleagues as to why. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KING] and I first intended to offer this amendment when the bill was originally scheduled for floor consideration a month ago. During the same week the House voted overwhelmingly to lift the arms embargo in the former Yugoslavia. The amendment was a simple one. It would supply $50 million worth of TOW antitank missiles to the Bosnian Government which it desperately needs to overcome the lopsided advantage of the Bosnian Serbs in tanks and armored vehicles and it was intended simply to demonstrate that Congress was willing to put its money where its mouth was, not only by lifting the embargo but by actually providing the Moslems with some of the weapons they need to defend themselves, weapons they cannot afford to buy after years of devastating aggression against them.

I still believe in that amendment, I still believe the Moslems have the right to defend themselves, and at the proper time the United States as the leader of the free world has the duty to assist them. But, of course, significant events have occurred over the last month and they are transpiring as we speak today. The Bosnian Serbs suffered a dramatic reversal in Crimea, the United Nations and the allies have shown renewed resolve and have taken firm action to halt Serb aggression, and for the first time in a while, perhaps since the beginning of hostilities, it looks like we might be on the verge