United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 14, 1996 *No. 67*

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FOLEY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 14, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable MARK FOLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] for 5 minutes.

LEGISLATION NEEDED TO COMBAT UNSCRUPULOUS BUSINESS PRACTICE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. It is a pleasure to again be able to address Speaker FOLEY.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a subject in which I plan soon to introduce legislation. It has to do with the practice of large, wealthy entities using a combination of their wealth but also the laws of this country, the securities laws, the tax laws, accounting principles to acquire companies when their intention in acquiring the companies is to shut them down.

In particular, I am addressing the situation in New Bedford, MA, where, to my great dismay, the firm of Kohlberg, Jerome Kohlberg and James Kohlberg, bought a company which had a plant in New Bedford, MA, a plant that has been in existence for over 100 years, that is profitable today as it was profitable when they bought it, making various forms of fasteners, shoe eyelets, and they bought it apparently to close it down. They bought it because given the tax advantages that were available to them when they borrowed money for the purchase, given other kinds of accounting questions as to what things are valued at, it enriches them more, because they are very wealthy people—we are not talking about anyone fighting for survival—it enriches them more to close it down.

I want to make a distinction because I have had people say to me, ''Well, don't the owners of private property have a right to do things? In some cases closing down a plant that's faltering is the only thing to do.''

Yes; sadly that is the case. But I want to make this important distinction. I am not, in the legislation I will be preparing, seeking to restrict someone who is in business, who has owned a business, who is trying to make a product, who decides that he or she can no longer profitably do that, that his or her capital would produce a better return elsewhere. I am not talking about disturbing the business decisions of long-term owners. That is a different issue. I will address that in another context. I am talking here about the case of Jerome Kohlberg and James Kohlberg acquiring this business for the purpose of shutting it down.

If it were a business that was dying because of a lack of profitability, the question would be a different one. If it were a business that were losing its suppliers, that was being even outcompeted by others, the case would be a different one. What I want to do is to examine the tax laws, the corporate laws, the accounting practices in this country that make it profitable for people to buy a company and shut it down.

The Kohlbergs, having paid, they tell us, $16 million for this company as they account for it, and I am skeptical of how exactly they got to that number, will not accept bona fide offers that were made for the company. I want to stress that again. We are not talking about forcing someone to keep open an unprofitable enterprise. There are responsible businesspeople in the city of New Bedford. They have worked with the United Electrical Workers Union, which has been very statesmanlike in this regard; they have worked with the mayor of New Bedford and her Economic Development Commission. And people who know the business, people who have made manufacturing work in New Bedford, have come in and said, ''Please sell us this at a reasonable price,'' and they have been refused. Indeed, the Kohlbergs did not want to even entertain offers of a sale. We pressured them so they said they would entertain offers but they did it in so unrealistic a fashion that we had no chance to succeed.

What happens? What happens is they use various laws so they can buy up a company just to shut it down. More than 100 people are thrown out of work. Their families will be in distress. Costs will be imposed on the city of New Bedford, on the State of Massachusetts, on banks, on schools, on auto dealers. These are hardworking Americans who suddenly find themselves bereft of an income at a time and a place where it is not going to be easy for them to replace it, so that Jerome Kohlberg and James Kohlberg, who are already quite wealthy, can get wealthier.

Again, I want to stress, this is a case where they bought this place to shut it

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

down. People have said, ''Do you want to interfere with private property?''

Well, yes; I do want to reduce the incentive people have to buy a going concern that was in no danger, that we know of, of shutting down just so they can shut it down and get richer. We had in this case people ready to step forward. If the owner wanted to sell, a fair price would have been offered. There were people ready to say, ''Here's your money and we will take over and we will keep this place running.''

We are not talking about confiscating private property. We are not talking about interfering with a legitimate business decision that says, ''This is no longer a profitable enterprise. I'm taking my capital elsewhere.'' We are talking about a set of laws in this country and regulations and accounting practices, and these need to be looked at further, that incentivize someone buying a plant solely for shutting it down. That is something that must be changed.

WE TOLD YOU SO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, last year, after a long and passionate debate, the United States joined the World Trade Organization. The WTO, as it is known, is an international body based in Geneva with 120 nation members. In simple terms, the WTO is the police force of international commerce and trade, a mechanism for enforcement of the world's trade laws.

Supporters of the WTO promoted entry as a means toward a fair and free trade policy. It was, they argued, a way for the United States to knock down other nation's protectionist trade barriers.

Opponents, who came from all political spectrums, foresaw a different world. Citizen's groups predicted a situation where other countries would pressure the WTO into weakening America's world-leading environmental, health, and safety laws. Economists warned that the WTO would penalize the forward-looking United States to the advantage of the mercantilist nations of East Asia and of the European Union. Nationalists were terrified of an organization that held the United States as equal to the other 120 member nations, for we would have no veto power, despite our obvious stature.

Many of us in Congress worked diligently to defeat the ill-advised entry into this Organization. I believed then, and still maintain, that our sovereignty is endangered by our membership in the WTO. Simply put, we are not equal to other nations. We have the world's most powerful econony, the world's most desirable markets, and the world's most advanced and forward-looking environmental, health, and safety laws. In other words, we have the most to lose. Entry into the WTO made no sense to us; we saw it as a means toward the demise of our sovereignty, the weakening of our standards and laws, and as a means toward the subversion of our already precarious trading position.

Unfortunately for all Americans, we were right.

The WTO handed down its first decision in January, and guess who came out the loser? If you said the United States, you're right. The case, which was brought against the United States by Venezuela and Brazil, challenged a 1993 EPA rule on gasoline standards. Specifically, the rule required America's dirtiest cities to improve their gasoline by 15 percent over 1990 levels. The two plaintiffs argued that this rule put their fuel at unfair disadvantage, that they would be held to higher standards than domestic producers because they didn't have adequate 1990 data. The case was decided by a panel of three trade experts from Finland, Hong Kong, and New Zealand, who unanimously ruled in favor of the plaintiffs.

The WTO ruling granted America three choices as retribution: First, we can change the EPA rule and let in dirtier gasoline; second, we can keep the regulation in place and face $150 million in annual trade sanctions, such as tariffs on U.S. exports; or third, we can negotiate the terms of the sanctions and perhaps compensate the plaintiffs with lower tariffs on their exports. Regardless of which plan we pick, we lose. U.S. oil refiners, who have invested millions of dollars to come into compliance by producing cleaner fuel and by adequately reporting their data, will be forced to compete with dirtier, cheaper gasoline imports. Of course, the worse part of the ruling is the establishment of the WTO jurisprudence over a wide array of U.S. laws.

The ruling affirmed the fears of everyone who opposed America's entry into the WTO. It deemed our environmental policy too stringent; it provided two weaker nations a means to unfairly enter our market; and worst of all, the ruling undercuts our sovereignty.

Our laws and policies are made through a democratic process. And although we may not always agree with the laws and rules that govern us, we at least have the benefit of representation. Obviously, through this process we hope to balance the concerns of all involved parties. We hope, ultimately, to maintain a modicum of fairness.

The WTO ruling has proven to be the antithesis of the democratic process. We as a nation have been forced to comply with the decisions of a body, whose main interest seems to be the forced opening of our markets. The WTO, in their ruling, subverted our laws and our legitimate trade barriers. They determined that we as a sovereign nation have no right to bar entry into our markets, regardless of the merits and regardless of another nation's failure to meet our democratically set standards.

My colleagues, this is dangerous stuff. The WTO's ruling sets a scary precedent. It sends a message to the nations of the world that U.S. policy can be thwarted, that our democratic process means nothing, and that our standards mean even less. Furthermore, the ruling puts our own industries at a disadvantage, for they must continue to play by the rules.

They must continue to obey the standards and rules of production and dissemination.

In the end, America is the only loser. Our involvement in this Organization creates an unfair advantage for our trading partners, who don't have to live up to the same standards as U.S. firms. It forces American businesses, who must comply with stricter standards to compete with companies from countries with weak policies and a strong entry mechanism in the WTO.

As is becoming the standard with our trade policy, the WTO will ultimately force American jobs overseas and force our country to weaken our environmental and health standards. This, of course, undermines the trust of our trade policy, which should serve as a job creation mechanism and as a tool to force other countries to come into compliance with out higher standards. Our involvement in the WTO is, unfortunately, the explication of all that is wrong with our current trade policy.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I am afraid that we will continually be forced into inequitable positions by the WTO, that the Organization will serve only as a tool for other nation's to bypass our sovereignty. America is the only loser in this game, and this, my colleagues is game we can't afford to play.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying, this first ruling by the WTO forbodes a dark future for our Nation. I ask that we reconsider our entry into the WTO.

SACRED COW DISEASE ALIVE AND WELL IN DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk a bit about what we are getting ready to do today. We are getting ready to go into the Defense Department authorization and I want to know, where are the budget hawks? Where are all these people who have been talking about the deficit? Because when we look at where we are, it is really very, very troubling.

Let me show my colleagues some charts. Everybody has their charts and I did not come unprepared. If we look at this and we look at the United States, which is the blue line, that is where we are spending. If we look at the red line, that is where Russia is spending. As we can see, when the cold war ended, their spending melted down. Not us. We keep right on spending.

Even though we talk about the deficit, we do not do anything when it comes to the defense bill.

Then we look at threat potentials, at the United States and what we are spending on defense, here is what Russia spends, here is what China spends, and here is what a whole range of other countries spend: Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Cuba. Either we are not spending very well or something is really wrong. We are spending an awful lot of money on stuff that there is some question about.

What do I think the real problem is? In Great Britain they are talking about mad cow disease. This Congress has sacred cow disease. They see the Defense Department as the biggest sacred cow around here, and they will not allow anybody to touch their sacred cow. So, everybody, watch. This is our wonderful Republican colleagues pulling the sacred cow back in.

The bill we are taking up today will not allow any cuts at all, even though it is 5 percent above what the administration asked for. Any number of us requested the ability to at least offer cuts to bring it down to what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs said was enough, what the Commander in Chief said was enough, but, no, we are not even being allowed to debate that here. We are totally gagged.

Do the Members know what we are going to debate here today? Today this body is going to become the moral police for the military. The people who represent us in the military, we do not want them to have the rights other Americans have, that they defend. Other Americans will get the Constitution defending their rights. People in the military get the Congress. Ask the average American, ''Who do you want defending your rights, the Constitution or the Congress?'' I think most of them will go with the Constitution. The Constitution looks a whole lot better today.

But that sacred cow, I cannot even touch it today. I had an amendment to try to bring down the numbers. Any number of Members had amendments to bring down the numbers. I have been on the Committee on Armed Services for 24 years, and they are not going to allow us to touch the sacred cow. So sacred cow disease is alive and well.

What are we doing today? We are charging it all to our kids. That is basically what we are doing. Anybody who votes for this bill today and tells us that they are a deficit hawk, that they really want to bring the deficit down, is absolutely wrong. What they are really saying is they will do everything they can to spend money on weapons systems.

I guess that to me is the saddest part of all, because it is even coming out in the military. I just saw their new poster, their new poster that has nothing on it but fancy dandy toys, new toys for the boys from the Congress. These are all cold war weapons. They do not really fit any of the kind of missions that we are on today. But are we not happy to have them?

I am so old, I remember that when we had Armed Forces Day, we celebrated the men and women who were in the Armed Forces. That is who we celebrated. None of these weapons are worth anything if we are not paying attention to the men and women in the Armed Forces and their families.

So I find this a very sad day as we begin the debate on my last defense bill, because I am leaving. But in fact we have been gagged, we cannot mention one cut. We are going to spend hours here debating whether women should have the same reproductive rights as American women. We are going to have all sorts of stuff about HIV, sexual preference, what kind of magazines they can read, where they can read them, when they can read them, what they can do about them and on and on and on. We are encouraging a culture all driven by the industrial complex. This is sad, and I hope America wakes up.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL MEETS NATION'S COMMITMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that I get a chance to follow my esteemed colleague from Colorado, Mrs. SCHROEDER, because I want to show her some of what she calls wasteful spending on the part of the Republican majority for defense.

I have with me an ammunition pouch. It is an empty ammunition pouch. It was issued by the U.S. Marine Corps and it symbolizes some of the increased defense spending that we are going to be engaged in as we pass this bill through the House. It manifests some of the $12 billion plus in defense spending which, as the gentlewoman said, is a little less than a 5-percent increase over what the Clinton administration asked for.

This year I had a meeting with the services, and I had the ranking member, the Democrat, my good colleague from Missouri, Mr. SKELTON, the ranking member on the procurement subcommittee that I chair, participate in this meeting with me. We asked the services to come in. We asked the Marine Corps and the Army and the Navy and the Air Force to come in.

I had a basic question for them: ''Do you have enough ammunition, basic bullets for your troops, to fight the two-war scenario that we request you to fight, that President Clinton has said you must be able to meet?'' That means if we should have a problem in the Middle East, like Desert Storm, and at the same time perhaps have a problem in the Korean Peninsula, if the North Koreans should take advantage of our being tied up in the Middle East and start moving down the Korean peninsula, and we had to move there and fight basically two contingencies at the same time, would we have enough basic ammo to fight that two-war contingency under the Clinton administration's defense budget?

The answer from the Marines—and, incidentally, the Marines are always the most candid, perhaps they are the worst politicians in Washington but they are always the most candid—they said, ''Congressman, we don't have enough bullets to fight the two-war contingency that we are charged with.''

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield briefly to my colleague, although I did not ask her to yield, but go ahead.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman knows I was not going to make any amendment that would attack extra ammunition. That is not the point. The point was about some of the weapons that I think even the gentleman might agree we did not need to add.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend but I want to tell her, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement, what my jurisdiction includes and what we are adding money for. I want to go through the list, but the most basic one, the one that I charged our staff with first, was to make sure that the troops have enough bullets in their guns to be able to defend the country. That was the first priority that we gave on this $6 billion add-on.

To get back to my point, I asked the Marines what it would take to fill their ammunition pouches and to add all the mortar rounds, the howitzer rounds and everything else, starting with basic M–16 bullets for infantrymen. What did they need beyond what President Clinton is providing them in his budget? They said, ''Congressman, we are about 96 million M–16 bullets short. That means we run out. That means our ammo pouches are empty when we get to that point.''

So the first thing we put in this budget was enough money for 96 million M–16 bullets, and we put that in the budget this year. They then gave me a list. I said, ''Give me a list of what it is going to take you to be able to handle the two-war scenario.'' They gave us that list and it came to about $360 million. That was the first addition that we made.

We then went to the Chiefs of the respective services, because last year when the Republicans added defense money it was charged, ''You're adding stuff that the President doesn't want, you're adding stuff that the Pentagon doesn't want, that his Chiefs in the services don't want.'' So we asked the Chiefs to come before us. We did that because we got a memorandum from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili, that said we need to spend for modernization, that is for new equipment for our soldiers, $60 billion a year.

Even President Clinton in 1995 when he was projecting the 1997 defense budget, which is what we are debating today, said ''In fiscal year 1997,'' that is this year's defense budget, ''I want to have almost $50 billion spent on modernization.'' Yet when he came through with the budget, it was $10 billion less than what he said he was going to be asking for a couple of years ago. So it did not even fit the President's blueprint. It was $10 billion under the President's blueprint for defense spending this year.

So we asked the service Chiefs to come in. We said, ''What do you need to make sure that the men and women of the services have the best equipment?'' They came up with a list of $15 billion. In the defense bill today we are going to be able to go over those systems and tell the Members exactly what they are. We did improve the safety requirements for the Marines also. We are adding 24 Harrier safety upgrades, in light of the 3 crashes that occurred in the last few months. We will describe this in greater detail in the defense debate.

PLIGHT OF THE KASHMIRI PANDITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the President might have delinked human rights from trade, but that should not be taken as a signal by other countries that the U.S. Congress no longer cares about human rights.

Indeed, concern for human rights in our own country and around the world remains a prominent concern on both sides of the aisle. Congresswoman PELOSI, Congressman LANTOS, Congressman SMITH of New Jersey and Congressman WOLF are just four of the many Members who have made human rights a burning concern.

I want to add my voice today to the concern about human rights in a part of the world about which we hear very little: Kashmir.

Indeed, Kashmir is one of the main trouble spots in the world today. India and Pakistan have fought two wars over Kashmir, and it remains a sore spot in Indo-Pakistani relations. Pakistan has taken every opportunity to destabilize the situation in Kashmir.

Soon after I took office in 1993, I received a group of activists from the Kashmiri Pandit community. The Pandits are not well known in this country.

They are Hindus who have been made refugees in their own country.

They are also a proud people with a special place in the history of India and the subcontinent. I might note that as India struggles to form a new government in the wake of the historic defeat suffered by the Congress Party, the Pandit community has made enormous contributions to Indian culture, including Jawaharlal Nehru.

Listening to the Pandits, I was touched by their story.

And I was shocked by the human rights abuses that have been perpetrated in Kashmir against the Hindus.

Indeed, the Pandits have been the target of a campaign of ethnic cleansing.

They have been brutalized and killed because they are Hindus.

Many of them have been forced from their ancestral homeland and now live in squalid camps.

Their future is uncertain.

I believe the Pandits are truly the forgotten people of Kashmir.

The State Department recently included a mention of the Pandits' plight in the annual ''country reports'' on human rights. That is at least a start—a recognition of a human rights problem.

We must not look the other way while Pandit people are killed, raped, abducted, brutalized and exiled. We must not accept the fact that they have been exiled in their own country.

We must pay attention to the plight of internally displaced people, a status that is becoming all too familiar in our new world.

I urge other Members to look below the surface of the conflict in Kashmir and focus on the human cost.

In the refugee camps there is a growing sense of unease, even panic, at the thought of being forgotten by the rest of the world.

As we have shown in Bosnia and other places, the United States is not the type of country that turns its back on people who are in dire straits.

That hope is what keeps the Kashmiri Pandits and other internally displaced people from lapsing into despair at their predicament.

They look to the West for the hope of a better future. We must not look the other way.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY—WILL AMERICA GROW UP BEFORE IT GROWS OLD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized during morning business for 6 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I attended a Social Security forum. One of the presenters at that forum said Social Security could be taking in less money from FICA taxes than it is required to pay Social Security checks by the year 2005. By the year 2005, Social Security under that definition could be broke. There is no real trust fund. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I have entitled my remarks for this morning ''Protecting Social Security—Will America Grow Up Before It Grows Old?''

In 1983 Congress passed historic legislation to save Social Security. At that time the Social Security Administration warned that the system had an unfunded liability equal to 1.82 percent of payroll. In other words, the taxes would have to be increased by 1.82 in order to accommodate the requirements for survival for Social Security.

A 1983 law eliminated this liability temporarily. However, the actuaries today now say that the unfunded liability is 2.17 percent of taxable payroll, 19 percent worse than in 1983, and yet, Mr. Speaker, we do nothing. Some people have called it a third rail. Some people say, do not touch Social Security because you might not be reelected, because seniors do not want their Social Security interrupted or considered. I do not believe that is true. I believe most senior citizens today want to protect Social Security for their kids and their grandkids.

Let me tell my colleagues about the existing liability that equals $4 trillion in Social Security. Put another way, under the current system every beneficiary for the next 75 years will have to absorb a 14-percent cut in benefits for the system to balance. The other alternative is that we raise taxes by 16 percent on the already overburdened American worker.

Traditionally Congress waits until the last minute or the last moment to solve these kinds of problems, using a crisis environment to convince our constituents and ourselves that sacrifices could be made. If that happens, probably what Congress would do first is to look at reducing COLA's for existing retirees.

That is not the right way to solve this problem. I think, no matter how we try under current law, there will only be two workers paying into the system for each retiree drawing benefits by the time that we reach the 2010 to 2020 era. When we started this program, there were 38 workers for every 1 retiree. Today there are 3 workers for every retiree. When we hit the catastrophic era of 2010 to 2020, there will only be two workers for each retiree.

I am introducing legislation this year, and it offers a way out and I believe it justifies consideration. Part one of my bill eliminates the unfunded liability of the trust funds by slowing the growth of benefits in two basic ways.

Under the bill initial benefits will still rise after inflation, but they will not double as they do now under current law. It also imposes some modest means testing of benefits. This proposal holds harmless low-income workers and also existing retirees. I repeat, my proposal holds harmless the low-income workers and also existing retirees. Furthermore, this proposal gradually raises the retirement age, then indexes it to life expectancy. These two reforms more than eliminate the unfunded liability of this system, according to the Social Security's actuaries.

The Social Security Administration has scored this bill and found that each worker could invest between 1.8 percent of what they earn in payroll and 10 percent of their paycheck in a personal retirement savings account that

is going to be their personal passbook savings account, their property, so at least for those funds they do not have to be worrying about a government that is going to use these moneys up and eventually not pay those payments.

Over time, the assets in workers' accounts will grow very rapidly, producing genuine retirement security. The balances grow so rapidly that it seems only fair to ask these successful investors to agree to lower Social Security benefits. Thus, worker/investors will still receive Social Security checks, although they will be smaller than those defined under part 1, as well as full ownership rights to their plans. However, the benefits flowing from their personal retirement savings accounts will more than make up the difference. Furthermore, account balances will belong to workers and will be passed on to their heirs, improving the financial security of wives, husbands and their children. Personal retirement savings accounts are a very good deal.

With some guidelines I believe it should be up to each worker to determine how his funds will be invested or if he wants to fund a personal retirement savings account at all. In fact, workers may elect to remain in the existing system if they wish and collect only Social Security benefits. It will be their option alone whether to place a portion of their paychecks in the hands of professional money managers. However, eligible investments in accounts include only assets now eligible for investment in individual retirement accounts [IRA's]. Also, under the proposal, managed investment accounts will have to meet investment and reporting requirements.

Another important benefit of this proposal is that it will stabilize fiscal policy. This year, Social Security will take in $75 billion more than it distributes. By 2005, the annual cash flow surplus will rise to $135 billion. But in 2025 and beyond, there will be annual cash deficits of $330 billion and rising as far as the eye can see. Under this plan, cash flow in and out of the Social Security System will always be equal. Pressure to cut other spending or to raise taxes will not be required by cash flow problems. Social Security will be depoliticized—as it should be.

I plan to introduce this bill soon and invite my colleagues to cosponsor. Together, we can restore the solvency of America's most popular program and make it even better.

THE TRAGEDY OF FLIGHT 592

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER]. Knowing her long years of service in the area of our defense appropriations and spending, I simply want to pose the question to my Republican colleagues, what kind of House are we when we are not allowed to debate fully a reduction in the defense budget, a fair, open discussion about how best to utilize the precious dollars that we have in this country to serve America?

However, Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor for another concern. Before I start, let me say to my colleagues that I am a former member of the city of Houston's Aviation Committee. I think if my colleagues review my record, they will find me a strong and active advocate for the aviation industry.

I also will say that I believe that those who work in the aviation industry are some of the more dedicated workers and employees and individuals committed to service. But this is not about questioning the integrity of our industry and who works in the industry. It is, of course, raising a question about a terrible loss of life just 1 day before Mother's Day in Flight 592. We realize that many mothers lost sons and daughters, and families were destroyed and devastated.

But the question becomes, when we come to the U.S. Congress, I always thought that we should be problem solvers and not dart throwers. It was interesting to listen to the expose of Rush Limbaugh. He always gives us such pointed dialog, sometimes greatly erroneous, as I thought his comments were in giving us a gravity study and a gravity talk about how wonderful it is that airplanes float and fly and how we should marvel at that, and why is there such hysteria and emotion around the loss of 109 lives?

Well, I will tell you, Rush, because America is a humanitarian Nation. And yes, we lose lives in violence, gun violence and car crashes, but every time there is a tragedy like Flight 592, we raise our voices because we want to ask the question why, and does it have to happen again? Rush, I am not interested in your debate and comment on flotation and the marvel of aviation. I understand that. The question becomes, why did we lose those 109 lives?

First, this particular airline or airplane was some 30 years old, almost. Its maiden voyage for this particular airline was in 1993 but it was actually purchased in 1969. I am not against old airplanes, but I am for maintaining them.

In addition, some seven times this particular airplane was forced back to the gate to return for some mechanical problems over a 2-year period. The question becomes, to FAA Administrator David Hinson, ''What kind of job is the Federal Aviation Administration doing? What kind of safety measures are you providing for the American people?''

I am now asking for a full report on inspection procedures that are done by the FAA. I want to find out the status of staffing, the expertise of those who inspect, the years of experience and what kind of criteria they use to inspect our Nation's airplanes.

I would like to know whether or not we in this Congress have provided sufficient resources so that the planes we travel in can be in fact inspected. And, yes, I will be exploring legislation that requires that when a plane has been pulled back for mechanical violations a certain number of times, it be retired, out of commission, until that plane meets all safety standards.

Yes, I am in pain about the loss of 109 lives, just as each and every one of us each time we lose an American through such a terrible tragedy. I think it is a travesty for us to make excuses about what should have been done and not do it.

Oh, yes, Rush, next time I hear from you, I look forward to hearing a discussion about flotation, but I am going to stand on the side of saving American lives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address the Chair and not others outside the Chamber.

REPUBLICAN LEADERS WANT MEDICARE TO WITHER ON THE VINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Medicare provides quality health care benefits for over 32 million senior citizens, but the Republican leadership wants to transform Medicare into a program of substandard care.

The Republican leadership says that Medicare is in crisis—that it is now running at a deficit. I would argue that minor adjustments, not a major overhaul, could ensure Medicare's solvency. When Democrats were in the majority, we made sure that Medicare was being adequately funded. In 1982, the Medicare trustees predicted that the Medicare trust fund would run out of money by 1986. Obviously that did not happen.

Democrats protected Medicare and maintained a level of quality care for senior citizens into the 1990's.

Now the Republicans are scaring seniors by saying that Medicare is again going to go bankrupt in the early part of the next decade and using the words like ''reform'' to disguise their efforts to destroy the Medicare Program. Senior citizens are not in danger of not receiving health care, but Speaker GINGRICH still claims that a major overhaul is necessary.

His real motives lie in an earlier speech he gave during last year's Medicare debate, where the Speaker said he wanted to see Medicare wither on a vine. Only minor adjustments need to be made to ensure Medicare solvency. When Democrats were in the majority, Medicare never ran deficits. It is a sign of the misguided Republican leadership that Medicare has run its first ever deficit in its 31 years as a health care program for senior citizens. Enough is enough with Speaker GINGRICH and his

band trying to dismantle Medicare yet one more time.

The new Republican budget calls for over $168 billion cuts, reductions, or whatever you want to call them, in the Medicare Program. Basically, the Republican leadership is proposing to take money out of the Medicare Program for their $176 billion tax break for wealthy individuals.

Although the amount of money being taken from Medicare is significant, the devil is really in the details, because the Republican leadership is proposing a major overhaul of Medicare to make it less efficient and more costly for seniors. Their proposed calls for coopting senior citizens into managed care. I do not have a problem with managed care per se, but I do not believe in Speaker GINGRICH's attempts to force seniors into managed care and call it ''Medicare Choices.''

The only choice that the Republican leadership is giving to seniors under this radical Medicare plan is the choice to receive substandard health care.

Where Medicare historically offered patients their own choice of doctor, protected against high out-of-pocket costs, and offered a guaranteed level of coverage, the Republican leadership's proposal would take it all away.

In addition, the Republicans are again proposed to incorporate medical savings accounts—or healthy wealthy tax breaks—into the Medicare overhaul. Last year, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office stated that these tax breaks would actually cost Medicare several billion dollars. This proposal is largely untested and very controversial.

Unfortunately, this is all a repeat of the failed Republican attempts to overhaul Medicare last year. I would urge my colleagues to vote against this impractical budget proposal on Thursday and urge senior citizens to call on Congress to protect Medicare from further raids by Speaker GINGRICH.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL DOES NOT PROMISE REAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I have brought here a chart that shows what we do with the money that the Congress has discretion over and over half the red part is Pentagon spending. The other part is everything else, education, income security, health, environment.

The House Committee on National Security has increased defense spending this year by $12.9 billion more than the President requested and more than the Pentagon even asked for. Republican and Democrat Members went to the Rules Committee with 5 different amendments to cut some Pentagon spending, from $1 to $13 billion, in between. We were not allowed to bring those to the floor and the leadership refused to allow us to discuss this most vital issue.

What does it mean when we increase Pentagon spending by $13 billion? It means that we have to cut everything else, all these other things. Cuts, cuts, cuts, cuts.

What does that mean to the American people? It means that we are putting our citizens' security in jeopardy. How? For instance, in the State of Oregon that I represent a district in, last year 38 children died from child abuse or neglect. One of the reasons they died was there were no shelters there for their mother to bring those children into a safe, secure home. Why is there no money for shelters? Because we are spending all our additional money on huge weapons systems that we really do not need now that the cold war is over.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has finally come when we must put common sense back in the U.S. budget, when we must say what is real security? Is it having police in our streets? Is it having places where our children can go to be safe? Is it a whole security? Or are we only putting our security into cold-war weaponry?

Mr. Speaker, I ask the leadership to allow us to vote on amendments that would cut some of this additional $13 billion that the President did not ask for and, most significantly, that the Pentagon did not ask for.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COMBEST] at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

May the beauty of the day remind us, O God, of the beauty of Your blessings to us; may the majesty of Your creation remind us of the majesty of Your power; may the growth of the blossoms that surround us remind us of the nurture we receive by Your hand; may the splendor of the Sun remind us of the warmth of Your presence in our lives and may the opportunities of this new day remind us that we should serve others with grace, with dignity, and with justice. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

THE COMMUNITY RENEWAL ACT

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, today, under the leadership of my good friends, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT], a bipartisan coalition will introduce the American Community Renewal Act of 1996.

The bill reflects a critically important understanding that government must stop being the enemy of the family. Nowhere has the destructive power of the arrogant Federal bureaucracy caused greater harm than in our heavily urban areas, such as my district in Cincinnati.

The Federal Government cannot be a substitute for strong families and vibrant neighborhoods. Instead, we must work to unleash the creative energies and the talents of all Americans, including especially those Americans least equipped to overcome government-erected barriers to economic success. The Community Renewal Act will provide parents of needy children greater choice in education. It will recognize that religious groups can be valuable colleagues in arms in the war against drugs, and it will help to promote individual entrepreneurship in areas where government heretofore has smothered it.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the introduction of the legislation and encourage its adoption.

RICHARD SPECK'S EASY TIME IN PRISON FOR MURDERING EIGHT NURSES

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago Richard Speck killed eight nurses in Chicago. Opponents of the death penalty said Richard Speck should get life in prison. That is much harder time and much more punishment.

Well, check this out. News reports now confirm that while in the Illinois State Prison, Richard Speck had total

freedom, all the cocaine and marijuana he wanted, and sex parties. In fact, it was such a hard time, Richard Speck, with two other inmates, made a 2-hour video, a porno video, in the prison TV studio. Two hours. And listen to what Speck says on the tape. He says, ''If those squares knew what a good time I was having, they would actually turn me loose.''

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. Eight nurses are rolling over in their graves. The only free thing that Richard Speck should have gotten was 50,000 volts. Is it any wonder America has more murder than any other country on the planet?

All the politicians down here are worried about the rights of criminals. I think they better start being concerned about the rights of the American people.

DEMOCRAT PARTY THE PARTY OF HIGHER TAXES AND BIG GOVERNMENT

(Mr. FUNDERBURK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, no matter how hard they try, no matter how much help they get from the liberal media to convince people otherwise, the Democrat Party is and remains the party of higher taxes and bigger government.

Just look at Bill Clinton's 1997 budget. This budget has tax increases and creates more Government programs. Surprise, surprise.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost reflexive that the Democrats want to raise taxes and spend more money in Washington. Bill Clinton creates 14 new Government programs in his budget and does not even begin to cut domestic spending until 1998. In fact, 76 percent of his spending cuts come after the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, this budget gives the American people more of what they do not want: Higher taxes, higher spending, and bigger Government. It also provides that liberal Democrats are unwilling to do what it takes to balance the budget and do the right thing for America's children.

LET THOSE WHO PAID BE REPAID

(Mr. FILNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the on-going gasoline price crisis and the proposed repeal of the 4.3-cent gas tax.

I would like to offer my three-point plan for this repeal.

First, we must guarantee that this repeal is directly returned to the consumer in the form of lower prices at the gas pump. We must not simply feed the profit margin of big oil companies. We cannot repeal this fee and naively assume that gas prices will decline accordingly. Let those who paid be repaid.

Second, we must pay for this repeal. I have a bill, H.R. 1497, the Insurance Tax Fairness and Small Company Economic Growth Act, that will collect almost $2 billion every year, simply by closing a tax loophole that only benefits the 18 largest mutual life insurance companies.

Third, this Congress must provide answers for the American people about the cause of these price increases. Congress must hold hearings and conduct an investigation. The American people deserve answers from their elected officials and it is our duty to provide those answers.

Mr. Speaker, I say again, the consumer must benefit from our actions—let those who paid be repaid.

MINIMUM WAGE QUOTES

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, now the President wants to ''make work pay'' by raising the minimum wage. Yet just 2 years ago he said that raising the minimum wage is ''the wrong way to raise the income of low-wage earners.''

President Clinton knows that upgrading worker skills results in an increase in wages. He has said that ''what you earn depends on what you learn; the most effective way to help is to make workers more productive because wages reflect the value of what people produce.''

''After all, most minimum wage workers are not poor.'' That is Secretary Reich to President Clinton.

''An increased minimum wage often takes from the poor to help the middle class.'' That is economist Robert Shapiro, friend of Bill Clinton's.

UNDERSTAND THE DEBATE ON MEDICARE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the House is expected to consider another budget resolution this time around. It would seem to me my Republican colleagues would have learned a lesson from the last budget experience. At that time the American public said ''no'' to severe cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, in education, in the environment.

Although we fought that battle and staved off those cuts, the congressional majority is back here again to cut Medicare. We are looking at a $168 billion cut in Medicare. Cuts of this magnitude force rural hospitals to close and will limit the ability of senior citizens to choose their own doctor.

What are our priorities? What are our values in this Nation? We now have 99 percent of our seniors covered for health care through the Medicare system. Why would we want to dismantle Medicare?

It was the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] who said not too long ago that what he wanted to see with Medicare was to have it wither on the vine.

The money they cut from Medicare does not go into the Medicare trust fund. Do not let them kid you with that argument. What they will do is one more time pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans. The tax break package is $180 billion, and the cut in Medicare is $168 billion. Understand the debate.

PASS THE CLINTON GAS TAX REPEAL ACT

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEATRAND. Mr. Speaker, in AL GORE's book, ''Earth in the Balance,'' the Vice President peers into his crystal ball and cheerfully foresees the end of the automobile as America's primary transportation. If he and his Democrat colleagues are attempting to force the automobile out of existence through excessive gas tax hikes, Americans had better fasten their seatbelt, we are in for a wild ride.

While the rest of the Nation averaged just over a 1 cent increase in gas prices, the families on California's central coast witnessed some prices closing in on the $2 mark for a gallon of gas. The American people are tired of unnecessary burdensome taxes to feed the coffers of Washington benefactors. Last week, I introduced H.R. 3415, the Clinton Gas Tax Repeal Act, which will stop this mindless taxation.

The Republican perscription for gas relief is to put money back into the pockets of every working American family. The Democrats perscription for gas relief is a Gas-X tablet and an election year nap. Americans deserve better. Pass H.R. 3415.

TREAT ALL SIDES FAIRLY WITH BUDGET CUTS

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, as we listen to the Republicans talk about budget, budget, balance the budget, balance the budget, well, we will get a chance today to see how serious they are, because we are taking up the defense bill.

I want to tell you, as I said earlier, the British may be having trouble with mad cow disease, but the Republicans are having trouble with sacred cow disease. This is the biggest scared cow you have ever seen, this defense budget. Everybody else is downsizing. Not us. They had to add more than the President asked for. In my entire time of being here, I have never seen that.

So it is very interesting that the people who on the civilian side of the budget say cut, cut, cut, on the defense side say spend, spend, spend. Even if they did not ask for it, spend, spend, spend. It is very hard to listen to those people talk about being serious about the budget. Both sides should be treated the same, and I hope they will.

CONCERNS ABOUT 1997 BUDGET

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, we've now had a look at the Republican's 1997 budget, and I have several major concerns.

It appears that many of the cuts proposed last year have reappeared in the new budget. These include cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, cuts in the earned income tax credit, and in education.

I am greatly concerned about the impact of these cuts on seniors, on rural health programs, on student loan programs.

I also worry about extremist positions on these budget areas which will lead once again to Government shutdowns, disruption of service to Americans, and a tremendous waste of time and money.

Mr. Speaker, we have the means to reach agreement on a plan to balance the budget in 7 years.

In discussions earlier this year, Republicans and the President agreed on certain cuts, enough to realize $711 billion in savings.

At the time of the discussion, only $635 billion in cuts was needed to balance the budget by the year 2002. More recent figures show similar areas of agreement.

Let's build on areas where we agree. Let's balance the budget while protecting essential programs for Americans—education, the environment, Medicaid, and Medicare.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 10, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that Jim Dyer, currently the staff director of the Appropriations Committee and formerly a staff assistant for Congressman Joseph McDade of Pennsylvania, has been served with a subpoena issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the case of United States versus McDade.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

BOB LIVINGSTON,
Chairman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV. Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 5 p.m. today.

HEALTHY MEALS FOR CHILDREN ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2006) to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide greater flexibility to schools to meet the Dietary Guidelines for Americans under the school lunch and school breakfast programs, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2066

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Healthy Meals for Children Act''.

SEC. 2. INCREASED FLEXIBILITY FOR SCHOOLS TO MEET THE DIETARY GUIDELINES FOR AMERICANS UNDER THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT.

Section 9(f)(2) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(f)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

''(D) USE OF ANY REASONABLE APPROACH.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A school food service authority may use any reasonable approach, within guidelines established by the Secretary in a timely manner, to meet the requirements of this paragraph, including—

''(I) using the school nutrition meal pattern in effect for the 1994—1995 school year; and

''(II) using any of the approaches described in subparagraph (C).

''(ii) NUTRIENT ANALYSIS.—The Secretary may not require a school to conduct or use a nutrient analysis to meet the requirements of this paragraph.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

□ 1415

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2066 which amends the School Lunch Program to provide schools flexibility in demonstrating how they have met the dietary guidelines for Americans.

This bill not only has bipartisan support in Congress, it has the support of the American School Food Service Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the National School Boards Association, and the Association of School Business Officials.

During the 103d Congress, the National School Lunch Program was modified to require schools to meet the dietary guidelines for Americans under the school lunch and breakfast programs. I supported this change.

The law permitted schools to use nutrient-based menu planning, assisted nutrient-based menu planning or a food-based menu system, which was the only method of menu planning used under prior law, as long as they met the dietary guidelines. On Tuesday, June 13, 1995, the Department of Agriculture published their final regulations on the school meal initiatives for healthy Americans. Unfortunately, these regulations did not meet congressional intent with respect to providing schools with flexibility in how they demonstrated they were in compliance with the dietary guidelines.

Schools throughout the Nation expressed concern about the implementation of these final regulations. Of special concern were changes to the food-based menu system which had the potential of adding from 5 to 10 cents to the cost of school meals. The reason for the increased cost was a requirement that schools add additional servings of grains, bread, and fruits and vegetables to school meals. Even schools currently meeting the dietary guidelines under the previous food-based menu plan would have to enact such changes. The alternative would be to use the nutrient standard menu plan, which would require schools to make a significant investment in computer hardware and require extensive training and technical assistance to implement the new software and procedures associated with this plan.

On July 1995, I introduced H.R. 2066 with my colleague on the committee, GEORGE MILLER. H.R. 2066 will not change, in any way, the requirement that school meals meet the dietary guidelines for Americans. It will, however, permit schools to use any reasonable approach to meet the dietary guidelines, including those contained in the regulations issued by the Department. Adding additional fruits, vegetables, and grains is certainly one way to ensure the dietary guidelines are met. However, schools could choose to bake instead of fry certain food items or use low-fat alternatives to some food items. There are not just one or two ways to meet the dietary guidelines.

Nothing in this act affects the ability of States to determine if schools have met the dietary guidelines. Compliance reviews will continue to take place. There will still be State and Federal audits and corrective action will still be required for schools not meeting the dietary guidelines.

According to the American School Food Service Association, ''We support giving schools the maximum flexibility in planning their menus so that they can best meet local taste preferences and maintain maximum control over program costs while improving the nutritional quality of their meals.''

We need to allow schools the flexibility to serve meals students will eat. Only 50 percent of low-income students Participate in the School Lunch Program and 46 percent of middle and upper income children participate. As long as schools are serving healthy, nutritious meals, it shouldn't matter how individual schools meet the dietary guidelines.

The bottom line is that schools know best what children will eat. We need to free their hands to do the job that they know how to do best.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2066.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2066 and want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for moving this important bill through committee and to the floor.

This bill is good for the School Lunch Program and for the children it serves.

H.R. 2066 confirms that reason will be applied in the implementation of the requirement we enacted in the School Lunch Act last Congress that school breakfasts and lunches meet the dietary guidelines for Americans. We must enable schools to meet this requirement both with efficiency and in as cost effect manner as possible and this legislation will see that this happens. I firmly believe that such flexibility also will result in more children actually eating the nutritious meals that schools provide.

This legislation in no way retreats from our commitment to ensuring that school meals meet the dietary guidelines for Americans, nor does it compromise the timelines established for schools to provide balanced nutritious meals beginning this fall under these guidelines.

I am grateful to the American School Food Service Association for its assistance and support on this measure. I think the comfort level of the school food service community is important, since they are the ones throughout this Nation who are committed to seeing that the guidelines are reached in school menus. But I also think it is important to recognize the other major education groups that are behind this effort—the National School Board Association, the American Association of School Administrators, and the Association of School Business Officials—all sharing the common goal of having well-fed children ready to learn.

I am most pleased that the administration supports the enactment of this bill, and worked with us in crafting substitute language to ensure that a reasonable accountability mechanism is in place for schools.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he would mind engaging in a colloquy at this point.

The amendment to the committee-reported bill is a welcome addition to this legislation. It would have the Secretary of Agriculture establish general guidelines for school food authorities to turn to for help when crafting the approach they will use to meet the dietary guidelines.

I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, am I correct that it is the intent of this amendment that the Secretary exercise this authority sparingly, so that schools will have maximum control over how they meet the dietary guidelines and not be limited only to federally prescribed approaches.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Yes, the gentleman is correct. School food authorities must have maximum flexibility to plan menus that adhere to the dietary guidelines, meet children's preferences, and take account of food, planning, and preparation costs. While the amended language recognizes some Federal oversight is advisable, the guidelines to be issued by the Secretary must ensure that school food authorities may choose among the widest possible range of reasonable approaches consistent with their responsibility to serve meals that comply with the dietary guidelines. The Secretary's guidelines are to help schools in designing their meal programs, not micromanage them. They should set outer bounds and clearly impermissible practices, not prescribe a list of approved approaches or simply add some options to the three choices already in regulations. The committee continues to believe that the primary method of assuring accountability is, as already incorporated in regulations, periodic review of schools' meals to see whether they live up to the dietary guidelines and follow-up corrective actions if necessary. The Secretary's guidelines should not be used to unnecessarily prejudge schools' menu planning approaches, especially when many schools are already meeting the dietary guidelines using their food-based menu systems.

Mr. MILLER of California. If I might ask the gentleman one other question, and that is, would the Secretary's guidelines limit schools that already use or want to use a food-based menu system to the options in current regulations and the 1994–95 school year meal pattern as added by the bill?

Mr. GOODLING. No, they would not. It should be clearly understood that the Secretary's guidelines are to recognize school food authorities' right to develop their own approach to complying with the dietary guidelines using their best judgment. This could mean using their current meal patterns, already designed alternatives, the options in current regulations, the 1994–95 meal pattern, or any other reasonable approach within the general bounds set by the Secretary. They could, for example, make adjustments to the food-based system in current regulations to better recognize children's preferences or control costs, or take suggestions from the Department's options to revise their own system. The bottom line is that the basic responsibility for developing reasonable approaches to meeting the dietary guidelines is with the school food authorities, with Federal guidance and oversight but not a panoply prescriptive rules or preset options.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for those clarifications.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the Healthy Meals for Children Act and urge its immediate adoption. I applaud my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman BILL GOODLING, and the gentleman from California, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, for their commitment to the healthy development of kids in this country, and their ability to work together in a bipartisan fashion to bring this important bill to the floor.

The Healthy Meals for Children Act provides schools with more flexibility in how they meet the dietary guidelines for school meals was required by the National School Lunch Act. This bill in no way, it in no way changes the dietary guidelines or erodes the nutritional content of school breakfasts or lunches. This measure allows school administrators and food service staff to make nutritious affordable meals that our kids will eat.

The school lunch program provides man of our children with the one balanced meal that they eat all day. In my home State of Connecticut this legislation will ensure more nutritious meals or over half a million children. In the largest city in my district, New Haven, CT, over half of the children in public schools qualify for either free meals or reduced priced meals through the school lunch program.

Hungry or malnourished children cannot perform at their highest capability in the classroom or in their lives. By giving schools more flexibility to meet the national dietary guidelines, we are improving the health, the life and the performance of children in and out of our classrooms.

Last year the congressional majority made school lunches for our Nation's kids the first item on the chopping block; and, fortunately, the American people fought back and the school lunch program was saved. I am pleased that the bipartisanship of my colleagues has produced this sensible progressive legislation which I support.

My hope is that we can achieve this kind of bipartisan legislation and sensible legislation in the areas of Medicare and Medicaid and education and our environment.

The Healthy Meals for Children Act is supported by the administration, the American Association of School Administrators, an the National School Board Association, among others, Passing this legislation provides food and service workers with flexibility to design meals that children will eat and that meet the dietary guidelines at the same time.

I thank my colleagues for their hard work on this legislation and urge the immediate adoption of the Healthy Meals for Children Act.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] who realizes that computers will never give us the nutritional value that milk does.

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying I am delighted to be on the floor dealing with a school nutrition issue other than milk. The fact is, however, Mr. Chairman, that I rise in strong support of this bill but I think it is important as I do so that we understand part of the problem that we faced over the last couple of years.

This is not the first time we have had to deal with all of this. A couple of years ago this whole attempt to regulate through administrative regulations the nutrient standards, et cetera, created such an uproar that we had to take legislative action at that time to make clear that that did not happen.

Many of my colleagues will recall about a year ago, when we were asking the question about whether or not we ought to literally block grant our school nutrition programs, give the money and give the authority back to the schools and let them design a program based on the proper meal plan, and, obviously, the nutrition standards that we all sought, that there was all kind of concern that if we let that happen there would be all kinds of problems.

Well, I think what we are doing today is we are witnessing the problems on the other side once again. Anybody who believes that a one-size-fits-all Washington mentality is going to be able to deal with this issue, does not understand the real life of school nutrition. We looked at this issue in many of our schools in western Wisconsin the last time it was around and we literally discovered that the cost of computers and training was more than what many of these schools spent on salaries for the school dietitians that provided the meals for the children, and we recognized how absurd that was; that we were going to lose everything in the process.

And, frankly, schools were seriously asking me the question.

□ 1430

I remember one school administrator, she called me up and she said: We are trying to decide. We are going to build a new school. We are trying to decide whether we should even build a hot lunchroom, because the regulations from Washington are getting so complex and so costly, there is simply no way in our small school system we can meet them.

Well, we were able to put that off once, and now we are back here today to put that off a second time and say let us not jeopardize the nutrition goals for our school children because of our love in Washington for regulations and mandates.

So I support the legislation. I commend the chairman for bringing it forth.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2066, the Healthy Meals for Children Act.

Last June, after the publication of the final regulations for the Healthy Meals for Healthy Americans Act, I was contacted by school food service providers from my congressional district. One particular individual, Richard Deburgh, director of food services for the Glendale Unified School District, expressed his concern about the regulations in a letter urging that we ''support the dietary guidelines but oppose dietary commandments.''

This sentiment was echoed by others who contacted me to express their concern that the regulations would affect their ability to prepare meals which were not only healthy and met the dietary guidelines, but which children would eat.

As we all know, the same foods do not appeal to all children in all areas of the country. It is important to allow local school food service providers the freedom to provide students with meals they will eat.

Mr. Speaker, those individuals who work with children each day in local schools know best what they will eat. They live in the local community, talk to the children each day as they pass through the cafeteria line, and have a vested interest in the health of these children. We need to provide them with the flexibility to design and serve healthy meals which children will eat.

H.R. 2066 provides schools with this flexibility and at the same time, maintains the requirement that such meals meet the dietary guidelines for Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 2066, the Healthy Meals for Children Act. This legislation would offer school food service providers greater flexibility in meeting the national dietary guidelines in school lunch and breakfast programs.

We are moving this bipartisan legislation because the USDA Food and Consumer Service under the direction of Ellen Haas is out of control. In the name of advancing good nutrition for children, the USDA is burying our schools in bureaucratic paperwork and regulatory micromanagement. The USDA mandates not just that schools meet the national dietary guidelines, but that they demonstrate their compliance in two or three different ways, as required by prescriptive and needless regulation.

Here is what school food service directors are saying about the USDA's June, 1995, regulation on School Meal Initiatives for Healthy Americans, and about our bill:

Richard DeBurgh, Glendale, CA: ''I believe that this bill is essential to stop the ever-increasing bureaucracy associated with school lunch.''

Helen Kerrian, National City, CA: ''The final regulations published by the Department of Agriculture are very prescriptive. They mandate additional costs * * * even in districts which are meeting the dietary guidelines today.''

Sharon Briel, Glendora, CA: ''I believe this bill is necessary because USDA has been unresponsive to the concerns of the school food service industry.''

This kind of big government run amok will 10 to 17 cents of the cost of every school lunch, according to the National School Food Service Association—and for nothing. It's time for government and bureaucrats to take less, and for America's needy children to get more.

I am proud that this Congress has been uncompromising in its support for excellent school lunch and breakfast programs in our schools. As part of this historic Congress, Chairman GOODLING and I have approached this issue from two solid principles that all of us can agree upon. First, hungry children cannot learn. And second, because needless bureaucratic paperwork literally steals from families, from taxpayers, and from the mouths of hungry children, we need to act to cut the red tape.

H.R. 2066 does just that. Schools will still offer nutritious meals that meet the dietary guidelines. They just won't have to tell USDA about it in triplicate, when simpler compliance will do.

I understand that H.R. 2066 has the support of the American School Food Service Association, and from Congressman GEORGE MILLER. I have enclosed letters of support from a number of school food service directors in my State. It was adopted by voice vote in the Opportunities Committee May 1. And I am proud to be a cosponsor of the chairman's excellent bill, and I urge its adoption without amendments. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2066, the Healthy Meals for Children Act to allow schools greater flexibility in meeting dietary guidelines under the school lunch and school breakfast programs. A proper nutritional diet is essential to a child's mental and physical development. Schools need to provide nutritious and wholesome food to nourish growing children at the same time that schools work to nourish the students' minds and spirits with education.

I believe that our local schools should be given the flexibility to offer food that the students will actually like to eat. I support this Healthy Meals for Children Act because it will give schools the discretion to meet the goal of

offering nutritious and wholesome food to our children.

Furthermore, I am concerned about the cost of wasting food in our schools. Food is essential nourishment for everyone, and I support policies that would allow the Houston Independent School District [HISD] to design a nutritional program. In the HISD school system, schools can provide students with nutritious meals while giving students food that they like to eat, and then designing a program to allow the Houston schools to donate the extra food to feed the homeless. I encourage the formation of such a program by HISD and I encourage other districts to adopt this innovative and beneficial program. Hunger in America warrants continued efforts to stomp out hunger.

In closing, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of the Healthy Meals for Children Act.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the 53 years since the Federal Government began supporting lunch programs in schools, 25 laws have been passed by Congress making changes in the form and goals of Federal school lunch assistance. The history of school lunches is an interesting one, with its beginnings in World War II and depression-era programs to help the farmer. The war years also saw Federal support for lunch programs justified by the growing numbers of women in the work force.

When I first came to the House of Representatives, 23 years ago, public schools provided a basic lunch to students. In the 1970's Congress began to focus on the operational needs of school lunch programs. Congress enacted a series of laws that established guaranteed cash and commodity reimbursements for each school lunch served and inflation adjustments in these reimbursements. This so-called performance funding feature was designed to encourage program expansion by assuring schools an amount of Federal funding they would receive. Later, Congress established uniform meal reimbursements for all lunches served and varied the financial support for different types of lunches according to their nutritional content.

Over time, educators showed us that students learned better, behaved better, and were more attentive when they weren't hungry. Social services providers have shown us that the lunch children received in school was the most nutritious meal of the day for many children. Breakfasts are now offered in many communities before the school day begins.

In fiscal year 1995, a national total of over 4.2 billion lunches were served under the School Lunch Program. Of these, 1.8 billion were served free, and 300 million lunches were served at a reduced price of no more than 40 cents each. In Illinois alone, a total of 156 million lunches were served—62 million free and 9 million at a reduced rate.

Over the years Congress continued to support school lunches by providing commodities to supplement the local education agency's lunch menu. Also over the years, the ideas of dietary requirements have changed. The Healthy Meals for Healthy Americans Act of 1994, Public Law 103–448, addressed concerns raised by the 1993 school nutrition dietary assessment study concerning levels of fat, sodium, and carbohydrates in meals served under the School Lunch Program.

A 1994 law, Public Law 103–448, established a new set of nutritional requirements for school lunch programs, largely to reduce the amount of fat content in the lunches served to our schoolchildren every schoolday. This bill under consideration today, H.R. 2066, the Healthy Meals for Children Act, will provide increased flexibility for schools to meet the standards required for reimbursement. This bill was designed to clear up confusion about what nutritional standards may be used in order to comply with Federal guidelines, and will make it easier for schools to meet new dietary guidelines for school lunch programs.

American schoolchildren are fortunate to have national standards that are available to be used to assure the families and children that the food they are provided in school will be safe, healthful, and nutritionally beneficial to their growing minds and bodies. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2066, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2066, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

REREFERRAL OF H.R. 3387, J. PHIL CAMPBELL, SENIOR NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION CENTER

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Resources be discharged from further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3387, to designate the Southern Piedmont Conservation Research Center located at 1420 Experimental Station Road in Watkinsville, GA, as the J. Phil Campbell, Senior Natural Resource Conservation Center, and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Agriculture.

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

There was no objection.

SELMA TO MONTGOMERY NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1129) to amend the National Trails Systems Act to designate the route from Selma to Montgomery as a national historic trail, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1129

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(a) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

''( ) The Selma to Montgomery National Historic Trail, consisting of 54 miles of city streets and United States Highway 80 from Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church in Selma to the State Capitol Building in Montgomery, Alabama, traveled by voting rights advocates during March 1965 to dramatize the need for voting rights legislation, as generally described in the report of the Secretary of the Interior prepared pursuant to subsection (b) of this section entitled 'Selma to Montgomery' and dated April 1993. Maps depicting the route shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The trail shall be administered in accordance with this Act, including section 7(h). The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service, which shall be the lead Federal agency, shall cooperate with other Federal, State and local authorities to preserve historic sites along the route, including (but not limited to) the Edmund Pettus Bridge and the Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1129 designates the route from Selma to Montgomery, AL, as a national historic trail. This route is the site of one of the most significant protest demonstrations of the modern civil rights movements, which led directly to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The National Park Service, pursuant to a previous act of Congress, has studied the trail and found that it merits designation as a national historic trail. It is important to note that the National Park Service felt the events which took place at this site were so significant that it warranted waiving the customary 50-year waiting period for designation of historic sites.

The language including in the bill by the subcommittee makes it clear that by enactment of this legislation, Congress will not be establishing the Selma to Montgomery Trail as a new unit of the National Park System. Only 2 of the approximately 15 congressionally designated trails are currently units of the park system. However, the definition of what constitutes a unit of the park system is so unclear, that the other trails could be easily added at a later date by administrative action. In this case, there are no Federal lands in the area, and it makes good sense of the NPS to work with other co-operators in the administration of this trail. It is important to point out that in making this amendment, it is not my intention that this trail should receive any less financial or administrative support than any other trail where the

NPS currently serves as the lead agency.

This is an important bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], the hero of the civil rights struggle, the author of this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I am pleased and delighted to stand here today as this bill is voted on. I want to thank the Chairman YOUNG and Chairman HANSEN for their support of this bill. I also want to thank the ranking members of the committee, Mr. MILLER and Mr. RICHARDSON. I also want to recognize Mr. HILLIARD who represents Selma and Montgomery. I also want to recognize Mr. VENTO for all of his help since we began this process. I want to thank all of you for your help and support.

This bill is very important to me and to many others. I believe that designating the route from Selma to Montgomery as a National Historic Trail is very fitting and appropriate. The march from Selma to Montgomery was a turning point in the journey to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. It was a long and difficult journey.

Before the civil rights movement, most blacks in the South could not vote. There were certain political subdivisions in the South—from Virginia to Texas—where 50 to 80 percent of the population was black, but there was not a single black registered voter. The few who were allowed to register were harassed, intimidated, and even beaten when they tried to exercise their precious right to vote.

In Lowndes County, AL, between Selma and Montgomery, the county was more than 80 percent black, and there was not a single registered black voter. In Selma, the county seat of majority black Dallas County, only 2.1 percent of voting age blacks were registered to vote.

So, to dramatize the need for voting rights legislation, a peaceful, nonviolent march from Selma to Montgomery was planned.

On Sunday, March 7, 1965, in the afternoon, a group of people left the Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church, walking in two's. It was a silent, nonviolent, peaceful protest, walking through the streets of Selma.

When we reached the apex of the Edmund Pettus Bridge, we saw a sea of blue—Alabama State troopers. The Governor of Alabama, at that time, George Wallace, had issued a statement the day before saying the march would not be allowed. The sheriff of Dallas County, a man by the name of Jim Clark, on the night before the march, had requested that all white men over the age of 21 come down to the Dallas County Courthouse to be deputized to become part of his posse to stop the march.

As we cross over the bridge on that Sunday afternoon, we faced the State troopers and a man identified himself and said:

> I am Major John Cloud of the Alabama State Troopers. I give you 3 minutes to disperse and go back to your church. This is an unlawful march, and it will not be allowed to continue.

In less than 1½ minutes, Major John Cloud said, ''Troopers advance,'' and we saw the troopers put on their gas masks. They came toward us, beating us with nightsticks, bullwhips, trampling us with horses, and using tear gas.

That day became known as Bloody Sunday. There was a sense of righteous indignation all across the country. People could not understand what they saw on television and read in the paper.

Two days later, the marchers, joined by religious leaders from around the country, made a second attempt but turned back to avoid more bloodshed. After that march, a young white minister from Boston, James Reed, was beaten by the Klan and later died.

One week later, President Lyndon Johnson addressed the Nation and called for passage of the Voting Rights Act. He said:

> I speak tonight for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy. At times, history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was a century ago in Appomattox. And so it was last week in Selma, Alabama.

It was one of the most moving speeches I ever heard an American President make.

Finally, on March 21, 1965, the marchers were allowed to proceed. However, during that week of marching, Viola Liuzzo, a housewife from Detroit, was shot and killed.

As a direct result of these events, the Voting Rights Act was signed into law on August 6, 1965.

The history along this route is precious. It is imperative that we preserve and interpret this history. Even more than 30 years later, standing at the apex of the Edmund Pettus Bridge is a powerful experience. The trail reminds us of where we were in 1965 and how far we have come as a Nation and as a people.

Today, too few people cherish the right to vote. In the 1992 Presidential election, only 56 percent of the voting age population voted. In 1994, in the congressional elections, only 38 percent voted.

This trail will remind people that Americans—black and white, young and old, from the North and South—shedded blood. Some even gave their lives—to win the right for every American to vote.

It is my hope and belief that the history told along this trail will inspire more people to become involved in the democratic process.

By designating the route from Selma to Montgomery as a national historic trail, we will help educate and remind people of the right and responsibility to vote. We will also give well-deserved recognition to the men and women who sacrificed so much for voting rights for all Americans.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill to designate the trail and help preserve the important sites along the trail for future generations.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the body realizes the gentleman from Georgia was actually there and part of it, so it is a very historic time for the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD], in whose district we are celebrating today.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, of course we realize that this fantastic event took place about 50 years ago. This is a bill that would help memorialize this event and give it some national historical impact so that everyone will be able to realize that it is a part of history. I wish to thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] for his forethought and his tenacity in continuing this effort to make this bill one that will pay recognition to all of those who marched with him from Selma to Montgomery.

The communities of Selma and Montgomery began this project years ago in recognition of the importance of this 50-mile stretch from the steps of Brown Chapel in Selma to the Alabama State Capitol Building. The struggle of those brave men and women, numbering almost 25,000 near the end, inspired this Nation and in fact inspired this Congress to start righting the wrongs of the past. That journey has already begun and significant progress has been made. Today we hope to reaffirm that progress by remembering the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we show all Americans, as well as visitors to our great Nation, our belief in those who came before us and for what they did. This trail will cement a place in history for the leaders of our movement. Selma and Montgomery will become historical designations, along with Philadelphia, Gettysburg, and even Washington, DC, to be surveyed by historians in the future. They will come and study. Hopefully they will learn about our mistakes so that those mistakes will never be repeated again, so that the future will be able to be from those mistakes what it ought to be and what we hope it to be.

Mr. Speaker, by allowing this vote, we have demonstrated an awareness and appreciation for this cause. In passing this bill, we grant these communities the means by which to carry out their mission of commemorating the past and honoring the men and women who brought us a better future.

I am very happy to serve in Congress not only with JOHN LEWIS, who marched behind Dr. King and who became a part of history and who made

this country what it is today. Hopefully with this bill we will be able to commemorate an event that has a significant place in our national history.

□ 1445

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I rise in strong support of designating the road from Selma to Montgomery as a national historic trail. I thank the gentleman for allowing the bill to come to a vote, the bill sponsored by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD].

We have a lot to thank people from 30 years ago. I was working in Washington at that time right across the street at the Library of Congress. I could not believe what I saw on television, saw the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] and others beaten badly, saw the sacrifices that were made, and turned to my colleagues and said what is going on there? All people are asking for are equal rights, the right to vote, the most precious vote, the most precious freedom that we have.

So several of us said that sacrifices that those people were making in Alabama deserve support from people all around the Nation. Thousands of people joined them. I joined the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] a few miles outside of Montgomery. Thousands of people marched into Montgomery. It was an incredible testimony to people who saw that democracy could be made better in this Nation, that the right to vote was something literally that one struggled to die for.

That march, as we know, bore great fruit; the Voting Rights Act was passed a few months later, resulting in the largest increase in democratic rights in this country in about 50 years.

We have, as I said, Mr. Speaker, a lot to thank for the sacrifices that those at the Edmond Pettus Bridge, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] was at, for sparking all of us into a consciousness and a realization of what was going on. That march, I think, inspired democracy all over this Nation because it showed that people taking direct action could, in fact, move Congress, and in different Congresses, to taking the right and moral actions.

So, we designate this trail from Selma to Montgomery as a national monument, we dedicate that trail to the lives of people who were sacrificed, we dedicate ourselves and recommit ourselves to the democracy to which they took action, and we will remember that terrible price that people had to pay for all of us to have democracy in this Nation, for all of us to have the right to vote, and we have to remind all of us every time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for allowing us to rededicate ourselves to increasing democracy in America for all our citizens.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CUMMINGS].

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for yielding this time to me, and I commend his work and leadership on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the trail that Dr. Martin Luther King walked when he led a march for black voting rights in 1965 is as meaningful as the route Paul Revere took when he rode through Boston, it is as historic and symbolic as the expedition led by Lewis and Clark. I am pleased that the Selma to Montgomery path has been recognized as a national historic trail. This trail is a testament to the courage that Dr. King and the civil rights marchers exemplified. It will stand as a monument to their tireless efforts to provide and extend fundamental civil rights to all Americans regardless of their gender, race or creed.

The young people in my district of Baltimore and across this great country will walk the steps of these civil rights marchers. They will cross the Edmond Pettus Bridge, and they will remember the blood, sweat and tears and determination that the marchers embodied so that all generations will enjoy freedoms and rights that the Founders of this great Nation envisioned.

The route from Selma to Montgomery, Mr. Speaker, is 54 miles long. Each step that Dr. King and the marchers took brought freedom closer. In 1965 freedom was 54 miles away. Today the distance is shorter, but there are still civil rights injustices to overcome. It is my sincere hope that one day there will be no distance between the citizens of this great country, that all will be afforded basic enumerated freedoms without prejudice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the swift passage of this bill and am hopeful that we in the Congress of the United States of America will recognize the need to provide full funding for this historic and important landmark.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I had not intended to speak; I am not one to speak very often on the floor, but when I heard the words of our colleague from Georgia, I simply had to rise to pay tribute to him as a leader in that march and in that movement and to pay tribute to the gentleman from Utah who pointed out the historical significance of what the gentleman from Georgia and what his colleagues did at that time.

I was a young person also, like my colleague from California, working in Washington at the time. I was among many hundreds from Washington who chartered a train to go from Union Station to Montgomery. Some of my colleagues may remember that train was stopped in Atlanta, and the crew walked off when they discovered why it was we were headed to Alabama, and they were promptly ordered back on by the Attorney General of the United States, Robert Kennedy, and for a young white man who had grown up in an overwhelmingly, almost totally, white environment in New England, it was, to put it mildly, an eye opener. For the first time in my life to feel safe only in the company of black people and to have spent two nights in a black church in the outskirts of Montgomery and to make the final 2 days of that walk into the city led by men such as Martin Luther King and our colleague from Georgia was an extraordinary experience.

I hope Members understand that in this Hall, where language is so often cheapened and demeaned and overused and where there is a shortage of masters of the spoken word, that we are in the presence of one gentleman from Georgia, that these words are real, and they are historic.

I would also finally close by citing the gentleman from Maryland, our newest Member here, who pointed out that the chapters of civil rights, there are some that still remain to be written, and I want to pay a particular tribute again to the gentleman from Georgia, who has focused not only on the struggle over the centuries of his own race and people of color, it was 102 years after President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation that that bridge was crossed, literally and figuratively, and that march was made and that bill was signed.

Fourteen years after that, I would just say to my colleagues, the first march on Washington for lesbian and gay rights occurred, and I was a Member of Congress, and I was too frightened to even go near it. A lot has changed; there is still a chapter to be written.

I would like to pay special tribute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] for being a champion and leader in that fight as well. All of these fights belong to all of us, and I hail the gentleman from Georgia and those who have been with him.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I first would like certainly to commend the gentleman from Utah, the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, for his leadership and working cooperatively with the Members of this side of the aisle, for bringing this very important piece of legislation for the Members to consider and approve. I also offer my commendation to the gentleman from New Mexico, who is our ranking member of the subcommittee, but certainly the

author of the legislation now before us, the gentleman from Georgia.

I want to say to my colleagues that 6 years ago I was, along with other Members of the Congress, going to Selma, AL, to commemorate the 25th anniversary of that historic march that took place in 1965. Mr. Speaker, I realize that coming from the other part of the world, I guess those islands out there in the Pacific are somewhat isolated at times, where we out in the Pacific do not seem to know what is going on in the continental United States. But seeing the extent of what had happened in watching this on television and seeing that one of our Members here, as the author of this very important legislation who participated in this important march knows, I want to share with my colleagues that one of the most spiritual experiences I have had was going down there to Selma, AL, and participating in a church service of that little chapel where it all started. All I was thinking of was the great and the late Martin Luther King, Jr., the advocate and certainly the leader of that momentous occasion and where our own Member, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] was part of that great march, and I hope that every Member of this Chamber will have an opportunity to go to Selma, AL, and see what it was like and to feel the problems and inequities that existed in the civil rights, not only of our black brothers and sisters, but certainly for all Americans. I think this is what this legislation is all about, to serve as a reminder that there are inequities despite what it says in the Constitution. We still have problems that are human, and as I certainly endorse the comments made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, we need to look a little deeper in terms of the problems that we still face in this Nation.

Again I commend the gentlemen from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] for sponsoring this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this side. I commend the gentlemen from Georgia and New Mexico, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard orally the courage of men like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] today, but graphically, too. I would like to commend to my colleagues the National Trail Study that was done by the Park Service, Selma to Montgomery, and there are captions in this book that capture what we are doing here today. There is a photograph, 1965, Selma, highway patrolmen attack JOHN LEWIS, and other peaceful marchers, with clubs and tear gas on Bloody Sunday, March 7, 1965, UPI photo.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here is marking an important historical event for this country, a significant milestone in the civil rights movement. This was the impetus for the Voting Rights Act; again the hero of the Voting Rights Act, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], and it is only fitting that we commemorate this event with this trail study, and I want to commend the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] for the speed with which he undertook this legislation.

It is also fitting that the sponsor of this important legislation is the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], probably an authentic hero here in the U.S. Congress before he came to Congress and now also as a Member of this body.

When the civil rights marchers were attacked on the Edmond Pettus Bridge on March 7, 1965, JOHN was there suffering serious injury at the hands of law enforcement officials, and what the Nation saw that day, a day that has been known as Bloody Sunday, had a profound effect on American society. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] and the many other marchers, men and women like the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] and others, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], remembering the impact that this day had on him, has been an inspiration to us all.

Mr. Speaker, although 31 years have passed since the march, time has not diminished the importance of this event. Rather its importance continues to grow. The National Historical Trail designation contained in this bill will provide an ongoing tribute to the struggle for voting rights in this country. It will also help serve to educate new generations to the work of men like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] and others in standing up for our most basis freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous support of this House for this historic bill.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for H.R. 1129, to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route from Selma to Montgomery, AL, as a national historic trail.

For the moment let us forget the fact that this bill meets all the criteria for historic trail designation under the National Trails System Act of 1968, and instead, let me focus on the extraordinary significance of that historic march led by one of the world's greatest advocates for human and civil rights, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

On March 7, 1965, as Dr. King attempted to lead a voting rights march from Selma to Montgomery, AL, he was confronted by a sheriff's posse and State troopers on the Edmond Pettus Bridge. After first blocking the path of the marchers, law enforcement officials drove the marchers from the bridge in an attack which we now know as Bloody Sunday.

A later march was scheduled to afford Dr. King and others with Federal protection by an order of President Lyndon B. Johnson. On August 6, 1965, less than 5 months after the Selma to Montgomery march, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was signed into law.

While this 54-mile route remains essentially unchanged from its appearance in 1965, its impact has dramatically altered the American political landscape. This march illustrated to Congress and to all America that after almost a century blacks were still being denied the right to vote in most southern States or parts of these States.

When this 1965 law was enacted, the States of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia, were still using the literacy test as a mean-spirited device to restrict black voting. Since their emancipation from slavery, blacks have encountered both public and private resistance to their efforts to exercise their rights as citizens and members of the American community. The right to vote has always ranked high on the list of disenfranchised Americans, even though throughout the years, to exercise this right, for blacks, was often met with violence.

Mr. Speaker, had Dr. King and many others not made that historic and dangerous walk from Selma to Montgomery, perhaps I would not be standing before this body today. And, perhaps, neither would any of my distinguished African-American colleagues, women, and other minorities be here either.

Historic trail designation has more typically been associated with westward expansion and exploration. We have blazed this trail of human rights. Existing criteria require that in order to determine that an event or building is historically significant, it be at least 50 years old or of extraordinary significance. How much more extraordinary can this event be perceived before it is given its due? The National Park Service recommends the trail be designated by Congress. Therefore, given this recommendation, given the blood that was shed for American civil rights, Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of H.R. 1129, designating the route from Selma to Montgomery, AL, to be a national historic trail.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and support the commemoration of this Nation's civil rights movement through the designation of a national historic trail.

This legislation will recognize a turning point in the history of this country's struggle for civil rights. The well-documented story of how Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., began a peaceful and historic march for black voting rights from Selma, AL, on March 7, 1965, can be appreciated by each of us. We know that when the marchers attempted to leave Selma they were beaten by law enforcement officers as they crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

Two weeks later, under the protection of the Alabama National Guard, Dr. King was able to lead the march successfully, and in August of that same year President Johnson signed into law the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

This legislation will make a 54-mile route, beginning at the Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church in Selma and ending at the State Capitol Building in Montgomery, a part of the National Historic Trail Registry.

With the support of this body, generations to come can know and appreciate those early steps in the civil rights movement that began the road to making the Constitution of this country extend its rights and protections to all of its citizens. For some this will be freedom at last. Freedom from that bloody day to the recognition of today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1129, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1129, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITION OF LANDS TO GOSHUTE INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2464) to amend Public Law 103–93 to provide additional lands within the State of Utah for the Goshute Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2464

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

SECTION 1. ADDITION OF CERTAIN UTAH STATE LANDS TO GOSHUTE INDIAN RESERVATION.

The Utah Schools and Lands Improvement Act of 1993 (107 Stat. 995) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 11 as section 12; and

(2) by inserting after section 10 the following new section:

''SEC. 11. ADDITIONAL GOSHUTE INDIAN RESERVATION LANDS.

''(a) FURTHER ADDITIONS TO GOSHUTE RESERVATION.—In addition to the lands described in section 3, for the purpose of securing in trust for the Goshute Indian Tribe certain additional public lands and lands belonging to the State of Utah, which comprise approximately 8,000 acres of surface and subsurface estate, as generally depicted on the map entitled 'Additional Utah-Goshute Exchange', dated July 1, 1994, such public lands and State lands are hereby declared to be part of the Goshute Indian Reservation in the State of Utah effective upon the completion of conveyance of the State lands from the State of Utah and acceptance of title by the United States.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire through exchange those lands and interests in land described in subsection (a) which are owned by the State of Utah, subject to valid existing rights.

''(c) APPLICATION OF PRIOR PROVISIONS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the remaining provisions of this Act which are applicable to the lands to be transferred to the Goshute Indian Tribe pursuant to section 3 shall also apply to the lands subject to this section.

''(2) The Goshute Indian Tribe will be responsible for payment of the costs of appraisal of the lands to be acquired pursuant to this section, which costs shall be paid prior to the transfer of such lands.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, the Utah Schools and Lands Improvement Act, Public Law 103–93, which passed in 1993, is an important bill to all Utahns. After much hard work, we were able to pass legislation that was meant to help play a vital role in paying for the education of Utah's children. The act provided the framework for a proposed exchange of lands between the Federal Government and the Utah school trust.

H.R. 2464 would amend Public Law 103–93 to correct a boundary problem on the southern edge of the Goshute Indian Reservation located about 60 miles south of Wendover, UT. It places approximately 8,000 acres of land located within the boundaries of the Goshute Indian Reservation in trust for the Goshute Tribe. Approximately 7,000 acres of this land are currently owned by the State, and will become part of the reservation upon acquisition by the United States.

The State and Federal Government will simply ask the existing team of appraisers, both surface and mineral, to look at these additional properties. The appraisers are already collecting comparables, so the marginal cost of appraising these lands should be relatively small. Once appraised, and agreement on value is reached, the State school trust will be compensated out of the properties identified elsewhere in Public Law 103–93.

This bill will allow for the school trust to receive fair compensation for their ground as well as improve the ability of the tribe to manage their lands and clear-up an ongoing problem with their southern border. H.R. 2466 is noncontroversial and enjoys the support of the BLM, the State of Utah, Juab County, and the Goshute Tribe.

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

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today would amend Public Law 103–93, the Utah Schools and Land Improvement Act, which transferred land between the Federal Government and the State of Utah. At the time the bill was under consideration, we were approached by the Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation, which is located along the border of Utah and Nevada. Their request was to correct some boundary problems along the southern edge of the reservation in Utah. Due to the current configuration of that boundary and the remoteness of the area, proper management of the land has been very difficult. The State of Utah and the Bureau of Land Management and the tribe have been unable to prevent persistent problems with trespassing and poaching on the land.

Some are concerned that stopping action on the Utah Schools and Land Improvement Act to deal with the needs of the Goshute Tribe could be detrimental to the passage of this legislation. It was, therefore, agreed that the tribe would withdraw its request, with the promise that their needs would be addressed at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that we are here today to keep our promise to the Goshute Tribe. This bill will transfer approximately 8,000 acres of State and 400 of BLM land to the tribe, resulting in a much clearer boundary definition for the tribe to manage.

This bill is supported by the tribe, the administration, the board of trustees for the school and Institutional Trust Lands Administration of Utah, Juab County, UT, and the Utah Wilderness Coalition.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] the author of this piece of legislation. He is certainly to be commended for his tireless efforts to bring all the appropriate parties to negotiate an agreeable arrangement of land boundaries between the tribe and the State of Utah and the Federal Government. I also want to commend the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON], the ranking member of the subcommittee, for his review and close collaboration with the interested parties and organizations to bring this bill now up for full consideration by the House.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is what I would consider a model piece of legislation, where there has truly been the spirit of bipartisanship in certainly the leadership exemplified by the gentleman from Utah in bringing this now to the forefront and before the body.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from American Samoa for his kind words, and handling the bill on this side. I ask my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2464.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2464, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CARBON HILL NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2982) to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to extend the authorizations of appropriations through fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2982

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Carbon Hill National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act''.

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF CARBON HILL NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY TO THE STATE OF ALABAMA.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIREMENT.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the State of Alabama without reimbursement, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in subsection (b), for use by the Game and Fish Division of the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, as part of the State of Alabama fish culture program.

(b) PROPERTY DESCRIBED.—The property referred to in subsection (a) is the property known as the Carbon Hill National Fish Hatchery, located on County Road 63 at Carbon Hill, Alabama, in Walker County, Alabama, consisting of 67 acres (more or less), and all improvements and related personal property under the control of the Secretary that is located on that property, including buildings, structures, equipment, and all easements, leases, and water rights relating to that property.

(c) USE AND REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—The property conveyed to the State of Alabama pursuant to this section shall be used by the State for purposes of fishery resources management and fisheries-related activities, and if it is used for any other purpose detrimental to those purposes and activities, all right, title, and interest in and to all property conveyed pursuant to this section shall revert to the United States. The State of Alabama shall ensure that the property reverting to the United States is in substantially the same or better condition as at the time of transfer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

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

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 2982, introduced by our colleague, TOM BEVILL, to convey the Carbon Hill National Fish Hatchery to the State of Alabama.

This legislation is virtually identical to measures enacted into law last year which transferred three Federal fish hatcheries to the States of Arkansas, Iowa, and Minnesota.

Under the terms of H.R. 2982, the Secretary of the Interior will convey within 180 days of enactment all rights, title, and interest to this 67-acre facility to the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. The bill also contains the standard reversionary clause the stipulates that the property will be returned to the Federal Government if it is used for any purpose other than the State's fish cultural program.

This hatchery, which has been in operation for nearly 60 years, produces about one million fish each year which are used to restock ponds, lakes, and rivers throughout the Southeast.

For the past 2 years, the Clinton administration has proposed to provide title to the State because Carbon Hill is no longer essential to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's nationwide hatchery program. In fact, the facility is already being operated by the State under a long-term memorandum of agreement.

By enacting H.R. 2982, the Federal Government will save thousands of dollars a year in operating costs, a Federal-State partnership will be fostered, and Carbon Hill will continue to produce thousands of bluegill, channel catfish, striped bass, and walleye for recreational, stocking, and restoration efforts.

I urge an ''aye'' vote on H.R. 2982.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey has said it all, although I must say, at inexplicable length. This bill is without controversy. Except for the astonishing assertion that there might be striped bass in Alabama, I find no objection whatsoever on this.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2982.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2982.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR INCLUSION IN AMAGANSETT NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1836) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire property in the town of East Hampton, Suffolk County, NY, for inclusion in the Amagansett National Wildlife Refuge, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment:

Page 2, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 2. CORRECTIONS TO COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES MAP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall make such corrections to the map described in subsection (b) as are necessary—

(1) to move the eastern boundary of the excluded area covering Ocean Beach, Seaview, Ocean Bay Park, and part of Point O'Woods to the western boundary of the Sunken Forest Preserve; and

(2) to ensure that the depiction of areas as ''otherwise protected areas'' does not include any area that is owned by the Point O'Woods Association (a privately held corporation under the laws of the State of New York).

(b) MAP DESCRIBED.—The map described in this subsection is the map that is included in a set of maps entitled ''Coastal Barrier Resources System'', dated October 24, 1990, that relates to the unit of the Coastal Barrier Resources System entitled ''Fire Island Unit NY–59P''.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not have the slightest intention of objecting. I would simply give the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] the opportunity to explain, as briefly as possible, the substance of this request.

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

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, once again I am pleased to present to the House H.R. 1836, a bill introduced by the gentleman from New York, MIKE FORBES, to add a 98-acre oceanfront parcel of land to the Long Island National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious this bill was passed by the House on another occasion. It was sent over to the Senate, and it is back with an amendment. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill in its current form.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to once again present to the House H.R. 1836, a bill introduced by Congressman MIKE FORBES to add a 98-acre ocean-front parcel of land to the Long Island National Wildlife Refuge.

This legislation was overwhelmingly adopted in the House on April 23 of this year, and was approved by the other body on May 3. While the other body had no objection to the provisions of H.R. 1836, the text of H.R. 2005 was added to this measure and it is, therefore, necessary for the House to once again act affirmatively before sending this proposal to the President.

H.R. 2005 was unanimously approved by the House on October 30, 1995, and this noncontroversial measure will correct a mapping error in the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

In 1982, when unit NY–59P was created, a portion of privately owned land was incorrectly mapped as being part of an adjacent ''otherwise protected area'', the Fire Island National Seashore. This 88-acre tract is owned by a private homeowners group, the Point O'Woods Association, and has never been part of the National Seashore. This small, but important change in the Coastal Barrier Resources System has broad bipartisan support and has been endorsed by the administration.

Finally, I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York [MIKE FORBES] for his outstanding leadership in this matter. MIKE is the author of both H.R. 1836 and H.R. 2005 and he has done an outstanding job of not only gaining support for these measures but also representing his constituents in a most effective manner.

I urge an aye vote on H.R. 1836.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1836 and the Senate amendment thereto.

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

There was no objection.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT OF 1984 AUTHORIZATION EXTENSION

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1743) to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to extend the authorizations of appropriations through fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate Amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Section 102 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10301) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', productivity of natural resources and agricultural systems,'' after ''environmental quality'';

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) long-term planning and policy development are essential to ensure the availability of an abundant supply of high quality water for domestic and other uses; and

''(9) the States must have the research and problem-solving capacity necessary to effectively manage their water resources.''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

Section 103 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10302) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking ''to''; and

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) encourage long-term planning and research to meet future water management, quality, and supply challenges.''.

SEC. 3. GRANTS; MATCHING FUNDS.

Section 104(c) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(c)) is amended by striking ''one non-Federal dollar'' and all that follows through ''thereafter'' and inserting ''2 non-Federal dollars for every 1 Federal dollar''.

SEC. 4. GENERAL AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 104(f)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(f)(1) is amended by striking ''of $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending September 30, 1989, through September 30, 1995,'' and inserting ''of $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, $7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 and 1998, and $9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000''.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR RESEARCH FOCUSED ON WATER PROBLEMS OF INTERSTATE NATURE.

The first sentence of section 104(g)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(g)(1)) is amended by striking ''of $5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995'' and inserting ''of $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000''.

SEC. 6. COORDINATION.

Section 104 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) COORDINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To carry out this Act, the Secretary—

''(A) shall encourage other Federal departments, agencies (including agencies within the Department of the Interior), and instrumentalities to use and take advantage of the expertise and capabilities that are available through the institutes established by this section, on a cooperative or other basis;

''(B) shall encourage cooperation and coordination with other Federal programs concerned with water resources problems and issues;

''(C) may enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, and other transactions without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5);

''(D) may accept funds from other Federal departments, agencies (including agencies within the Department of the Interior), and instrumentalities to pay for and add to grants made, and contracts entered into, by the Secretary;

''(E) may promulgate such regulations as the Secretary considers appropriate; and

''(F) may support a program of internships for qualified individuals at the undergraduate and graduate levels to carry out the educational and training objectives of this Act.

''(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall report to Congress annually on coordination efforts with other Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities under paragraph (1).

''(3) RELATIONSHIP TO STATE RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act shall preempt the rights and authorities of any State with respect to its water resources or management of those resources.''.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California.

There be no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] for a brief explanation of the matter.

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

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the primary intent of H.R. 1743 is to extend the authorization for the State Water Resources Research Institutes. There are 54 of these institutes located at the land grant university in each of the 50 States and several of the territories. These institutes are a primary link between the academic community, the water-related personnel, and the Federal and State governments and the private sector.

H.R. 1743 would expand the act's findings and focus on the need for long-term planning and policy development and maintaining productivity of national resources and agricultural systems. In the fiscal year 1996 interior appropriations conference, there was a request to introduce an additional element of competition into this program. Subsequent discussions resulted in the USGS crafting a competitive element of the program, which takes funding out of the grants to the States and creates a competitive regional program.

Unfortunatly, it did not leave adequate base funding for the State program. While the House-passed version of H.R. 1743 authorizing the program does not require a competitive element, the senate amended this bill to specifically reauthorize the separate competitive regional program which had historically been a part of this program, thereby leaving the State-based program authorized by the House intact. We concur with this approach, and in adopting the Senate-passed language, endorse that approach, providing a competitive element to this program.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minority for the extensive cooperation we have had from their side on this very broadly based, bipartisan-supported bill. I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1743.

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

There was no objection.

URANIUM MILL TAILINGS RADIATION CONTROL ACT OF 1978 AUTHORIZATION EXTENSION

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2967) to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2967

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

SECTION 1. REFERENCE.

Whenever in this Act (other than in section 3) an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION; AUTHORIZATION.

Section 112(a) (42 U.S.C. 7922(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a)(1) The authority of the Secretary to perform remedial action under this title shall terminate on September 30, 1998, except that—

''(A) the authority of the Secretary to perform groundwater restoration activities under this title is without limitation, and

''(B) the Secretary may continue operation of the disposal site in Mesa County, Colorado (known as the Cheney disposal cell) for receiving and disposing of residual radioactive material from processing sites and of byproduct material from property in the vicinity of the uranium milling site located in Monticello, Utah, until the Cheney disposal cell has been filled to the capacity for which it was designed, or September 30, 2023, whichever comes first.

''(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'byproduct material' has the meaning given that term in section 11e.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014(e)(2)).''.

SEC. 3. REMEDIAL ACTION AT ACTIVE PROCESSING SITES.

(a) SECTION 1001.—Section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 2296a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(A), by striking ''$5.50'' and inserting ''$6.25'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(B), by striking ''$270,000,000'' and inserting ''$350,000,000'';

(3) in subsection (b)(2)(C), by striking ''$40,000,000'' and inserting ''$65,000,000'';

(4) in subsection (b)(2)(E)(i), by striking ''$5.50'' and inserting ''$6.25''; and

(5) in subsection (b)(2)(E)(ii), by striking ''$5.50'' and inserting ''$6.25''.

(b) SECTION 1003.—Section 1003 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2296a–2) is amended by striking ''$310,000,000'' and inserting ''$415,000,000''.

SEC. 4. REMEDIAL ACTION FOR THE DISPOSAL OF RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS.

(a) SECTION 104.—Section 104(d) (42 U.S.C. 4914(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''For purposes of this subsection, the term 'site' does not include any property described in section 101(6)(B) which is in a State which the Secretary has certified has a program which would achieve the purposes of this subsection.''.

(b) SECTION 108.—Section 108(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 7918(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Residual radioactive material from a processing site designated under this title may be disposed of at a facility licensed under title II under the administrative and technical requirements of such title. Disposal of such material at such a site in accordance with such requirements shall be considered to have been done in accordance with the administrative and technical requirements of this title.''

(c) SECTION 115.—Section 115(a) (42 U.S.C. 7925(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''This subsection does not prohibit the disposal of residual radioactive material from a processing site under this title at a site licensed under title II or the expenditure of funds under this title for such disposal.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] each will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

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

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

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2967 reauthorizes the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act, the 1978 law which has been cleaning up the radioactive contamination created by uranium milling operations. The program has been a valuable and generally successful endeavor, and has already completed remediation at a number of uranium milling sites, many of which had been abandoned and at which mill tailings were simply left out on the open ground.

At title I sites, all of the contamination was generated by Federal activities. For the most part, the tailings were created in the process of obtaining supplies of uranium for the Manhattan Project, which produced America's first nuclear weapons. It is fitting that the Federal Government should be responsible for cleaning up these wastes, and the statute maintains a 90 percent Federal, 10 percent State split for remediation of these sites. Title II sites encompass a range of areas which have combined tailings of both Federal and private responsibility. At those sites, the private owners remediated the contamination, then are reimbursed by the Government for that share of tailings which can be traced to Federal activities.

The bill before us extends the authority for title I cleanup from 1996 to 1998. DOE is confident that all its title I sites can be cleaned up by that time. The bill also incorporates a number of changes to ensure that the program can continue to function in an efficient and responsible manner. First, the bill includes an authorization for DOE to keep one of its title I disposal cells open for the receipt of additional tailings from its Grand Junction and Monticello sites. Second, it increases the authorization of expenditures for the Government's share of its costs at title II sites, so that the Federal Government bears a more equitable share of its financial responsibility at these sites. Third, the bill clears up an ambiguity in the current statute to ensure that title I tailings can be disposed of at licensed title II sites. Finally, H.R. 2967 gives the DOE flexibility with the current statute's deed annotation requirement if the affected State has a sufficient program of landowner notification already in place. All of these changes will be of great benefit to the program, and were worked out in a very bipartisan manner within the Commerce Committee. In that regard, I would especially like to thank Mr. DINGELL and the ranking member of the Energy and Power Subcommittee, Mr. PALLONE, for their efforts to move this bill forward. I would also like to thank Mr. HASTERT for his contributions and involvement in this important issue.

Without this legislation DOE will be unable to continue its cleanup of the remaining title I sites. H.R. 2967 is a responsible measure—a positive measure—which allows the Federal Government to continue to clean up its environmental liabilities at uranium mill sites. I strongly recommend the bill's approval by the House.

☐ 1515

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer my support for H.R. 2967. The legislation was considered in the Committee on Commerce and voted out with full support from both sides of the aisle.

I did have some concerns about provisions affecting deed records so that potential homeowners would know whether or not a property had been polluted and, if so, whether the problem had been remediated. Fortunately, we were able to work this out to everyone's satisfaction in the committee.

I want to thank Chairman SCHAEFER for his assistance in perfecting this legislation. I am very happy to support it today.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2967 because it reauthorizes the remediation activities of environmental damage created at uranium mill sites. Without this legislation, the current authorization for cleanup will expire on September 30, 1996.

Uranium mill tailings were created as a result of Federal Government activities to secure supplies of uranium for the Manhattan project—a top-secret activity designed to build the world's first nuclear weapon—located in my congressional district in New Mexico. This development lead to continued production of nuclear weapons and the use of nuclear energy production for electric generation.

The milling process separates high-grade uranium from low-grade surrounding rock. These high volume sand-like leftovers emit low levels of radioactivity and consequently need to be disposed of properly by the Department of Energy.

The original Uranium Mill Tailings Control Act of 1978 provided for the cleanup of 22 title I sites—abandoned and inactive sites which were used primarily for Federal purposes.

Due to the significant volume of tailings to be remediated and more strict cleanup standards imposed after the 1978 act, more time and additional funds are necessary to complete the Department of Energy's activities.

H.R. 2967 will allow the Department an additional 2 years to safely complete the cleanup process. This is a good piece of legislation which will address public health and environmental concerns in many western States. I urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 2967.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2967, a bill to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act [UMTRCA] through 1998.

This bill is sound environmental cleanup legislation, and it marks the final chapter of the cold war. The mill tailings date back to the Manhattan project of 1942 and the national security purchases of uranium by the Federal Government from 1947 to 1970. During this period, there were no environmental cleanup standards for mill sites, nor were any standards enacted into law until the 1970's. The United States and the free world benefited from this program; therefore, it is just that the Federal Government pay for its share of cleanup costs.

Of particular note is the environmental reclamation project at Uravan on Colorado's western slope. The mill tailings date back to Madam Curie's radium research at the turn of the century. In 1942, as part of the war effort, the Manhattan Army Engineering District contracted with UMETCO Minerals Corp. for uranium produced at the site.

Today, UMETCO is in the process of restoring the environment to its former natural beauty. This has been a true success story for the Department of Energy, State of Colorado, local government entities, and UMETCO. The accomplishments of this project clearly demonstrate that the public and private sector can work together to preserve the environment.

In closing, I would also like to point out that the UMTRCA legislation is fiscally responsible. In Colorado, $100,000,000 will be saved by keeping the Cheney disposal facility near Grand Junction open so that the mill tailings that are uncovered in future road and nearby utility repair work can be disposed of in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation is effective in preserving the environment and should be promptly enacted into law.

I commend my good friend from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] on this sound environmental legislation which takes into account the needs of Colorado communities and the budgetary constraints of the Federal Government.

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

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2967, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2967, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

OVERSEAS CITIZENS VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1996

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3058) to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to extend the period for receipt of absentee ballots, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3058

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Overseas Citizens Voting Rights Act of 1996''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR RECEIPT OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS.

Section 102 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–1) is amended—

(1) by striking out ''and'' at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) permit absentee ballots to be received at least until the close of polls on election day.''.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL WRITE-IN ABSENTEE BALLOT PROVISIONS TO SPECIAL, PRIMARY, AND RUNOFF ELECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(a) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–2(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after ''general'' the following: '', special, primary, and runoff''; and

(2) by striking out ''States,'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''State''.

(b) SPECIAL RULES.—Section 103(c) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–2(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting after ''candidate or'' the following: '', with respect to a general or special election,''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting after ''candidate or'' the following: ''with respect to a general election''.

(c) USE OF APPROVED STATE ABSENTEE BALLOT IN PLACE OF FEDERAL WRITE-IN ABSENTEE BALLOT.—Section 103(e) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–2(e)) is amended by striking out ''a general'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''an''.

(d) CERTAIN STATES EXEMPTED.—Section 103(f) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–2(f)) is amended by striking out ''general'' each place it appears.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections taking place after December 31, 1996.

SEC. 4. USE OF ELECTRONIC RETURN OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 104 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–3) is amended—

(1) by striking out ''and'' at the end of paragraph (8);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting in lieu thereof ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(10) in consultation with the Presidential designee, consider means for providing for expeditious methods for the return of absentee ballots, including return by electronic transmittal, with maximum regard for ballot secrecy, audit procedures, and other considerations relating to the integrity of the election process.''.

(b) SECRECY AND VERIFICATION OF ELECTRONICALLY TRANSMITTED BALLOTS.—Section 104 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–3) is amended—

(1) by striking out ''To afford'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''(a) IN GENERAL.—To afford''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) SECRECY AND VERIFICATION OF ELECTRONICALLY TRANSMITTED BALLOTS.—No electronic transmittal or related procedure under subsection (a)(10) that is paid for, in whole or in part, with Federal funds may be carried out in any manner that (1) permits any person other than the voter to view a completed ballot, or (2) otherwise compromises ballot secrecy. At the earliest possible opportunity, the original of each completed ballot that is transmitted electronically shall be submitted in a secrecy envelope to the applicable location in the State involved.''

SEC. 5. ELECTRONIC TRANSMITTAL OF BALLOTING MATERIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C.

1973ff et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

"SEC. 108. ELECTRONIC TRANSMITTAL OF BALLOTING MATERIALS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State, in cooperation with the Presidential designee, shall establish a system for electronic transmittal of balloting materials for overseas voters. The system shall provide for—

''(1) electronic transmittal as an alternative method for transmittal of balloting materials to overseas voters;

''(2) use of the format of the official post card form prescribed under section 101 (or the format of any other registration form provided for under State law) for purposes of absentee voter registration application and absentee ballot application, with the condition that a State may require receipt of a form with an original signature before the ballot of the voter is counted;

''(3) furnishing of absentee ballots by electronic transmittal, from locations within the State, as selected by the chief State election official, to overseas voters who request such transmittal; and

''(4) special alternative methods of transmittal of balloting materials for use only when required by an emergency declared by the President or the Congress.

''(b) FUNDING REQUIREMENT.—The requirements of subsection (a) shall apply to a State with respect to an election—

''(1) if there is full payment by the Federal Government of any additional cost incurred by the State after the date of the enactment of this Act for the implementation of such subsection (a), with such costs to be determined by the Presidential designee and the chief State election official, acting jointly; or

''(2) in any case of less than full payment, as described in paragraph (1), if the State, in the manner provided for under the law of the State, agrees to the application of such requirements.

"SEC. 109. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR APPROVAL OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMITTAL METHOD.

''The Presidential designee may not approve use of any method of electronic transmittal for purposes of this Act, unless, not later than 90 days before the effective date of the approval, the Presidential designee submits to the Congress a detailed report describing the method.''.

(b) DEFINITION AMENDMENT.—Section 107 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–6) is amended—

(1) by striking out ''and'' at the end of paragraph (7);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting in lieu thereof ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9) the term 'electronic transmittal' means, with respect to balloting materials, transmittal by facsimile machine or other electronic method approved by the Presidential designee.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections taking place after December 31, 1996.

SEC. 6. REPORT PROVISION.

Section 101(b)(6) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–(b)(6)) is amended—

(1) by striking out ''participation and'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''participation,''; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and a separate analysis of electronic transmittal of balloting materials''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS].

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us amends the Uniform and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act. It was unanimously passed in committee on March 12, 1996.

Currently, 6 million citizens are covered by the provisions of the original act passed in 1986, a decade ago. This includes 1.5 million U.S. military personnel in and out of the United States, their families, and over 3 million U.S. citizens living overseas.

This measure will make it easier for overseas citizens to cast absentee ballots in a timely fashion, and help to guarantee ballot integrity for all those covered in the act by requiring ballot secrecy and the return of the original paper ballots to the State where the ballots are counted. A manager's amendment strengthens the guarantee of ballot secrecy in the bill by providing for ballot confidentiality throughout the federally funded transmission process, not just at the voting location.

I would emphasize, also, that the Federal Government will be paying the full cost of this program, particularly that required to electronically transmit ballot materials. Therefore, this is not an unfunded mandate being imposed on local units of government.

A great many States already provide for electronic transmission of ballot applications and some do for ballots as well. This bill would encourage all States to ensure that all American citizens everywhere throughout the world have speedy access to the voting box.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we suspend the rules and pass this bill.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. EHLERS, and Chairman THOMAS in cosponsoring H.R. 3058, to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act.

This is a small, but important, step forward in trying to make it easier for American citizens to register and vote.

The Federal Voting Assistance Program, which administers the law and which operates under the Secretary of Defense, has been very successful over the years in working with the States to facilitate registration and voting by our military personnel, their families, and the several million American citizens who live abroad.

The program has been responsible for a number of innovative ideas in the elections area, including the promotion of electronically transmitted ballot materials which were essential during the Gulf war, with so many military personnel in a combat area during the election period.

Because of its established organization and lines of authority, the military portion of the voting assistance program has run well and has achieved voting participation rates well in excess of the overall population.

But the several million overseas American civilians are widely dispersed, often isolated, and can be found anywhere around the globe. Many are nowhere near an embassy or consulate but do have access to a fax machine. These amendments, by allowing registration and voting materials to be sent and received electronically while ensuring their security and integrity, will provide a much greater opportunity for those Americans living abroad to participate in our most important democratic responsibility.

This legislation is strongly supported by the Department of Defense and by the various organizations representing citizens abroad. I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 3058.

Mr. Speaker, having no requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from California for his support of this legislation and for his comments. He points out very clearly the need to update this legislation to ensure that every citizen, whether serving in the military or as a civilian overseas, has the opportunity to express their opinion, and voice their opinion at the ballot box. I appreciate the support of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3058, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is aware of the insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and believes the gentleman raises a question of personal privilege.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, last week, in a ''Dear Colleague'' communication with the Members of Congress and in an extension of remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and, again, in remarks included in a special order at the end of congressional business, Congressman BOB DORNAN raised questions about me and my sponsorship of an event in a Federal Government building.

The gentleman from California has every right to dislike me if he so chooses. But he has no right to misrepresent the facts, nor the motives of others in this, his latest, attempt to smear the gay community. Today, I take this time to set the record straight. I apologize to my colleagues for using valuable floor time in a busy legislative week, but in this circumstance, I have no choice. This is a much bigger issue than a personal or ideological dispute. This is a question of whether individuals in American society should be able to intentionally misrepresent the facts, question others' motives, and intentionally falsify information in an attempt to discredit other elements of society. If there is to remain any element of mutual respect in a diverse society, we must reject intentional efforts to personally destroy those with whom we might disagree.

Mr. DORNAN uses an article by a freelance journalist Marc Marano and a video tape produced by the Family Research Council to portray a recent series of events held in this town, in government buildings, as a party of numerous illegal activities. Nothing could be further from the truth. Here is the entire story, with the facts.

Early this year, four young professional men from the Washington-Baltimore area decided they wanted to ''do something to make a difference.'' These gentlemen, in their twenties, are Kenny Eggerl, a producer and owner of KSE Productions—a sales meetings, special events, and fashion show company; David Parham, a director of public policy and education for the Urban Land Institute; Ryan Peal, an account executive with Hill & Knowlton; and Bill Pullen, a manager of rehab services at Mid Atlantic medical Services, Inc. They felt the younger generation was not yet doing its part, especially in the fight against AIDS. Their generation is unable financially to support most large fund raising dinners in this town. So they decided to create a weekend of low-dollar events which many could afford. Because of the popularity of dance events, they chose this avenue for the focus of their activities. Because the availability of buildings centered around the weekend of April 12–14, they called the event Cherry Jubilee in honor of the cherry blossoms decorating this town at the time.

Tickets for the events met these financial concerns. Individual tickets were $20 for the Friday night dance; $35 for the Saturday night dance; and $25 for the Sunday morning brunch. In the end approximately $130,000 was raised. Expenses, I am told, will finalize at between $70,000 and $80,000. The net proceeds then will be $50,000 to $60,000 raised for two AIDS service organizations: Whitman-Walker Health Clinic, and Food and Friends. Most citizens should be very proud of these efforts and the services they will provide. This was a gift of love, not a weekend of illegal activity. It was a human response of charity, not a call for more Federal funds. It should be an undertaking that both Democrats and Republicans are proud of. I dare say if more such events were held across the country, we could find ways to meet the needs of our fellow man while still balancing the Federal budget!

Friday night, April 12 kicked off the weekend with a dance at a club called Diversite'. Approximately 800 attended. There were no reports of violence or illegal activity.

Saturday night—April 13; the main event was held at the Mellon Auditorium part of the Department of Commerce. This place had been recommended to the sponsors by a mutual friend. All of the proper paper work required by the Department was completed and the arrangements were finalized. A liability contract was signed for the evening. A total of nine security personnel were obtained. Security was primarily contracted through a security agency approved by the Commerce Department. The final security detail included nine individuals; two Federal security personnel, six security officers approved by the Department through private contract, and an off-duty policeman. The auditorium was rented by the hour, for a total cost of $7,500 plus $1,600 for cleaning afterward. In addition, a building engineer and a building representative were on duty during the entire time.

Approximately 2,000 attended the dance. In addition to the security detail mentioned above, approximately 30 event volunteers assisted the sponsors in managing the event. Food and Friends provided eight individuals to assist with tickets and such at the entrance. Whitman-Walker, who served as the fiscal agent, provided three individuals to collect and handle the money throughout the night.

Sunday morning, a brunch was held in the Rayburn Courtyard. I had been asked if I would obtain a space that might be used as a part of the weekend's activities to benefit Whitman-Walker and Food and Friends. Because these events were in Washington, and some of the attendees would be from out of town, the sponsors desired a place which helped to portray our Nation's Capitol. I was happy to be of assistance. The event was held from 1 to 4 p.m. on Sunday, April 14th in the Courtyard of the Rayburn Office Building. Approximately 500 attended the event. Capitol Hill uniformed police frequently walked through the event. Absolutely no trouble occurred or was reported by anyone. The sponsors made sure everyone understood they were in the offices of the U.S. Congress. Proper dress and decorum were maintained at all times.

Mr. DORNAN refers to an article written by Marc Marano as the basis for his allegations. Some things should be understood. Mr. Marano is a free lance journalist who often works as a material source for so-called conservative journalists. To our knowledge, no mainstream press ran Mr. Marano's story. He never once tried to interview me or any of the event's sponsors. Nor did he talk to any of the security personnel, nor the responsible authorities at the Department of Commerce. Throughout his entire story, not one source is ever identified or quoted. The only knowledge we have of the story being published is in Human Events, and as a basis for a column by columnist Armstrong Williams. According to that column, Mr. Marano was hired by the Family Research Council to do the investigation. The Family Research Council produced a video tape regarding the event.

There is no record that Mr. Marano purchased tickets for any of the events. He clearly did not use his own name and address at any time. Nor did he seek to obtain any press credentials for the events. Rather he chose to go undercover, unaccounted for, and free to discover his own story. Personally, I am disappointed that he chose to misrepresent himself, and his profession in an attempt to find material to use against others in society. I wish he had the courage, honesty, and decency to simply buy the tickets under his own name, or pursue the story through legitimate journalistic procedures.

Mr. Marano says in his story, he ''proceeded on assignment into the gay world for an undercover investigation.'' I also wish the Family Research Council had been willing to honestly ask for press credentials and cover the weekend. Honesty is something this town and this debate both need.

But fact is not the basis for the story. Rather hate and prejudice are the motives by which Mr. Marano and Mr. Williams sought to totally misrepresent the fund raising events and their purpose. Allow me to respond to specific allegations in Mr. Marano's article published and circulated by Mr. DORNAN.

Allegation: ''The dance party featured public nudity, illegal sexual activity, and evidence of illegal drugs.''

The facts: Absolutely no one other than Mr. Marano makes such allegations. Not one complaint was filed by a security officer, nor were any complaints lodged with them. Security personnel had been given full authority to remove anyone for misconduct; not one person was asked to leave. There is no evidence of even a fight among the 2,000 dance attendees.

The sponsors intentionally took steps to prevent even the atmosphere conducive to illegal activity. The security personnel and volunteers were strategically placed throughout the entire room to make sure nothing happened. Three foot by four foot posters were placed throughout the auditorium and the restrooms with the message: The possession or use of illegal substances is strictly prohibited. A $14,000 lighting system was purchased to make sure the room was both decorative and well-lit. I would point out to those who watched parts of the Family Research video that the filming occurred without any camera lighting. This should make clear there was no place dark enough for the alleged illegal activity to occur. Nor does the video show any illegal activity. If the video was produced undercover, without lights, is there any doubt such illegal activity would have been filmed if it actually occurred? I don't think so.

Allegation: ''A Federal building, the Andrew Mellon Auditorium played host to the dance and was the backdrop for the illegal activity.''

The facts: Again, there is no evidence by anyone, including all security personnel and authorities at the Department of Commerce, of any illegal activity.

Allegation: ''The sponsors included Gay Republican STEVE GUNDERSON of Wisconsin.''

The facts: The four individuals mentioned earlier, were the sponsors through a nonprofit organization called Friends being Friends. Numerous corporations sponsored part of the financial costs of the weekend. My sole role was to serve as the congressional host for the Sunday Brunch by requesting a space in my name. Publicity for the event gave special thanks to me, and to 17 others, for their assistance.

On Friday and Saturday, I was actually in Wisconsin. I returned to Washington Saturday night, but did not attend the dance. On Sunday morning, if you want to know, I attended church. In the afternoon, Rob Morris and I attended the brunch. We brought a close friend, and former Capitol Hill staffer, who now has AIDS. We purchased our tickets for this event.

Allegation: ''The homosexual community's credo seems to be 'Die young and leave a pretty corpse'.''

The facts: This is the journalism of bigotry and prejudice. It has no place in American society in the 1990's. It has nothing to do with an event organized to raise private funds for AIDS Care Organizations, or a story of the event. People with AIDS don't die pretty—they suffer the worst possible pain and illness, as their bodies wither away to nothing. One would hope that 15 years and over 300,000 deaths into this epidemic, we would all have a better understanding of the disease. I invite Mr. Marano, and Mr. DORNAN, to come visit the victims of this disease. In so doing, they will learn these are not some faceless pretty corpses. Rather, they are the sons, and brothers, and uncles, and lovers, and friends of the greater American family. Tragically, in increasing numbers they are also the mothers, and sisters, and daughters of America, as well.

Allegation: ''At about 4 a.m., two men proceeded to engage in illicit sexual behavior in the main auditorium.''

The facts: Absolutely no one but Mr. Marano claims to have seen this incident. But one must wonder why he did not film it. One must wonder why he did not report it to security. Sexual acts are not instantaneous occurrences. Why is no one willing to come forth as witness to this event other than Mr. Marano, who admits to being on an assignment? According to the organizers, security and the volunteers were placed at every possible place in the auditorium to prevent even the remote possibility of this type of incident from happening.

Allegation: ''A battle between security and partygoers erupted over the restroom lights.''

The facts: The main restrooms for the event were in the basement. Because of this, security personnel were placed there from the beginning of the event and throughout the evening to prevent any kind of occurrence. Security reported no fights, no harassment, no drugs, no smoking, nor any sexual activity. Security made no reports of illegal activity or trouble. At my request, the organizers of the event contacted the responsible authority at the Department of Commerce just yesterday to confirm this information.

Second, the security system for the evening included person-to-person communication through headsets so that each security guard might know anything that was happening. At no time during the entire event, did a complaint come over the headsets indicating a problem between partygoers and security.

Allegation: ''Despite the flaunting of public nudity, illicit sexual activity, illegal drug use, and pornography * * * law enforcement never intervened.''

The facts: Conveniently, only Mr. Marano claims to have seen this illegal activity. He feels compelled to discuss a S/M conference that apparently occurred in 1993 in the same building. He then links that unconnected event to the dance and concludes that the same activities occurred during both events. According to those who attended, the allegation of pornography at the dance is without basis. Given the purpose of the dance event, discussion of S/M or pornography has no place in an article summarizing the weekend's activities.

As mentioned numerous times before, law enforcement never intervened because there was no basis for intervention.

Allegation: ''Every conceivable isolated spot became a dilemma for security. Security officers had to dilegently watch the outside courtyard stairwell in the smoking area. The steps led to a dark alley on the side of the building where many of the men were congregating. * * * Orange cones were erected to close the area off, as a security officer was assigned to stand watch.''

The facts: If Mr. Marano had interviewed any of the event sponsors before writing his story, he would have discovered the total error of his perceptions. First, the dance event was sold out. Fire code would not allow any more in the auditorium. Accordingly, security monitored the back entrance to prevent people from entering without tickets. Second, the orange cones alluded to were placed there by a construction company to block access to their construction. They had nothing to do with the dance. Finally, security guards were placed in the alley, near the far door for two reasons. First, this was the room where all the money was being handled and stored. Second, this entrance was also used for supplies and garbage. Thus, there was much traffic in and out during the evening. Security was there to make sure only the right people used this entrance, and no one without credentials had access to the money room.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has sought to question my integrity and that of the sponsors of Cherry Jubilee through misrepresentation of the facts and distortion of the events surrounding that weekend, and their purposes. He has every right in a free society to pursue his opposition to those of us who happen to be gay. He has no right to misrepresent the facts, nor distort information, in a desperate attempt to smear an element of society he dislikes.

While I am proud of the efforts of these four young men to raise private funds for people in need, my personal involvement in this weekend was very limited. I secured the space for the Sunday brunch. My partner and I attended the brunch, first to support the cause, and second to make sure we could refute any ill-founded allegations if they were to come forth. I would point out to my colleagues that the Rayburn Courtyard is consumed in sunlight between the hours of 1 and 4 in the afternoon. I would further point out that the space is created by four walls with oversized windows on six floors. On one side alone, there exist 45 oversized windows. There was certainly no attempt to hide anything, or in anyway misuse Federal property.

I rise today, in a question of privilege, not for myself but for others. First, I rise in defense of the four young men who worked tirelessly throughout the spring to produce this event. They are all professionals, in their own right, who did this out of their concern for, and love for, those suffering from AIDS. They raised $60,000 in new resources that we won't have to finance with Federal funds. Every conservative and every Republican should applaud such efforts.

Their efforts do not deserve to be misrepresented as they have been by

Mr. DORNAN, Mr. Marano, and Mr. Williams. The facts simply state otherwise.

Second, I rise in defense of those in need of these services. We often talk in this chamber about the declining morals of American society. I would remind my colleagues of those words from the New Testament, ''Thou shalt love thy Lord, they God, with all thy heart, thy soul, and mind. This is the greatest of all commandments. And thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. This is the second greatest commandment of all.''

The Greater Washington area, today, unfortunately has the largest concentration of HIV positive people in the country. This is at the same time, a city suffering from financial bankruptcy. Few, if any, have suffered from this financial mismanagement as have the AIDS service organizations. No place in America needs the charity and help of the individual citizens more than in this area, for this cause.

Cherry Jubilee represented the best of the American tradition; it was the classic public private-partnership to help those who cannot help themselves.

Cherry Jubilee represented the best of the American family. If family means ''unconditional love'' then no group has rallied to care for its own, more than the American gay community. When others cast the AIDS victims out of their houses, out of their communities, and out of their churches; the gay community raised unparalleled funds to meet the needs of its victims.

Cherry Jubilee represented the best of America's Judao-Christian ethic. They saw the least of these among us, who needed food, and clothing, and shelter. And through such events as this, they tried to provide it. They became the love of God personified, as they became their brothers' keepers.

And yes, Mr. DORNAN, they pursued a Republican solution to a domestic problem. They didn't demonstrate on the steps of the Capitol for more Federal funds. They didn't ask for more Federal mandates upon the local community. Rather, they took it upon themselves to become a part of the solution. They did it on their own. They were one of George Bush's thousand points of light. They were one of NEWT GINGRICH's shining lights upon a hill. They heard BOB DOLE tell them to ''do all they could, and then some.'' And that is what they did.

This country desperately needs its people to stop the yelling, and simply ask, ''How can I help?'' May I suggest that to begin, we stop questioning other people's motives. Second, may I suggest that we seek the facts, all the facts, before we make unfounded accusations. The sponsors of these events are willing to do it again, if there is support. But if all this should reap is misrepresentation, controversy, and lies, they will simply stop. In that case, either we at the Federal level must increase our financial payments, or the victims must suffer even more.

Let us as leaders set the right example by our words, and our conduct. And I hope that in a small way, this time has served to correct the inaccuracies and distortions about this event, its activities, and my role therein.

□ 1545

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY IN RESPONSE TO THREAT POSED BY PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 104–210)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. COMBEST) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I transmit herewith a report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order No 12938 of November 14, 1994, in response to the threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons (''weapons of mass destruction'') and of the means of delivering such weapons.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1996.*

REVISED DEFERRAL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 104–211)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral of budgetary resources, totaling $1.4 billion. The deferral affects the International Security Assistance program.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1996.*

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 430 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3230.

□ 1555

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 3230) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will each control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

ALTERING ORDER OF CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 4(c) of House Resolution 430, I request that during the consideration of H.R. 3230, amendments Nos. 1 and 2 printed in part A of House Report 104–570 be considered after all other amendments printed in that part of the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's request is noted.

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

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3230 continues an effort we began last year to revitalize this country's national defenses after a decade of spending decline and force structure reductions. For the second consecutive year, and in a bipartisan fashion, the National Security Committee has reported a bill that I believe considers the future more realistically, and address shortfalls and shortcomings in the present more aggressively, than does the administration. Moreover, the committee's efforts have been undertaken within the broader context and constraints of a commitment to balance the budget by the year 2002.

The primary mission of our military forces has not changed very much since the fall of the Berlin Wall—it remains the protection and promotion of vital U.S. interests around the world. Despite the end of the cold war, the events of just the past year clearly demonstrate that new challenges to U.S. global interests are emerging on many fronts.

China, as an emerging power, has demonstrated a disturbing willingness to use military force as a tool of coercion as it threatens stability, prosperity and the growth of democracy in East Asia. The administration's decision last week to waive sanctions against the Chinese for their export of nuclear sensitive technology to Pakistan undermines this country's commitment to nonproliferation in the

eyes of much of the world, and seemingly rewards Beijing's leaders for their increasingly assertive and aggressive diplomacy throughout the region.

Russia, as a disintegrating military superpower, careens back and forth from extreme nationalism to unreconstructed communism as it struggles to hold itself together in the post-cold-war world. As it does, it wages a bloody war in Chechnya, threatens the use of nuclear weapons in response to NATO expansion and sells advanced weaponry of all kinds—including nuclear technologies—to anyone willing to pay cash. We spend United States taxpayer's dollars to assist Russia and other countries of the former Soviet Union to dismantle their nuclear weapons, yet Moscow maintains its nuclear forces at cold war levels of readiness and continues to invest scarce resources in further strategic modernization.

And throughout the world, America confronts a lengthening list of failed and failing states, terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ethnic, tribal, and religious conflict. The events of the past year and the range of U.S. peacekeeping and humanitarian missions testifies to the rise of ethnic violence, terrorism and other challenges to the evolving post-cold-war world.

The administration's underfunding of U.S. military forces stands in stark contrast to this troubling strategic landscape, as does its extensive use of the military on missions of peripheral U.S. national interest. The gap between our national military strategy and the resources this administration has decided to commit to executing that strategy, estimated by some to be greater than $100 billion, continues to widen. So the result is a Department of Defense that has been designed to carry out one set of missions, is being called upon to execute an entirely different set of missions, and is inadequately funded for either. The result is a deepening sense of confusion, frustration, and disarray in our military.

Consequently, H.R. 3230 once again attempts to address the shortfalls and shortcomings created by the internal contradictions of the administration's defense program. Beginning last year, the committee focused its efforts on the four key pillars of a sound national defense; improving the quality of military life; sustaining core readiness; revitalizing an underfunded modernization plan; reforming and innovating the Pentagon. H.R. 3230 builds on last year's efforts in these four key areas.

The bill provides $266.7 billion in budget authority for Department of Defense and Department of Energy programs and is $600 million below the spending levels set by the Budget Committee for the national security budget function in fiscal year 1997. The bill provides for $2.4 billion more than current fiscal year 1996 authorized spending which, when adjusted for inflation, represents a real decline of approximately 1.5 percent in spending and not an increase. The fact that this bill authorizes defense spending at a level that is $12.4 billion greater than the President's request, yet still reflects spending decline, speaks volumes about the extent to which the President is underfunding the military.

I will leave discussion of the many important initiatives in the bill to my colleagues on the National Security Committee who have worked very hard since late February to get this bill to the floor this early in the year. In particular, I would like to recognize the diligence and dedication of the subcommittee and panel chairman and ranking members. Unlike most committees in the House, the National Security Committee's seven subcommittees and panels are each responsible for producing discreet pieces of the broader bill. From the outset of the process, ensuring that the bill comes together in a coherent product requires a lot of planning, coordination and teamwork, all of which I have consistently been able to count on.

Because our fiscal year 1996 defense authorization bill was not enacted until this past February, the National Security Committee had no chance to pause before launching into the fiscal year 1997 hearing and mark-up process in order to get the bill to the floor this early in the legislative cycle. I applaud the efforts of my colleagues on the committee, all or who are responsible for us being here today.

In particular, I would like to recognize the contributions of the gentleman from California, the committee's ranking member, Mr. DELLUMS. He is one of this institution's most articulate Members as well as strongest proponents of the deliberative process. The committee's work, and this bill, are that much better because of it.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the staff. This bill authorizes funding for approximately 50 percent of the Federal Government's discretionary budget. To say it is a lot of work is an understatement. We have a small staff relative to the size of the committee and the magnitude of our oversight responsibilities, so the work gets done only through great dedication and effort.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, I urge strong bipartisan support for this bipartisan bill. The Constitution makes raising and maintaining the military one of Congress's most fundamental responsibilities. H.R. 3230 clearly demonstrates the extent to which the National Security Committee has taken this responsibility seriously.

□ 1600

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 11 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take a few moments to express my concerns with H.R. 3230, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997. I would begin at the outset by thanking my distinguished colleague for his very kind and generous remarks with respect to this gentleman in his opening remarks.

Second, I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman SPENCE, again for a more bipartisan approach to this year's bill, both at the staff and member level. But I would hasten to add, Mr. Chairman, civility, collegiality and some effort at bipartisanship notwithstanding, there remain many issues that caused me to vote against the bill in committee and to offer additional and dissenting views on its reports.

I refer my colleagues who are interested to those views and will request that at the appropriate time they be approved for inclusion into the RECORD.

Let me enumerate some of my concerns. First, Mr. Chairman, the unwarranted, I underscore, unwarranted addition of nearly $13 billion to the defense topline is justified primarily to meet a notional modernization crisis. The hue and cry over modernization reminds me of last year's readiness crisis, another purported crisis that quickly evaporated before conference was concluded on last year's bill.

Careful thinking would conclude that there is no modernization crisis. The leadership of the Department of Defense has offered a cogent and calm viewpoint demonstrating that the drawdown of our forces has allowed for a slower replacement of our weapon systems. The carefully crafted future years defense plan adequately meets modernization requirements while allowing us to fund other important accounts in our overall budget.

In many cases, it would appear that the committee adds were made with little consideration to the ability to sustain the program, which will cause disruptive program instabilities and forestall our ability to meet future program needs.

Rather than, Mr. Chairman, buying more hardware now, we should invest in technologies of the future, both the direct military technologies, including innovative nonlethal weapons technology more appropriate to operations other than war, to operations such as operations that are being carried out in Bosnia, humanitarian efforts in other parts of the world and into those dual-use technologies that will give our economy a leg up as we move into the next century. Our failure to plan and invest wisely for the future because of hyperbolic claims about a modernization crisis will harm our national security in both the short and long term.

Mr. Chairman, it is true as well that failure to fund the domestic education and economic development programs that form a critical element of our national security strategy is contrary to our long-term national interests.

Second, the bill fails to take advantage of the opportunities to move further beyond the nuclear abyss, Mr. Chairman, whether it is in the form of

constraints on the cooperative threat reduction program, euphemistically referred to as the Nunn-Lugar program, that destroys nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union or the needless acceleration of Department of Energy weapons programs or the continuing restrictions on retiring strategic systems, these are all missed opportunities.

Third, the bill contains the funding for an overly aggressive and unnecessary national missile defense program that would be noncompliant with the ABM Treaty.

The combination of all these three issues, when combined with the prospect of near-term NATO expansion, has contributed dramatically, in this gentleman's view, to destabilizing our relationship with Russia. In turn, it has reduced the prospect that we can work with democratic forces in Eastern Europe to achieve long-term stability in Europe, stability based upon a respect for human rights, economic development and a nonthreatening balance of military power in the region.

Fourth, the bill grabs hold of numerous hot button cultural issues. The Committee, without hearings, Mr. Chairman, negated the do not ask do not tell policy in its mark and returns us to an era in which capable, willing gay men and lesbians are completely denied the opportunity to serve their Nation in uniform.

The committee, again without hearings, required the discharge of personnel who test positively for HIV–1 virus, which is neither medically nor militarily necessary. It flies in the face, Mr. Chairman, it flies in the face of Congress's very recent appeal of such a policy before it even went into effect. Our service personnel, who have served this Nation with honor, with distinction and professionalism, need better treatment from their Government than this.

The committee refused to return the right of secure safe abortion to servicewomen serving overseas. The committee trampled on the Constitution's first amendment protections by embracing overly broad and vague language in an effort to suppress lascivious literature and other media.

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude, let me just say that I believe that because all of these reasons, in order to make it in order that we be able to more successfully fix the problems that are in this bill, I urge the committee to reject this bill as reported by the committee.

With whatever time I have remaining, I would like to point out to my colleagues that, as I said before, the topline in this budget increases President Clinton's budget request by nearly $13 billion, no small sum at all. That is what makes politics. That is why there is a Republican Party and a Democratic Party, left, right and center on the political perspective.

What is tragic to this gentleman, who has always attempted to take the floor of this body not to challenge on the basis of partisanship, not to challenge on the basis of personality but to be prepared to challenge any Member of Congress on the issues of the day, on the critical, vital issues of our time, we ought to be able to debate, win or lose. The tragedy is that the rule that governed this bill did not allow, Mr. Chairman, not one single amendment to reduce the overall level of the military budget in a post-cold-war environment.

Some may rationalize the inclusion of 13 additional billion dollars. But there are some of us in this body who are prepared to discuss rationally, intelligently and cogently and substantively that there is no rational military requirement to add $13 billion in a post-cold war so-called balanced budget limited dollar environment. But we were denied the opportunity.

For the first time in my 25-plus years in the Congress, denied outright any opportunity to cut the budget, rendering those of us who believe that $13 billion additional in the budget is virtually obscene, rendered us impotent in our capacity to challenge on behalf of constituencies in this country who believe that there is no need for $13 billion additional. No opportunity whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, if we look at the amendments that were made in order, it does not allow us not only to break into the topline, we cannot even get at the priorities. Of the six major amendments that have been made in order, two of them are not going to be offered. So we are down to four. Of the 35 minor amendments that were primarily language amendments, noncontroversial, seeking studies and reports, most of those 35 amendments will be rolled into two omnibus amendments, bipartisan, noncontroversial. So for a military budget of close to $170 billion, we will move across this floor with a degree of alacrity that staggers the imagination, in this gentleman's opinion, is frightening.

In the atmosphere of a balanced budget, we ought to pay more attention to nearly $270 billion. In a post-cold-war environment, where we are not moving into an era of change and transition and challenge and opportunity, we ought to be able to talk about a rational military budget that walks us into the 21st century with pride and dignity and competence and capability. But to deny that in the rule means that when my colleagues adopted the rule, they adopted this budget. With rare exception we could have given the rule, and what I am saying to my colleagues is, with rare exception, this military budget, $267 billion, could have been offered on the suspension calendar. There are no major amendments here; there are no amendments that take $1 out of this budget. There are no amendments, with rare exception, that make any major policy changes.

□ 1615

Something is wrong with this process. I did not labor marching uphill to find us in a post-cold war environment with great opportunities for 25 years, to come to the floor, rendered totally impotent, in my capacity to try to shake the reality, along with my colleagues, of the billions of dollars we are spending on defense and to move us in a direction that makes sense.

I conclude that I will oppose this bill for all the reasons that I have enunciated. I urge my colleagues to reject this bill. Let us go back to committee and fix the problems.

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

ADDITIONAL AND DISSENTING VIEWS OF RONALD V. DELLUMS

I offer dissenting views because I am deeply troubled by several aspects of the authorization bill and its report, most especially by its overall focus and directions. I remain convinced that the authorization top line is significantly higher than required for the military aspects of our national security strategy. It may be true that the committee marked to a top line that it anticipates in the coming fiscal year 1997 budget resolution. Despite this, I believe it had the opportunity to make prudent reductions in the overall program authorization, thereby providing guidance to the Committee on the Budget as to how better to meet deficit reduction goals. Moreover, I remain convinced that the significant plus-up over the President's request has caused a lack of focus and a lack of discipline in our procurement and research and development accounts, a point to which I will return later.

Despite the collegial and effective working relationship between the committee's majority leadership and the minority, there has at times been a troubling partisan appearance to some of the committee's business and is reflected in the committee report as well. Most troubling has been an unwillingness to hear from administration witnesses on important policy issues before the committee. It is certainly true that outside experts provide important insight into the policy choices and strategic circumstances we confront, but we owe ourselves the responsibility to hear also from government experts and responsible officials. What is especially troubling is that we have failed to request the traditional intelligence threat briefing which has provided a cogent perspective on the strategic requirements that we face. Given our rapidly changing world, this annual review is even more important now than it was during the period of the Cold War.

A small but important additional example of this problem is the committee's determination to plumb the conclusions reached by the Intelligence Community in a National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) on the ballistic missile threat to the United States. Whether or not there is a legitimate concern about the development of the NIE and whatever questions one has regarding the validity of its conclusions, it is unconscionable that we have failed to have the Intelligence Community before the committee to testify on the NIE's contents and its methodology. I have requested such a committee hearing on several occasions, and am disappointed that this has not occurred. While I am willing to support the provisions contained in the committee report asking the Director of Central Intelligence to review both the matter of the NIE and to develop an updated and expanded assessment, and while I accept the majority's interest in having an alternative analysis analysis rendered, it concerns me that we have gotten to this point without a full committee deliberation on the substance and development of the IN.

While the fiscal year 1997 authorization bill reported by the committee does not itself contain highly contentious provisions on the command and control of U.S. armed forces participating in peacekeeping operations, the issue arises in a free-standing piece of legislation marked-up the same day by the committee and reported as H.R. 3308 just three months after the Congress sustained the President's veto of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 on this issue, among other reasons.

The same point can be made for the committee's decision to report out H.R. 3144, a national missile defense program guideline clearly calculated to breach the ABM Treaty and return the United States to pursuit of a ''star wars'' missile defense program. A less extreme formulation for national missile defense program activity was met with a Presidential veto on last year's defense authorization bill. As with the command and control issue, it strikes this gentleman that there is a little legislative reason to have decided to push forward an even more extreme ballistic missile defense program, given that it is surely destined to meet a Presidential veto as well. Our committee must achieve its policy goals through legislation, and obviously that activity must be bound by the constraints of our Constitution's separation of powers between the Branches. Pursuing legislation knowing that it will be vetoed, when nothing has occurred to change the imaginable outcome seems a political rather than a legislative course.

But the national ballistic missile defense issue is also embedded in the committee recommendation and report on H.R. 3230 in important ways. And there is much more commonality between the administration and the Congress on this issue than the political rhetoric would suggest. Many of the differences between the two approaches are rooted on a perception of the timing of the appearance of a threat to which we would need such a response. This is essentially a function of risk management, and how to determine what type of ''insurance policy'' we wish to purchase against such a future contingency. What is less focused on but should be very central to the debate, is the cost and character of the alternative ''insurance policies'' that are available to the Nation. And this is where the parties diverge.

The administration's current national ballistic missile defense plan can provide for an affordable defense against limited ballistic missile threats before those threats will emerge. It does so in a way that anticipates likely changes in the threat from today's estimates. It also does so in a way that avoids becoming trapped in a technological cul-de-sac by a premature deployment of a potentially misdirected system.

The committee recommendation and its report would unfocus U.S. efforts by pursuing space-based interceptors without regard to ABM Treaty requirements, START treaty considerations and the threat reduction and strategic stability goals that the treaties promise.

This course of action commits us as well to an incredibly expensive and ultimately unaffordable path. Both the department's 3+3 program and the Spratt substitute to H.R. 3144, provide for a more capable missile defense system when deployed, and one that is affordable within current budget projections. It blends arms control and counterproliferation activities with deterrence and missile intercept capabilities. It thus pursues the most effective approach to missile defense, preventing missiles from being deployed at all, while providing a prudent ''insurance policy'' against limited but as of yet non-existent threats.

The overreliance by the committee on a ''hardware'' solution to intercept incoming missiles in the final minutes of their flight time, risks constructing a very expensive 21st Century Maginot Line. Such a defense strategy may well prove as ineffective to the 21st Century threats we might face as the original Maginot Line was in defending France during World War II.

Returning now to refocus on the issue of the size of the top line and its impact on our procurement choices, I am reminded of echoes from last year's debate on the fiscal year 1996 authorization bill.

During that debate, we heard a hue and cry that there existed a readiness crisis in the services. Foregone training and maintenance, as well as ''optempo'' stress were all allegedly impacting adversely on the U.S. armed force's ability to perform its principal missions. This hue and cry was raised despite assurances by the top military leadership that the force was receiving historically high levels of operational funding and was as ready a force as we had ever had. Facts have borne out their more sober assessment and, indeed, one can say that the relatively modest increased investment that the fiscal year 1996 defense authorization conference in the end committed to the readiness accounts confirmed the view that a ''crisis'' did not really exist. The small increase in the readiness account proposed in the fiscal year 1997 authorization bill lends additional credence to this assessment.

This year's hue and cry is that there is a ''modernization'' crisis, with much displaying of data to support the view that low levels of procurement spending must equate with an insufficient modernization strategy. What is so remarkably similar about this debate with last year's debate on readiness are three things.

First, the services generally agree that they could all ''use'' more money for procurement this year, but that they could meet their requirements with what had been budgeted as long as long-term trends supported their needs. This sounds very much like ''we're missing some training'' but ''we're as ready as we've ever been.''

Second, the leadership of the Department of Defense has offered a cogent and calm viewpoint that the drawdown of the force structure from its Cold War levels allowed them one more year's grace before they needed to begin to replace equipment that had been procured in large numbers during the 1980s for a much larger force. In other words, they had a plan, it was being managed, and they could perform their mission. And they could more appropriately use defense resources in other accounts and reserve for the future year's defense plan a significant increase in procurement dollars.

Third, while the committee invited the service chiefs to submit their ''wish list'' for additional procurement items, it has not followed the Secretary of Defense's plea to limit procurement additions to those items needed by the services. By my calculation approximately half of the procurement plus-up does not meet that qualification.

Not satisfied with this explanation the committee recommendation would spend an additional $7.5 billion on procurement, and as I noted above much of that on requirements not established by the service chiefs. I believe that this unsolicited largess is imprudent and will have significant adverse impact on our ability to meet real future requirements. It will provoke budget and program disruptions in the near term and it will preempt important opportunities into the future.

In many cases it would appear that these adds were made with little consideration to the ability to sustain the program in the next year. The disruptive business and human implications of creating program instabilities by ''spiking'' procurement for one or two years could haunt the military industrial base for years to come. This is a costly and ineffective way to approach long-term modernization requirements. In addition, it would also appear that program risks, indeed even assessing the department's ability to even execute a program, may not have been given adequate consideration in determining authorization levels.

Equally important and worse, the committee recommendation throws much of this money into systems that were designed ''to fight the last war.'' This is a common failing that is so easily avoidable. In addition, the procurement ''theme'' to solve the ''crisis'' appears to be only to buy more, and often not more of what the service chiefs requested. This binge in procurement both purchases needlessly redundant weapons capabilities and does so in excessive amounts. With regard to the former, we will end making purchases of too many different systems, rather than making choices and sticking with the best choice. With regard to the latter, we are spending our investment capital to buy unneeded equipment for today that will prevent us from purchasing the right equipment when it becomes available tomorrow.

Rather than buying more hardware now, we should invest in the technologies of the future, both the direct military technologies, including innovative non-lethal weapons technology more appropriate to operations other than war, and into those dual-use technologies that will give our economy a leg up as we move into the next century. Our failure to plan and invest wisely for the future because of hyperbolic claims about a modernization ''crisis'' will harm our national security in both the short and long term.

Much more could be said about this particular problem. Let me summarize my views in this area by saying that this extravagant level of spending is neither needed for our current military requirements nor prudent for meeting the needs of the future. In addition, it contributes to a defense authorization top line that needlessly consumes resources from the two other elements of our national security triad: our economy and our foreign policy program that can dampen the circumstances that give rise to war. And, unlike money put into the operations and maintenance accounts, it is not easily or efficaciously diverted to other priorities when hindsight establishes that the perceived requirement in fact does not exist.

There are other issues and problems in this report other than with its dollar level and the procurement choices. They deserve illumination as well.

Foremost among them are the several issues that erupted in the personnel title of the bill and report. While I do not support the current ''don't ask, don't tell'' policy on gays and lesbians serving in the military, I more strongly reject the committee's view that we should return to an era in which capable and willing gay men and lesbians were denied the opportunity to serve their nation in uniform. I support a policy that would allow individuals to serve regardless of sexual orientation. Clearly ''don't ask, don't tell'' has not provided the protections to such individuals that its crafters felt it would; but a return to an era of repression and intolerance is not the solution.

By way of explanation of the necessity for the change in policy under section 566 of this legislation, the committee elsewhere in this report cites at length the decision in the case by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in the case of Paul G. Thomasson, Lieutenant, United States Navy, *Plaintiff-Appellant,* v. *William J. Perry,* Secretary of Defense; John H. Dalton, Secretary of the Navy, *Defendants-Applies.*

It is useful to note that this case is but one of several that are expected to be heard before the United States Supreme Court later this year on the issue of the Administration's ''don't ask, don't tell'' policy. No fewer than eight other cases on the policy are presently before the federal courts. In the last year, judges in two of those cases reached the opposite view of the judges in the *Thomasson* case, yet the committee does not make reference to those decisions.

The committee has not held a single hearing on the issue of gays and lesbians in the military in either the first or second session of the 104th Congress—the period during which the current policy has been implemented. Though the committee obviously feels that it is of utmost importance to change the current policy, it did not choose to expend any time or effort to get the views of witnesses from the military, the administration or the public on the issue. Instead, it relies on the decision on one court case to base a major change to military policy.

If the committee is to make an informed and thoughtful decision on this matter, it should make the effort to shed light on the competing views and experiences that represent all sides on this complex and important issue through the committee hearing process. The committee avoids the subject by relying instead on the judicial branch for justification and to explain Congressional intent. By including legislative provisions in the subcommittee chairman's mark without any discussion of the matter, the committee demonstrates a lack of faith in the hearing process, betrays a lack of confidence that its provision would prevail under scrutiny, and abuses the prerogatives of the majority.

Similarly the committee's recommendation to discharge personnel who test positive for the HIV–1 virus is medically and militarily unnecessary and flies in the face of the Congress's very recent determination to rescind such a policy even before it went into effect. Of even greater concern than having established a policy for which there is no military requirement, the committee's recommendation pretends that it has protected the medical disability rights of personnel who will face discharge under its provisions. This is a disingenuous formulation given that the committee was fully apprised that in order to provide such protection it would have to do so in legislative language, which it refused to do because of the direct spending implications that would have forced funding cuts in other accounts. Our service personnel who have served this nation with honor, distinction and professionalism need better from their government than this.

In language on section 567, elsewhere in this report, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ''deem separating service members determined to be HIV-positive as meeting all other requirements for disability retirement * * *.''

While giving the appearance of providing for medical retirement, the fact is that such language had to be stripped from the bill by amendment in the full committee markup because of direct spending implications. The Congressional Budget Office has scored this provision as costing $27 million over the next five years, and it could not be enacted without identifying an offset to pay for it. The committee could not accomplish this and, instead, decided to foist the problem off on the Department of Defense as an unfunded mandate, and then take credit for supposedly providing the medical retirement benefit.

Worse yet, it turns out that the Secretary of Defense may not have the statutory authority to fund such a mandate ''out of hide'' in any case. 10 U.S.C. §1201 and 1204 direct DoD to use the Department of Veterans Affairs rating schedule. While the tables currently indicate that a servicemember who is symptomatic of AIDS is eligible for medical retirement, it rates a servicemember who has asymptomatic HIV with a zero percent disability rating. Consequently, they would not be entitled to disability retired pay.

Under these circumstances, and since the law which would be reinstated by this section was repealed, the member who is discharged under section 567 would have no medical or retirement benefits at all, nor would the members of his or her family. He or she would be promptly discharged within two months of testing positive for HIV–1 virus. It would be the height of irresponsibility to enact such a provision without first clearing up these discrepancies.

The committee's refusal to return the right to secure safe abortion services to servicewomen serving overseas is an additional reason why I could not support the bill being reported. Of equal concern to our servicewomen should be the committee's apparent view of the role of women in combat-related specialties and the important equal-opportunity problems that its position raises.

On another social issue, the committee has trampled on the Constitution's First Amendment protections by embracing overly broad and vague language in an effort to suppress pornographic literature and other media. Despite the obviously degrading and sexist imagery of such media, those who would publish, sell or purchase them enjoy the protection of the Constitution. Surely better ways exist to overcome these problems than by legislating overly broad and unconstitutional attacks on the problem.

The committee's decision to weigh in on these cultural battles in this manner will, I believe, be to the ultimate detriment of the morale and welfare of our service personnel. We are a diverse society, with varying views on these issues. As such, we should decline as a legislature to impose a narrow view that fails to account fully for the human dignity of all in our society. Civility, morality and the Constitution all argue for such restraint. Failure to yield to the natural progression of expanded civil and human rights will only result in further turmoil, which will be adverse to the national security interests of our nation.

In this regard, let me note my appreciation for the committee's action to confront in a purposeful and reasonable manner the problem of hate crime in the military. Obviously, we are a multi-racial, multi-ethnic and multi-cultural society, a society with varying religious traditions. With a Constitution committed to the equality of each person, we seek to vindicate the promise of that equality. The provision in the committee recommendation helps to build upon the military's successes in moving toward making that principle a reality, and should help to overcome the shortcomings where they have occurred.

The committee's treatment of international, peacekeeping and arms control issues displays a continuing resistance to realign our requirements and resources to the realities emerging in this new strategic era. It has become apparent that operations other than war, such as our participation in the peacekeeping effort in Bosnia-Herzegovina, will become more and more common. Yet the image of the U.S. servicemember as peacekeeper is new and it does not yet fit comfortably in the view of the committee. As a result, the committee attempts to micromanage the services, and the Commander in Chief, as I noted above, as they seek to implement these efforts at which we are relatively new participants. The report language requiring probing insight into military plans to withdraw from what is thus far a highly successful effort in Bosnia, for example, is both insulting to our service leadership and potentially dangerous in what it could reveal about our planning process.

The committee and the Congress surely have an oversight responsibility; but it is equally clear that we do not have management responsibility, and the Framers of our Constitution clearly viewed it that way. I would have hoped that we could have demonstrated more confidence in our service leaderships and their ability to develop and implement an appropriate plan for the withdrawal of the U.S. forces in Bosnia. Similarly, the committee's recommendations concerning humanitarian demining and amending the prospective land-mine use moratorium are disturbing and will unduly constrain our theater CINCS in pursuing demining programs that are an essential part of their overall strategy in their area of responsibility.

On another positive note, let me support the determination reached in this bill that the environmental management and restoration programs operated by the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy are important and integral parts of our military requirements. I am pleased that we have not had the same struggle over both funding levels and authority that I believe plagued last year's effort and I look forward to continuing to work with the committee to fashion effective programs for accelerating clean-up, making environmental management more effective and efficient and for saving money on these accounts as a result.

I remain concerned though with the funding levels and program direction of the nuclear weapons program accounts of Title XXXI. The addition of funds to the requested levels for stockpile stewardship and management seem unnecessary given the still pending Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on Stockpile Stewardship and Management. While I appreciate the committee's responsiveness in establishing a modest fence around the stewardship increase, I do not believe that the committee has taken sufficient time to inquire fully into the opportunities available for a more fundamental reassessment of our nuclear weapons policy.

The permanent extension of the Non Proliferation Treaty concluded last year was achieved in part because of the U.S. reaffirmation of its adherence to the Treaty's Article VI requirement to reduce our arsenal towards elimination. Despite the fact, that this is, and remains, the policy of our government, we are not proceeding outside of our bilateral discussions with Russia under the START process to pursue further reductions. I am concerned that such a failure will lead to lost opportunities that seemed so promising only a year and a half ago, when President Clinton and Russian President Yeltsin jointly declared that each nation would consider pursuing such unilateral initiatives.

Finally, let me note that, despite my disagreements with the committee report, I applaud the chairman and my colleagues for their willingness to work cooperatively where possible to find common ground on the important issues covered in the recommended bill and its accompanying report. I am concerned that, despite this collegiality, we may have produced a committee recommendation that remains vulnerable to a Presidential veto because of the weight of the many contentious matters that it contains.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] who is chairman of our Subcommittee on Procurement.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me start off by giving also my congratulations to our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] who has done a superb job of working on this defense bill, walking us through the hearings that we had to have in rapid fire order, marshaling this great staff that we have got on the majority side and the minority side to put this bill together, answering the tough questions and the tough issues that we had to answer this year in bringing it to the floor. Let me thank him.

Let me also thank the ranking member the gentleman from California [Mr. DULLUMS], and let me tell my colleagues as we go through the debate, and Mr. DELLUMS reminded us that we have had in the past some long debates on defense issues, I remember the 6-week debate we had on the nuclear freeze that we Republicans enjoyed, quite frankly, and the great times that we have had engaging. I wish myself that we had more time to discuss the top line because I think it is a great debate; I agree with the gentleman that it is an important issue for the country.

Let me answer what I think are three important questions that the American people have about this bill. First, do we need this level of spending? And this level of spending is a little over $12 million above what the President has asked for. The answer, I think is yes, and I think our hearings showed that we need this level of spending.

When we asked the Secretary of Defense if he wanted to get to $60 billion in modernization spending instead of the $38.9 billion that we have got this year in the President's budget, he said yes. He said I want to get there as soon as possible. General Shalikashvili said, yes, I want to get there as soon as possible. They had recommended initially having that level of spending in 1998, $60 billion in spending instead of $38.9. When President Clinton put his defense budget together 2 years ago in 1995 and said here is what I am going to want in 1997, here is a blueprint, his blueprint for this year was $50 billion. Well, we have gone up from $38.9 billion $6.2 billion. We have added an additional $6.2. We asked the services to come in and tell us what equipment they needed; they gave us a list. This is the uniformed services of the Clinton administration, gave us a list for about $15 billion, and when we decided on the new equipment we were going to put in, the things that we have put in for additions in terms of modernized equipment were 95 percent in commonality with what the services asked for.

So if the question is did the services ask for this equipment, the answer is, yes, the services asked for this equipment, and if somebody could throw me down that Marine ammo belt that I have been carrying around for the past couple of days, some people told me that is a silly prop, but I think that is the essence of this defense bill because this Marine ammo belt symbolizes the meeting that I had with the Marines and with the other services, with all of the people who are in charge of ammunition supply for the services. The Marines looked us in the eye and said, Mr. Chairman, Congressman, we cannot fight the two-war scenario that the President has given us the responsibility to fight, and they said we are short of M–16 bullets and a lot of other ammo. We found out they were 96 million M–16 bullets short. That means they run out unless they borrow from somebody else, and if that other service has their minimum requirement, then they are out of ammunition.

So we plussed up over $300 million for Marine ammunition. That was the M–16 and mortar rounds and many other things that they needed.

So, yes, we do safety upgrade the Marine Harriers, the AV–8B's the crashes. They said that they would like to have those 24 Harriers that the administration did not plan to upgrade safety upgraded to give those pilots a better chance of surviving. We did provide ammunition, and we did help to modernize the forces across the board.

We have done the right thing for America. This is a good defense bill, and I ask every Member to support this work that the committee has done.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the ranking member, the senior Democrat on our side.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for yielding me this time and to thank him, for over the years he has been my chairman, for many years, for the support he has given me; sometimes, not that much, we have disagreed on military matters, but he is always considerate and fair to me, and I certainly want this to appear in the RECORD today. And Chairman SPENCE I thank for our cooperation over the years, and I have enjoyed working with him very, very much, as to as well the committee and also to the staff.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the defense authorization bill. The National Guard, and I know I am taking some by surprise that I will talk about the National Guard and Reserve, they have done very well in this legislation. We have tried to improve the readiness, modernization and standard of living in this bill. We have added $805 million for Guard and Reserve equipment, modernization, above the President's budget. We have increased the good year retirement points for the Reserves from 60 points to 75 points. This had not been changed since 1948. There is a 3-percent military pay raise for both the active and reserve forces. We have allowed active guard and reserve enlisted members to retire at the highest rank that they will obtain. Officers can do that now.

However, I am disappointed that the Defense Department provided the Guard and Reserve $294 million for military construction. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is only 3 percent of the total funds for construction for all the military, and the Guard and Reserve, I point this out, have 40 percent of the mission. We have inserted in this bill asking the military to give us a report of actually what the Guard and Reserve need for military construction and armory construction, and I might say that the chairman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] and ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ] were very fair to us. They tried to help.

We have added the funding to keep the air guard fighters at 15 in a squadron instead of dropping the level to less effective 12 planes per squadron. By adopting the amendment that will mean en bloc reservists will have a second chance to take out mobilization insurance if they decide to go into the Guard or the Reserve.

We have done many other things. We have a revitalization for the Guard and Reserve, and finally, Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] will not be offering his amendment to this bill. Now there is strong feeling on both sides whether the Army Reserve should report to two commanders or one commander. We prefer the one commander, just like the other reserve services do. The committee has supported our position on this throughout the debate. We are trying, Mr. Chairman, to improve the Army Reserve, not tear it down, and I am pleased that this amendment will not be offered and we can work out this disagreement in conference.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, I might add this particular point. As a lot of people realize, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is retiring after this year, and personally I would like to offer him my gratitude for all he has meant to this committee and to this country for his service here over the years. I know of no one who stood stronger and taller for national defense than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and he is going to be going down in history and known as Mr. National Guard and Reserve, and we are going to miss you, SONNY.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, less than 2 years ago, the National Security Committee brought to light the downward trend in readiness throughout the military services resulting from defense spending cuts, diversion of funds to meet unbudgeted contingency operations, force structure reductions, and

a high pace of operations. Routine training was being canceled. We also heard reports of deferred maintenance, spare parts shortages, and a quality of life for our servicemembers which was suffering. under the strong leadership of Chairman SPENCE, the committee undertook a multifaceted strategy to maintain readiness which has helped to address the unacceptable trends in short-term readiness.

Readiness is a perishable commodity which demands our constant attention. The root causes which led to the readiness problems less than 2 years ago still exist. Defense spending is being cut, force structure is being reduced, and the pace of operations is still high. Adding to my concern is what I view as the administration trying to squeeze defense requirements into a topline driven budget which does not satisfy the current and future needs of our military forces. This has resulted in a juggling exercise that unfortunately pits near-term readiness against modernization. This should not be an either-or-proposition.

H.R. 3230, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 continues last year's work, achieving the goals that we all share: providing the necessary resources to ensure force readiness and improving the quality of life for the men and women of our Armed Forces.

H.R. 3230 fully funds the military services' operations and training accounts, and adds significant resources to other important readiness activities which have been underfunded by the Department of Defense in the fiscal year 1997 budget request, including real property maintenance to address health, safety, and mission critical deficiencies; depot maintenance to reduce backlogs; base operations support to address shortfalls in programs which sustain mission capability, quality of life and work force productivity, mobility enhancements to help deploy U.S. forces more rapidly and efficiently, and reserve component training.

The bill also contains several provisions in the area of civilian employees to provide the Department of Defense better tools for managing the work force and for saving resources.

I would like to thank the ranking member of the Readiness Subcommittee, my colleague from Virginia, Mr. SISISKY for his outstanding cooperation, knowledge, and leadership through the year on the many issues which came before the Readiness Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3230 is a responsible, meaningful bill that will provide adequate resources for the continued readiness of our military forces. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the bill.

□ 1630

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Readiness of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support the DOD authorization bill.

This bill will go a long way toward supporting and sustaining our U.S. military forces.

As ranking member of the Readiness Subcommittee, I want to commend our chairman, HERB BATEMAN.

He continues to have the foresight necessary to address some of the long-term issues we have identified.

We worked together to add nearly $2 billion to O&M accounts, from $89 billion to $91 billion.

We added $1 billion to real property maintenance, $190 million to depots, $190 million to base ops, $100 million to mobility, and $90 million for reserve component training.

But what we did not do may be just as important.

We did not authorize DOD to go forward with their privatization plan.

As one who represents significant public and private sector interests, let me tell you why.

DOD recognizes that they save money through public-private competition.

Nevertheless, DOD wants to eliminate the public sector as a competitor.

DOD believes the private sector can do anything better and cheaper.

I'm here to tell you that I've ''been there, done that''—and ''it ain't necessarily so.''

We've got to responsibly pick and choose where and when we give someone a monopoly.

We've got to have the business sense to recognize that two overheads cost more than one—whether you talk about air logistics centers, or working on 5-inch guns in Louisville.

It's simple arithmetic, but when you factor in brac politics, it comes out as new math nobody understands.

I don't think anyone opposes it, but we oppose going into it blind—with such a vague roadmap of the future.

Our silence on the privatization issue tells DOD they need to go back to the drawing board on this one.

The issue is far too important to risk national security by going too far, too fast. We need to be careful.

HERB BATEMAN and I also worked to reform DOD financial management, specifically the defense business operating fund—or DBOF.

DBOF has long been a thorn in the side of some of the most dedicated proponents of better business practices at DOD.

Centralized cash management and standardized cost accounting is absolutely necessary to run an organization as big as DOD.

However, to create an $80 billion slush fund to pay for unfunded contingencies—as they did early on—or to hide the real cost of brac—or maybe even environmental clean-up—behind the fig leaf of DBOF cannot be allowed to continue.

Our bill says DOD will develop a plan to improve DOD cash management by the end of September, 1997.

They will implement those plans and terminate DBOF by October 1, 1998.

Bill language outlines nine specific elements of any new plan—such as rates that more accurately reflect real operating costs—as opposed to surcharges tacked on to replenish losses in entirely unrelated areas.

As is often the case, had DOD been willing to do this in the first place, legislation wouldn't be necessary.

In conclusion, I think the bill, on balance, achieves many of the goals Members of both parties have said they wanted to reach at DOD.

I think it is a good bill, it deserves strong bipartisan support with a few exceptions and I ask my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of the Committee on National Security, has just returned from Moscow, where he met with all the senior Russian military people. He can give us a report on it.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise and thank the distinguished chairman of our full committee and the ranking member, two fine gentlemen who have worked together with us to achieve this piece of legislation. While we may disagree in certain elements, we certainly come together and respect each other's views. In the end, hopefully we will have a bill that all of us can support.

In terms of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] for his cooperation and support. The request by the administration was $34.7 billion, $1.5 billion less than the fiscal year 1996 request. Because of the request by the service chiefs, which amounted to $20 billion of additional funding in the R&D area alone, we increase slightly the R&D account to a level of $35.5 billion.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, the service chiefs asked us for an additional $20 billion that we just could not provide. It is somewhat discouraging, Mr. Chairman, that we were criticized very heavily last year by both the White House and the Secretary of Defense's office for plusing up the defense budget, but then in this year's hearings, the Secretary came in and showed us charts taking credit for flattening out the acquisition downturn; in effect, taking credit for funds that we were criticized for putting in last year. The same thing is happening this year, Mr. Chairman. That is somewhat disheartening to me, as someone who tries to support the administration and their defense requests, and the requests of the service chiefs.

In particular, we have plused up some specific priorities that were raised in our hearings, and by the members of our subcommittee, including chemical biological defense, $44 million to address shortfalls as a result of the General Accounting Office report, a very needed effort in the area of chem-bio defense that all of us feel strongly about; $43 million of additional money for the countermine program, especially important for our troops on the ground in Bosnia and around the world. This Congress has taken a leadership role in plusing up funding to find solutions to protect our troops from the threat of mines in any hostile environment.

Dual use technology. We reinvigorated a program that will allow the Defense Department and the services to control where dual use applications can occur. There will be no outside agency interference. We have funded it to the level of $350 million, including a special allocation at the office of the Secretary and at Dr. Kaminski's level to oversee as aggressively as possible the efforts toward dual use technology and off-the-shelf acquisition.

We have also added an initiative that we are currently working on with two other committees, the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science, in terms of consolidating oceanographic efforts. The Navy has been the lead agency in this area, and we in fact give them a further coordinating role with a $30 million allocation to expand partnerships that first of all have a defense implication, but secondarily have an implication for both the environment and for economic opportunities with the oceans.

Mr. Chairman, the real change here in R&D is in missile defense. We will debate that this week. Mr. Chairman, the key difference between this administration and this Congress was and will be this year, the area of missile defense. After a robust series of hearings, after a detailed analysis of what is occurring throughout the world, including those countries that are trying to get missile technology, we have crafted very carefully, with the full cooperation of General O'Neill, a missile defense program that we feel very confident with.

We have plused up national missile defense, theater missile defense, brillian eyes, so we have a space-based sensor program as well as our cruise missile defense. All of these initiatives, Mr. Chairman, we feel are vitally important. We have even put $20 million in this year's bill for joint Russian-United States missile defense initiatives, so we can show that we are not about just sticking it in the eye of the Russians; that we in fact want to work with them in jointly exploring missile defense capabilities.

We no longer live in a biopolar world. We know the North Koreans and the Chinese are developing capabilities. We know Iraq has achieved some technologies from Russia. We know the threat is there, and it is there now. We must meet that threat. This bill does that.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement of the Committee on National Security.

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

Mr. Chairman, for our men and women in uniform, I ask for support of this authorization bill. For our soldiers in the U.S. Army in places like Sinai, Ecuador, Peru, South Korea, Haiti, and the Balkans, I ask for support of increased spending for equipment and maintenance accounts. For our sailors and Marines off the coast of Liberia and places such as the Arabian Gulf Coast, East China Sea, and the Adriatic, I ask for support of increased pay and benefits. For U.S. Air Force airmen, 81,000 of whom are deployed abroad and 9,300 are on temporary duty, I ask for support to improve operations and eliminate fatigue.

For the talented and highly specialized men and women of our Special Operations Forces currently deployed in over 60 nations, some in excess of 200 days during the past year, I ask for support of the modernization priorities contained in this bill. If we must talk about quality of life, let us speak of providing the most capable and modern equipment available as we ask our troops to go into harm's way.

For the past 2 years I have testified before the Committee on the Budget in favor of increased defense spending. This year, while readiness and quality of life remains pressing issues, I feel the lack of military modernization has reached a critical level. Our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California, DUNCAN HUNTER, has worked hard to correct this modernization problem. I have enjoyed working as ranking member of that subcommittee.

Let me commend the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], for his leadership in writing legislation to address this trend. This bill, with almost $13 billion in new spending, is a step in the right direction.

Let me also point out that the ranking member, the gentleman from California, RON DELLUMS, has shown again his unwavering commitment to caring for our troops. I thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker, I fear we have reached the danger point, the point of breaking our forces with high operational tempo rates. The Army's pace of operations has increased 300 percent, with over 25 deployments in the past 6 years. Gen. George Joulwan has noted that his European command has experienced the highest tempo rate in its history. The Air Force has averaged 3 to 4 times the level of overseas deployment as during the cold war. Air crews abroad AWAC's, JSTARS, and EF–111's are in especially high demand. Naval and marine personnel are abroad so often that back-to-back temporary assignments away from home are no longer uncommon. Our carrier battle groups, intent on providing deterrence with continued presence, are straining to guard against aggressive acts throughout the world's oceans.

Members of our special forces, trained in specialties such as language, carpentry, electricity, and cultural affairs, have been the first to answer our Nation's call in Bosnia, Haiti, and Liberia. Although few in number, together they are great in influence, deploying in adverse conditions, day or night, and often assisting local officials with tasks traditionally nonmilitary in nature.

As I ask my colleagues for support for the priorities in this bill, I also ask for support for improvements. I would have preferred language to continue research and development of the CORPS SAM/MEADS theater missile defense system, the only system designed to protect our frontline highly mobile troops from missile attack. This threat is upon our troops today, and threatened our troops during Operation Desert Storm in 1991. I am disappointed, Mr. Chairman, sorely disappointed, that the Committee on Rules did not allow my amendment in order to address this and look to conference for improvement.

Mr. Chairman, from the Bosnian theater, Maj. Gen. Bill Nash recently said, ''The number one thing we've used so far that has allowed us to enforce the peace is a weapons system called the American soldier.'' On behalf of that soldier, I ask for support of this bill, and I ask for continued commitment to this excellent weapons system as we move to conference with the Senate.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Construction.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3230. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I want to focus my remarks on the important bipartisan initiatives we are bringing to the House today concerning the military construction program for fiscal 1997.

H.R. 3230 would continue the bipartisan effort of the Congress to rebuild and enhance our crumbling military infrastructure, and I want to express my appreciation to the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, SOLOMON ORTIZ, for his tireless efforts to help to put this bill together.

Based on the hearing record, we know the military services have a steep backlog of construction and maintenance requirements that will take decades to resolve unless we accelerate the program. That backlog has serious implications for operational

readiness and impairs the quality of life for men and women and their families who volunteer to serve the Nation.

□ 1645

Mr. Chairman, it is unacceptable to me and it should be unacceptable to this House that 20 percent of the Army's facilities are considered unsuitable due to either deteriorated conditions or an inability to meet mission requirements and that roughly two-thirds of the barracks, dormitories and military family housing units in the service's inventory are considered unsuitable. These are just two glaring examples of the impact of years of neglect.

But where is the administration?

The President proposes to spend 18 percent less than current levels on military construction and, amazingly, 5 percent less than he told us he would spend in fiscal year 1997 when he submitted budget estimates in February of 1995.

In every major category of direct benefit to the modernization of military facilities, the President proposes a cut. This chart shows the problem and how we propose to fix it: MILCON for the active forces and reserve components cut, family housing cut, troop housing cut. troop housing cut. The child development centers, this is one that is truly unbelievable and virtually defunded. It is fashionable in this administration to say it takes a village to raise children. Evidently the President does not believe that sense of community support should extend to our military families.

This bill adds funding to every one of these major categories.

Even those programs which Secretary Perry has placed great emphasis upon, quality of life, family housing, do not fare well under this President.

The next chart will explain the point better than I can. Two years ago, with great fanfare, the President announced a $25 billion plus-up for defense and made a big deal out of his commitment to improve the quality of life for our military personnel. The President said that we ask much of our military and we owe much to them in return. Everyone apparently agrees, except the President's budget does not support that rhetoric.

Mr. Chairman, just 2 months ago, senior administration officials were on the Hill trying to defend the budget request. Secretary Perry admitted that it would be a lot easier to deal with the military housing crisis if we simply had more money. Mr. Hamre seemed equally at a loss to explain the administration's position.

This is a good bill, I urge the Members to support H.R. 3230.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities.

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, and would like to lend my strong endorsement of the military construction title of the bill.

I want to express my great appreciation to the leadership of both sides of the aisle in compiling what I believe to be a truly bipartisan legislative package to address our Nation's military construction backlog.

The military construction portion of this bill places a very strong emphasis on quality of life initiatives and addresses our military's need for modernization.

I am extremely pleased that as a committee, we have been successful in allocating to quality of life programs approximately 70 percent of the additional funds which have been made available for military construction this year.

During committee deliberations, we were careful to fund those projects that were identified by the military services as a top priority.

I think this portion of the defense authorization bill makes a strong statement of congressional concern for our military and bolsters our commitment to maintaining readiness and modernization.

Furthermore, this bill continues the pledge made by Congress last year to stretch housing dollars by increasing the funds available to the military services for public/private partnership initiatives.

On balance, I believe that this is a good bill that emphasizes readiness and quality of life projects, and I congratulate Chairman HEFLEY, Chairman SPENCE, and our distinguished ranking minority member for the full committee, Congressman DELLUMS, for a job well done.

Again, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, whether we talk about acquisition or research and development to keep our forces modern or quality of life, one thing was very evident to us at the outset of this process. That is that the President again severely underfunded with his request.

Make no mistake about it. The principle upon which we guided our actions this year was that we needed to do more for our military. We simply were tired of an administration which was trying to talk the talk without walking the walk. The administration is eager to sing the praises of our military but is simply unwilling to provide the necessary support needed to ensure that we continue to have a capable, modern force.

Just last year, the Committee on National Security received testimony from the General Accounting Office and from the CBO. Both organizations stated that the administration's defense plan was underfunded to the tune of $120 to $150 billion over the next 5 to 7 years. The White House's response? Request $30 billion less this year. With respect to military construction alone and family housing, as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] just pointed out, the budget was 18 percent less than current funding for this year.

Mr. Chairman, some Members are quick to point out that the cold war is over, and I agree. Yes, it is, and the world is different today than it was in the 1980's, but not necessarily safer.

The list of post-war operations grows daily. Think about the headlines that describe places our soldiers and airmen and sailors are, all over the world: carrier groups off Taiwan, mass evacuations by United States special forces in Liberia, 22,000 troops in Bosnia, actions in Haiti, in Somalia, in Panama, in the Middle East. The list goes on and on. It is our duty, Mr. Chairman, at least in my opinion, it is our duty to properly finance these men and women who go around the world to do the great job that they have been tasked to do.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], a member of the committee.

(Mr. PETERSON of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman SPENCE, and the gentleman from California, Mr. DELLUMS, the ranking member, for putting together what is generally a very good bill. We worked very hard to address the issues that were facing the military in outyears, and I think we have done a pretty good job with that.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a perfect bill. Clearly there are far too many social mandates contained in this bill that could invite a veto. But it also contains a provision prohibiting R&D funding for the JASTOVL variant.

While I am adamantly opposed to the bill's provision which would kill the Marine Corps' advanced short takeoff and vertical landing aircraft, I have been assured by senior members that this language would be satisfactorily resolved in conference. Those assurances have been bolstered by additional discussions between committee leaders, Marine Corps representatives and key committee staffers. I appreciate my colleagues' support on this issue.

For the record, I would like to make the following points;

The ASTOVL variant of the Joint Strike Fighter is crucial to the Marine Corps long-range plan. That criticality is based on the Marine Corps' strong dependence upon the use of integrated air assets in its combined arms scheme of warfare. It is this air support that allows the Marines to maintain their expeditionary nature by radically reducing their dependence upon armor and artillery, and in doing

so, has helped ensure that they have the strategic mobility necessary to remain the ''Nation's 9–1–1 Force.''

What needs to be perfectly clear is that cancellation of the program would not affect only the Marine Corps. The Air Force is looking at purchasing the variant as well. The ASTOVL is in fact an integral leg in the three-legged Joint Strike Fighter program which links Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps aircraft development into a single design that can be modified to individual military branch needs. This element of commonality consolidates numerous fixed-wing programs and provides enormous cost savings. Those cost savings will disappear with the removal of participation by either the Marine Corps, Air Force, or Navy.

One final issue of note is that without the protection provided by ASTOVL, the Marine Corps would be forced to substantially increase its amphibious lift because of a need for Marine Corps ground forces to increase their artillery forces to compensate for the lack of air cover. This is a costly solution financially and puts an unconscionable number of warriors at risk, who otherwise could be protected by an aircraft manned by a one-or-two man crew.

Recognizing that there is no more logical choice than for this program to go forward, I join my colleagues in their efforts to resolve this issue in conference.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], a valuable member of our committee.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of this measure. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and his extremely capable staff, led by Andrew Ellis, have brought to this floor a sound bill that strengthens our Nation's defense in an increasingly unstable world.

While I support the measure, I have strong reservations regarding many of the social policies adopted in the military personnel section of the bill. As my colleagues are well aware, I am personally opposed to limiting the right of servicewoman to choose whether or not to have an abortion. Additionally, I am opposed to changing the Pentagon's current policy regarding HIV positive service members.

Consequently, I will support the amendment of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], but I will decline to offer my amendment on the issue of personnel who test positive for the HIV virus. I have had many conversations with Members in the other body and am confident that we can resolve this issue more appropriately in conference than on the floor of the House.

My overall support for this authorization bill is based upon my confidence that it adequately sustains the core capabilities of our military. Indeed, the Clinton budget request, once again, has passed the buck and declined to preserve vital elements of our national security apparatus.

The bill before us addresses fundamental defense issues like readiness, modernization, and military housing. Key aspects of disagreement between the administration and Congress regarding missile defense and U.N. command and control have been removed and will be addressed at a later time. I believe this strategy is wise and does not weigh down the larger work represented in this measure to maintain our troops.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this bill.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hard work of the able gentleman from California, and I appreciate very much his yielding time to me.

Outrageously, this bill revisits and denies choice for women in the Armed Forces who have made the choice to serve their country.

There is a tag line on the end of a Republican ad on television attacking the President for his gas tax proposal. I say, what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for Republicans.

We get lots of lip service on children, for example, with disproportionate cuts; on families with disproportionate cuts. Now what we get for military women is patriotism and abandonment overseas if they happen to need an abortion.

Imagine. A woman in the armed service, in Bosnia, or Haiti, who needs an abortion. Are we prepared to guarantee a safe abortion in those countries or in any one of the trouble spots in which women now serve their country?

What are we going to do if a woman ends up dead or injured because an abortion was performed in a Third World country where safe abortions are unavailable? Does a woman lose her constitutional right to pay American medical personnel to perform a legal procedure simply by singing up for the armed services? Join the armed service and lose your constitutional rights. That ought to be the tag line on the next commercial.

Mr. Chairman, words of patriotism are nice, but women in the armed services want actions that speak louder than words, to quote my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], another very valuable member of our committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It enhances the security of the United States in ways that are going to get very little notice today. One of those ways is in people issues. The bill has a pay raise for our troops and it increases their housing allowance substantially. It also fills a $500 million shortfall in the administration's request for health care. Although more work is needed here so that we provide the health care we promise to those who serve and those who had served, there is a lot to be proud of.

Another key issue in this bill is the safety and effectiveness of our nuclear weapons. Making sure that our nuclear arsenal is safe and reliable and effective is as important now as it has ever been. We received testimony that at least $4 billion a year is required to ensure that our nuclear arsenal works without nuclear testing. Yet here again the administration request was severely short.

Mr. Chairman, we should not forget some basic facts. First, our nuclear weapons were designed to last about 20 years. We are about at the end of that design life. Someday soon we are going to have to build weapons again, to modernize and replace those that are getting out of date.

Second, we are going from 18 facilities down to 8 facilities in our nuclear weapons complex. We are going to have to modernize those 8 facilities to do the job of 18, to make sure they can do the job and do it safely and effectively.

Third, to make sure that our weapons work well without nuclear testing is going to be an expensive proposition. All those fancy machines we have got to buy to replace testing is expensive. It is absolutely essential that we get and keep the best people we can at the labs and at the production facilities, and we should not forget them.

With the Communists threatening to return to power in Russia, with China, North Korea, and other places, nuclear weapons is not the place to be penny wise and pound foolish. This bill takes steps in the right direction, but more work will be needed.

☐ 1700

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, we are here today not to debate the size of the military budget, but to debate which arms manufacturers will get more of taxpayers' dollars.

How is it that we can find an extra $13 billion to give away to defense contractors, but we can't find the money to increase education funding?

As this chart demonstrates, Mr. Chairman, we spend more on the military than Russia, China, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, North Korea, and Cuba combined.

It appears that we are paying an extra $13 billion so that companies like Lockheed-Martin can send around these cassette tapes of radio programs to all the Members of Congress. Why, Mr. Chairman, must we throw another $13 billion at the largest and most wasteful bureaucracy in the world? The answer is simple, more Pentagon pork for military contractors means more campaign contributions for big defense defenders. Just one more example of the GOP's new and improved cash-and carry government.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Jacksonville, FL [Mrs. FOWLER].

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, when President Clinton sent us his fiscal year 1997 budget, he requested the lowest level of spending for defense procurement in nearly 50 years. He reduced operations and maintenance funding by $1.5 billion. And he reduced military construction dollars by 18 percent.

President Clinton did this despite the fact the Joint Chiefs say we need a $60 billion modernization budget if we want to meet the needs of the 21st century, and despite reports from the Defense science board that over 60 percent of military housing is unsuitable.

H.R. 3230 restores balance to this request. It adds $8 billion for new weapons, consistent with the need to invest in modernization now. It restores O&M funding to assure readiness. It funds the advanced technologies necessary to meet our security needs, including $350 million more for national missile defense. And it increases military pay and housing allowances, providing the quality of life necessary to keep the best and the brightest in our military.

I congratulate the Chairman for bringing forward this urgently needed legislation, and urge its adoption.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Research and Development.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this authorization bill may be the last of the big time spenders. It does plus up the President's request by a substantial amount, $12.9 billion, but it takes up defense spending next year by only $2.6 billion over the current fiscal year. From next year onward, defense spending, according to the budget program, does not go up in any year more than $2 to $3 billion. We are going into a future of very constrained defense budgets after this year.

So the question that should concern us greatly in this debate as we add $12.9 billion to the Pentagon's request, is whether we can sustain, finish, in the out years what we are starting beefing up and speeding up next year. This question looms in particular over ballistic missile defense, national and theater, which was increased by $940 million in this bill. There are, as a consequence, out-year funding requirements which we simply may not be able to meet in a defense budget programmed to go up by no more than $2 to 3 billion a year.

I rise to speak to just one small piece of that partly to illustrate the problem, but also to illustrate a very important problem, which I think needs correcting, and I will offer an amendment to that effect. The piece that I want to speak about is something called space and missile tracking system. I have an amendment that will deal with this, and let me explain the reason for it and the problem that we have in this bill.

When deployed, these so-called SMTS, once called Brilliant Eyes, now called SMTS for space missile and tracking system, is a constellation of 18 to 24 satellites, all of them in low-earth orbit. They compliment satellites in higher orbit, including the DSP and geosynchronous orbit, which serve to spot missiles which might be launched against us and then hand off the data to the SMTS.

These SMTS missiles circling the globe in low-earth orbit will acquire the incoming missiles or reentry vehicles, track them for a period of time, feed that data to ground-based radars and battle management computers, and these in turn will cue the ground-based interceptors and give them their initial target vectors to go get the oncoming missiles.

All of these are components of what is called the space-based infra-red system, or SBIR's. They are vital programs, vitally important, and they have my full support.

The Air Force, which manages the SMTS on behalf of the other services, first planned to deploy it in the year 2006, because they thought at that time it could be optimized and serve several different missions rather than just one. But last year in conference, the defense bill was changed to mandate deployment by the year 2003. We legislatively mandated an IOC, an initial operational capability. There were no hearings, there was no debate, there was no discussion of the consequences.

Here are the consequences which we never weighed. First of all, by forcing the deployment schedule to a much earlier date, SMTS has to be downscoped in the words of the Air Force. For example, the more sensors can sense or see an object, trying to track it, the more accurate a track they can get on the object. This frequency is referred to as a revisit rate. The more often you ping it, the better the data you get back. By forcing deployment in the year 2003, the acquisition sensor revisit rate rate will be less than half the rate which was originally specified for mission effectiveness.

Point two: The SMTS works well by itself, but it works best as part of an integrated system, high earth orbit satellites, geosynchronous satellites, ground-based radar. By forcing deployment in the year 2003, the data rate for crosslinking and downlinking information has to be reduced by 80 percent. Some call this dumbing down the system.

Furthermore, the requiring that the system be deployed early, we will probably rob from it one of its essential missions. We wanted it to do three things: Provide sensors, infrared sensors in space for theater ballistic missile defense, provide sensors for national missile defense, and also through this network of low earth orbit satellites encircling the globe, provide technical intelligence data that we could use for battlefield characterization all over the world, vastly enhancing our technical intelligence sources. All three missions were to be wrapped into one system, but this cannot be done if we force the deployment in 2003, rather than waiting for the system to be developed.

The design life of the satellites if we force early deployment will be cut nearly in half. The mean mission duration drops from 8.5 years to 5 years. Although everyone agrees, everybody agrees, that theater missile defense is the most immediate and pressing threat, national missile defense capabilities, because of last year's bill, are given priority over theater missile defense and these other roles and missions of this particular satellite system are simply put on the back burner. They will have to wait until later.

To cap it off, to buy this diminished system, we will have to spend $2 billion more between now and 2003 to accelerate the program to meet the deadline that we legislated last year.

Mr. Chairman, in general, I am opposed. I think we should all be opposed to Congress thinking it knows best and trying to legislate deployment dates or IOC's. We take the technical risk in increasing, we place mission cam capabilities in jeopardy, and we put program managers in untenable positions. They either break the law or field a system that is less than optimal.

Last year's conference requirement is especially shaky. It not only usurped the Services' role in determining what was the right acquisition schedule, it ignored the Air Force's suggestions for accelerating this program.

Last fall the Air Force proposed a faster schedule, one that would field the original design, the baseline system, in the year 2005. To meet the conference requirements, the Air Force will now attempt to field a limited system in 2004 at the expense of delaying full fielding of the baseline system until the year 2009. In a rush to deploy something, we are on line to get our best system 4 years late, in order to get a limited system 1 year early.

The opponents of my amendment say it is an attack on the high segment of the space based infrared system. They are wrong. We do not mention that. They are still an integral part of it, just like a fully capable SMTS is an integral part of the overall system.

Opponents also say it will disrupt or delay the acquisition system. It will not. My amendment does not direct the Air Force to change anything. If the services are dissatisfied with the block one capabilities, they can proceed with it.

I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to explain this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS], a very valuable member of our committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3230—the 1997 National Defense Authorization Act.

I'd like to address the first of the four main goals of the House National Security Committee:

Improving the quality of life for military personnel and their families.

Our all-volunteer service men and women choose to join the military. And each few years, they will choose whether or not to stay in uniform.

If these folks don't have a decent place to live and work, they're not going to choose to stay. We need these people, and their experience. Too many are leaving, too soon.

Mr. Chairman, I'm privileged to represent Fort Knox, in Kentucky's Second District.

In order to keep men and women in uniform, our defense authorization bill includes $20.5 million for new enlisted barracks at Fort Knox along with a wide variety of quality-of-life improvements, and a 3-percent pay raise for our service men and women.

Let me close by saying I also support the 13 million urban combat training center at Fort Knox included on the Senate side.

Soldiers from nearly every armed service, as well as National Guardsmen and civilian police, would train there. It's likely that more and more future battles will be fought in urban areas—consider our experiences in Somalia and Haiti.

When it comes time to go to conference, I hope the Members of this body will give that project consideration as well.

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

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to underscore the comments of two of my colleagues, first the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY]. What the gentlewoman was attempting to point out is something that we have to reiterate over and over until we get the point.

Mr. Chairman, American people need to know and understand that America's military budget is roughly equal to all of the combined budgets in the rest of the world. That in and of itself is awesome. But what the gentlewoman went further to point out was that when you combine the military budget of the United States and its allies, its friends, that budget exceeds 80 percent of the world's military budget.

We have to keep repeating, less than 20 percent of the military budget is being spent in that so-called reservoir of nations that can potentially be adversaries, which means we outspend, the United States and its allies, the rest of the world 4 to 1.

So it ought to place it in some proper context when we understand exactly what it means to plus up a military budget beyond the administration's request by $13 billion and not allow this body to have any access to challenging that figure.

The second point that I would like to make is to underscore a very significant point offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT]. This year's budget pluses up the military budget by $13 billion. But if you look at the Republican's budget over the several out years of their balanced budget, their own figures only increase the military budget each year after this year. Each year after this year, by your own figures, you only increase the military budget by slightly over $2 billion a year.

Now, that money could be eaten up in inflation costs alone. I reiterate the point I made in my opening remarks: In many cases it would appear that the committee adds were made with little consideration to the ability to sustain the program, which will cause disruptive program instabilities and forestall our ability to meet future program needs.

The point is simple: Are we starting programs that we cannot finance in the out years? I believe the answer is yes. Are we now starting programs in this $13 billion spike in the budget that will preclude our ability to reach into the future and develop and purchase new technologies that are better suited as we march into the 21st century on activities other than war, peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance?

□ 1715

I think the answer to all of those questions is yes. So while it might make people feel good that they put $13 billion in this year's military budget, the question we ought to be addressing as we carry out our fiduciary responsibilities to the voters and to the taxpayer is, is this a rational way to do business and can we fund these matters in the outyears?

My prediction, underscore it, Mr. Chairman is that this budget will produce instability and it will be extraordinarily disruptive because we are purchasing equipment to fight last year's wars and we are maintaining a budget to produce jobs, the most expensive way we can produce jobs, when we ought to be investing in our people and investing in our economy and investing in the strategies of economic conversion that move us into a peace oriented economy so that we do not have to spend billions of dollars building weapon system that we do not field.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes and 15 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] who is chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, when the Republicans took the leadership helm of this, the world's greatest legislative body, and with unanimity looked forward to the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina, Navy Capt. FLOYD SPENCE, at the chairmanship of this committee, we reduced the subcommittee chairmanships from six to five. We figured that each of the five areas of responsibility, procurement, R&D, readiness, personnel, and installations could do their own oversight.

So when the five subcommittee chairman met, we said how can we refer to ourselves with one term? I suggested we were going to be the marshals for Sheriff SPENCE. And as the marshal of military personnel, I am very, very proud of the Democrats on our subcommittee, of our staff on both sides, particularly the hard work John Chapla, our chief of staff, and Michael Higgins and Donna Hoffmeier have done on our staff in all the areas that we rather quickly call quality of life.

Now, I have taken a lot of heat and some heavy-duty press, big artillery, on what I tried to do about the culture of degradation in our military. I would tell the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] directly, and I know this appeals not only to his keen intellect but also to his heart, young Americans on Okinawa are going to spend the rest of their adult lives rotting in Japanese prisons because they raped not a teenager but a 12-year-old, and kidnaped her and tied her up and degraded her. That must stop.

We have also seen the collapse of brilliant naval combat careers, flag officers to be, because of an unfair, too far extension of what came to be called the Tailhook scandal. But I sat in that committee with five four-stars in front of me, the gentleman from California was there, and I said if my daughter was a naval officer, or one of any nieces, as two of my nephews are officers in the Air Force and the Navy, and she had gotten off an elevator on the third floor at the Hilton in Vegas, and I was on the next elevator up, it would have all been elbows and feet and karate chops as I defended the honor of my daughter.

So I am not making light of what is called Tailhook, but it has gone too far, and it comes out of the culture of degradation.

And the hits I have taken on homosexuals in the military, keeping people with a fatal venereal disease, a regiment of them, on active duty; or the abortion in the military, which is public law as of February 10, DORNAN initiated and supported in the majority in this House, public law which was going to be discussing in a few minutes; or taking Hustler, read today's paper where Larry Flint from his drug soaked wheelchair, his own daughter damns her father's whole rotten life, that is all under the culture of degradation.

And because I have taken hits on that, I have not had a chance to talk about the quality of life things we did. So here it is, and I will put in the RECORD what we have done on the Military Personnel Subcommittee with

health care, with raises, with basic allowance for quarters. These personnel readiness and quality of life provisions were the product of a bipartisan effort for which I thank all my colleagues and thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] on his side.

I believe that as a result of all the input of the Committee on National Security and the support of this entire legislative package that we are about to consider, that therein are many provisions designed to redress major shortcoming in Mr. Clinton's defense budget request.

I will only get a chance to probably mention one out of seven key points here.

First, his budget sets the stage for a continued personnel drawdown beginning in 1998 below their own Bottom-Up Review levels. The army will shrink by 20,000 and the Air Force by 6,000. This despite public testimony by Clinton officials that the drawdown is just about over, quote-unquote.

Second, touts strong quality of life programs providing a 3-percent military pay raise. However, after browbeating Mr. Clinton into giving us this 3-percent pay raise, it largely reneges on the promise made by Secretary of Defense Perry last year to continue a 6-year effort to reduce military personnel out-of-pocket costs. And as others have said before me, it goes on and on and on what we have done for our men and women in uniform.

I submit the rest for the RECORD, Mr. Chairman.

Listen to this, Mr. Chairman, 2 weeks ago, the House National Security Committee reported out H.R. 3230—a bill that contains a strong package of legislation that, in my opinion, does more than any other part of the fiscal year 1997 National Defense Authorization Act to directly improve the personnel readiness and quality of life of the people who serve in our military forces.

These personnel readiness and quality of life provisions were the product of a bi-partisan effort for which I thank my colleagues. I believe that as a result of their input and support the legislative package that we are about to consider contains many provisions designed to redress the major shortcomings of the President's defense budget request. Specifically the President's budget:

Sets the stage for a continued personnel drawdown beginning in fiscal year 1998 below the administration's own Bottom-Up Review levels. The Army will shrink by 20,000, the Air Force by 6,000. This despite public testimony by administration officials that ''the drawdown is just about over.''

Touts strong quality of life programs and provides a 3-percent military pay raise. However, it largely reneges the promise made by the Secretary of Defense last year to continue a 6-year effort to reduce military personnel out-of-pocket housing costs.

Does nothing to reduce the 30-percent out-of-pocket costs born by service members and their families each time they make a permanent change of station move in response to military orders.

Underfunds the defense health program by nearly $500 million, a move undertaken in order to stretch an inadequate budget to fund modernization.

In response to these areas of concern, the H.R. 3230 takes several major initiatives, including:

A 4.6-percent basic allowance for quarters buyback instead of the 3-percent BAQ increase contained in the President's budget.

Restrictions on end-strength reductions below the floors set in 1996.

A package of enhanced reimbursements for permanent change of station moves.

Restoration of the defense health fund shortfall.

H.R. 3230 also provides force structure additions for National Guard fighter squadrons and Navy P3C maritime patrol aircraft. It also adds full-time support personnel for the Army Reserve, and increases recruiting funding for the Army Reserve and the U.S. Marine Corps.

Even more to the point that the administration's defense budget request is clearly insufficient to meet the needs of the services, H.R. 3230 adds nearly $150 million to the Army's military personnel accounts to solve continuing manpower readiness shortfalls.

In reporting out H.R. 3230, the full committee also approved two other major initiatives. The first initiative would restore the Department's regulations and policy regarding homosexuals that were in effect on January 19, 1993. The second initiative would require the discharge of persons who become HIV-positive while also providing for the medical retirement of HIV-positive service members. Medical retirement would guarantee full health care for discharged service personnel and their dependents, as well as an income.

Overall, I consider H.R. 3230 to be a strong defense bill, the product of a bipartisan consensus. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill.

I thank Chairman SPENCE and the subcommittee chairman for their good work. Despite difficult fiscal times, this bill is evidence of a careful keeping of the constitutional duty to provide for defense—a duty which we all took an oath to fulfill.

I am especially appreciative of the initiatives taken to improve the quality of life of our Armed Forces.

The 3-percent pay raise—the 50-percent increase over the President's budget for housing allowance. The many additions for quality of life projects such as family housing, barracks, and child care facilities. These were all desperately needed by the men and women serving their country.

I believe that a continued emphasis on quality of life is critical if we are to recruit and maintain a highly competent voluntary service.

This bill obviously benefits those already serving. Less obvious, but equally important, by improving the quality of life of our Armed Forces we will continue to attract the very best to serve. The Armed Forces of the United States are the best in the world. This bill will help to keep it that way.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS].

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, this bill does many of the things very necessary for the modernization of our Nation's military. I would like to personally thank my friend, Chairman SPENCE, and my friend, ranking member DELLUMS, the subcommittee chairman and the other ranking members that have worked together to prioritize and lead the committee into the authorization of these programs that will protect this country as we enter a new century.

I am very encouraged by what I see in this bill. Chairman SPENCE's consultation with priorities outlined by the individual services has resulted in the creation of a good bill that has America's national security interests at its very heart.

I have heard the concern expressed by a few Members that balancing the budget must come first. Nobody in this body wants to balance the budget of this country more than I do, and I would remind those Members that this bill fits within the balanced budget plan that this House passed last year by some $600 million.

In fact, this authorization represents a real decline in spending of 1.5 percent. To roll spending back even further would do a serious disservice to the brave Americans that pledge their lives to the defense of this Nation.

There are two other issues extremely important to me. One is the issue of quality of life. We compete in the services every day with the private sector for the highest quality of young men and women that we produce in our high schools and our colleges.

We need that 3-percent pay raise. We need to upgrade the quality of living in dorms and housing. We need to upgrade the medical and dental service treatment that we give our men and women, in order to attract those men and women and to keep those men and women once we get them in the services.

The second thing I wanted to address is the two MRC scenario we constantly hear about. We have talked and we have heard folks complain that we are upping the President's budget by $13 billion. If we are going to be able to put our troops in harm's way to defend two MRC's, we have to do that. I urge support of this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY], another valuable member of our committee.

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

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3230, the National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 1997. As a veteran of Desert Storm and Desert Shield, I had the honor of serving my country in a major conflict. I felt secure in the knowledge that we had the best equipment, the best training, and the best leadership in the world.

I consider it my sacred duty to do everything in my power to make sure that in any current or future military operation our brave men and women will have the same support. With this bill, I believe Congress is doing its part to make sure we maintain that kind of fighting force.

Under President Clinton's budget proposal for fiscal year 1997, defense spending would continue on its dangerous descent. As a percentage of gross domestic product, defense spending is now at its lowest level since World War II. As a result, our military preparedness has fallen to a dangerously low level.

Last year's budget was a good start toward stabilizing and reversing the rapid downward spiral in spending and readiness. We must stay the course, not because it is easy in this time of budgetary crisis, but because we must be ready to meet the challenges of an increasingly volatile world.

The world is still a dangerous place. We cannot forget about Saddam Hussein or North Korea and their quest to try to get nuclear weapons. We cannot forget about China in its drive for improved weapons of mass destruction and to become a major world military power. If we continued with the budget President Clinton proposed, I am very concerned that it would leave the United States ill-prepared to defend our national security interests.

The President's procurement request for fiscal year 1997 was $38.9 billion, a level that is at its lowest in real terms in nearly 50 years, and $5 billion below what he was recommending only 1 year ago.

Through research and development, we must continue to strive to maintain our technical advantage which was so evident in the gulf war. In this bill we continue to support our troops with a 3-percent pay raise and 4.6-percent increase in basic allowance for quarters.

This is the second consecutive year we have had to try to stabilize the defense spending decreases. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], who is the son of a distinguished former Member of this body.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this bill. This bill is a bipartisan bill that has been skillfully put together by Chairman FLOYD SPENCE of my neighboring State of South Carolina.

As a Representative of the Third District of North Carolina, I represent such well-known facilities as the Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, Camp Lejeune, and Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base. Improving quality of life is extremely important to me. I am, therefore, pleased that this bill provides for a 3-percent pay raise, increases housing allowances 50 percent over the President's request, and authorizes $900 million above the President's request for military construction.

This bill also appropriately addresses our military modernization. As my colleagues know, we must continue to provide our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines with the technological edge to dominate on the new world battlefield.

I urge my colleagues to support the men and women who bravely serve our country in uniform by voting in favor of H.R. 3230.

□ 1730

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], our top gun on the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, this bill came out of our committee 49 to 2. That is Republicans and Democrats voting for a bill 49 to 2. But yet the far left still wants more and more defense cuts. This President has devastated national security and defense cuts, but yet he tries to stand up and say he is a strong defense President, national security. A bill that comes out 49 to 2, and this President threatens to veto it? This is Republicans and Democrats, just like the bipartisan two-time welfare bill that the President vetoed.

My colleagues have gone through and described what is in this bill and why it is good. We need to provide for our men and women in service. We have decimated the 1980 buildup that we had in national security, that is leaving our forces without equipment that are upgraded. For example, the AV–8 that the Marines are flying, a simple fix increases the safety record by over 50 percent. But yet it was not funded. The F–144's that we have lost, simple fixes like flight controls, we added the money to fix those. A system called Argonne, in Vietnam we used a Shriek missile, fought against Sampson surface-to-air missiles. When the enemy turns off his radar, the missile goes stupid so we had another system called Harm, could only be carried on a certain A–6 and F–111 and a very low kill probability.

Now we have a system called Argonne. It uses the latest technology called GPS. When the enemy turns on its radar like in the case of Captain O'Grady, that radar site would be gone and those pilots would be safe. But yet this President continues to cut defense. It has devastated California by over a million jobs. Between BRAC and defense cuts, he is diminishing national security hurting California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

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

Mr. Chairman, the military personnel provisions of H.R. 3230 evolved in a manner that gave fair consideration to minority concerns. I want to thank Chairman DORNAN for that. I also want to thank the staff for their efforts.

H.R. 3230 solidly enhances quality of life and readiness efforts, reflecting this committee's continued support of our military service members through significant enhancements in these areas.

To highlight just a few of the more significant personnel initiatives contained in H.R. 3230, I would begin by mentioning a 3-percent military pay raise, requested by the President, as well as a 4.6-percent increase in the basic allowance for quarters [BAQ]. This increase in BAQ will fully fund a 1 percent reduction in out-of-pocket housing expenses for service members.

Once again, the military personnel titles of H.R. 3230 provide the Secretary of Defense with the authority to establish a minimum variable housing allowance so that even very junior services members can acquire safe and adequate housing in high cost areas. Additionally, the military personnel provisions include several enhancements to the reimbursements for permanent change of station moves. Military members shouldn't be required to use their personal savings to offset the cost of a government-directed move.

To minimize the readiness impact of continued shortfalls in the Army military personnel account, this bill includes nearly $150 million more than the President's budget request for the Army military personnel account.

H.R. 3230 also restores the nearly half a billion dollar shortfall in the Defense Health Program. Medical care consistently rates as a top quality of life issue. Not correcting this problem would have had disruptive and adverse consequences for active-duty family members and retirees who have a difficult enough time already trying to obtain medical care in military facilities. It would have been perceived as a significant breach of faith with our military members and retirees.

I am disappointed, however, that H.R. 3230 does not include a demonstration program for Medicare subvention in the military personnel titles. CBO has contrived, without any basis in fact, to score demonstration legislation that is specifically and clearly budget neutral as having direct spending implications. The Parliamentarian has ruled that this matter falls under the primary jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee and the Commerce Committee. Everyone in this body should urge members of these two committees to consider acting on this important matter.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me say that overall I believe the military personnel provisions of this bill represent an integrated approach to improving the quality of life of our military men

and women while ensuring a well-trained, ready force. It exemplifies our commitment to readiness, training and taking care of the men and women who serve in our armed forces.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 3230.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE], a member of our committee.

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

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, and insert in the RECORD a statement concerning section 220 and the future participation of the Marine Corps in the JAST program.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3230, as currently written, contains a provision—subsection (b) of section 220—which precludes the Marine Corps from pursuing an advanced short take-off and vertical landing variant under the JAST program—the future of Marine Corps aviation. I had submitted an amendment to the Rules Committee—along with my colleagues Congressman Longley, and Congressman Peterson of Florida—to strike this language, but our amendment was not allowed under the rule. However, based on firm assurances given to me by the chairman of the Rules Committee, and senior members of the National Security Committee, I am confident that subsection (b) of section 220 will be satisfactorily modified in conference.

Subsection (b), of section 220 of the bill, as currently written would deliver a crippling blow to the future of Marine Corps aviation. It would effectively bar the Marine Corps from any participation in the development of our Nation's next generation of fighter aircraft, the JAST program.

I am a member of both the National Security Committee and the Research and Development Subcommittee. The language of section 220, now contained in the bill, was inserted without notice to the committee members. There was no debate. There was no consideration of the issue at either the committee or subcommittee levels. There was no prior notice to the Marine Corps. In short, this attack upon Marine Corps aviation came completely without warning, without Member involvement, and without service consultation.

In light of the foregoing information and the importance of this issue, I will rely on assurances given to me, Congressman Longley, and Congressman Peterson, and will anticipate a final conference report which presents no barriers to Marine Corps ASTOVL development under the JAST program. Whether some young marine, on some future battlefield, has the air support he needs, when he needs it, may well turn upon the wisdom of the deliberations of the appointed conferees. Relying upon the assurances given to me, I will trust in their judgment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank our distinguished chairman of the full committee for yielding me the time to talk in general about this bill and one of the major problems that I have with this administration when it comes to defense spending.

There have been a number of evidences, Mr. Chairman, of hypocrisy as we walk through the defense process that I want to talk about today. As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, it started last year when in a combined conference of the House and the Senate, we added approximately $7 billion to the authorization bill in the authorization process. We were severely criticized by the President and by Secretary Perry for putting money in that they said was not necessary, even though we put money in for such things as cruise missile defense, money in for pay raises for the military personnel, improving housing, qualify of housing initiatives for military personnel around the country, including money for countermine measures.

What really aggravated me, Mr. Chairman, was when Secretary Perry came before our committee, and I respect the gentleman and respect the position that he took last year that the add-ons that we made were unnecessary. But in presenting to use the flow charts that talked about how much money the Clinton administration was requesting for acquisition, what was interesting is that the line was bottomed out. Secretary Perry said to us in the committee, as you can see, there are no further cuts requested in terms of acquisition. In fact, the bottoming out has occurred and we are actually starting to increase.

Mr. Chairman, what the Secretary was doing was taking credit for money that we put in last year that he criticized us for. Mr. Chairman, we cannot have it both ways. If we really feel that we added too much money in, that is fine. I respect the gentleman if that is in fact his position. But do not come back this year and then take credit for that and say we have really done the service well in terms of maintaining the acquisition levels.

Now more specifically, Mr. Chairman, unlike many of my colleagues on this side, I opposed the B–2 bomber. I felt it was a technology that I like but we just cannot afford. The President railed about the B–2 bomber, said it was unnecessary. The conference put money in for the B–2, and what did the President do? He goes out to southern California to the areas where the B–2 bomber is built and he stands up and says, I am going to build one more B–2 bomber. I am going to use the technology available to reconfigure one that we have left, one more platform to go to 20.

Obviously that is well received by all those workers. But then he goes on to say, and I am going to commission a study of deep-strike bomber capabilities. And oh, by the way, that study probably will not be out until after the November election.

Mr. Chairman, that is outrageous. If we are against the B–2 bomber, then we are against the B–2 bomber in Pennsylvania and in California, regardless of who we are talking to.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we added $7 billion last year. Much of that money has gone to pay for the missions that this President has assigned our troops, to Somalia, to Haiti, around the world. But what really aggravates me, Mr. Chairman, is that here is a President criticizing us for putting more money in but not willing to tell the American people that some of the money that is being asked to be reprogrammed is going to be used to train the Haitian police force. And it is going to be used for travel costs for the Haitian police force. Now, I have got some police in Philadelphia who could use some training, and I have got some police who could use some travel expenses. But the President does not want to talk about that because he asked for that money. He wants to use the money for those purposes that he feels are priorities that in my mind are not militarily significant.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a good bill. We take the priorities that the Joint Chiefs have given us in terms of adding on additional dollars for key issues. Our troops in Bosnia need more money for countermine measures. Our troops around the world need more money and support for understanding a threat from chemical and biological weapons.

Mr. Chairman, let me really get to the heart of what this debate is all about. I read the veto message put out by the President where in the end, after saying he is going to veto the bill, he talks about the Nautilus program, the program that we are doing to help Israel. Mr. Chairman, I want our colleagues to listen to this, because this President went before AIPAC and he told AIPAC at their national convention, I urge my colleagues to read his statement, that he is committed to an agreement to expand our theater missile defense program so that we will have the ability to detect and destroy incoming missiles. That way Israel will not only have the advantage it needs today, but will be able to defeat the threats of tomorrow, which is basically the Nautilus program.

This President is all for it and so is Secretary Perry. But like every other defense priority, what did this President do, Mr. Chairman? When the funding requests were made, what we are talking about, the high energy laser program, which is in fact the Nautilus program, in fiscal year 1994, the Clinton budget was $4.8 million. This Congress put in $24.8 million. In fiscal year 1995, this President, who had the audacity to go before AIPAC and say I support you and the high energy laser program must go forward, asked for zero money. He zeroed the program out. Not one dime of money. Yet he is taking credit for that initiative in front of every person concerned about Israel's security across the world.

What did they ask for it this year before there was an incident of the

Katyusha rockets being fired? They asked for $3 million, starvation of the program.

Mr. Chairman, the time for the demagoguery of this administration on defense spending has got to come to an end. This President can no longer get away with saying one thing and doing something else, whether it is the Nautilus program, whether it is the B–2 bomber or whether it is missile defense.

Mr. Chairman, let me say we are not about tweaking Russia in this bill. In my conversations with key Russian leaders over the weekend with Senator BILL BRADLEY, we did not hear one word about missile defense. What do we hear in terms of jeopardizing the START II talks? We heard about this administration's plan to expand NATO. But we never hear the President talk about that, because that is a key priority. That is the only thing the Russians talked about the entire time we were there. In fact, I said to them, I have heard more about NATO expansion in 2 days than I have heard on the floor of the Congress in 2 years. But this administration does not talk about that, because it is not consistent with their position.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, under the leadership of this full committee chairman, we have reached out to the Russians in a way that has never been done before; $20 million of joint missile defense initiatives with the Russians so that we can continue the Ramos project, the Skipper project and do joint technology work. Under the leadership of this chairman, we have reached out to the Russians to show them that we want to work together.

Mr. Chairman, let me also say we are not going to be shortchanged by looking at a military leadership in Russia that was the same when it was the former Soviet Union. While democracy is occurring over there and economic reform and stability and hopefully the elections will turn out well next month, the military leadership is the same. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues if they would get a copy of what is called the Sirikov document, an internal document circulated among the Russian Ministry of Defense that shows some of the military thought about what their posture should be with the United States.

This is not my document, Mr. Chairman. This was circulated in the Russian media 2 short months ago. I had it translated. What does it say? It says that Russia should look at the United States militarily as a long-term adversary. That Russia should look at the United States in a way that allows them, if they are backed into a corner, to share technology and missile defense capability and offensive missile technology with Iraq, Iran, and Syria.

It further states that the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are rogue nations run by mafiosi. Mr. Chairman, that is the problem. We are not talking about Boris Yelstin. We are not talking about those leaders like Mr. Lukin who definitely want better relations. We are talking about a military that we still have to be prepared to deal with. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, we are committed to work with Russia. We are committed to work with the leaders. The current efforts that are being put forth by the Utah Russian Institute to establish a working relationship with those members of the Russian Duma who want us to work together cooperatively. Under Speaker GINGRICH's leadership we have established a new landmark process that will allow us for the first time to have the Speaker of the Russian Duma, Mr. Seleznyov and the Speaker of this Congress to come together twice a year where our Members who are interested in key issues can get to know their colleagues, both in the Russian Duma and in this American Congress.

□ 1745

Mr. Chairman, what we are saying is we want to work with the Russians, we want to reach out to them, we want to share technology. But in the end we do not want to shortchange the American people. This administration will have us believe that arms control agreements are the end all and the cure all. I do not disagree with arms control agreements, but when I see the administration ignore a violation of the missile control technology regime, as they did in December, and not even call the Russians for it, when I see not even calling the Russians on a nuclear test that occurred in Nove Zamky, I wonder how we can say we base our relationship on arms control agreements when we do not want to call the Russians when they violate those same agreements.

What we are saying, Mr. Chairman, is we have a solid approach to work with the Russians, to show that we no longer live in a bipolar world, that we must, first of all, protect and defend the American people.

It is so ironic, Mr. Chairman, with all the rhetoric of the administration that both the Air Force and the Army have said they can give us an ABM Treaty compliant missile defense capability, not for the tens of billions of dollars that President Clinton cites in his veto message, but for between $2 and $5 billion.

These are the administration's leaders in the Pentagon who are telling us we can give the American people something they do not now have, and that is a protection against what? Five incoming missiles. What is so outrageous is that while we try to give the American people this protection, the Russians have had an operational ABM system for the past 20 years that protects 80 percent of their population.

Mr. Chairman, I ask our colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 9½ minutes.

First, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that with respect to premature expansion of NATO I would tend to agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], but I would remind my colleague that in the context of H.R. 7, Contract for America, there was a great deal of very poignant, strident remarks with respect to the issue of the expansion of NATO, and it is slightly disingenuous to make that attack at this point when those remarks were contained in the Republican sponsored H.R. 7.

Second, I tried to listen very carefully to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], who pointed out that they could purchase a missile, a national missile defense, from between $2 and $3 billion. That is not the missile defense system that is contained in the freestanding piece of legislation that will come to the floor over the next several days. As a matter of fact, as I understand it, the Congressional Budget Office, in costing the potential of the freestanding piece of legislation dealing with nationalistic defense, would more approximate $8 billion, and that is if we just keep it on the ground. If we go into space with Brilliant Pebbles, et cetera, we could be talking about a missile system well in excess of $30 billion, maybe approaching even $40 billion. So this $2 or $3 billion does not square with the reality.

Now, there are several comments that have been made during the course of this debate that I think we need to clarify. With respect to this so-called modernization crisis and the need for procurement, my colleagues on this side of the aisle plused up the procurement budget by $7.5 billion, an incredible amount of money. Now, their argument is that we had a procurement crisis, a modernization crisis. Mr. Chairman, the simple facts are as follows:

In the context of a post-cold-war environment we began to downsize our military force structure. In downsizing our military force structure after the $300 billion per year spending that characterized the 1980's, we had an incredible inventory of resources designed to serve a much larger force structure.

Now, one does not have to be a rocket scientist to understand that if we got inventory to support a force structure here and we are downsizing to a force structure here, that that excess inventory can handle this force structure. So for several years obviously the procurement budget went down as we drew from these excesses in the inventory. The thought was that down the road, they ran back up as we move beyond this so-called procurement holiday, saving taxpayers billions of dollars. That was rational, that was calm, that was cogent, that was responsible. But we are adding $7.5 billion over and above all of that.

Next comment: We are now operating on the basis of the Bottom-Up Review that justifies a military budget to carry out two major regional contingencies. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that Bottom-Up Review was

more a first cautious step away from the end of the cold war than it was a bold step into the future, and I asked Secretary Perry should the Bottom-Up Review be perceived as a dynamic living document and not a static document? His answer was, yes, that we are presently looking at the world through a glass darkly, and as we gain greater knowledge about the world, we must then begin to change the assumptions upon which we build a military budget.

I believe we are beginning to develop that kind of analysis. I have said over and over and continue to believe that there is much less chance that we would engage in some major regional war than it is we would be involved in the Somalias, the Haitis, the Rwandas, and the Bosnias of the world, activities other than war. But we are building a military budget to fight the last war. We still cling tenaciously to the notions of the cold war. Even one of my colleagues used an antiquated term like the far left. I thought we were beyond that, Mr. Chairman. The cold war is over.

Old labels make no sense. Old ideas make no sense. Old paradigms make no sense. We have to strip those labels, strip those ideas, strip those paradigms and come to the table intellectually honest enough to develop a military budget based on the realities of the emerging world, and we ought to be challenging each other intellectually, we ought to be challenging each other with respect to our fiduciary responsibilities to the taxpayer. Spending $267 billion in the context of the cold war, post-cold-war, is obscene when we are challenging education budgets, welfare budgets, jobs budgets, health budgets and other budgets, finding money to balance the budget. But some kind of way we found $13 billion to build the military budget. Who are we afraid of in the world? Some Third World country?

When we fought in Desert Storm, the President told us we were fighting the fourth largest military in the world. The Soviet Union vanished. The Warsaw Pact evaporated. We were spending over 200 and some odd billion dollars per year to wage war, potentially wage war, on two entities that no longer exist.

Mr. Chairman, we do not need this military budget.

Finally, let me say this. I was hoping that we would come to this floor to explore the realities of what we ned in a post-cold-war environment. None of us could have anticipated this moment. Historians will decide who won the cold war and how it ended. I do not have time for that. It is real, it is here, it is now, and we must step up to the plate and address it.

I believe the end of the cold war allows us to develop a new national security strategy with three components: First, a healthy vibrant economy, which means that we invest in our people and we invest in our country, where we have an intelligent, enlightened, educated, informed, and well-trained society. Healthy, where we invest in technologies and research that enhance the quality of human life as we march into the 21st century at the end of the post-cold-war world, the end of the cold war.

The second element is a foreign policy based upon the notion that it is a heck of a lot more responsible to attempt to prevent war than it is to walk cocky into war. The problems of the world do not necessarily lend themselves to a military solution. The problems of the world are political and economic and social and cultural and need to be resolved in that context. We ought to be about prevention, political solution, dialog, sitting at the peace table.

Why have we produced peace in Bosnia? Because people came to the negotiating table. Diplomacy was the order of the day, not building more bombs and more missiles and more weapons so that we stride across the world prepared to wage war. The world has changed, and we must change with it.

The third element is a properly sized, properly trained, properly equipped military to meet the national security needs into the 21st century. I do not believe this budget does that. We have not taken the time to review the bottom-up review and come up with a new one if we do not think it works. We have not taken the time to sit down to develop a national security strategy so that our children and our children's children inherit a world that is indeed worthy of them.

That is why we are paid to be here, to grapple with each other, to debate beyond that, to think and to have the audacity to think new and to think fresh and to think boldly. But we are marching cautiously away from the cold war, funding weapon systems that we do not need.

In conclusion, we are doing it because of unemployment. We are doing it because we know that people work on these weapon systems, and I understand that. Each of us has to get up each day and pay our bills and pay our rent and educate our children, house our family. So I am not cavalier about jobs. But there is a better way to produce jobs in this country than for the military budget to be a jobs bill. Our strategy ought to be a strategy that embraces full employment, that embraces economic conversion, that invests in people and invests in our society, but not use the military budget because we lack the courage and lack the willingness to move boldly into the future.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we look back at history. What is being said today on both sides of the aisle is not a whole lot different from what we experienced before. if we look back at history, we always have found people who thought we were doing too much in defense of our country, and we also found people who thought that we were not doing enough, and somehow or another we have been able to overcome those arguments from people who refuse to see the threats that we face in the world, our freedom, and we have remained free because of it.

The fight is a continuing fight, it has always been here, it is always going to be here. Today is rehash of the same thing.

We have a dangerous world. Our obligation is to keep our country free, what we are trying to do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pensacola, FL [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman I want to make a couple quick comments.

The ranking member talked about how the world had changed, and I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], but I will agree with him on this point. The world has changed.

☐ 1800

The cold war world is over. We are no longer a bipolar world. Unfortunately, we have gone from being a bipolar world to becoming a singularly polar world. For the first time since the end of the fifth century, we are the sole superpower on the planet. There is only one superpower for the first time since the end of the Roman Empire.

If we are going to be the world's policeman, as the gentleman argued that we should have been in Bosnia and in Haiti and in Somalia and around the four corners of the globe while taking care of our troops, we are going to have to make an investment. If we want to ensure that our men and women who are enlisted can serve this country without the fear of having to be on food stamps, then we have to make an adequate investment.

If we want to make sure that service families do not continue to deteriorate and fall apart because the President has fired 300,000 people in the military, and he is still asking them to do more with less and more with less, year in and year out and year in and year out, then we are going to have to make an investment.

If we want to ensure that we can protect this country at least from a ballistic missile from an emerging Third World country, or if we want to be prepared for the great China threat, and Mr. Chairman, it is coming, the 21st century may not be the China century but there is a good chance it is going to be the Asian century, if we are going to look forward and protect against those threats, then we have to make the investment. This bill does it. I support it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished

gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] for a combined 5 minutes, to allow them to enter into a colloquy.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a discussion with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON]. As the gentleman knows, I had planned to offer an amendment which would keep in place the administrative command structure for the Army Reserve. As a senior member of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel which has jurisdiction over this matter, I think it would be beneficial to the Members if the gentleman could explain the impact of the provisions and whereby you support the provision as it is currently written in keeping the U.S. Army Reserve Command as it currently exists.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this important issue of Army Reserve.

Title XII of H.R. 3230, the reserve forces revitalization, is intended to set forth the administrative and organizational structure of our Nation's reserve forces. This provision was not contained in the chairman's original mark but was included following a spirited debate on the issue. Several subcommittee members and I remain particularly concerned about the language that would change the command structure of the Army Reserve.

The U.S. Army Reserve Command is responsible for providing well trained and equipped soldiers to augment active duty forces during times of conflict. Currently the Army Reserve Command reports to the Chief of Staff to the Army through the Army's Forces Command. Since Forces Command is the provider of ground forces to the war-fighting Commanders-in-Chief, this relationship seems both appropriate and beneficial. The adopted provision would alter this command organization by making the United States Army Reserve Command a wholly separate command and have the Reserve commander report directly to the Chief of Staff. Under this structure the U.S. Army Reserve Command would have to advocate for needed resources without the benefit of the commanding general of Forces Command, an influential four-star general.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned with this change on two accounts. First, the current command relationship is operating well and making good progress towards addressing noted weaknesses. While it is true that in the past, Reserve forces seem to be last in line to receive needed resources, significant changes have been made which make restructuring unnecessary at this time.

In the words of the current Chief of Staff of the Army Reserve, Maj. Gen. Max Barantz, from a letter addressed to me on May 3, 1996: ''Because 100 percent of the Army Reserve line units and 92 percent of the support units are utilized in the CINCs' current war-fighting plans, I believe it is a good idea between peacetime and war to work directly for the people one will fight with. We have been under this system for 4 years and our readiness has increased during this time as a direct result of this command relationship.

Second, in the Military Personnel Subcommittee markup, I offered language which would allow the Army's leadership to determine whether or not to restructure. This seemed a better approach than to mandate what is essentially a military decision.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for providing the Members with that insight. I share the gentleman's views on the issue. In fact, it was in response to those concerns that I proposed my amendment to keep the situation the way it is.

In addition to the points which the gentleman has raised, I would like to add two other points. First, as the gentleman knows, within the Pentagon the budget battles are ultimately decided by four-star generals. Left unchanged, H.R. 3230 would set up a command structure which puts the commander of the Army Reserve, a two-star general, in competition with generals that wear four stars. I am concerned that in that arrangement, the U.S. Army Reserve will inevitably end up with the short end of the stick.

In addition, I know of no other command within the military which has been the subject of such congressional oversight and attention as the Army Reserve has. The Army Reserve Command is a relatively new command established in 1991. In 1994 Congress mandated a significant change in the command structure. Both actions require time to fully implement and to determine whether further changes are necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that, at this time, mandating a change in the U.S. Army Reserve Command structure is premature. My amendment was intended to keep all options open to retain the current command structure, yet permit the change to take place should it be necessary. I have elected to withdraw my amendment, understanding that this issue will be taken up in conference.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for withdrawing that amendment. I would point out that this colloquy is not what is in the bill. The bill is the amendment that we sponsored that said the Army Reserve commander would only report to one person, the Chief of Staff. That is the biggest difference between this amendment they are talking about. They want two people that the Army Reserve chief has to report to.

The Army Reserve commander is the only one that has to report to two chiefs. The Army Guard, the Air Guard, the Air Reserve, the Marine Reserve, the Naval Reserve, their commanders go directly to those Chiefs of Staff. It is simple. It makes a lot of sense to do it that way.

Mr. Chairman, I have five letters from former commanders of the Army Reserve. I will read part of one from General Ward, who was former chief of the Army Reserve. He said: ''Having two bosses is something less than ideal. The conflicts that arise are frequent and not easily resolved as you attempt to advise and comply with the guidance of two superiors whose points of view are different.''

Really, he says that this is inefficient, ineffective, and flies in the face of logic. He says we need common sense. We only need one commander that the Army Reserve reports to. That is what is in the bill. We hope it stays in there.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and offer compliments to the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York, Mr. JERRY SOLOMON, chairman of the Committee on Rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for three-quarters of a minute.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to rise to commend the chairman of the committee and the ranking member, because they have done an outstanding job with probably the most important legislation that ever will come before this body each year, and also to call attention to my amendment that will be first up tomorrow morning dealing with the Nunn-Lugar issue. I hope every Member comes over, listens to the debate, and supports my amendment.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman and his staff for a job well done.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

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

Mr. Chairman, many in the new majority seem determined to do anything they possibly can to interfere with a woman's privacy rights and freedom of choice about abortion. They even want to turn this bill into a battleground on that issue. This bill should be about defending the country, not making war on a woman's right to choose.

Mr. Chairman, we will soon be taking up the DeLauro amendment, which

would protect the rights of U.S. servicewomen abroad by allowing them to exercise the same constitutional rights available to women here at home. I ask my colleagues to support it. I ask them in the strongest possible terms.

It is ironic, I think, that when we ask members of the U.S. Armed Forces serving abroad, women members of the Armed Forces to defend this country and its Constitution, we at the same time, if the language in the bill is retained, deny them the fundamental rights accorded every other woman in this society under the very Constitution they are being asked to defend. Of all people for us to single out, of all the people to deny the fundamental protections of the Constitution, rights to privacy and freedom of choice, we certainly should not be doing it to those women in uniform willing to risk their lives to defend this country and the rest of us.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the majority in this body to leave these soldiers alone. Do not target them for this very ill-advised and I think ill-considered act of ideological retribution. They have enough to worry about as they go about doing their jobs without having to face the prospect that in an unfortunate situation, their only choice is to rely on suspect and frequently dangerous clinics in a strange land to deal with the most anguished personal problem they might face.

Many in the new majority seem determined to do anything to interfere with a woman's privacy rights and freedom of choice about abortion. They even want to turn Defense authorization into an ideological battle ground on this issue. This bill should be about defending the country, not making war on a woman's right to choose.

Mr. Chairman, we will soon take up the DeLauro amendment to protect the rights of U.S. service women overseas by allowing them to exercise their constitutional rights in the same way as women at home. I ask my colleagues to support it.

The U.S. Constitution guarantees women the right to privacy and to choose whether to have an abortion or not. Without the DeLauro amendment, the bill before us makes a mockery of that right by denying access to safe, sanitary reproductive health care to women who have volunteered to serve their country in uniform.

Imagine your sister or daughter in a strange land struggling with what may well be the most difficult decision of her life. Why shouldn't she have access—at her own expense—to military hospitals and health care? Why should the country for which she is willing to risk her life deny her the same rights and choices all other American women have?

As members of the U.S. armed services abroad, military women defend this country and its Constitution. Without the DeLauro amendment, this bill will deny them the fundamental rights accorded every other American woman under the very Constitution they defend.

Of all people for this body to single out—of all people to deny fundamental rights—those willing to risk their lives to defend the United States should be the last.

I urge the majority in this body to leave these soldiers alone; find another ideological target. These soldiers have enough to worry about as they go about their jobs without having to worry about relying on suspect, possibly dangerous, clinics in strange lands in one of the most difficult and anguished circumstances they'll ever face.

Vote ''yes'' on the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, to the chairman of the committee and to the ranking member, let me first say that I hope as we proceed with this very important discussion that we will unshackle ourselves from the definition of doves and hawks. We now move into the 21st century, when all of us have claimed the birthright of a safe and secure nation. To categorize those of us who have come to this floor to ask that we have a reasonable debate on reducing this defense budget is inaccurate and unfair.

Let me simply say that I believe in defense as well, and am proud of the men and women who serve in the U.S. military; equally more proud of the African-Americans who lost their lives who will now be honored by this authorization bill.

But I come honestly to say have we done the right thing by our children and by America, for the fact that we did not allow one single amendment that would discuss the reducing of a $13 billion excess, even to half it, as I had offered in the Committee on Rules? The real thing is we are doing good things for the military personnel by including a percentage for a raise. We are including a percentage for a housing allowance. We are recognizing the value of human resources.

But I must share the remarks of my ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], who made a very vital point: This is a new world order. We will not fight, as we can imagine, the kind of massive war we have fought in the past. We hope that we will again sit down to the table of peace and be able to resolve the Bosnia's and the Haiti's and the Rwanda's and the Somalia's, and yes, maybe a South Africa. What we must understand is that this country must be a leader in defense, yes; I do not deny that, but we must also be a leader in peace. Therefore, our strategy of defense must be one carved with the details of peace and negotiation in showing the readiness of our military, providing housing, securing fairness to all, but yet not overburdening this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that we defeat this authorization and recognize that we can go back to the table.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], my distinguished colleague and a member of the committee.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, as we close general debate on the fiscal 1997 national defense authorization bill, I wonder what sort of message we are sending to the citizens of this country. For months the American public has heard nothing but the dangers of the growing deficit and the need to tighten our belts and balance the budget. Frankly, I could not agree more.

☐ 1815

Unfortunately, today we are considering a bill that adds $13 billion to the Pentagon's request. That is right, $13 billion more than the Pentagon asked for. The same Congress that shut down the Government twice in the name of balancing the budget is sending a Government agency $13 billion more than it wants. Congress is sinking $13 billion into defense, and we will not even be discussing the final cost to the defense budget during this debate because the Republican-controlled leadership has refused to put a single amendment in order that would cut this budget.

We added $7 billion in the fiscal year. Now we are adding $13 billion in this fiscal year. The defense budget is half of all discretionary spending we have in this country. If half of discretionary spending, we are going to tell the Government they need to spend more, $20 billion over 2 years, how in the world are we going to make the investments in education, in student loans, in children?

We are not making that investment because we do not have the courage to make the difficult choices when it comes to the defense budget in this country. This is an outrage, that we cannot even have an amendment before this House, the people's House, to determine whether or not we should add $13 million to a budget where the Pentagon said they already had enough.

The American public ought to be outraged that we are actually coming before this House. I urge us not to vote for this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to argue for eliminating the Defense authorization provisions requiring that members of the armed services who are diagnosed with HIV be discharged from the service. The systematic discharge of those personnel that are HIV-positive is discriminatory and unnecessary.

Defense Secretary Perry, General Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other military leaders have all successfully urged repeal of the requirement that HIV personnel be discharged. If military personnel are able to perform their duties, we cannot in good conscience discharge them when we have no justifiable reason to do so.

I oppose provisions to summarily discharge someone based on their medical condition.

This violates our sense of fairness and justice. We should not be punishing someone for contracting HIV, or any other disease. We do not systematically discharge personnel who have contracted cancer or diabetes. These military personnel have served honorably and are prepared in heart and body to defend and protect our Nation. I think we do a great disservice to all of the armed services when we support a discriminatory policy to those who would sacrifice their lives for our Nation.

As this legislation proceeds through the House and Senate and to the conferences, I expect that the right decision will be made and these strikingly discriminatory provisions that disregard the service of our military personnel, who are infected with HIV, will be rejected.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, as we have added funds to the Pentagon's budget, we have unfortunately neglected, until this year, changing the mindset of the military on how it makes purchasing decisions. Regardless of how much Congress provides, we must ensure that all of the dollars are spent wisely.

As my colleagues know, I am a strong and vocal advocate for creating an industrial base that can meet both commercial and military requirements. It is clear that we cannot afford to maintain two distinct industrial bases—one for defense, one for commercial applications—as we have had the luxury of maintaining in the past.

Instead, we must pursue policies and develop programs that encourage cooperative ventures in which defense and commercial expertise and technology complement and support each other. As such, I want to commend Mr. WELDON, chairman of the research and development subcommittee, and bring to my colleagues' attention section 203 of the bill.

Section 203 creates an innovative and robust dual-use technology program. It does this by elevating within the Department of Defense an emphasis on integrating commercial technologies into current and future military systems. It devotes over the next 4 fiscal years increasing percentages of the DOD science and technology budget for dual use applications. And it encourages program managers to use these funds to develop and acquire technologies with both military and commercial applications, rather than purchasing more expensive milspec items. And it does this while sharing the costs of development with industry.

I strongly believe that the dual use program authorized in the bill will make defense dollars stretch farther while sustaining critical components of our Nation's industrial base. I will fight for it in conference and trust Mr. WELDON will join me.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to bring to my colleagues' attention another provision which I believe is widely supported by this body.

As you know, on April 28, the Secretary of Defense and the Prime Minister of Israel entered into an agreement for the joint development of the Nautilus Laser/Theater High Energy Laser Program.

This program will lead to the development of a ballistic-missile defense system for Israel—a goal which in itself will ensure continued stability and peace for the Middle East.

Unfortunately, at the time of our subcommittee markup, the administration had still not forwarded its funding request nor identified offsets to pay the estimated $40 to $50 million U.S. share.

As a result, the subcommittee included at my request, and with the full support of all members, a statement expressing strong congressional support for the Nautilus Program and encouraging the Secretary to send up a funding request.

I am hopeful that by the time the House and Senate conference on the defense bill, we will be in a position to authorize the funds necessary to develop this critical missile defense program.

I am pleased that committee also authorized funds to continue several badly-needed weapons programs. Ten C–17's, for example, were funded and the 6-year procurement of 80 aircraft approved. By buying the transport aircraft in this fashion, the taxpayers save nearly $1 billion.

The committee also added $290 million to improve the conventional mission capability of the B–2 strategic bomber and $49 million for similar improvements to the B–1. Both recommendations deserve the support of this body.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that there will be some changes and modifications to the bill in conference, including the repeal of the abortion language, the HIV-discharge requirement, other discriminatory provision affecting gays and lesbians, and the unconstitutional restrictions on the sale and rental of materials at military PXs.

I would hope that a clean prodefense bill will pass this House this week, pass the Senate soon, be reported by a Senate-House conference and signed into law by the President. Our national security, our military, and our industrial base depend on it.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3230, the Department of Defense Authorization Act. As many Members know, the decline in defense spending that began in the aftermath of the cold war has drastically accelerated under the Clinton administration. Troop levels, air wings, and naval vessels have all been impacted. At the same time, demands on our military are increasing and we must ensure that our military can effectively respond to these demands.

I want to inform Members who might be concerned about the modernization levels in the bill that the President cut these levels after promising last year that modernization spending would rise. In fact, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified in support of a $60 million funding level for modernization accounts. Because we are reducing our overall troop levels and forward military presence, it is critical to finance these needs. H.R. 3230 will arm our bombers and fighters with smart weapons and protect our ships from missile attack. I urge support for this legislation.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, the Clinton administration's national security strategy is based on being able to fight two regional contingencies [MRC's] simultaneously, yet the administration has underfunded this strategy by as much as $150 billion over the next 5 years. The national Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1997 before us today will help shore up the inadequacies of Clinton's defense budget.

In staying with the congressional Republican commitment to prevent the hollowing of the Nation's military, the National Security Committee added nearly $13 billion to Clinton's request of $255 billion which is consistent with Congress' plan to balance the budget by 2002. These additional funds are primarily focused on three areas, to include quality of life enhancements for service members and their families, maintaining military readiness, and modernizing outdated weapon systems. All three of these areas are crucial if America wants to maintain a highly motivated and highly capable military, and I feel this defense keeps the country moving in this direction.

While I am supportive of most provisions contained in this legislation, I am concerned about the lack of a cogent depot maintenance policy in the bill. Last year, the House supported the elimination of the 60/40 policy with the hope that the Pentagon would arrive at a sensible maintenance policy that preserves an in-house capability to support the CORE workload requirements, but also utilizes the private sector industrial base for DOD's remaining maintenance workload.

This already complex industrial base/military readiness matter involving outsourcing and privatization became embroiled in Presidential politics in the aftermath of the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Act. President Clinton's unwise, and in my view, flagrant abuse of the base closure process resulted in the privatization in place concept at Kelly and McClellan Air Force Logistics Centers for political expediency in Texas and California. The Pentagon has done little to clarify this matter.

Last month, Department of Defense officials testified before the National Security Committee and failed to put forth a balanced depot maintenance policy. In fact, the comments about wholesale depot privatization enraged committee members and lent credence to the 60/40 policy. Rather than clear up any confusion or ambiguity, the Pentagon's unfocused testimony forced the committee to withhold any action until conference negotiations with the Senate.

The 60/40 depot-level maintenance policy is archaic and based on a public/private worksharing arrangement that has no relevance to readiness or military capability. I believe the $15 billion that the taxpayer pays annually for this purpose can be pared significantly if a sound maintenance policy is put in place.

From a private sector industrial base perspective, I have a specific example in my district of just how harmful the current policy is. A private helicopter remanufacturing company has tried repeatedly to bid on depot-level maintenance for Army Blackhawk helicopters. They have a long history of performing very good work on UH–60 and CH–53E helicopters.

But as a result of the Army's interpretation of this 60/40 policy, the 40 percent of the work this firm can actually bid on is being largely consumed by organizational and intermediate-level maintenance for fixed-wing aircraft.

Not only is the firm in my district, that specializes in helicopter work, inhibited from competing for depot-level maintenance work on Blackhawks, but the 40 percent share set aside for the private sector is nearly fully consumed by fixed-wing work comprised of emptying ashtrays and changing windshield wiper blades. The ramifications of this haphazard policy yield virtually no industrial base benefits to support rotary-wing, or for that matter fixed-wing, aircraft. This is not a cogent industrial base policy for our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, the 60/40 workload split makes even less sense today than it did when

it was first adopted, and I hope this maintenance issue is examined thoroughly when the House and Senate go to conference on this legislation.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program [CSEPP] was established in 1988 to assist communities near the eight chemical weapons storage sites in the United States. The program, currently managed jointly by the Army and FEMA, provides States and local governments funding and technical assistance to improve emergency response capabilities for an accident involving the chemical stockpile.

Although the Federal Government has spend $387 million on CSEPP, communities near the storage sites are not fully prepared to respond to a chemical emergency. Since 1993, GAO reports have attributed CSEPP's lack of progress to Federal management weaknesses including fragmented responsibilities, poor guidance, and inadequate financial controls. The amendment I am offering today to H.R. 3230, 1997 National Defense authorization bill, seeks to rectify this situation.

Efforts are ongoing between the Army, FEMA, and the States to establish site specific integrated product and process teams as a management tool for the CSEPP portion of the Chemical Demilitarization Program. In view of CSEPP's past management difficulties, I encourage the expeditious establishment of the IPT's. My amendment requires the Army to report within 120 days of enactment on the success of the IPT process.

But if at the end of the 120-day period the Army and FEMA have been unsuccessful in implementing site-specific IPT's with each of the affected States, my amendment authorizes the Army to assume full control and responsibility for CSEPP, eliminating FEMA's role as joint program manager. This will allow the Army to negotiate directly with the States regarding program requirements, implementation schedules, training and exercise requirements, and funding in the form of direct grants for program support.

Mr. Chairman, during consideration of H.R. 3230 by the House National Security Committee, I called on the committee to schedule full and open hearings next year on the stockpile program. We as a nation need to answer three central questions about our aging chemical weapons stockpile: First, do we really need to destroy these weapons; second, how should we destroy these weapons; and third, how much are we willing to pay to destroy these weapons?

The price tag for the destruction program has already climbed above $12 billion, making it one of DOD's largest procurement programs. If this were an airplane or a ship or a missile, my colleagues in the House, the media, and the American public would be screaming from the rooftops about the outrageous cost and mismanagement of this program. But because it involves chemical weapons, it isn't sexy enough to merit more than lip service from our Nation's highest officials.

I ask your support of my amendment to H.R. 3230 as we attempt to try to bring some sanity and fiscal constraint to CSEPP and the Chemical Stockpile Destruction Program.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to speak about an issue which I believe to be very important. I requested that the committee consider including language in the fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization bill authorizing additional funds for the purchase of combat boots during fiscal year 1997 and directing the Defense Personnel Support Center [DPSC], a unit of the Defense Logistics Agency [DLA], to procure a minimum of 85 percent of the anticipated consumption of combat boots. Over a period of 3 years this plan would provide a reduction in inventories of 557,000 pairs. At the end of that time, this country would have a 38-week peacetime supply of combat boots—including a 20-week mobilization stock. This supply, only a few weeks of boots at Desert Storm consumption rates, compares to an 18-week supply currently planned by the DPSC.

Late last year the Military Boot Manufacturers Association [MBMA], which is comprised of the four manufacturers of combat boots for the military services, brought to my attention the fact that the DPSC planned to continue its reduction in inventory of combat boots over the next 3 years from the present 65-week supply to an 18-week supply of boots. By letter dated February 29, 1996, Congressmen HEFNER, COSTELLO, LEWIS, ROMERO-BARCELÓ, KINGSTON, and I wrote to the Department of Defense and expressed concern about the DPSC's plan to purchase between 579,000 and 869,000 boots per year, when the annual consumption of boots is expected to be 1.2 million, resulting in an inventory decrease of approximately 380,000 pairs per year, or 1.14 million pairs over a 3-year period.

While I recognize and appreciate the need to reduce inventories to the lowest practical level, the 18-week supply contemplated by the DPSC may be insufficient in the event of a national emergency or mobilization and could impair the viability of our producers. Moreover, in view of the fact that 90 percent of the footwear in the United States is imported, the Department of Defense has recognized the importance of preserving the small industrial base represented by the MBMA.

The January 30, 1996, response we received from Brig. Gen. Carl H. Freeman of the DPSC, confirmed the statistics cited in our letter but asserted that ''DPSC is no longer authorized to carry mobilization stocks, only to maintain safety levels.'' According to the DPSC, due to the need to prioritize limited funding and to comply with a September 5, 1991, Department of Defense comptroller decision which requires DPSC to reduce mobilization stocks to ''safety levels,'' DPSC plans to continue purchasing reduced numbers of boots over the next 3 years unless it receives additional funding specified for boots and an authorization to carry additional inventory.

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to bring to the committee's attention an innovative distribution plan for combat boots which the MBMA members recently proposed to the DPSC. Under the plan, boots would be shipped by contractors directly to recruit induction centers and other boot consumers, bypassing the present Government depots and saving the Government freight and administrative costs. Each contractor would provide quick response shipment upon receipt of Government delivery orders transmitted via electronic data interchange [EDI]. The plan is consistent with the DLA's goal of lowering costs and improving customer service through director vendor delivery [DVD] and EDI. Inventories would be reduced at a rate of 15 percent of consumption per year rather than the more drastic reduction in inventory contemplated by DPSC. I hope that the committee will encourage the DLA to give careful consideration to the plan as a means of ensuring an adequate supply of combat boots in the event of a national emergency or mobilization and preserving a fragile industrial base.

Thank you Mr. Chairman and I look forward to working with you and the DLA on this crucial matter.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

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

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

H.R. 3230

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997''.

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

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

(1) Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations.

(2) Division B—Military Construction Authorizations.

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

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

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES DEFINED.

For purposes of this Act, the term ''congressional defense committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on National Security and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 101. ARMY.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for procurement for the Army as follows:

(1) For aircraft, $1,556,615,000.
(2) For missiles, $1,027,829,000.
(3) For weapons and tracked combat vehicles, $1,334,814,000.
(4) For ammunition, $1,160,728,000.
(5) For other procurement, $2,812,240,000.

SEC. 102. NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

(a) NAVY.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for procurement for the Navy as follows:
(1) For aircraft, $6,668,952,000.
(2) For weapons, including missiles and torpedoes, $1,305,308,000.
(3) For shipbuilding and conversion, $5,479,930,000.
(4) For other procurement, $2,871,495,000.
(b) MARINE CORPS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for procurement for the Marine Corps in the amount of $546,748,000.
(c) NAVY AND MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for procurement of ammunition for Navy and the Marine Corps in the amount of $599,239,000.

SEC. 103. AIR FORCE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for procurement for the Air Force as follows:
(1) For aircraft, $7,271,928,000.
(2) For missiles, $4,341,178,000.
(3) For ammunition, $303,899,000.
(4) For other procurement, $6,117,419,000.

SEC. 104. DEFENSE-WIDE ACTIVITIES.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for Defense-wide procurement in the amount of $1,890,212,000.

SEC. 105. RESERVE COMPONENTS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for procurement of aircraft, vehicles, communications equipment, and other equipment for the reserve components of the Armed Forces as follows:
(1) For the Army National Guard, $118,000,000.
(2) For the Air National Guard, $158,000,000.
(3) For the Army Reserve, $106,000,000.
(4) For the Naval Reserve, $192,000,000.
(5) For the Air Force Reserve, $148,000,000.
(6) For the Marine Corps Reserve, $83,000,000.

SEC. 106. DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for procurement for the Inspector General of the Department of Defense in the amount of $2,000,000.

SEC. 107. CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 the amount of $799,847,000 for—
(1) the destruction of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521); and
(2) the destruction of chemical warfare materiel of the United States that is not covered by section 1412 of such Act.

SEC. 108. DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAMS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for the Department of Defense for procurement for carrying out health care programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Defense in the total amount of $269,470,000.

Subtitle B—Army Programs

SEC. 111. REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN AIRCRAFT.

(a) APACHE HELICOPTERS.—Section 132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1383) is repealed.
(b) OH–58D ARMED KIOWA WARRIOR HELICOPTERS.—Section 133 the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1383) is repealed.

SEC. 112. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR ARMY PROGRAMS.

(a) AVENGER AIR DEFENSE MISSILE SYSTEM.—Notwithstanding the limitation in subsection (k) of section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, relating to the maximum duration of a multiyear contract under the authority of that section, the Secretary of the Army may extend the multiyear contract in effect during fiscal year 1996 for the Avenger Air Defense Missile system through fiscal year 1997 and may award such an extension.
(b) ARMY TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM.—The Secretary of the Army may, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, enter into a multiyear procurement contract, beginning with the fiscal year 1997 program year, for procurement of the Army Tactical Missile System (Army TACMS).

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

SEC. 121. NUCLEAR ATTACK SUBMARINE PROGRAMS.

(a) AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED FROM SCN ACCOUNT.—Of the amount authorized by section 102 to be appropriated for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, for fiscal year 1997—
(1) $699,071,000 is available for continued construction of the third vessel (designated SSN–23) in the Seawolf attack submarine class, which shall be the final vessel in that class;
(2) $296,186,000 is available for long-lead and advance construction and procurement of components for construction of a submarine (previously designated by the Navy as the New Attack Submarine) beginning in fiscal year 1998 to be built by Electric Boat Division; and
(3) $504,000,000 is available for long-lead and advance construction and procurement of components for construction of a second submarine (previously designated by the Navy as the New Attack Submarine) beginning in fiscal year 1999 to be built by Newport News Shipbuilding.
(b) AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED FROM NAVY RDT&E ACCOUNT.—(1) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201 for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy, $489,443,000 is available for the design of the submarine previously designated by the Navy as the New Attack Submarine. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure under contracts with Electric Boat Division and Newport News Shipbuilding to carry out the provisions of the ''Memorandum of Agreement Among the Department of the Navy, Electric Boat Corporation (EB) and Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company (NNS) Concerning the New Attack Submarine'', dated April 5, 1996, relating to design data transfer, design improvements, integrated process teams, updated design base, and other research and development initiatives related to the design of such submarine.
(2)(A) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2), $60,000,000 is available to address the inclusion on future nuclear attack submarines of the specific advanced technologies that are identified by the Secretary of Defense (in the report of the Secretary entitled ''Report on Nuclear Attack Submarine Procurement and Submarine Technology'', submitted to Congress on March 26, 1996) as those technologies the maturation of which the Submarine Technology Assessment Panel recommended be addressed in its March 15, 1996, final report to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition, as follows: hydrodynamics, alternative sail designs, advanced arrays, electric drive, external weapons and active controls and mounts.
(B) Of the amount referred to in subparagraph (A), $20,000,000 shall be equally divided between the two shipyards for the purpose of ensuring that the shipyards are principal participants in the process of addressing the inclusion of technologies referred to in subparagraph (A). The Secretary of the Navy shall ensure that those shipyards have access for such purpose (under procedures prescribed by the Secretary) to the Navy laboratories and the Office of Naval Intelligence and (in accordance with arrangements to be made by the Secretary) to the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.
(3) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2), $38,000,000 is available to begin funding those Category I and Category II advanced technologies described in Appendix C of the report of the Secretary of Defense referred to in paragraph (2).
(4) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2), $40,000,000 is available to provide funds for the design improvements in accordance with subsection (f), to be equally divided between the two shipyards.
(5)(A) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2), $50,000,000 is available to initiate the design of a new, next-generation nuclear attack submarine, the design of which is not intended to be an outgrowth of the submarine program described in section 131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 208). Those funds shall be equally divided between the two shipyards and shall provide alternatives to the design or designs to be derived in accordance with subsection (f). The Secretary of the Navy shall compete those alternative designs with the design or designs to be derived in accordance with subsection (f) for serial production beginning not earlier than fiscal year 2003.
(B) The design under subparagraph (A) should proceed from, but not be limited to, the technology specified in paragraph (2)(A), especially with respect to hydrodynamics concepts and technologies. The Secretary shall require the two shipyards to submit to the Secretary an annual report on the progress of the design work under subparagraph (A) and shall transmit each such report to the committees specified in subsection (d)(1).
(c) CONTRACTS AUTHORIZED.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, using funds available pursuant to paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a), to enter into contracts with Electric Boat Division and Newport News Shipbuilding, and suppliers of components, during fiscal year 1997 for—
(A) the procurement of long-lead components for the fiscal year 1998 submarine and the fiscal year 1999 submarine under this section; and
(B) advance construction of such components and other components for such submarines.
(2) The Secretary may enter into a contract or contracts under this section with the shipbuilder of the fiscal year 1998 submarine only if the Secretary enters into a contract or contracts under this section with the shipbuilder of the fiscal year 1999 submarine.
(d) LIMITATIONS.—(1) Of the amounts specified in subsection (a), not more than $50,000,000 may be obligated until the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives that procurement of nuclear attack submarines to be constructed after four submarines are procured as provided for in the plan described in section 131(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996 will be under one or more contracts that are entered into after competition between Electric Boat Division and Newport News Shipbuilding in which the Secretary of the Navy solicits competitive proposals and awards the contract or contracts on the basis of best value to the Government.
(2) Of the amounts specified in subsection (a), not more than $50,000,000 may be obligated until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology submits to the congressional committees specified in paragraph (1) a report in writing detailing the following:
(A) The Under Secretary's oversight activities to date, and plans for the future, for the development and improvement of the nuclear attack submarine program of the Navy as required by section 131(b)(2)(C) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996.
(B) The implementation of, and activities conducted under, the program required to be established by the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency by section 131(i) of

the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 for the development and demonstration of advanced submarine technologies and a rapid prototype acquisition strategy for both land-based and at-sea subsystem and system demonstrations of such technologies.

(C) A description of all research, development, test, and evaluation programs, projects, or activities within the Department of Defense which are designed to or which could, in the opinion of the Under Secretary, contribute to the development and demonstration of advanced submarine technologies leading to a more capable, more affordable nuclear attack submarine, specifically identifying ongoing involvement, and plans for future involvement, in any such program, project or activity by either Electric Boat Division, Newport News Shipbuilding, or both.

(3) Of the amount specified in subsection (b)(1), not more than $50,000,000 may be obligated or expended until the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) certifies in writing to the congressional committees specified in paragraph (1) that the Department has complied with section 132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 and that the funds specified in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (b), have been obligated.

(e) ACQUISITION SIMPLIFICATION.—(1) In furtherance of the direction provided by subsection (d) of section 131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 to the Secretary of Defense regarding the application of acquisition reform policies and procedures to the submarine program under that section, the Secretary shall direct the Secretary of the Navy to implement for the submarine programs of the Navy the acquisition reform initiatives begun by the Secretary of the Air Force in May 1995 referred to as the ''Lightning Bolt'' initiatives. The Secretary of the Navy shall, not later than March 31, 1997, submit to the congressional committees specified in subsection (d)(1) a report on the results of the implementation of such initiatives.

(f) DESIGN RESPONSIBILITY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy shall carry out the submarine program described in section 131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 in a manner that ensures that neither of the two shipyards has the lead responsibility for submarine design under the program. Each of the two shipyards involved in the design and construction of the four submarines described in that section shall be allowed to propose to the Secretary any design improvement that shipyard considers appropriate for the submarines to be built at that shipyard as part of those four submarines. Control of the configuration of each of the four submarines shall be separately maintained, and there shall be no single design to compete for serial production with those designs derived from the design work under subsection (b)(5), such competition to occur not earlier than fiscal year 2003.

(2) The Secretary of the Navy shall submit an annual report to the committees specified in subsection (d)(1) on the design improvements proposed by the two shipyards under paragraph (1) for incorporation on any of the four submarines using the funds specified in subsection (b)(4). Each annual report shall set forth each design improvement proposed and whether that proposal was—

(A) reviewed, approved, and funded by the Navy;

(B) reviewed and approved, but not funded; or

(C) not approved, in which case the report shall include the reasons therefor and any views of the shipyard making the proposal.

SEC. 122. COST LIMITATIONS FOR SEAWOLF SUBMARINE PROGRAM.

(a) FIRST TWO SUBMARINES.—The total amount obligated or expended for procurement of the first two Seawolf-class submarines (designated as SSN–21 and SSN–22) may not exceed $4,793,557,000.

(b) THIRD SUBMARINE.—The total amount obligated or expended for procurement of the third Seawolf-class submarine (designated as SSN–23) may not exceed $2,430,102,000.

(c) AUTOMATIC INCREASE IN SSN–21 AND SSN–22 LIMITATION AMOUNT.—The amount of the limitation set forth in subsection (a) is increased by the following amounts:

(1) The amounts of outfitting costs and post-delivery costs incurred for the submarines referred to in that subsection.

(2) The amounts of increases in costs for those submarines attributable to economic inflation after September 30, 1995.

(3) The amounts of increases in costs for those submarines attributable to compliance with changes in Federal, State, or local laws enacted after September 30, 1995.

(d) AUTOMATIC INCREASE IN SSN–23 LIMITATION AMOUNT.—The amount of the limitation set forth in subsection (b) is increased by the following amounts:

(1) The amounts of outfitting costs and post-delivery costs incurred for the submarine referred to in that subsection.

(2) The amounts of increases in costs for that submarine attributable to economic inflation after September 30, 1995.

(3) The amounts of increases in costs for that submarine attributable to compliance with changes in Federal, State, or local laws enacted after September 30, 1995.

(e) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED PROVISION.—Section 133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 211) is repealed.

SEC. 123. PULSE DOPPLER RADAR MODIFICATION.

The Secretary of the Navy shall, to the extent specifically provided in an appropriations Act enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act, spend $29,000,000 solely for development and procurement of the Pulse Doppler Upgrade modification to the AN/SPS–48E radar system, to be derived by the Secretary from amounts appropriated for Other Procurement, Navy, for fiscal years before fiscal year 1997 that are unobligated and remain available for obligation.

SEC. 124. REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF VESSELS EXCLUDED FROM LIMIT ON PURCHASE OF VESSELS BUILT IN FOREIGN SHIPYARDS.

Section 1023 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 2838) is amended by striking out ''three ships'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''one ship''.

SEC. 125. T–39N TRAINER AIRCRAFT FOR THE NAVY.

(a) PROCUREMENT.—The Secretary of the Navy shall, using funds appropriated for fiscal year 1996 for procurement of T–39N trainer aircraft for the Navy that remain available for obligation for such purpose, enter into a contract only for the acquisition of not less than 17 T–39N aircraft for naval flight officer training that are suitable for low-level training flights. The Secretary shall use procurement procedures authorized under section 2304(c) of title 10, United States Code, for a contract under subsection (a). The Secretary shall enter into such a contract not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Subsection (a) of section 137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 212) is repealed.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

SEC. 141. REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON PROCUREMENT OF F–15E AIRCRAFT.

Section 134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1383) is repealed.

SEC. 142. C–17 AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT.

The Secretary of the Air Force may, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, enter into a multiyear contract under the C–17 aircraft program for the procurement of a total of not more than 80 aircraft. Such a contract may (notwithstanding subsection (k) of such section 2306b) be entered into for a period of six program years, beginning with fiscal year 1997.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for the use of the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation as follows:

(1) For the Army, $4,669,979,000.

(2) For the Navy, $8,189,957,000.

(3) For the Air Force, $13,271,087,000.

(4) For Defense-wide activities, $9,406,377,000, of which—

(A) $252,038,000 is authorized for the activities of the Director, Test and Evaluation; and

(B) $21,968,000 is authorized for the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation.

SEC. 202. AMOUNT FOR BASIC AND APPLIED RESEARCH.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 1997.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 201, $4,088,043,000 shall be available for basic research and applied research projects.

(b) BASIC RESEARCH AND APPLIED RESEARCH DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ''basic research and applied research'' means work funded in program elements for defense research and development under Department of Defense category 6.1 or 6.2.

SEC. 203. DUAL-USE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.

(a) DESIGNATION OF OFFICIAL FOR DUAL-USE PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of Defense shall designate a senior official in the Office of the Secretary of Defense whose sole responsibility is developing policy relating to, and ensuring effective implementation of, dual-use programs and the integration of commercial technologies into current and future military systems for the period beginning on October 1, 1996, and ending on September 30, 2000. Such official shall report directly to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology.

(b) FUNDING REQUIREMENT.—Of the amounts appropriated for the Department of Defense for science and technology programs for each of fiscal years 1997 through 2000, at least the following percentages of such amounts shall be available in the applicable fiscal year only for dual-use programs of the Department of Defense:

(1) For fiscal year 1997, five percent.

(2) For fiscal year 1998, seven percent.

(3) For fiscal year 1999, 10 percent.

(4) For fiscal year 2000, 15 percent.

(c) LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), funds made available pursuant to subsection (b) may not be obligated until the senior official designated under subsection (a) approves the obligation.

(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to funds made available pursuant to subsection (b) to the Department of the Air Force or to the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

(d) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may transfer funds made available pursuant to subsection (b) for a dual-use program from a military department or defense agency to another military department or defense agency to ensure efficient implementation of the program. The Secretary may delegate the authority provided in the preceding sentence to the senior official designated under subsection (a).

(e) FEDERAL COST SHARE.—(1) The share contributed by the Secretary of a military department for the cost of a dual-use program during the fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000 may not be greater than 50 percent.

(2) In calculating the share of the costs of a dual-use program contributed by a military department or a non-Government entity, the Secretaries of the military departments may not consider in-kind contributions.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''dual-use program'' means a program of a military department—

(A) under which research or development of a dual-use technology (as defined in section 2491 of title 10, United States Code) is carried out; and

(B) the costs of which are shared between the Department of Defense and non-Government entities.

(2) The term ''science and technology program'' means a program of a military department under which basic research, applied research, or advanced technology development is carried out.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

SEC. 211. SPACE LAUNCH MODERNIZATION.

(a) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization in section 201(3), $50,000,000 shall be available for a competitive reusable launch vehicle technology program (PE 63401F).

(b) LIMITATION.—Funds made available pursuant to subsection (a)(1) may be obligated only to the extent that the fiscal year 1997 current operating plan of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration allocates at least an equal amount for its Reusable Space Launch Vehicle program.

SEC. 212. LIVE-FIRE SURVIVABILITY TESTING OF V–22 AIRCRAFT.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR RETROACTIVE WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may exercise the waiver authority in section 2366(c) of title 10, United States Code, with respect to the application of survivability testing to the V–22 aircraft system, notwithstanding that such system has entered engineering and manufacturing development.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—In exercising the waiver authority in section 2366(c), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report explaining how the Secretary plans to evaluate the survivability of the V–22 aircraft system and assessing possible alternatives to realistic survivability testing of the system.

(c) ALTERNATIVE SURVIVABILITY TESTING REQUIREMENTS.—If the Secretary of Defense submits a certification under section 2366(c)(2) of such title that live-fire testing of the V–22 aircraft system under such section would be unreasonably expensive and impractical, the Secretary shall require that sufficiently large and realistic components and subsystems that could affect the survivability of the V–22 aircraft system be made available for any alternative live-fire testing of such system.

(d) FUNDING.—The funds required to carry out any alternative live-fire testing of the V–22 aircraft system shall be made available from amounts appropriated for the V–22 program.

SEC. 213. LIVE-FIRE SURVIVABILITY TESTING OF F–22 AIRCRAFT.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR RETROACTIVE WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may exercise the waiver authority in section 2366(c) of title 10, United States Code, with respect to the application of survivability testing to the F–22 aircraft system, notwithstanding that such system has entered engineering and manufacturing development.

(b) ALTERNATIVE SURVIVABILITY TESTING REQUIREMENTS.—If the Secretary of Defense submits a certification under section 2366(c)(2) of such title that live-fire testing of the F–22 aircraft system under such section would be unreasonably expensive and impractical, the Secretary of Defense shall require that sufficiently large and realistic components and subsystems that could affect the survivability of the F–22 aircraft system be made available for any alternative live-fire testing of such system.

(c) FUNDING.—The funds required to carry out any alternative live-fire testing of the F–22 aircraft system shall be made available from amounts appropriated for the F–22 program.

SEC. 214. DEMILITARIZATION OF CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS, ROCKETS, AND EXPLOSIVES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS, ROCKETS, AND EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish an integrated program for the development and demonstration of technologies for the demilitarization and disposal of conventional munitions, rockets, and explosives in a manner that complies with applicable environmental laws.

(b) DURATION OF PROGRAM.—The program established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be in effect for a period of at least five years, beginning with fiscal year 1997.

(c) FUNDING.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201, $15,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the program established pursuant to subsection (a). The funding request for the program shall be set forth separately in the budget justification documents for the budget of the Department of Defense for each fiscal year during which the program is in effect.

(d) REPORTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the plan for the program established pursuant to subsection (a) at the same time the President submits to Congress the budget for fiscal year 1998. The Secretary shall submit an updated version of such report, setting forth in detail the progress of the program, at the same time the President submits the budget for each fiscal year after fiscal year 1998 during which the program is in effect.

SEC. 215. RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OF THE DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY RELATING TO CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 1701(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 107 Stat. 1853; 50 U.S.C. 1522) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''The Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency may conduct a program of basic and applied research and advanced technology development on chemical and biological warfare defense technologies and systems. In conducting such program, the Director shall seek to avoid unnecessary duplication of the activities under the program with chemical and biological warfare defense activities of the military departments and defense agencies and shall coordinate the activities under the program with those of the military departments and defense agencies.''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 1701(d) of such Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking out ''military departments'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''Department of Defense'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting after ''requests for the program'' in the first sentence the following: ''(other than for activities under the program conducted by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency under subsection (c)(2))'';

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

''(3) The program conducted by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency under subsection (c)(2) shall be set forth as a separate program element in the budget of that agency.''.

SEC. 216. LIMITATION ON FUNDING FOR F–16 TACTICAL MANNED RECONNAISSANCE AIRCRAFT.

(a) LIMITATION.—Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, not more than $50,000,000 (in fiscal year 1997 constant dollars) may be obligated or expended for—

(1) research, development, test, and evaluation for, and acquisition and modification of, the F–16 tactical manned reconnaissance aircraft program; and

(2) costs associated with the termination of such program.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to obligations required for improvements planned before the date of the enactment of this Act to incorporate the common data link into the F–16 tactical manned reconnaissance aircraft.

SEC. 217. UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may not enter into a contract for the Joint Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle project, and no funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated for such project, until a period of 30 days has expired after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress a certification that the reconnaissance programs of the Department of Defense—

(A) are justified on the basis of the projected national security threat;

(B) have been subjected to a roles and missions determination;

(C) are supported by an overall national, joint, and tactical reconnaissance plan;

(D) are affordable within the budget of the Department of Defense as projected by the future-years defense program; and

(E) are fully programmed for in the future-years defense program.

(2) In this subsection, the term 'reconnaissance programs of the Department of Defense' means programs for tactical unmanned aerial vehicles, endurance unmanned aerial vehicles, airborne reconnaissance, manned reconnaissance, and distributed common ground systems that—

(A) are described in the budget justification documents of the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office;

(B) are included in the funding request for the Department of Defense; or

(C) are certified as acquisition reconnaissance requirements by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council for the future-years defense program.

(b) PROCUREMENT FUNDING REQUEST.—The funding request for procurement for unmanned aerial vehicles for any fiscal year shall be set forth under the funding requests for the military departments in the budget of the Department of Defense.

(c) TRANSFER OF PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.—Program management for the Predator Unmanned Aerial Vehicle, and programmed funding for such vehicle for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 (as set forth in the future-years defense program), shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force, effective October 1, 1996, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

(d) PROHIBITION ON PROVIDING OPERATING CAPABILITY FROM NAVAL VESSELS.—No funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated for purposes of providing the capability of the Predator Unmanned Aerial Vehicle to operate from naval vessels.

(e) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 201 for program element 35154D, $10,000,000 shall be available only for an advanced concepts technology demonstration of air-to-surface precision guided munitions employment using a Predator, Hunter, or Pioneer unmanned aerial vehicle and a nondevelopmental laser target designator.

SEC. 218. HYDRA–70 ROCKET PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) FUNDING AUTHORIZATION.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 201(1) for the Army for Other Missile Product Improvement Programs, $15,000,000 is authorized as specified in subsection (b) for completion of the Hydra–70 product improvement program authorized for fiscal year 1996.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIONS.—Funding is authorized to be appropriated for the following:

(1) Procurement for test and flight qualification of at least one nondevelopmental item 2.75-inch composite rocket motor type, along with other nondevelopmental item candidate motors

that use composite propellent as the propulsion component and that have passed initial insensitive munition criteria tests.

(2) Platform integration, including additional quantities of the motor chosen for operational certification on the Apache attack helicopter.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''nondevelopmental item'' has the meaning provided in section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403) and also includes an item the flight capability of which has been demonstrated from a current Hydra–70 rocket launcher.

SEC. 219. SPACE-BASED INFRARED SYSTEM PROGRAM.

(a) FUNDING.—Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 201(3) are authorized to be made available for the Space-Based Infrared System program for purposes and in amounts as follows:

(1) For Space Segment High, $180,390,000.

(2) For Space Segment Low (the Space and Missile Tracking System), $247,221,000.

(3) For Cobra Brass, $6,930,000.

(b) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized under subsection (a) to be made available for the Space-Based Infrared System program may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that the requirements of section 216(a) of Public Law 104–106 (110 Stat. 220) have been carried out.

(c) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.—Before the submission of the President's budget for fiscal year 1998, the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review of the appropriate management responsibilities for the Space and Missile Tracking System, including whether transferring such management responsibility from the Air Force to the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization would result in improved program efficiencies and support.

SEC. 220. JOINT ADVANCED STRIKE TECHNOLOGY (JAST) PROGRAM.

(a) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to the authorizations in section 201, $589,069,000 shall be available only for advanced technology development for the Joint Advanced Strike Technology (JAST) program. Of that amount—

(1) $246,833,000 shall be available only for program element 63800N in the budget of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1997;

(2) $263,836,000 shall be available only for program element 63800F in the budget of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1997; and

(3) $78,400,000 shall be available only for program element 63800E in the budget of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1997.

(b) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to the authorizations in section 201 may be used for Advanced Short Takeoff and Vertical Landing aircraft development.

(c) FORCE STRUCTURE ANALYSIS.—Of the amount made available under subsection (a), up to $10,000,000 shall be available for the conduct of an analysis by the Institutes of Defense Analysis of the following:

(1) The weapons systems force structure requirements to meet the projected threat for the period beginning on January 1, 2000, and ending on December 31, 2025.

(2) Alternative force structures, including, at a minimum, JAST derivative aircraft; remanufactured AV–8 aircraft; F–18C/D, F–18E/F, AH–64, AH–1W, F–14, F–16, F–15, F–117, and F–22 aircraft; and air-to-surface and surface-to-surface weapons systems.

(3) Affordability, effectiveness, commonality, and roles and missions alternatives related to the alternative force structures analyzed under paragraph (2).

(d) COST REVIEW.—The cost analysis and improvement group of the Office of the Secretary of Defense shall review cost estimates made under the analysis conducted under subsection (c) and shall provide a sensitivity analysis for the alternatives evaluated under paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c).

(e) DEADLINE.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a copy of the analysis conducted under subsection (c) and the review conducted under subsection (d) not later than February 1, 1997.

SEC. 221. JOINT UNITED STATES-ISRAELI NAUTILUS LASER/THEATER HIGH ENERGY LASER PROGRAM.

The Congress strongly supports the Joint United States-Israeli Nautilus Laser/Theater High Energy Laser programs and encourages the Secretary of Defense to request authorization to develop these programs as agreed to on April 28, 1996, in the statement of intent signed by the Secretary of Defense and the Prime Minister of the State of Israel.

SEC. 222. NONLETHAL WEAPONS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 201 for program element 63640M, $3,000,000 shall be available for the Nonlethal Weapons Research and Development Program.

Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense Programs

SEC. 231. FUNDING FOR BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.

Of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 201(4), not more than $3,258,982,000 may be obligated for programs managed by the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization.

SEC 232. CERTIFICATION OF CAPABILITY OF UNITED STATES TO DEFEND AGAINST SINGLE BALLISTIC MISSILE.

Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a certification in writing stating specifically whether or not the United States has the military capability (as of the time of the certification) to intercept and destroy a single ballistic missile launched at the territory of the United States.

SEC. 233. POLICY ON COMPLIANCE WITH THE ABM TREATY.

(a) POLICY CONCERNING SYSTEMS SUBJECT TO ABM TREATY.—Congress finds that, unless and until a missile defense system, system upgrade, or system component is flight tested in an ABM-qualifying flight test (as defined in subsection (c)), such system, system upgrade, or system component—

(1) has not, for purposes of the ABM Treaty, been tested in an ABM mode nor been given capabilities to counter strategic ballistic missiles; and

(2) therefore is not subject to any application, limitation, or obligation under the ABM Treaty.

(b) PROHIBITIONS.—(1) Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense may not be obligated or expended for the purpose of—

(A) prescribing, enforcing, or implementing any Executive order, regulation, or policy that would apply the ABM Treaty (or any limitation or obligation under such Treaty) to research, development, testing, or deployment of a theater missile defense system, a theater missile defense system upgrade, or a theater missile defense system component; or

(B) taking any other action to provide for the ABM Treaty (or any limitation or obligation under such Treaty) to be applied to research, development, testing, or deployment of a theater missile defense system, a theater missile defense system upgrade, or a theater missile defense system component.

(2) This subsection applies with respect to each missile defense system, missile defense system upgrade, or missile defense system component that is capable of countering modern theater ballistic missiles.

(3) This subsection shall cease to apply with respect to a missile defense system, missile defense system upgrade, or missile defense system component when that system, system upgrade, or system component has been flight tested in an ABM-qualifying flight test.

(c) ABM-QUALIFYING FLIGHT TEST DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, an ABM-qualifying flight test is a flight test against a ballistic missile which, in that flight test, exceeds (1) a range of 3,500 kilometers, or (2) a velocity of 5 kilometers per second.

SEC. 234. REQUIREMENT THAT MULTILATERALIZATION OF THE ABM TREATY BE DONE ONLY THROUGH TREATY-MAKING POWER.

Any addition of a new signatory party to the ABM Treaty (in addition to the United States and the Russian Federation) constitutes an amendment to the treaty that can only be agreed to by the United States through the treaty-making power of the United States. No funds appropriated or otherwise available for any fiscal year may be obligated or expended for the purpose of implementing or making binding upon the United States the participation of any additional nation as a party to the ABM Treaty unless that nation is made a party to the treaty by an amendment to the Treaty that is made in the same manner as the manner by which a treaty is made.

SEC. 235. REPORT ON BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE AND PROLIFERATION.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on ballistic missile defense and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, and the missiles that can be used to deliver them. The report shall be submitted not later than December 31, 1996, and shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of how United States theater missile defenses contribute to United States efforts to prevent proliferation, including an evaluation of the specific effect United States theater missile defense systems can have on dissuading other states from acquiring ballistic missiles.

(2) An assessment of how United States national missile defenses contribute to United States efforts to prevent proliferation.

(3) An assessment of the effect of the lack of national missile defenses on the desire of other states to acquire ballistic missiles and an evaluation of the types of missiles other states might seek to acquire as a result.

(4) A detailed review of the linkages between missile defenses (both theater and national) and each of the categories of counterproliferation activities identified by the Secretary of Defense as part of the Defense Counterproliferation Initiative announced by the Secretary in December 1993.

(5) A description of how theater and national ballistic missile defenses can augment the effectiveness of other counterproliferation tools.

SEC. 236. REVISION TO ANNUAL REPORT ON BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM.

Section 224(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (10 U.S.C. 2431 note) is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraphs (3), (4), and (10);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (5) and in that paragraph by striking out ''of the Soviet Union'' and ''for the Soviet Union'';

(4) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (6); and

(5) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (7) and in that paragraph—

(A) by striking out ''of the Soviet Union'' in subparagraph (A);

(B) by striking out subparagraphs (C) through (F); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (C).

SEC. 237. ABM TREATY DEFINED.

For purposes of this subtitle, the term ''ABM Treaty'' means the Treaty Between the United

States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, and signed at Moscow on May 26, 1972, and includes the Protocols to that Treaty, signed at Moscow on July 3, 1974.

SEC. 238. CAPABILITY OF NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM.

The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that any National Missile Defense system deployed by the United States is capable of defeating the threat posed by the Taepo Dong II missile of North Korea.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 241. UNIFORM PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR AT AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS.

The Secretary of the Air Force shall apply uniform procedures and criteria to allocate funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this title and title III of this Act for maintenance and repair of real property at military installations of the Department of the Air Force.

SEC. 242. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH PROGRAM.

(a) MANAGEMENT AND EXECUTION BY PROGRAM MANAGER.—The Secretary of Defense, in conducting within the Department of Defense the Small Business Innovation Research Program (as defined by section 2491(13) of title 10, United States Code), shall ensure that the Program is managed and executed, for each program element for research and development for which $20,000,000 or more is authorized for a fiscal year, by the program manager for that element.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than March 30, 1997, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress and to the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth an assessment of whether there has been a demonstrable reduction in the quality of research performed under funding agreements awarded by the Department of Defense under the Small Business Innovation Research Program since fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 243. EXTENSION OF DEADLINE FOR DELIVERY OF ENHANCED FIBER OPTIC GUIDED MISSILE (EFOG–M) SYSTEM.

Section 272(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 239) is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1998,'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1999,''.

SEC. 244. AMENDMENT TO UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVE SUPPORT PROGRAM.

Section 802(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 107 Stat. 1701; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note) is amended by striking out ''fiscal years before the fiscal year in which the institution submits a proposal'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''most recent fiscal years for which complete statistics are available when proposals are requested''.

SEC. 245. AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESEARCH.

Section 257(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 2705; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking out ''Director of the National Science Foundation'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology''; and

(B) by striking out ''and shall notify the Director of Defense Research and Engineering of the States so designated''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking out ''Director of the National Science Foundation'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology'';

(B) by striking out ''as determined by the Director'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''as determined by the Under Secretary'';

(C) in subparagraph (A), by striking out ''(to be determined in consultation with the Secretary of Defense);'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''; and'';

(D) by striking out ''; and'' at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(E) by striking out subparagraph (C).

SEC. 246. ELIMINATION OF REPORT ON THE USE OF COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES FOR THE AWARD OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

Section 2361 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (c).

SEC. 247. NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The oceans and coastal areas of the United States are among the Nation's most valuable natural resources, making substantial contributions to economic growth, quality of life, and national security.

(2) Oceans drive global and regional climate. Hence, they contain information affecting agriculture, fishing, and the prediction of severe weather.

(3) Understanding of the oceans through basic and applied research is essential for using the oceans wisely and protecting their limited resources. Therefore, the United States should maintain its world leadership in oceanography as one key to its competitive future.

(4) Ocean research and education activities take place within Federal agencies, academic institutions, and industry. These entities often have similar requirements for research facilities, data, and other resources (such as oceanographic research vessels).

(5) The need exists for a formal mechanism to coordinate existing partnerships and establish new partnerships for the sharing of resources, intellectual talent, and facilities in the ocean sciences and education, so that optimal use can be made of this most important natural resource for the well-being of all Americans.

(b) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—(1) Subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding after chapter 663 the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 665—NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

''§ 7901. National Oceanographic Partnership Program

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Navy shall establish a program to be known as the 'National Oceanographic Partnership Program'.

''(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the program are as follows:

''(1) To promote the national goals of assuring national security, advancing economic development, protecting quality of life, and strengthening science education and communication through improved knowledge of the ocean.

''(2) To coordinate and strengthen oceanographic efforts in support of those goals by—

''(A) identifying and carrying out partnerships among Federal agencies, academia, industry, and other members of the oceanographic scientific community in the areas of data, resources, education, and communication; and

''(B) reporting annually to Congress on the program.

''§ 7902. National Ocean Research Leadership Council

''(a) COUNCIL.—There is a National Ocean Research Leadership Council (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the 'Council').

''(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Council is composed of the following members:

''(1) The Secretary of the Navy, who shall be the Chairman of the Council.

''(2) The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, who shall be the Vice Chairman of the Council.

''(3) The Director of the National Science Foundation.

''(4) The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

''(5) The Deputy Secretary of Energy.

''(6) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

''(7) The Commandant of the Coast Guard.

''(8) The Director of the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior.

''(9) The Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

''(10) The Director of the Minerals Management Service of the Department of the Interior.

''(11) The President of the National Academy of Sciences, the President of the National Academy of Engineering, and the President of the Institute of Medicine.

''(12) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

''(13) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(14) One member appointed by the Chairman from among individuals who will represent the views of ocean industries.

''(15) One member appointed by the Chairman from among individuals who will represent the views of State governments.

''(16) One member appointed by the Chairman from among individuals who will represent the views of academia.

''(17) One member appointed by the Chairman from among individuals who will represent such other views as the Chairman considers appropriate.

''(c) TERM OF OFFICE.—The term of office of a member of the Council appointed under paragraph (14), (15), (16), or (17) of subsection (b) shall be two years, except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

''(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Council shall have the following responsibilities:

''(1) To establish the Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group as provided in section 7903.

''(2) To establish the Ocean Research Advisory Panel as provided in section 7904.

''(3) To submit to Congress an annual report pursuant to subsection (e).

''(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Council shall submit to Congress a report on the National Oceanographic Partnership Program. The report shall contain the following:

''(1) A description of activities of the program carried out during the fiscal year before the fiscal year in which the report is prepared. The description also shall include a list of the members of the Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group, the Ocean Research Advisory Panel, and any working groups in existence during the fiscal year covered.

''(2) A general outline of the activities planned for the program during the fiscal year in which the report is prepared.

''(3) A summary of projects continued from the fiscal year before the fiscal year in which the report is prepared and projects expected to be started during the fiscal year in which the report is prepared and during the following fiscal year.

''(4) A description of the involvement of the program with Federal interagency coordinating entities.

''(5) The amounts requested, in the budget submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31 for the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the report is prepared,

for the programs, projects, and activities of the program and the estimated expenditures under such programs, projects, and activities during such following fiscal year.

"§ 7903. Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Council shall establish an entity to be known as the 'Ocean Research Partnership Coordinating Group' (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the 'Coordinating Group').

''(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Coordinating Group shall consist of members appointed by the Council, with one member appointed from each Federal department or agency having an oceanographic research or development program.

''(c) CHAIRMAN.—The Council shall appoint the Chairman of the Coordinating Group.

''(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Council, the Coordinating Group shall have the following responsibilities:

''(1) To prescribe policies and procedures to implement the National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

''(2) To review, select, and identify and allocate funds for partnership projects for implementation under the program, based on the following criteria:

''(A) Whether the project addresses critical research objectives or operational goals, such as data accessibility and quality assurance, sharing of resources, education, or communication.

''(B) Whether the project has broad participation within the oceanographic community.

''(C) Whether the partners have a long-term commitment to the objectives of the project.

''(D) Whether the resources supporting the project are shared among the partners.

''(E) Whether the project has been subjected to adequate peer review.

''(3) To promote participation in partnership projects by each Federal department and agency involved with oceanographic research and development by publicizing the program and by prescribing guidelines for participation in the program.

''(4) To submit to the Council an annual report pursuant to subsection (i).

''(e) PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM OFFICE.—The Coordinating Group shall establish, using competitive procedures, and oversee a partnership program office to carry out such duties as the Chairman of the Coordinating Group considers appropriate to implement the National Oceanographic Partnership Program, including the following:

''(1) To establish and oversee working groups to propose partnership projects to the Coordinating Group and advise the Group on such projects.

''(2) To manage peer review of partnership projects proposed to the Coordinating Group and competitions for projects selected by the Group.

''(3) To submit to the Coordinating Group an annual report on the status of all partnership projects and activities of the office.

''(f) CONTRACT AND GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Coordinating Group may authorize one or more of the departments or agencies represented in the Group to enter into contracts and make grants, using funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization for the National Oceanographic Partnership Program, for the purpose of implementing the program and carrying out the Coordinating Group's responsibilities.

''(g) FORMS OF PARTNERSHIP PROJECTS.—Partnership projects selected by the Coordinating Group may be in any form that the Coordinating Group considers appropriate, including memoranda of understanding, demonstration projects, cooperative research and development agreements, and similar instruments.

''(h) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the Coordinating Group shall submit to the Council a report on the National Oceanographic Partnership Program. The report shall contain, at a minimum, copies of any recommendations or reports to the Coordinating Group by the Ocean Research Advisory Panel.

"§ 7904. Ocean Research Advisory Panel

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Council shall appoint an Ocean Research Advisory Panel (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the 'Advisory Panel') consisting of not less than 10 and not more than 18 members.

''(b) MEMBERSHIP.—Members of the Advisory Panel shall be appointed from among persons who are eminent in the fields of marine science or marine policy, or related fields, and who are representative, at a minimum, of the interests of government, academia, and industry.

''(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—(1) The Coordinating Group shall refer to the Advisory Panel, and the Advisory Panel shall review, each proposed partnership project estimated to cost more than $500,000. The Advisory Panel shall make any recommendations to the Coordinating Group that the Advisory Panel considers appropriate regarding such projects.

''(2) The Advisory Panel shall make any recommendations to the Coordinating Group regarding activities that should be addressed by the National Oceanographic Partnership Program that the Advisory Panel considers appropriate.''.

(2) The tables of chapters at the beginning of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, and at the beginning of part IV of such subtitle, are each amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 663 the following:

"665. National Oceanographic Partnership Program ..... 7901".

(c) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS.—The Secretary of the Navy shall make the appointments required by section 7902(b) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (b)(1), not later than December 1, 1996.

(d) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS OF ADVISORY PANEL MEMBERS.—The National Ocean Research Leadership Council established by section 7902 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (b)(1), shall make the appointments required by section 7904 of such title not later than January 1, 1997.

(e) FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL OCEAN RESEARCH LEADERSHIP COUNCIL.—The first annual report required by section 7902(e) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (b)(1), shall be submitted to Congress not later than March 1, 1997. The first report shall include, in addition to the information required by such section, information about the terms of office, procedures, and responsibilities of the Ocean Research Advisory Panel established by the Council.

(f) AUTHORIZATION.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense in section 201, $30,000,000 is authorized for the National Oceanographic Partnership Program established pursuant to section 7901 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (b)(1).

(g) REQUIRED FUNDING FOR PROGRAM OFFICE.—Of the amount appropriated for the National Oceanographic Partnership Program for fiscal year 1997, at least $500,000, or 3 percent of the amount appropriated, whichever is greater, shall be available for operations of the partnership program office established pursuant to section 7903(e) of title 10, United States Code, for such fiscal year.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDING.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, in amounts as follows:

(1) For the Army, $18,436,929,000.

(2) For the Navy, $20,433,797,000.

(3) For the Marine Corps, $2,524,677,000.

(4) For the Air Force, $17,982,955,000.

(5) For Defense-wide activities, $10,375,368,000.

(6) For the Army Reserve, $1,155,436,000.

(7) For the Naval Reserve, $858,927,000.

(8) For the Marine Corps Reserve, $106,467,000.

(9) For the Air Force Reserve, $1,504,553,000.

(10) For the Army National Guard, $2,297,477,000.

(11) For the Air National Guard, $2,688,473,000.

(12) For the Defense Inspector General, $136,501,000.

(13) For the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, $6,797,000.

(14) For Environmental Restoration, Defense, $1,333,016,000.

(15) For Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense-wide, $682,724,000.

(16) For Medical Programs, Defense, $9,831,288,000.

(17) For Cooperative Threat Reduction programs, $302,900,000.

(18) For Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs, $60,544,000.

(19) For payment to Kaho'olawe Island, $10,000,000.

SEC. 302. WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working capital and revolving funds in amounts as follows:

(1) For the Defense Business Operations Fund, $947,900,000.

(2) For the National Defense Sealift Fund, $1,123,002,000.

SEC. 303. ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund the sum of $57,300,000 for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, including the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home and the Naval Home.

SEC. 304. TRANSFER FROM NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE TRANSACTION FUND.

(a) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—To the extent provided in appropriations Acts, not more than $250,000,000 is authorized to be transferred from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund to operation and maintenance accounts for fiscal year 1997 in amounts as follows:

(1) For the Army, $83,334,000.

(2) For the Navy, $83,333,000.

(3) For the Air Force, $83,333,000.

(b) TREATMENT OF TRANSFERS.—Amounts transferred under this section—

(1) shall be merged with, and be available for the same purposes and the same period as, the amounts in the accounts to which transferred; and

(2) may not be expended for an item that has been denied authorization of appropriations by Congress.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—The transfer authority provided in this section is in addition to the transfer authority provided in section 1001.

Subtitle B—Depot-Level Activities

SEC. 311. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR AVIATION DEPOTS AND NAVAL SHIPYARDS TO ENGAGE IN DEFENSE-RELATED PRODUCTION AND SERVICES.

Section 1425(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 104 Stat. 1684) is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1996'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1997''.

SEC. 312. EXCLUSION OF LARGE MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR PROJECTS FROM PERCENTAGE LIMITATION ON CONTRACTING FOR DEPOT-LEVEL MAINTENANCE.

Section 2466 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

''(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN LARGE PROJECTS.—If a single maintenance or repair project contracted for performance by non-Federal Government personnel accounts for five percent or more of the funds made available in a fiscal year to a military department or a Defense Agency for depot-level maintenance and repair workload, the project and the funds necessary for the project shall not be considered when applying the percentage limitation specified in subsection (a) to that military department or Defense Agency.''.

Subtitle C—Environmental Provisions

SEC. 321. REPEAL OF REPORT ON CONTRACTOR REIMBURSEMENT COSTS.

Section 2706 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

SEC. 322. PAYMENTS OF STIPULATED PENALTIES ASSESSED UNDER CERCLA.

The Secretary of Defense may pay, from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301(14), the following:

(1) Stipulated civil penalties, to the Hazardous Substance Superfund established under section 9507 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in amounts as follows:

(A) Not more than $34,000 assessed against the United States Army at Fort Riley, Kansas, under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.).

(B) Not more than $55,000 assessed against the Massachusetts Military Reservation, Massachusetts, under such Act.

(C) Not more than $10,000 assessed against the F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, under such Act.

(D) Not more than $30,000 assessed against the Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, under such Act.

(E) Not more than $37,500 assessed against Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, under such Act.

(2) Not more than $500,000 to carry out two environmental restoration projects, as part of a negotiated agreement in lieu of stipulated penalties assessed under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) against the Massachusetts Military Reservation, Massachusetts.

SEC. 323. CONSERVATION AND READINESS PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense may establish and carry out a program to be known as the ''Conservation and Readiness Program''.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Conservation and Readiness Program is to conduct and manage in a coordinated manner those conservation and cultural activities that have regional, multicomponent, or Department of Defense-wide significance and are necessary to meet legal requirements or to support military operations. These activities include the following:

(1) The development of ecosystem-wide land management plans.

(2) The conduct of wildlife studies to ensure the safety of military operations.

(3) The identification and return of Native American human remains and cultural items in the possession or control of the Department of Defense, or discovered on land under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, to the appropriate Native American tribes.

(4) The control of invasive species that may hinder military activities or degrade military training ranges.

(5) The establishment of a regional curation system for artifacts found on military installations.

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND GRANTS.—The Secretary of Defense may negotiate and enter into cooperative agreements with, and award grants to, public and private agencies, organizations, institutions, individuals, or other entities to carry out the Conservation and Readiness Program.

(d) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed or interpreted as preempting any otherwise applicable Federal, State, or local law or regulation relating to the management of natural and cultural resources on military installations.

SEC. 324. NAVY COMPLIANCE WITH SHIPBOARD SOLID WASTE CONTROL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE ACT TO PREVENT POLLUTION FROM SHIPS.—Subsection (c) of section 3 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1902(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', except as provided in paragraphs (4) and (5) of this subsection'' before the period at the end;

(2) by striking out paragraph (4); and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(4) A vessel owned or operated by the Department of the Navy for which the Secretary of the Navy determines under the compliance plan submitted under paragraph (2) that, due to unique military design, construction, manning, or operating requirements, full compliance with paragraph (1) would not be technologically feasible, would impair the vessel's operations, and would impair the vessel's operational capability, is authorized to discharge garbage consisting of either of the following:

''(A) A slurry of seawater, paper, cardboard, and food waste that does not contain more than the minimum amount practicable of plastic, if such slurry is discharged not less than 3 nautical miles from the nearest land and is capable of passing through a screen with openings of no greater than 12 millimeters.

''(B) Metal and glass garbage that has been shredded and bagged to ensure negative buoyancy and is discharged not less than 12 nautical miles from the nearest land.

''(5) Not later than December 31, 2000, the Secretary of the Navy shall publish in the Federal Register—

''(A) a list of those surface ships planned to be decommissioned between January 1, 2001, and December 31, 2005; and

''(B) standards to ensure, so far as is reasonable and practicable, without impairing the operations or operational capabilities of such ships, that such ships act in a manner consistent with the special area requirements of Regulation 5 of Annex V to the Convention.''.

(b) GOAL TO ACHIEVE FULL COMPLIANCE.—It shall be the goal of the Secretary of the Navy to achieve full compliance with Annex V to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, as soon as practicable.

SEC. 325. AUTHORITY TO DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT LAND USE PLANS FOR DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may, to the extent possible and practical, develop and implement, as part of the Defense Environmental Restoration Program provided for in chapter 160 of title 10, United States Code, a land use plan for any defense site selected by the Secretary under subsection (b).

(b) SELECTION OF SITES.—The Secretary may select up to 10 defense sites, from among sites where the Secretary is planning or implementing environmental restoration activities, for which land use plans may be developed under this section.

(c) REQUIREMENT TO CONSULT WITH REVIEW COMMITTEE OR ADVISORY BOARD.—In developing a land use plan under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with a technical review committee established pursuant to section 2705(c) of title 10, United States Code, a restoration advisory board established pursuant to section 2705(d) of such title, a local land use redevelopment authority, or another appropriate State agency.

(d) 50-YEAR PLANNING PERIOD.—A land use plan developed under this section shall cover a period of at least 50 years.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION.—For each defense site for which the Secretary develops a land use plan under this section, the Secretary shall take into account the land use plan in selecting and implementing, in accordance with applicable law, environmental restoration activities at the site.

(f) DEADLINES.—For each defense site for which the Secretary of Defense intends to develop a land use plan under this section, the Secretary shall develop a draft land use plan by October 1, 1997, and a final land use plan by March 15, 1998.

(g) DEFINITION OF DEFENSE SITE.—For purposes of this section, the term ''defense site'' means (A) any building, structure, installation, equipment, pipe or pipeline (including any pipe into a sewer or publicly owned treatment works), well, pit, pond, lagoon, impoundment, ditch, landfill, storage container, motor vehicle, rolling stock, or aircraft under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, or (B) any site or area under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense where a hazardous substance has been deposited, stored, disposed of, or placed, or otherwise come to be located; but does not include any consumer product in consumer use or any vessel.

(h) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 1998, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the land use plans developed under this section and the effect such plans have had on environmental restoration activities at the defense sites where they have been implemented. The report shall include recommendations on whether such land use plans should be developed and implemented throughout the Department of Defense.

(h) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—(1) Nothing in this section or in a land use plan developed under this section with respect to a defense site shall be construed as requiring any modification to a land use plan that was developed before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Nothing in this section may be construed to affect statutory requirements for an environmental restoration or waste management activity or project or to modify or otherwise affect applicable statutory or regulatory environmental restoration and waste management requirements, including substantive standards intended to protect public health and the environment, nor shall anything in this section be construed to preempt or impair any local land use planning or zoning authority or State authority.

SEC. 326. PILOT PROGRAM TO TEST ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGIES FOR LIMITING AIR EMISSIONS DURING SHIPYARD BLASTING AND COATING OPERATIONS.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary of the Navy shall establish a pilot program to test an alternative technology designed to capture and destroy or remove particulate emissions and volatile air pollutants that occur during abrasive blasting and coating operations at naval shipyards. In conducting the test, the Secretary shall seek to demonstrate whether the technology is valid, cost effective, and in compliance with environmental laws and regulations.

(b) REPORT.—Upon completion of the test conducted under the pilot program, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report setting forth in detail the results

of the test. The report shall include recommendations on whether the alternative technology merits implementation at naval shipyards and such other recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 327. NAVY PROGRAM TO MONITOR ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF ORGANOTIN.

(a) MONITORING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Navy shall, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, develop and implement a program to monitor the concentrations of organotin in the water column, sediments, and aquatic organisms of representative estuaries and near-coastal waters in the United States, as described in section 7(a) of the Organotin Antifouling Paint Control Act of 1988 (33 U.S.C. 2406(a)). The program shall be designed to produce high-quality data to enable the Environmental Protection Agency to develop water quality criteria concerning organotin compounds.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 1997, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to Congress a report containing the following:

(1) A description of the monitoring program developed pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) An analysis of the results of the monitoring program as of the date of the submission of the report.

(3) Information about the progress of Navy programs, referred to in section 7(c) of Organotin Antifouling Paint Control Act of 1988 (33 U.S.C. 2406(c)), for evaluating the laboratory toxicity and environmental risks associated with the use of antifouling paints containing organotin.

(4) An assessment, developed in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, of the effectiveness of existing laws and rules concerning organotin compounds in ensuring protection of human health and the environment.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, should develop, for purposes of the national pollutant discharge elimination system, a model permit for the discharge of organotin compounds at shipbuilding and ship repair facilities. For purposes of this subsection, the term ''organotin'' has the meaning provided in section 3 of the Organotin Antifouling Paint Control Act of 1988 (33 U.S.C. 2402).

Subtitle D—Civilian Employees and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Employees

SEC. 331. REPEAL OF PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OF LODGING EXPENSES WHEN ADEQUATE GOVERNMENT QUARTERS ARE AVAILABLE.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1589 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 81 of such title is amended by striking out the item relating to section 1589.

SEC. 332. VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PAY MODIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5597(g) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) If the employment is without compensation, the appointing official may waive the repayment.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to employment accepted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 333. WAGE-BOARD COMPENSATORY TIME OFF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5543 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

''(b) The head of an agency may, on request of an employee, grant the employee compensatory time off from his scheduled tour of duty instead of payment under section 5544 or section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 for an equal amount of time spent in irregular or occasional overtime work.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5544(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''and the provisions of section 5543(b)'' before ''shall apply''.

SEC. 334. SIMPLIFICATION OF RULES RELATING TO THE OBSERVANCE OF CERTAIN HOLIDAYS.

Section 6103 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d)(1) For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) the term 'compressed schedule' has the meaning given such term by section 6121(5); and

''(B) the term 'adverse agency impact' has the meaning given such term by section 6131(b).

''(2) An agency may prescribe rules under which employees on a compressed schedule may, in the case of a holiday that occurs on a regularly scheduled non-workday for such employees, and notwithstanding any other provision of law or the terms of any collective bargaining agreement, be required to observe such holiday on a workday other than as provided by subsection (b), if the agency head determines that it is necessary to do so in order to prevent an adverse agency impact.''.

SEC. 335. PHASED RETIREMENT.

(a) CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 8344 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(m)(1) In order to promote the retention of employees having knowledge, skills, or expertise needed by the Department of Defense, in a manner consistent with ongoing downsizing efforts, the Secretary of Defense or his designee may waive the application of subsection (a), with respect to reemployed annuitants of the Department of Defense, under this subsection.

''(2) A waiver under this subsection—

''(A) may not be granted except upon appropriate written application submitted and approved not later than the date of separation on which entitlement to annuity is based;

''(B) shall be contingent on the reemployment commencing within such time as the Secretary or his designee may require, may remain in effect for a period of not to exceed 2 years, and shall not be renewable; and

''(C) may be granted and thereafter remain in effect only if, with respect to the position in which reemployed, the number of regularly scheduled hours in each week or other period is at least ½ but not more than ¾ those last in effect for the individual before the separation referred to in subparagraph (A).

''(3)(A) In no event shall the sum of the rate of basic pay for, plus annuity allocable to, any period of service as a reemployed annuitant under this subsection exceed the rate of basic pay that would then be in effect for service performed during such period if separation had not occurred.

''(B) If the limitation under subparagraph (A) would otherwise be exceeded, an amount equal to the excess shall be deducted from basic pay for the period involved (but not to exceed total basic pay for such period), and any amount so deducted shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Fund.

''(4) The number of reemployed annuitants under this subsection at any given time may not, when taken together with the then current number under section 8468(j), exceed a total of 50.

''(5) All waivers under this subsection shall cease to be effective after September 30, 2001.''.

(b) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 8468 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j)(1) In order to promote the retention of employees having knowledge, skills, or expertise needed by the Department of Defense, in a manner consistent with ongoing downsizing efforts, the Secretary of Defense or his designee may waive the application of subsections (a) and (b), with respect to reemployed annuitants of the Department of Defense, under this subsection.

''(2) A waiver under this subsection—

''(A) may not be granted except upon appropriate written application submitted and approved not later than the date of separation on which entitlement to annuity is based;

''(B) shall be contingent on the reemployment commencing within such time as the Secretary or his designee may require, may remain in effect for a period of not to exceed 2 years, and shall not be renewable; and

''(C) may be granted and thereafter remain in effect only if, with respect to the position in which reemployed, the number of regularly scheduled hours in each week or other period is at least ½ but not more than ¾ those last in effect for the individual before the separation referred to in subparagraph (A).

''(3)(A) In no event shall the sum of the rate of basic pay for, plus annuity allocable to, any period of service as a reemployed annuitant under this subsection exceed the rate of basic pay that would then be in effect for service performed during such period if separation had not occurred.

''(B) If the limitation under subparagraph (A) would otherwise be exceeded, an amount equal to the excess shall be deducted from basic pay for the period involved (but not to exceed total basic pay for such period), and any amount so deducted shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Fund.

''(4) The number of reemployed annuitants under this subsection at any given time may not, when taken together with the then current number under section 8344(m), exceed a total of 50.

''(5) All waivers under this subsection shall cease to be effective after September 30, 2001.''.

(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than December 31, 2000, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to each House of Congress and the Office of Personnel Management a written report on the operation of sections 8344(m) and 8468(j) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this section. Such report shall include—

(1) recommendations as to whether or not those provisions of law should be continued beyond September 30, 2001, and, if so, under what conditions or constraints; and

(2) any other information which the Secretary of Defense may consider appropriate.

SEC. 336. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY FOR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO PARTICIPATE VOLUNTARILY IN REDUCTIONS IN FORCE.

Section 3502(f) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(f)(1) The Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department may—

''(A) separate from service any employee who volunteers to be separated under this subparagraph even though the employee is not otherwise subject to separation due to a reduction in force; and

''(B) for each employee voluntarily separated under subparagraph (A), retain an employee in a similar position who would otherwise be separated due to a reduction in force.

''(2) The separation of an employee under paragraph (1)(A) shall be treated as an involuntary separation due to a reduction in force.

''(3) An employee with critical knowledge and skills (as defined by the Secretary concerned) may not participate in a voluntary separation under paragraph (1)(A) if the Secretary concerned determines that such participation would impair the performance of the mission of the Department of Defense or the military department concerned.

''(4) The regulations prescribed under this section shall incorporate the authority provided in this subsection.

''(5) No authority under paragraph (1) may be exercised after September 30, 2001.''.

Subtitle E—Commissaries and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities

SEC. 341. CONTRACTS WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND INSTRUMENTALITIES FOR GOODS AND SERVICES.

(a) CONTRACTS TO PROMOTE EFFICIENT OPERATION AND MANAGEMENT.—Chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§2490b. Contracts with other agencies and instrumentalities for goods and services

''An agency or instrumentality of the Department of Defense that supports the operation of the exchange or morale, welfare, and recreation systems of the Department of Defense may enter into a contract or other agreement with another department, agency, or instrumentality of the Department of Defense or another Federal agency to provide goods and services beneficial to the efficient management and operation of the exchange or morale, welfare, and recreation systems.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2490b. Contracts with other agencies and instrumentalities for goods and services.''.

SEC. 342. NONCOMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT OF BRAND-NAME COMMERCIAL ITEMS FOR RESALE IN COMMISSARY STORES.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF EXCEPTION TO COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT.—Section 2486 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) The Secretary of Defense may not use the exception provided in section 2304(c)(5) of this title regarding the procurement of a brand-name commercial item for resale in commissary stores unless the commercial item is regularly sold outside of commissary stores under the same brand name as the name by which the commercial item will be sold in commissary stores.''.

(b) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not affect the terms, conditions, or duration of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Defense before the date of the enactment of this Act for the procurement of commercial items for resale in commissary stores.

SEC. 343. PROHIBITION OF SALE OR RENTAL OF SEXUALLY EXPLICIT MATERIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL—(1) Chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 2490b, as added by section 341, the following new section:

''§2490c. Sale or rental of sexually explicit material prohibited

''(a) PROHIBITION OF SALE OR RENTAL.—The Secretary of Defense may not permit the sale or rental of sexually explicit written or videotaped material on property under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense.

''(b) PROHIBITION OF OFFICIALLY PROVIDED SEXUALLY EXPLICIT MATERIAL.—A member of the armed forces or a civilian officer or employee of the Department of Defense acting in an official capacity for sale, remuneration, or rental may not provide sexually explicit material to another person.

''(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to implement this section.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'sexually explicit material' means an audio recording, a film or video recording, or a periodical with visual depictions, produced in any medium, the dominant theme of which depicts or describes nudity, including sexual or excretory activities or organs, in a lascivious way.

''(2) The term 'property under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense' includes commissaries, all facilities operated by the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, the Navy Exchange Service Command, the Navy Resale and Services Support Office, Marine Corps exchanges, and ship stores.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2490b, as added by section 341, the following new item:

''2490c. Sale or rental of sexually explicit material prohibited.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) of section 2490c of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle F—Performance of Functions by Private-Sector Sources

SEC. 351. EXTENSION OF REQUIREMENT FOR COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT OF PRINTING AND DUPLICATION SERVICES.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 351(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 266) is amended by striking out ''fiscal year 1996'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''fiscal years 1996 and 1997''.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—(1) Not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year in which the requirement of subsection (a) applies, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report—

''(A) describing the extent of the compliance of the Secretary with the requirement during that fiscal year;

''(B) specifying the total volume of printing and duplication services procured by Department of Defense during that fiscal year—

''(i) from sources within the Department of Defense;

''(ii) from private-sector sources; and

''(iii) from other sources in the Federal Government; and

''(C) specifying the total volume of printed and duplicated material during that fiscal year covered by the exception in subsection (b).

''(2) The report required for fiscal year 1996 shall also include the plans of the Secretary for further implementation of the requirement of subsection (a) during fiscal year 1997.''.

SEC. 352. REQUIREMENT REGARDING USE OF PRIVATE SHIPYARDS FOR COMPLEX NAVAL SHIP REPAIR CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 633 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§7315. Use of private shipyards for complex ship repair work: limitation to certain shipyards

''(a) LIMITATION ON REPAIR LOCATIONS.—Whenever a naval vessel (other than a submarine) is to undergo complex ship repairs and the Secretary of the Navy determines that a private shipyard contractor is to be used for the work required, such work—

''(1) may be performed only by a qualifying shipyard contractor; and

''(2) shall be performed at the shipyard facility of the contractor selected unless the Secretary determines that the work should be conducted elsewhere in the interest of national security.

''(b) QUALIFYING SHIPYARD CONTRACTOR.—For the purposes of this section, a qualifying shipyard contractor, with respect to the award of any contract for ship repair work, is a private shipyard that—

''(1) is capable of performing the repair and overhaul of ships with a displacement of 800 tons or more;

''(2) performs at least 55 percent of repairs with its own facilities and work force;

''(3) possesses or has access to a dry-dock and a pier with the capability to berth a ship with a displacement of 800 tons or more; and

''(4) has all the facilities and organizational elements needed for the repair of a ship with a displacement of 800 tons or more.

''(c) COMPLEX SHIP REPAIRS.—In this section, the term 'complex ship repairs' means repairs to a vessel performed at a shipyard that are estimated (before work on the repairs by a shipyard begins) to require expenditure of $750,000 or more.

''(d) EXCEPTION REGARDING PACIFIC COAST.—This section shall not apply in the case of complex ship repairs to be performed at a shipyard facility located on the Pacific Coast of the United States.''.

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

''7315. Use of private shipyards for complex ship repair work: limitation to certain shipyards.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 7315 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to contracts for complex ship repairs that are awarded after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

SEC. 360. TERMINATION OF DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND AND PREPARATION OF PLAN REGARDING IMPROVED OPERATION OF WORKING-CAPITAL FUNDS.

(a) REPEAL OF DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND.—(1) Section 2216 of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 371(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 277), is repealed.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 131 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item relating to such section.

(3) The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on October 1, 1998.

(b) PLAN FOR IMPROVED OPERATION OF WORKING-CAPITAL FUNDS.—Not later than September 30, 1997, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a plan to improve the management and performance of the industrial, commercial, and support type activities of the military departments or the Defense Agencies that are currently managed through the Defense Business Operations Fund.

(c) ELEMENTS OF PLAN.—The plan required by subsection (b) shall address the following issues:

(1) The ability of each military department to set working capital requirements and set charges at its own industrial and supply activities.

(2) The desirability of separate business accounts for the management of both industrial and supply activities for each military department.

(3) Liability for operating losses at industrial and supply activities.

(4) Reimbursement to the Department of Defense for each military department's fair share of the costs of legitimate common business support services provided by the Department of Defense (such as accounting and financial services and central logistics services).

(5) The role of the Department of Defense in setting charges or imposing surcharges for activities managed by the military department business accounts (except for the common business support costs described in paragraph (4)), and what such charges should properly reflect.

(6) The appropriate use of operating profits arising from the operations of the industrial and supply activities of a military department.

(7) The ability of military departments to purchase industrial and supply services from, and provide such services to, other military departments.

(8) Standardization of financial management and accounting practices employed by military department business accounts.

(9) Reporting requirements related to actual and projected performance of military department business management account activities.

SEC. 361. INCREASE IN CAPITAL ASSET THRESHOLD UNDER DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND.

Section 2216 of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 371(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 227), is amended in subsection (i)(1) by striking out ''$50,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$100,000''.

SEC. 362. TRANSFER OF EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY TO SUPPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—(1) Chapter 153 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2576 the following new section:

''§ 2576a. Excess personal property: sale or donation for law enforcement activities

''(a) TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may transfer to Federal and State agencies personal property of the Department of Defense, including small arms and ammunition, that the Secretary determines is—

''(A) suitable for use by the agencies in law enforcement activities, including counter-drug activities; and

''(B) excess to the needs of the Department of Defense.

''(2) The Secretary shall carry out this section in consultation with the Attorney General and the Director of National Drug Control Policy.

''(b) CONDITIONS FOR TRANSFER.—The Secretary may transfer personal property under this section only if—

''(1) the property is drawn from existing stocks of the Department of Defense; and

''(2) the transfer is made without the expenditure of any funds available to the Department of Defense for the procurement of defense equipment.

''(c) CONSIDERATION.—Personal property may be transferred under this section without cost to the recipient agency.

''(d) PREFERENCE FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS.—In considering applications for the transfer of personal property under this section, the Secretary shall give a preference to those applications indicating that the transferred property will be used in the counter-drug activities of the recipient agency.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2576 the following new item:

''2576a. Excess personal property: sale or donation for law enforcement activities.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 1208 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189; 10 U.S.C. 372 note) is repealed.

(2) Section 1005 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 104 Stat. 1630) is amended by striking out ''section 1208 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (10 U.S.C. 372 note) and section 372'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''sections 372 and 2576a''.

SEC. 363. STORAGE OF MOTOR VEHICLE IN LIEU OF TRANSPORTATION.

(a) STORAGE AUTHORIZED.—(1) Section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g)(1) In lieu of transportation authorized by this section, if a member is ordered to make a change of permanent station to a foreign country and the laws, regulations, or other restrictions imposed by the foreign country or the United States preclude entry of a motor vehicle described in subsection (a) into that country, or would require extensive modification of the vehicle as a condition to entry, the member may elect to have the vehicle stored at the expense of the United States at a location approved by the Secretary concerned.

''(2) If a member is transferred or assigned to duty at a location other than the permanent station of the member for a period of more than 30 consecutive days, but the transfer or assignment is not considered a change of permanent station, the member may elect to have a motor vehicle described in subsection (a) stored at the expense of the United States at a location approved by the Secretary concerned.

''(3) Authorized expenses under this subsection include costs associated with the delivery of the motor vehicle for storage and removal of the vehicle for delivery to a destination approved by the Secretary concerned.''.

(2)(A) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2634. Motor vehicles: transportation or storage for members on change of permanent station or extended deployment''.

(B) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 157 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''2634. Motor vehicles: transportation or storage for members on change of permanent station or extended deployment.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 406(h)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subparagraph:

''(B) in the case of a member described in paragraph (2)(A), authorize the transportation of one motor vehicle, which is owned or leased by the member (or a dependent of the member) and is for the personal use of a dependent of the member, to that location by means of transportation authorized under section 2634 of title 10 or authorize the storage of the motor vehicle pursuant to subsection (g) of such section.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 1997.

SEC. 364. CONTROL OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS IN TIME OF WAR.

(a) RESPONSIBILITY OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Chapter 157 of title 10, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2644. Control of transportation systems in time of war

''In time of war, the President, acting through the Secretary of Defense, may take possession and assume control of all or any part of a system of transportation to transport troops, war material, and equipment, or for other purposes related to the emergency. So far as necessary, the Secretary may use the transportation system to the exclusion of other traffic.''.

(b) CONFORMING REPEALS.—Sections 4742 and 9742 of title 10, United States Code are repealed.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 447 of such title is amended by striking out the item relating to section 4742.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 947 of such title is amended by striking out the item relating to section 9742.

(3) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 157 of such title 10 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2643 the following new item:

''2644. Control of transportation systems in time of war.''.

SEC. 365. SECURITY PROTECTIONS AT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES IN NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION.

(a) EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (b) of section 2674 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''at the Pentagon Reservation'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''in the National Capital Region''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2674. Operation and control of Pentagon Reservation and defense facilities in National Capital Region''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 159 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''2674. Operation and control of Pentagon Reservation and defense facilities in National Capital Region.''.

SEC. 366. MODIFICATIONS TO ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME ACT OF 1991.

(a) TERM OF OFFICE.—Section 1515 of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1991 (24 U.S.C. 415) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:

''(3) The chairman of the Retirement Home Board may appoint a member of the Retirement Home Board for a second consecutive term. The chairman of a Local Board may appoint a member of that Local Board for a second consecutive term.''; and

(2) by striking out subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

''(f) EARLY EXPIRATION OF TERM.—A member of the Armed Forces or Federal civilian employee who is appointed as a member of the Retirement Home Board or a Local Board may serve as a board member only so long as the member of the Armed Forces or Federal civilian employee is assigned to or serving in the duty position that gave rise to the appointment as a board member.''.

(b) DISPOSAL OF REAL PROPERTY.—Section 1516(d) of such Act (24 U.S.C. 416(d)) is amended by striking out ''(d)'' and all that follows through the end of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

''(d) DISPOSAL OF REAL PROPERTY.—(1) The Retirement Home Board may dispose of real property of the Retirement Home by sale or otherwise, except that the disposal may not occur until after the end of a period of 30 legislative days or 60 calendar days, whichever is longer, beginning on the date on which the Retirement Home Board notifies the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives of the proposed disposal. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411), and any other provision of law or regulation relating to the handling or disposal of real property by the United States shall not apply to the disposal of real property by the Retirement Home Board.''.

(c) ANNUAL EVALUATION OF DIRECTORS.—Section 1517 of such Act (24 U.S.C. 417) is amended by striking out subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

''(f) ANNUAL EVALUATION OF DIRECTORS.—The chairman of the Retirement Home Board shall annually evaluate the performance of the Directors and shall make such recommendations to the Secretary of Defense as the chairman considers appropriate in light of the evaluation.''.

(d) EFFECT OF AMENDMENT.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) shall not affect the staggered terms of members of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Board or a Local Board of the Retirement Home under section 1515(f) of such Act, as in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 367. ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES THAT BENEFIT DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

(a) CONTINUATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 301(5)—

(1) $50,000,000 shall be available for providing educational agencies assistance (as defined in subsection (d)(1)) to local educational agencies; and

(2) $8,000,000 shall be available for making educational agencies payments (as defined in subsection (d)(2)) to local educational agencies.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than June 30, 1997, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) notify each local educational agency that is eligible for educational agencies assistance for fiscal year 1997 of that agency's eligibility for such assistance and the amount of such assistance for which that agency is eligible; and

(2) notify each local educational agency that is eligible for an educational agencies payment for fiscal year 1997 of that agency's eligibility for such payment and the amount of the payment for which that agency is eligible.

(c) DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall disburse funds made available under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) not later than 30 days after the date on which notification to the eligible local educational agencies is provided pursuant to subsection (b).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''educational agencies assistance'' means assistance authorized under section 386(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 20 U.S.C. 7703 note).

(2) The term ''educational agencies payments'' means payments authorized under section 386(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 20 U.S.C. 7703 note).

(3) The term ''local educational agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 8013(9) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7713(9)).

SEC. 368. RETENTION OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEE POSITIONS AT MILITARY TRAINING BASES TRANSFERRED TO NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) MILITARY TRAINING INSTALLATIONS AFFECTED.—This section applies with respect to each military training installation that—

(1) was approved for closure in 1995 under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note);

(2) is scheduled for transfer during fiscal year 1997 to National Guard operation and control; and

(3) will continue to be used, after such transfer, to provide training support to active and reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(b) RETENTION OF EMPLOYEE POSITIONS.—In the case of a military training installation described in subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall retain civilian employee positions of the Department of Defense at the installation after transfer to the National Guard to facilitate active and reserve component training at the installation.

(c) MAXIMUM POSITIONS RETAINED.—The maximum number of civilian employee positions retained at an installation under this section shall not exceed 20 percent of the Federal civilian workforce employed at the installation as of September 8, 1995.

(d) REMOVAL OF POSITION.—The requirement to maintain a civilian employee position at an installation under this section shall terminate upon the later of the following:

(1) The date of the departure or retirement of the civilian employee initially employed or retained in a civilian employee position at the installation as a result of this section.

(2) The date on which the Secretary certifies to Congress that a civilian employee position at the installation is no longer required to ensure that effective support is provided at the installation for active and reserve component training.

SEC. 369. EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY TO DONATE UNUSABLE FOOD.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR DONATIONS FROM DEFENSE AGENCIES.—Section 2485 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''Secretary of a military department'' in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof ''Secretary of Defense''.

(b) EXPANSION OF ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking out ''authorized charitable nonprofit food banks'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''entities specified under subsection (d)''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking out ''may only be made'' and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ''may only be made to an entity that is one of the following:

''(1) A charitable nonprofit food bank that is designated by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Health and Human Services as authorized to receive such donations.

''(2) A State or local agency that is designated by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Health and Human Services as authorized to receive such donations.

''(3) A chapter or other local unit of a recognized national veterans organization that provides services to persons without adequate shelter and is designated by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as authorized to receive such donations.

''(4) A not-for-profit organization that provides care for homeless veterans and is designated by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as authorized to receive such donations.''.

(c) CLARIFICATION OF FOOD THAT MAY BE DONATED.—Subsection (b) of such section is further amended by inserting ''rations known as humanitarian daily rations (HDRs),'' after ''(MREs),''.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

SEC. 401. END STRENGTHS FOR ACTIVE FORCES.

The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 1997, as follows:

(1) The Army, 495,000.

(2) The Navy, 407,318.

(3) The Marine Corps, 174,000.

(4) The Air Force, 381,100.

SEC. 402. PERMANENT END STRENGTH LEVELS TO SUPPORT TWO MAJOR REGIONAL CONTINGENCIES.

Section 691 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(2) by striking out subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

''(c) The budget for the Department of Defense for any fiscal year as submitted to Congress shall include amounts for funding for each of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard) at least in the amounts necessary to maintain the active duty end strengths prescribed in subsection (b), as in effect at the time that such budget is submitted.

''(d) No funds appropriated to the Department of Defense may be used to implement a reduction of the active duty end strength for any of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard) for any fiscal year below the level specified in subsection (b) unless the reduction in end strength for that armed force for that fiscal year is specifically authorized by law.''.

SEC. 403. AUTHORIZED STRENGTHS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ON ACTIVE DUTY IN GRADES OF MAJOR, LIEUTENANT COLONEL, AND COLONEL AND NAVY GRADES OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, COMMANDER, AND CAPTAIN.

(a) REVISION IN ARMY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE CORPS LIMITATIONS.—The table in paragraph (1) of section 523(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''Total number of commissioned officers (excluding officers in categories specified in subsection (b)) on active duty:	*Number of officers who may be serving on active duty in the grade of:*		
	Major	*Lieutenant Colonel*	*Colonel*
Army:			
35,000	*8,922*	*6,419*	*2,163*
40,000	*9,614*	*6,807*	*2,347*
45,000	*10,305*	*7,196*	*2,530*
50,000	*10,997*	*7,584*	*2,713*
55,000	*11,688*	*7,973*	*2,897*
60,000	*12,380*	*8,361*	*3,080*
65,000	*13,071*	*8,750*	*3,264*
70,000	*13,763*	*9,138*	*3,447*
75,000	*14,454*	*9,527*	*3,631*
80,000	*15,146*	*9,915*	*3,814*
85,000	*15,837*	*10,304*	*3,997*
90,000	*16,529*	*10,692*	*4,181*
95,000	*17,220*	*11,081*	*4,364*
100,000	*17,912*	*11,469*	*4,548*
110,000	*19,295*	*12,246*	*4,915*
120,000	*20,678*	*13,023*	*5,281*
130,000	*22,061*	*13,800*	*5,648*
170,000	*27,593*	*16,908*	*7,116*
Air Force:			
35,000	*9,216*	*7,090*	*2,125*
40,000	*10,025*	*7,478*	*2,306*
45,000	*10,835*	*7,866*	*2,487*
50,000	*11,645*	*8,253*	*2,668*
55,000	*12,454*	*8,641*	*2,849*
60,000	*13,264*	*9,029*	*3,030*
65,000	*14,073*	*9,417*	*3,211*
70,000	*14,883*	*9,805*	*3,392*
75,000	*15,693*	*10,193*	*3,573*
80,000	*16,502*	*10,582*	*3,754*
85,000	*17,312*	*10,971*	*3,935*
90,000	*18,121*	*11,360*	*4,115*
95,000	*18,931*	*11,749*	*4,296*
100,000	*19,741*	*12,138*	*4,477*
105,000	*20,550*	*12,527*	*4,658*
110,000	*21,360*	*12,915*	*4,838*
115,000	*22,169*	*13,304*	*5,019*
120,000	*22,979*	*13,692*	*5,200*
125,000	*23,789*	*14,081*	*5,381*
Marine Corps:			
10,000	*2,525*	*1,480*	*571*
12,500	*2,900*	*1,600*	*592*
15,000	*3,275*	*1,720*	*613*
17,500	*3,650*	*1,840*	*633*
20,000	*4,025*	*1,960*	*654*
22,500	*4,400*	*2,080*	*675*
25,000	*4,775*	*2,200*	*695.''*

(b) REVISION IN NAVY LIMITATIONS.—The table in paragraph (2) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''Total number of commissioned officers (excluding officers in categories specified in subsection (b)) on active duty:	Number of officers who may be serving on active duty in grade of:		
	Lieutenant commander	Commander	Captain
Navy:			
30,000	7,331	5,018	2,116
33,000	7,799	5,239	2,223
36,000	8,267	5,460	2,330
39,000	8,735	5,681	2,437
42,000	9,203	5,902	2,544
45,000	9,671	6,123	2,651
48,000	10,139	6,343	2,758
51,000	10,606	6,561	2,864

"Total number of commissioned officers (excluding officers in categories specified in subsection (b)) on active duty:	Number of officers who may be serving on active duty in grade of:		
	Lieutenant commander	Commander	Captain
54,000	11,074	6,782	2,971
57,000	11,541	7,002	3,078
60,000	12,009	7,222	3,185
63,000	12,476	7,441	3,292
66,000	12,944	7,661	3,398
70,000	13,567	7,954	3,541
90,000	16,683	9,419	4,254."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on September 1, 1997, except that with the approval of the Secretary of Defense the Secretary of a military department may prescribe an earlier date for that Secretary's military department. Any such date shall be published in the Federal Register.

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

SEC. 411. END STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 1997.—The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for Selected Reserve personnel of the reserve components as of September 30, 1997, as follows:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 366,758.

(2) The Army Reserve, 215,179.

(3) The Naval Reserve, 96,304.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 42,000.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 108,843.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 73,281.

(7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 8,000.

(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may vary the end strength authorized by subsection (a) by not more than 2 percent.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component for a fiscal year shall be proportionately reduced by—

(1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at the end of the fiscal year, and

(2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at the end of the fiscal year.

Whenever such units or such individual members are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the end strength prescribed for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such reserve component shall be proportionately increased by the total authorized strengths of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

SEC. 412. END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES.

Within the end strengths prescribed in section 411(a), the reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 1997, the following number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 22,798.

(2) The Army Reserve, 11,729.

(3) The Naval Reserve, 16,603.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,559.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 10,378.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 625.

SEC. 413. END STRENGTHS FOR MILITARY TECHNICIANS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.—The minimum number of military technicians as of the last day of fiscal year 1997 for the reserve components of the Army and the Air Force (notwithstanding section 129 of title 10, United States Code) shall be the following:

(1) For the Army Reserve, 6,799.

(2) For the Army National Guard of the United States, 25,500.

(3) For the Air Force Reserve, 9,802.

(4) For the Air National Guard of the United States, 22,906.

(b) INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED WITH FUTURE AUTHORIZATION REQUESTS.—Section 10216 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

''(b) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED WITH ANNUAL END STRENGTH AUTHORIZATION REQUEST.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall include as part of the budget justification documents submitted to Congress with the budget of the Department of Defense for any fiscal year the following information with respect to the end strengths for military technicians requested in that budget pursuant to section 115(g) of this title, shown separately for each of the Army and Air Force reserve components:

''(A) The number of dual-status technicians in the high priority units and organizations specified in subsection (a)(1).

''(B) The number of technicians other than dual-status technicians in the high priority units and organizations specified in subsection (a)(1).

''(C) The number of dual-status technicians in other than high priority units and organizations specified in subsection (a)(1).

''(D) The number of technicians other than dual-status technicians in other than high priority units and organizations specified in subsection (a)(1).

''(2)(A) If the budget submitted to Congress for any fiscal year requests authorization for that fiscal year under section 115(g) of this title of a military technician end strength for a reserve component of the Army or Air Force in a number that constitutes a reduction from the end strength minimum established by law for that reserve component for the fiscal year during which the budget is submitted, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees with that budget a justification providing the basis for that requested reduction in technician end strength.

''(B) Any justification submitted under subparagraph (A) shall clearly delineate—

''(i) in the case of a reduction that includes a reduction in technicians described in subparagraph (A) or (C) of paragraph (1), the specific force structure reductions forming the basis for such requested technician reduction (and the numbers related to those force structure reductions); and

''(ii) in the case of a reduction that includes reductions in technicians described in subparagraphs (B) or (D) of paragraph (1), the specific force structure reductions, Department of Defense civilian personnel reductions, or other reasons forming the basis for such requested technician reduction (and the numbers related to those reductions).''.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking out ''section 115'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''section 115(g)''; and

(2) in subsection (c), as redesignated by subsection (b)(1), by striking out ''after the date of the enactment of this section'' both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof ''after February 10, 1996,''.

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 421. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for military personnel for fiscal year 1997 a total of $70,206,030,000. The authorization in the preceding sentence supersedes any other authorization of appropriations (definite or indefinite) for such purpose for fiscal year 1997.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Personnel Management

SEC. 501. AUTHORIZATION FOR SENIOR ENLISTED MEMBERS TO REENLIST FOR AN INDEFINITE PERIOD OF TIME.

Subsection (d) of section 505 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(d)(1) For a member with less than 10 years of service, the Secretary concerned may accept a reenlistment in the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Air Force, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Coast Guard, as the case may be, for periods of at least two but not more than six years.

''(2) At the discretion of the Secretary concerned, a member with 10 or more years of service who reenlists in the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Air Force, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Coast Guard, as the case may be, and who meets all qualifications for continued service, may be accepted for reenlistment of an unspecified period of time.''.

SEC. 502. AUTHORITY TO EXTEND ENTRY ON ACTIVE DUTY UNDER THE DELAYED ENTRY PROGRAM.

Section 513(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding after the first sentence the following new sentence: ''The Secretary concerned may extend the 365-day period for any person for up to an additional 180 days if the Secretary considers such extension to be warranted on a case-by-case basis.''; and

(2) in the last sentence, by striking out ''the preceding sentence'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''under this subsection''.

SEC. 503. PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR NAVY SPOT PROMOTIONS FOR CERTAIN LIEUTENANTS.

Section 5721 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (g).

SEC. 504. REPORTS ON RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING IMPROVEMENTS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE JOINT MANPOWER PROCESS.

(a) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a semiannual report on the status of actions taken by the Secretary to implement the recommendations made by the Department of Defense Inspector General in the report of November 29, 1995, entitled ''Inspection of the Department of Defense Joint Manpower Process'' (Report No. 96–029). The first such report shall be submitted not later than February 1, 1997.

(b) ADDITIONAL MATTER FOR FIRST REPORT.—As part of the first report under subsection (a), the Secretary shall include the following:

(1) The Secretary's assessment as to the need to establish a joint, centralized permanent organization in the Department of Defense to determine, validate, approve, and manage military and civilian manpower requirements resources at joint organizations.

(2) The Secretary's assessment of the Department of Defense timeline and plan to increase the capability of the joint professional military education system (including the Armed Forces Staff College) to overcome the capacity limitations cited in the report referred to in subsection (a).

(3) The Secretary's plan and timeline to provide the necessary training and education of reserve component officers.

(c) GAO ASSESSMENT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall assess the completeness and adequacy of the corrective actions taken by the Secretary with respect to the matters covered in the report referred to in subsection (a) and shall submit a report to Congress, not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, providing the Comptroller General's findings and recommendations.

SEC. 505. FREQUENCY OF REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON JOINT OFFICER MANAGEMENT POLICIES.

(a) CHANGE FROM SEMIANNUAL TO ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 662(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall periodically (and not less often than every six months) report to Congress on the promotion rates'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than January 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the promotion rates during the preceding fiscal year''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking out ''clauses'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''paragraphs''; and

(2) in the second sentence—

(A) by inserting ''for any fiscal year'' after ''such objectives''; and

(B) by striking out ''periodic report required by this subsection'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''report for that fiscal year''.

SEC. 506. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT THAT COMMISSIONED OFFICERS BE INITIALLY APPOINTED IN A RESERVE GRADE.

Section 532 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (e).

SEC. 507. CONTINUATION ON ACTIVE STATUS FOR CERTAIN RESERVE OFFICERS OF THE AIR FORCE.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 14507 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO RETAIN CERTAIN OFFICERS DESIGNATED AS JUDGE ADVOCATES.—(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary of the Air Force may retain on the reserve active-status list any reserve officer of the Air Force who is designated as a judge advocate and who obtained the first professional degree in law while on an educational delay program subsequent to being commissioned through the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

''(2) No more than 50 officers may be retained on the reserve active-status list under the authority of paragraph (1) at any time.

''(3) No officer may be retained on the reserve active-status list under the authority of paragraph (1) for a period exceeding three years from the date on which, but for that authority, that officer would have been removed from the reserve active-status list under subsection (a) or (b).

''(4) The authority of the Secretary of the Air Force under paragraph (1) expires on September 30, 2003.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (c) of section 14507 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 1996.

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Matters

SEC. 511. INDIVIDUAL READY RESERVE ACTIVATION AUTHORITY.

(a) IRR MEMBERS SUBJECT TO ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY OTHER THAN DURING WAR OR NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—Section 10144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a)'' before ''Within the Ready Reserve''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b)(1) Within the Individual Ready Reserve of each reserve component there is a mobilization category of members, as designated by the Secretary concerned, who are subject to being ordered to active duty involuntarily in accordance with section 12304 of this title. A member may not be placed in that mobilization category unless—

''(A) the member volunteers for that category; and

''(B) the member is selected for that category by the Secretary concerned, based upon the needs of the service and the grade and military skills of that member.

''(2) A member of the Individual Ready Reserve may not be carried in the mobilization category of members under paragraph (1) after the end of the 24-month period beginning on the date of the separation of the member from active service.

''(3) The Secretary shall designate the grades and critical military skills or specialities of members to be eligible for placement in such mobilization category.

''(4) A member in such mobilization category shall be eligible for benefits (other than pay and training) as are normally available to members of the Selected Reserve, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.''.

(b) CRITERIA FOR ORDERING TO ACTIVE DUTY.—Subsection (a) of section 12304 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''of this title),'' the following: ''or any member in the Individual Ready Reserve mobilization category and designated as essential under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned,''.

(c) MAXIMUM NUMBER.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) by inserting ''and the Individual Ready Reserve'' after ''Selected Reserve''; and

(2) by inserting '', of whom not more than 30,000 may be members of the Individual Ready Reserve'' before the period at the end.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (f), by inserting ''or Individual Ready Reserve'' after ''Selected Reserve'';

(2) in subsection (g), by inserting '', or member of the Individual Ready Reserve,'' after ''to serve as a unit''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) For purposes of this section, the term 'Individual Ready Reserve mobilization category' means, in the case of any reserve component, the category of the Individual Ready Reserve described in section 10144(b) of this title.''.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§12304. Selected Reserve and certain Individual Ready Reserve members; order to active duty other than during war or national emergency''.

(2) The item relating to section 12304 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1209 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''12304. Selected Reserve and certain Individual Ready Reserve members; order to active duty other than during war or national emergency''.

SEC. 512. TRAINING FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES.

Subsection (b) of section 12310 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(b) A Reserve on active duty as described in subsection (a) may be provided training and professional development opportunities consistent with those provided to other members on active duty, as the Secretary concerned sees fit.''.

SEC. 513. CLARIFICATION TO DEFINITION OF ACTIVE STATUS.

Section 101(d)(4) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''a reserve commissioned officer, other than a commissioned warrant officer'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''a member of a reserve component''.

SEC. 514. APPOINTMENT ABOVE GRADE OF 0–2 IN THE NAVAL RESERVE.

Paragraph (3) of section 12205(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or the Seaman to Admiral Program'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 515. REPORT ON NUMBER OF ADVISERS IN ACTIVE COMPONENT SUPPORT OF RESERVES PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) REPORT ON NUMBER OF ACTIVE COMPONENT ADVISERS.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report setting forth the Secretary's determination as to the appropriate number of active component personnel to be assigned to serve as advisers to reserve components under section 414 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (10 U.S.C. 12001 note). If the Secretary's determination is that such number should be a number other than the required minimum number in effect under subsection (c) of such section, the Secretary shall include in the report an explanation providing the Secretary's justification for the number recommended.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 414(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (10 U.S.C. 12001 note) is amended by striking out ''During fiscal years 1992 and 1993, the Secretary of the Army shall institute'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''The Secretary of the Army shall carry out''.

SEC. 516. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REPORT REGARDING REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS FOR MOBILIZED RESERVISTS EMPLOYED IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress is concerned about the lack of reemployment rights afforded Reserve component members who reside in foreign countries and either work for United States companies that maintain offices or operations in foreign countries or work for foreign employers. Being outside the jurisdiction of the United States, these employers are not subject to the provisions of chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, known as the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA). The purpose of that Act is to provide statutory employment protections that include reinstatement, seniority, status, and rate of pay coverage for Reservists who are ordered to active duty for a specified period of time, including involuntary active duty in support of an operational contingency. While most Reserve members are afforded the protections of that Act (which covers reemployment rights in their civilian jobs upon completion of military service), approximately 2,000 members of the Selected Reserve reside outside the United States and its territories and, not being guaranteed the job protection envisioned by the USERRA, are potentially subject to reemployment problems after release from active duty. During Operation Joint Endeavor, a number of Reservists who are currently living and working abroad and who were involuntarily ordered to active duty in support of that operation did in fact face reemployment problems with their civilian employers. This situation poses a continuing personnel management challenge for the reserve components.

(b) RECOGNITION OF PROBLEM.—Congress, while recognizing that foreign governments and companies located abroad, not being within the jurisdiction of the United States, cannot be required to comply with the provisions of the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act, also recognizes that there is a need to provide assistance to Reservists in the situation described in subsection (a), both in the near term and the long term.

(c) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than April 1, 1997, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report that sets forth recommended actions to help alleviate reemployment problems for Reservists who are employed outside the United States and its territories by United States companies that maintain offices or operations in foreign countries or by foreign employers. The report shall include recommendations on the assistance and support that may be required by other organizations of the Government, including the Defense Attaché Offices, the Department of Labor, and the Department of State. The report shall be prepared

in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor.

Subtitle C—Jurisdiction and Powers of Courts-Martial for the National Guard When Not in Federal Service

SEC. 531. COMPOSITION, JURISDICTION, AND PROCEDURES OF COURTS-MARTIAL.

Section 326 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a)'' at the beginning of the text of the section;

(2) by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ''They shall follow substantially the forms and procedures provided for those courts and shall provide accused members of the National Guard the rights and protections provided in those courts.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) Courts-martial of the National Guard not in Federal service do not have jurisdiction over those persons who are subject to the jurisdiction of a court-martial pursuant to section 802 of title 10.

''(c) A court-martial of the National Guard not in Federal service shall have such jurisdiction and powers, consistent with the provisions of this chapter, as may be provided by the law of the State or Territory, Puerto Rico, or District of Columbia in which the court-martial is convened.''.

SEC. 532. GENERAL COURTS-MARTIAL.

(a) CONVENING AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) of section 327 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or adjutant general'' after ''governor''.

(b) PUNISHMENTS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(b) A general court-martial may sentence an accused, upon conviction, to any of the following punishments:

''(1) A fine of not more than $500 for a single offense.

''(2) Forfeiture of pay and allowances in an amount of not more than $500 for a single offense or any forfeiture of pay for not more than six months.

''(3) A reprimand.

''(4) Dismissal, bad conduct discharge, or dishonorable discharge.

''(5) In the case of an enlisted member, reduction to a lower grade.

''(6) Confinement for not more than 180 days.

''(7) Any combination of the punishments specified in paragraphs (1) through (6).''.

(c) LIMITATION ON PUNITIVE DISCHARGES.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c)(1) A dismissal or bad conduct or dishonorable discharge may not be adjudged unless counsel was detailed to represent the accused and a military judge was detailed to the trial.

''(2) In a case in which the sentence adjudged includes dismissal or a bad conduct or dishonorable discharge, a verbatim record of the proceedings shall be made.''.

SEC. 533. SPECIAL COURTS-MARTIAL.

(a) CONVENING AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) of section 328 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', if a National Guard officer,'' after ''the commanding officer''.

(b) PUNISHMENTS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(b) A special court-martial may sentence an accused, upon conviction, to any of the following punishments:

''(1) A fine of not more than $300 for a single offense.

''(2) Forfeiture of pay and allowances in an amount of not more than $300 for a single offense, but adjudged forfeiture of pay may not exceed two-thirds pay per month and forfeitures may not extend for more than six months.

''(3) A reprimand.

''(4) Bad conduct discharge.

''(5) In the case of an enlisted member, reduction to a lower grade.

''(6) Confinement for not more than 100 days.

''(7) Any combination of the punishments specified in paragraphs (1) through (6).''.

(c) LIMITATION ON BAD CONDUCT DISCHARGES.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(c)(1) A bad conduct discharge may not be adjudged unless counsel was detailed to represent the accused and a military judge was detailed to the trial.

''(2) In a case in which the sentence adjudged includes a bad conduct discharge, a verbatim record of the proceedings shall be made.''.

SEC. 534. SUMMARY COURTS-MARTIAL.

(a) CONVENING AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) of section 329 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting '', if a National Guard officer,'' after ''the commanding officer''; and

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: ''Summary courts-martial may also be convened by superior authority.''.

(b) JURISDICTION.—Subsection (a) of such section is further amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(a)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) A summary court-martial may not try a commissioned officer.''.

(c) PUNISHMENTS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(b) A summary court-martial may sentence an accused, upon conviction, to any of the following punishments:

''(1) A fine of not more than $200 for a single offense.

''(2) Forfeiture of pay and allowances in an amount of not more than $200 for a single offense, but not to exceed two-thirds of one month's pay.

''(3) Reduction to a lower grade.

''(4) Any combination of the punishments specified in paragraphs (1) through (3).''.

(d) CONSENT OF ACCUSED FOR SUMMARY COURT-MARTIAL.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) An accused with respect to whom summary courts-martial have jurisdiction may not be brought to trial before a summary court-martial if the accused objects thereto. If an accused so objects to trial by summary court-martial, the convening authority may order trial by special or general court-martial, as may be appropriate.''.

SEC. 535. REPEAL OF AUTHORITY FOR CONFINEMENT IN LIEU OF FINE.

Section 330 of title 32, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 536. APPROVAL OF SENTENCE OF BAD CONDUCT DISCHARGE OR CONFINEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 331 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''or dishonorable discharge'' and inserting in lieu thereof '', bad conduct discharge, dishonorable discharge, or confinement for three months or more''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§331. Sentences requiring approval of governor''.

SEC. 537. AUTHORITY OF MILITARY JUDGES.

Section 332 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or military judge'' after ''the president''.

SEC. 538. STATUTORY REORGANIZATION.

(a) NEW TITLE 32 CHAPTER.—(1) Title 32, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 325 the following:

''CHAPTER 4—COURTS-MARTIAL FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD WHEN NOT IN FEDERAL SERVICE

''Sec.

''401. Courts-martial: composition, jurisdiction, and procedures.

''402. General courts-martial.

''403. Special courts-martial.

''404. Summary courts-martial.

''405. Sentences requiring approval of governor.

''406. Compelling attendance of accused and witnesses.

''407. Execution of process and sentence.''.

(2) The table of chapters at the beginning of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 3 the following new item:

''4. Courts-Martial for the National Guard When not in Federal Service 401''.

(3) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3 of such title is amended by striking out the items relating to sections 326 through 333.

(b) REDESIGNATION OF SECTIONS.—The following sections of title 32, United States Code (as amended by this subtitle), are redesignated as follows:

Section	Redesignated section
326	401
327	402
328	403
329	404
331	405
332	406
333	407

(c) SECTION HEADINGS.—The headings for sections 401, 402, 403, and 404 of title 32, United States Code, as redesignated by subsection (b), are amended by striking out ''**of National Guard not in Federal service**''.

SEC. 539. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that for an offense committed before that date the maximum punishment shall be the maximum punishment in effect at the time of the commission of the offense.

SEC. 540. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

(a) ARTICLE 20.—Section 820 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a)'' before ''Subject to'';

(2) by striking out the second and third sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

''(b) An accused with respect to whom summary courts-martial have jurisdiction may not be brought to trial before a summary court-martial if the accused objects thereto. If an accused so objects to trial by summary court-martial, the convening authority may order trial by special or general court-martial, as may be appropriate.''; and

(3) by designating as subsection (c) the sentence beginning ''Summary courts-martial may,''.

(b) ARTICLE 54.—Section 854(c)(1) of such title is amended by striking out ''complete record of the proceedings and testimony'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''verbatim record of the proceedings''.

Subtitle D—Education and Training Programs

SEC. 551. EXTENSION OF MAXIMUM AGE FOR APPOINTMENT AS A CADET OR MIDSHIPMAN IN THE SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS AND THE SERVICE ACADEMIES.

(a) SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS.—Sections 2107(a) and 2107a(a) of title 10, United States Code, are amended—

(1) by striking out ''25 years of age'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''27 years of age''; and

(2) by striking out ''29 years of age'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''30 years of age''.

(b) UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY.—Section 4346(a) of such title is amended by striking out ''twenty-second birthday'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''twenty-third birthday''.

(c) UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY.—Section 6958(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking out ''twenty-second birthday'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''twenty-third birthday''.

(d) UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY.—Section 9346(a) of such title is amended by striking out ''twenty-second birthday'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''twenty-third birthday''.

SEC. 552. OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT OF SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM.

(a) ENROLLMENT PRIORITY TO BE CONSISTENT WITH PURPOSE OF PROGRAM.—(1) Section 2103 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) An educational institution at which a unit of the program has been established shall give priority for enrollment in the program to students who are eligible for advanced training under section 2104 of this title.''.

(2) Section 2109 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c)(1) A person who is not qualified for, and (as determined by the Secretary concerned) will not be able to become qualified for, advanced training by reason of one or more of the requirements prescribed in paragraphs (1) through (3) of section 2104(b) of this title shall not be permitted to participate in—

''(A) field training or a practice cruise under section 2106(b)(6) of this title; or

''(B) practical military training under subsection (a).

''(2) The Secretary of the military department concerned may waive the limitation in paragraph (1) under procedures prescribed by the Secretary.''.

(b) WEAR OF THE MILITARY UNIFORM.—Section 772(h) of such title is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''if the wear of such uniform is specifically authorized under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned''.

SEC. 553. ROTC SCHOLARSHIP STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN SIMULTANEOUS MEMBERSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 2103 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding after subsection (e), as added by section 552, the following new subsection:

''(f) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that, in carrying out the program, the Secretaries of the military departments permit any person who is receiving financial assistance under section 2107 of this title simultaneously to be a member of the Selected Reserve.''.

SEC. 554. EXPANSION OF ROTC ADVANCED TRAINING PROGRAM TO INCLUDE GRADUATE STUDENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2107(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the last sentence the following new sentence: ''The Secretary of the military department concerned may provide similar financial assistance to a student enrolled in an advanced education program beyond the baccalaureate degree level if the student also is a cadet or midshipman in an advanced training program.''.

(b) DEFINITIONAL CHANGE.—Paragraph (3) of section 2101 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''students enrolled in an advanced education program beyond the baccalaureate degree level or to'' after 'instruction offered in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps to''.

SEC. 555. RESERVE CREDIT FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES HEALTH PROFESSIONS SCHOLARSHIP AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) SERVICE CREDIT.—Section 2126 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out ''Service performed'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''(a) GENERAL RULE AGAINST PROVISION OF SERVICE CREDIT.—Except as provided in subsection (b), service performed''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) SERVICE CREDIT FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—(1) This subsection applies with respect to a member of the Selected Reserve who—

''(A) completed a course of study under this subchapter as a member of the program;

''(B) completed the active duty obligation imposed under section 2123(a) of this title; and

''(C) possesses a specialty designated by the Secretary concerned as critically needed in wartime.

''(2) Upon satisfactory completion of a year of service in the Selected Reserve by a member of the Selected Reserve described in paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned may credit the member with a maximum of 50 points creditable toward the computation of the member's years of service under section 12732(a)(2) of this title for one year of participation in a course of study under this subchapter. Not more than four years of participation in a course of study under this subchapter may be considered under this paragraph.

''(3) In the case of a member of the Selected Reserve described in paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned may also credit the service of the member while pursuing a course of study under this subchapter, but not to exceed a total of four years, for purposes of computing years of service creditable under section 205 of title 37.

''(c) LIMITATIONS.—(1) A member of the Selected Reserve relieved of any portion of the minimum active duty obligation imposed under section 2123(a) of this title may not receive any point or service credit under subsection (b).

''(2) A member of the Selected Reserve awarded points or service credit under subsection (b) shall not be considered to have been in an active status, by reason of the award of the points or credit, while pursuing a course of study under this subchapter for purposes of any provision of law other than section 12732(a)(2) of this title and section 205 of title 37.''.

(b) RETROACTIVITY BARRED.—A member of the Selected Reserve is not entitled to any retroactive award or increase in pay or allowances as a result of the amendments made by subsection (a).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to individuals receiving financial assistance under section 2107 of title 10, United States Code, after September 30, 1996.

SEC. 556. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR EDUCATION BENEFITS TO INCLUDE CERTAIN RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) PARTICIPANTS.

(a) ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE.—Section 3011(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out ''or upon completion of a program of educational assistance under section 2107 of title 10'' in paragraph (2); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) An individual who after December 31, 1976, receives a commission as an officer in the Armed Forces upon completion of a program of educational assistance under section 2107 of title 10 is not eligible for educational assistance under this section if the individual enters on active duty—

''(A) before October 1, 1996; or

''(B) after September 30, 1996, and while participating in such program received more than $2,000 for each year of such participation.''.

(b) SELECTED RESERVE.—Section 3012(d) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out ''or upon completion of a program of educational assistance under section 2107 of title 10'' in paragraph (2); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) An individual who after December 31, 1976, receives a commission as an officer in the Armed Forces upon completion of a program of educational assistance under section 2107 of title 10 is not eligible for educational assistance under this section if the individual enters on active duty—

''(A) before October 1, 1996; or

''(B) after September 30, 1996, and while participating in such program received more than $2,000 for each year of such participation.''.

SEC. 557. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON COST AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF PERMITTING UP TO FIVE PERCENT OF SERVICE ACADEMY GRADUATES TO BE ASSIGNED DIRECTLY TO RESERVE DUTY UPON GRADUATION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report providing an analysis of the cost implications, and the policy implications, of permitting up to 5 percent of each graduating class of each of the service academies to be placed, upon graduation and commissioning, in an active status in the appropriate reserve component (without a minimum period of obligated active duty service), with a corresponding increase in the number of ROTC graduates each year who are permitted to serve on active duty upon commissioning.

(b) INFORMATION ON CURRENT ACADEMY GRADUATES IN RESERVE COMPONENTS.—The Comptroller General shall include in the report information (shown in the aggregate and separately for each of the Armed Forces and for graduates of each service academy) on—

(1) the number of academy graduates who at the time of the report are serving in an active status in a reserve component; and

(2) within the number under paragraph (1), the number for each reserve component and, of those, the number within each reserve component who are on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—The report shall be submitted not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) SERVICE ACADEMIES.—For purposes of this section, the term ''service academies'' means—

(1) the United States Military Academy;

(2) the United States Naval Academy; and

(3) the United States Air Force Academy.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 561. HATE CRIMES IN THE MILITARY.

(a) HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Secretary of each military department conducts ongoing programs for human relations training for all members of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Matters to be covered by such training include race relations, equal opportunity, opposition to gender discrimination, and sensitivity to ''hate group'' activity. Such training shall be provided during basic training (or other initial military training) and on a regular basis thereafter.

(2) The Secretary of Defense shall also ensure that unit commanders are aware of their responsibilities in ensuring that impermissible activity based upon discriminatory motives does not occur in units under their command.

(b) INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO PROSPECTIVE RECRUITS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each individual preparing to enter an officer accession program or to execute an original enlistment agreement is provided information concerning the meaning of the oath of office or oath of enlistment for service in the Armed Forces in terms of the equal protection and civil liberties guarantees of the Constitution, and each such individual shall be informed that if supporting those guarantees is not possible personally for that individual, then that individual should decline to enter the Armed Forces.

(c) ANNUAL SURVEY.—(1) Section 451 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§451. Race relations, gender discrimination, and hate group activity: annual survey and report

''(a) ANNUAL SURVEY.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out an annual survey to measure the state of racial, ethnic, and gender issues and discrimination among members of the armed forces serving on active duty and the extent (if any) of activity among such members that may be seen as so-called 'hate group' activity. The survey shall solicit information on the race relations and gender relations climate in the armed forces, including—

''(1) indicators of positive and negative trends of relations among all racial and ethnic groups and between the sexes;

''(2) the effectiveness of Department of Defense policies designed to improve race, ethnic, and gender relations; and

''(3) the effectiveness of current processes for complaints on and investigations into racial, ethnic, and gender discrimination.

''(b) IMPLEMENTING ENTITY.—The Secretary shall carry out each annual survey through the entity in the Department of Defense known as the Armed Forces Survey on Race/Ethnic Issues.

''(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion of biennial survey under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the survey.''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 22 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''451. Race relations, gender discrimination, and hate group activity: annual survey and report.''.

SEC. 562. AUTHORITY OF A RESERVE JUDGE ADVOCATE TO ACT AS A NOTARY PUBLIC.

(a) NOTARY PUBLIC AUTHORITY TO INCLUDE RESERVE LAWYERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—Section 1044a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking out ''on active duty or performing inactive-duty training'' and inserting in lieu thereof '', including reserve judge advocates not on active duty'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking out ''adjutants on active duty or performing inactive-duty training'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''adjutants, including reserve members not on active duty''; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking out ''persons on active duty or performing inactive-duty training'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''members of the armed forces, including reserve members not on active duty,''.

(b) RATIFICATION OF PRIOR NOTARIAL ACTS.—Any notarial act performed before the enactment of this Act, the validity of which has not been challenged or negated in a case pending before or decided by a court or administrative agency of competent jurisdiction, on or before the date of the enactment of this Act, is hereby confirmed, ratified, and approved with full effect as if such act was performed after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 563. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE LEGAL ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE OFFICERS.

(a) LEGAL ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE.—Subsection (a) of section 1044 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

''(3) Officers of the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service who are on active duty or entitled to retired or equivalent pay.

''(4) Dependents of members and former members described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).''.

(b) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking out ''armed forces'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''uniformed services described in subsection (a)''; and

(2) by inserting ''such'' after ''dependent of''.

(c) CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (a) of such section is further amended by striking out ''under his jurisdiction'' in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(d) STYLISTIC AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (a) of such section is further amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking out ''to—'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''to the following persons:'';

(2) by capitalizing the first letter of the first word of paragraphs (1) and (2);

(3) by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(4) by striking out ''; and'' at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 564. EXCEPTED APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN JUDICIAL NON-ATTORNEY STAFF IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 943(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading for the subsection, by inserting ''AND CERTAIN OTHER'' after ''ATTORNEY''; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and nonattorney positions on the personal staff of a judge'' after ''Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces''.

SEC. 565. REPLACEMENT OF CERTAIN AMERICAN THEATER CAMPAIGN RIBBONS.

(a) REPLACEMENT RIBBONS.—The Secretary of the Army, pursuant to section 3751 of title 10, United States Code, may replace any World War II decoration known as the American Theater Campaign Ribbon that was awarded to a person listed in the order described in subsection (b).

(b) RIBBONS PROPERLY AWARDED.—Any person listed in the document titled ''General Order Number 1'', issued by the Third Auxiliary Surgical Group, APO 647, United States Army, dated February 1, 1943, shall be considered to have been properly awarded the American Theater Campaign Ribbon for service during World War II.

SEC. 566. RESTORATION OF REGULATIONS PROHIBITING SERVICE OF HOMOSEXUALS IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) TERMINATION OF EXISTING ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY.—Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the following measures of the executive branch are rescinded and shall cease to be effective:

(1) The memorandum of the Secretary of Defense to the Secretaries of the military departments and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff dated July 19, 1993, that stated its subject to be: ''Policy on Homsexual Conduct in the Armed Forces''.

(2) The four-page document entitled ''Policy Guidelines on Homsexual Conduct in the Armed Forces'' that was issued by the Secretary of Defense as an attachment to the memorandum referred to in paragraph (1).

(3) The revisions to Department of Defense directives 1332.30, 1332.14, and 1304.26 that were directed to be made by the General Counsel of the Department of Defense by memorandum dated February 28, 1994, to the Director of Administration and Management of the Department of Defense.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF FORMER REGULATIONS.—Immediately upon the enactment of this Act and effective as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the Secretary of Defense shall reinstate the regulations (including Department of Defense directives) of the Department of Defense regarding service of homosexuals in the Armed Forces that were in effect on January 19, 1993; and

(2) the Secretary of each military department shall reinstate the regulations of that military department regarding service of homosexuals in the Armed Forces that were in effect on January 19, 1993.

(c) REVISION PROHIBITED.—The regulations (including Department of Defense directives) reinstated pursuant to subsection (b), insofar as they relate to the service of homosexuals in the Armed Forces, may not be revised except as specifically provided by a law enacted after the enactment of this Act.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—In the case of a conflict between the regulations required to be prescribed by subsection (b) and the provisions of section 654 of title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law, the requirements of such provision of law shall be given effect.

(e) RESTORATION OF QUESTIONING OF NEW ENTRANTS INTO MILITARY SERVICE.—(1) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall issue instructions for the resumption of questioning of potential new entrants into the Armed Forces as to homosexuality in accordance with the policy and practices of the Department of Defense as of January 19, 1993 (as reinstated pursuant to subsection (b)).

(2) Section 571(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 107 Stat. 1673; 10 U.S.C. 654 note) is repealed.

SEC. 567. REENACTMENT AND MODIFICATION OF MANDATORY SEPARATION FROM SERVICE FOR MEMBERS DIAGNOSED WITH HIV–1 VIRUS.

(a) REENACTMENT AND MODIFICATION.—(1) Chapter 59 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1176 the following:

''§1177. Members infected with HIV–1 virus: mandatory discharge or retirement

''(a) MANDATORY SEPARATION.—(1) A member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps who is HIV-positive and who on the date on which the medical determination is made that the member is HIV-positive has less than 15 years of creditable service shall be separated. Such separation shall be made on a date determined by the Secretary concerned, which shall be as soon as practicable after the date on which the medical determination is made that the member is HIV-positive and not later than the last day of the second month beginning after such date.

''(2) In determining the years of creditable service of a member for purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) in the case of a member on active duty or full-time National Guard duty, the member's years of creditable service are the number of years of service of the member as computed for the purpose of determining the member's eligibility for retirement under any provision of law (other than chapter 61 or 1223 of this title); and

''(B) in the case of a member in an active status, the member's years of creditable service are the number of years of service creditable to the member under section 12732 of this title.

''(b) FORM OF SEPARATION.—The characterization of the service of the member shall be determined without regard to the determination that the member is HIV-positive.

''(c) SEPARATION TO BE CONSIDERED INVOLUNTARY.—A separation under this section shall be considered to be an involuntary separation for purposes of any other provision of law.

''(d) COUNSELING ABOUT AVAILABLE MEDICAL CARE.—A member to be separated under this section shall be provided information, in writing, before such separation of the available medical care (through the Department of Veterans Affairs and otherwise) to treat the member's condition. Such information shall include identification of specific medical locations near the member's home of record or point of discharge at which the member may seek necessary medical care.

''(e) HIV-POSITIVE MEMBERS.—A member shall be considered to be HIV-positive for purposes of this section if there is serologic evidence that the member is infected with the virus known as Human Immunodeficiency Virus–1 (HIV–1), the virus most commonly associated with the acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) in the United States. Such serologic evidence shall be considered to exist if there is a reactive result given by an enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) serologic test that is confirmed by a reactive and diagnostic immunoelectrophoresis test (Western blot) on two separate samples. Any such serologic test must be one that is approved by the Food and Drug Administration.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 59 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1176 the following new item:

''1177. Members infected with HIV–1 virus: mandatory discharge or retirement.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 1177 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), applies with respect to members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps determined to be HIV-positive before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act. In the case of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps determined to be HIV-positive before such date, the deadline for separation of the member under subsection (a) of such section shall be determined from the date of the enactment of this Act (rather than from the date of such determination), except that no such member shall be separated by reason of such section (without the consent of the member) before October 1, 1996.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

SEC. 601. MILITARY PAY RAISE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.

(a) WAIVER OF SECTION 1009 ADJUSTMENT.—Any adjustment required by section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, in elements of compensation of members of the uniformed services to become effective during fiscal year 1997 shall not be made.

(b) INCREASE IN BASIC PAY AND BAS.—Effective on January 1, 1997, the rates of basic pay and basic allowance for subsistence of members of the uniformed services are increased by 3 percent.

(c) INCREASE IN BAQ.—Effective on January 1, 1997, the rates of basic allowance for quarters of members of the uniformed services are increased by 4.6 percent.

SEC. 602. AVAILABILITY OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS WHO SERVE ON SEA DUTY.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF ALLOWANCE.—Section 403(c)(2) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out ''A member'' in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof ''(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B) or (C), a member'';

(2) by striking out the second sentence; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(B) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, the Secretary may authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to a member of a uniformed service under the jurisdiction of the Secretary when the member is without dependents, is serving in pay grade E–5, and is assigned to sea duty. In prescribing regulations under this subparagraph, the Secretary concerned shall consider the availability of quarters for members serving in pay grade E–5.

''(C) Notwithstanding section 421 of this title, two members of the uniformed services in a pay grade below pay grade E–5 who are married to each other, have no other dependents, and are simultaneously assigned to sea duty are entitled to a single basic allowance for quarters during the period of such simultaneous sea duty. The amount of the allowance shall be based on the without dependents rate for the pay grade of the senior member.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on July 1, 1997.

SEC. 603. ESTABLISHMENT OF MINIMUM MONTHLY AMOUNT OF VARIABLE HOUSING ALLOWANCE FOR HIGH HOUSING COST AREAS.

(a) MINIMUM MONTHLY AMOUNT OF ALLOWANCE.—Subsection (c) of section 403a of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraph:

''(1) The monthly amount of a variable housing allowance under this section for a member of a uniformed service with respect to an area is equal to the greater of the following amounts:

''(A) An amount equal to the difference between—

''(i) the median monthly cost of housing in that area for members of the uniformed services serving in the same pay grade and with the same dependency status as that member; and

''(ii) 80 percent of the median monthly cost of housing in the United States for members of the uniformed services serving in the same pay grade and with the same dependency status as that member.

''(B) An amount equal to the difference between—

''(i) the adequate housing allowance floor determined by the Secretary of Defense for all members of the uniformed services in that area entitled to a variable housing allowance under this section; and

''(ii) the monthly basic allowance for quarters for members of the uniformed services serving in the same pay grade and with the same dependency status as that member.''.

(b) ADEQUATE HOUSING ALLOWANCE FLOOR.—Such subsection is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7)(A) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(i), the Secretary of Defense shall establish an adequate housing allowance floor for members of the uniformed services in an area as a selected percentage, not to exceed 85 percent, of the cost of adequate housing in that area based on an index of housing costs selected by the Secretary of Defense from among the following:

''(i) The fair market rentals established annually by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 8(c)(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(c)(1)).

''(ii) An index developed in the private sector that the Secretary of Defense determines is comparable to the fair market rentals referred to in clause (i) and is appropriate for use to determine the adequate housing allowance floor.

''(B) The Secretary of Defense shall carry out this paragraph in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.''.

(c) EFFECT ON TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR ALLOWANCE.—Subsection (d)(3) of such section is amended in the second sentence by striking out ''the second sentence of subsection (c)(3)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''paragraph (1)(B) of subsection (c) and the second sentence of paragraph (3) of that subsection''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (c) of such section is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking out ''this subsection'' in the first sentence and inserting lieu thereof ''paragraph (1)(A) or the minimum amount of a variable housing allowance under paragraph (1)(B)''; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''or minimum amount of a variable housing allowance'' after ''costs of housing''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 1997, except that the Secretary of Defense may delay implementation of the requirements imposed by the amendments to such later date as the Secretary considers appropriate upon publication of notice to that effect in the Federal Register.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

SEC. 611. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BONUSES FOR RESERVE FORCES.

(a) SELECTED RESERVE REENLISTMENT BONUS.—Section 308b(f) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

(b) SELECTED RESERVE ENLISTMENT BONUS.—Section 308c(e) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

(c) SELECTED RESERVE AFFILIATION BONUS.—Section 308e(e) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

(d) READY RESERVE ENLISTMENT AND REENLISTMENT BONUS.—Section 308h(g) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

(e) PRIOR SERVICE ENLISTMENT BONUS.—Section 308i(i) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

SEC. 612. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BONUSES AND SPECIAL PAY FOR NURSE OFFICER CANDIDATES, REGISTERED NURSES, AND NURSE ANESTHETISTS.

(a) NURSE OFFICER CANDIDATE ACCESSION PROGRAM.—Section 2130a(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

(b) ACCESSION BONUS FOR REGISTERED NURSES.—Section 302d(a)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

(c) INCENTIVE SPECIAL PAY FOR NURSE ANESTHETISTS.—Section 302e(a)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

SEC. 613. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY RELATING TO PAYMENT OF OTHER BONUSES AND SPECIAL PAYS.

(a) AVIATION OFFICER RETENTION BONUS.—Section 301b(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998,''.

(b) SPECIAL PAY FOR HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS WHO SERVE IN THE SELECTED RESERVE IN CRITICALLY SHORT WARTIME SPECIALTIES.—Section 302g(f) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

(c) REENLISTMENT BONUS FOR ACTIVE MEMBERS.—Section 308(g) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

(d) ENLISTMENT BONUSES FOR CRITICAL SKILLS.—Sections 308a(c) and 308f(c) of title 37, United States Code, are each amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

(e) SPECIAL PAY FOR ENLISTED MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE ASSIGNED TO CERTAIN HIGH PRIORITY UNITS.—Section 308d(c) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

(f) SPECIAL PAY FOR NUCLEAR QUALIFIED OFFICERS EXTENDING PERIOD OF ACTIVE SERVICE.—Section 312(e) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

(g) NUCLEAR CAREER ACCESSION BONUS.—Section 312b(c) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1998''.

(h) NUCLEAR CAREER ANNUAL INCENTIVE BONUS.—Section 312c(d) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''October 1, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''October 1, 1998''.

(i) REPAYMENT OF EDUCATION LOANS FOR CERTAIN HEALTH PROFESSIONALS WHO SERVE IN THE SELECTED RESERVE.—Section 16302(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''October 1, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''October 1, 1998''.

SEC. 614. SPECIAL INCENTIVES TO RECRUIT AND RETAIN DENTAL OFFICERS.

(a) VARIABLE, ADDITIONAL, AND BOARD CERTIFIED SPECIAL PAYS FOR ACTIVE DUTY DENTAL

OFFICERS.—Section 302b(a) of title 37, United States Code is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking out ''$1,200'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$3,000'';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking out ''$2,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$7,000''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking out ''$4,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$7,000'';

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking out subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

''(A) $4,000 per year, if the officer has less than three years of creditable service.

''(B) $6,000 per year, if the officer has at least three but less than 14 years of creditable service.

''(C) $8,000 per year, if the officer has at least 14 but less than 18 years of creditable service.

''(D) $10,000 per year, if the officer has at least 18 or more years of creditable service.''; and

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking out subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

''(A) $2,500 per year, if the officer has less than 10 years of creditable service.

''(B) $3,500 per year, if the officer has at least 10 but less than 12 years of creditable service.

''(C) $4,000 per year, if the officer has at least 12 but less than 14 years of creditable service.

''(D) $5,000 per year, if the officer has at least 14 but less than 18 years of creditable service.

''(E) $6,000 per year, if the officer has 18 or more years of creditable service.''.

(b) RESERVE DENTAL OFFICERS SPECIAL PAY.—Section 302b of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) RESERVE DENTAL OFFICERS SPECIAL PAY.—(1) A reserve dental officer described in paragraph (2) is entitled to special pay at the rate of $350 a month for each month of active duty, including active duty in the form of annual training, active duty for training, and active duty for special work.

''(2) A reserve dental officer referred to in paragraph (1) is a reserve officer who—

''(A) is an officer of the Dental Corps of the Army or the Navy or an officer of the Air Force designated as a dental officer; and

''(B) is on active duty under a call or order to active duty for a period of less than one year.''.

(c) ACCESSION BONUS FOR DENTAL SCHOOL GRADUATES WHO ENTER THE ARMED FORCES.—(1) Chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 302g the following new section:

''§302h. Special pay: accession bonus for dental officers

''(a) ACCESSION BONUS AUTHORIZED.—(1) A person who is a graduate of an accredited dental school and who, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section, and ending on September 30, 2002, executes a written agreement described in subsection (c) to accept a commission as an officer of the armed forces and remain on active duty for a period of not less than four years may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid an accession bonus in an amount determined by the Secretary concerned.

''(2) The amount of an accession bonus under paragraph (1) may not exceed $30,000.

''(b) LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR BONUS.—A person may not be paid a bonus under subsection (a) if—

''(1) the person, in exchange for an agreement to accept an appointment as an officer, received financial assistance from the Department of Defense to pursue a course of study in dentistry; or

''(2) the Secretary concerned determines that the person is not qualified to become and remain certified and licensed as a dentist.

''(c) AGREEMENT.—The agreement referred to in subsection (a) shall provide that, consistent with the needs of the armed service concerned, the person executing the agreement will be assigned to duty, for the period of obligated service covered by the agreement, as an officer of the Dental Corps of the Army or the Navy or an officer of the Air Force designated as a dental officer.

''(d) REPAYMENT.—(1) An officer who receives a payment under subsection (a) and who fails to become and remain certified or licensed as a dentist during the period for which the payment is made shall refund to the United States an amount equal to the full amount of such payment.

''(2) An officer who voluntarily terminates service on active duty before the end of the period agreed to be served under subsection (a) shall refund to the United States an amount that bears the same ratio to the amount paid to the officer as the unserved part of such period bears to the total period agreed to be served.

''(3) An obligation to reimburse the United States imposed under paragraph (1) or (2) is for all purposes a debt owed to the United States.

''(4) A discharge in bankruptcy under title 11 that is entered less than five years after the termination of an agreement under this section does not discharge the person signing such agreement from a debt arising under such agreement or this subsection. This paragraph applies to any case commenced under title 11 after the date of the enactment of this section.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 302g the following new item:

''302h. Special pay: accession bonus for dental officers.''.

(3) Section 303a of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''302g'' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof ''302h''.

(d) REPORT ON ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES TO INCREASE RECRUITMENT OF DENTISTS.—Not later than April 1, 1997, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report describing the feasibility of increasing the number of persons enrolled in the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance program who are pursuing a course of study in dentistry in anticipation of service as an officer of the Dental Corps of the Army or the Navy or an officer of the Air Force designated as a dental officer.

(e) STYLISTIC AMENDMENTS.—Section 302b of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''VARIABLE, ADDITIONAL, AND BOARD CERTIFICATION SPECIAL PAY.—'' after ''(a)'';

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting ''ACTIVE-DUTY AGREEMENT.—'' after ''(b)'';

(3) in subsection (c), by inserting ''REGULATIONS.—'' after ''(c)'';

(4) in subsection (d), by inserting ''FREQUENCY OF PAYMENTS.—'' after ''(d)'';

(5) in subsection (e), by inserting ''REFUND FOR PERIOD OF UNSERVED OBLIGATED SERVICE.—'' after ''(e)'';

(6) in subsection (f), by inserting ''EFFECT OF DISCHARGE IN BANKRUPTCY.—'' after ''(f)''; and

(7) in subsection (g), by inserting ''DETERMINATION OF CREDITABLE SERVICE.—'' after ''(g)''.

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

SEC. 621. TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSES OF MEMBER IN CONNECTION WITH FIRST PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION.

(a) PAYMENT OR REIMBURSEMENT AUTHORIZED.—Section 404a(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out ''or'' at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''or'' after ''Alaska;''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) from home of record or initial technical school to first duty station;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 1997.

SEC. 622. ALLOWANCE IN CONNECTION WITH SHIPPING MOTOR VEHICLE AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE.

(a) ALLOWANCE AUTHORIZED.—Section 406(b)(1)(B) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''If clause (i)(I) applies to the transportation by the member of a motor vehicle from the old duty station, the monetary allowance under this subparagraph shall also cover return travel to the old duty station by the member or other person transporting the vehicle. In the case of transportation described in clause (ii), the monetary allowance shall also cover travel from the new duty station to the port of debarkation to pick up the vehicle.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 1997.

SEC. 623. DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE AT A RATE EQUAL TO TWO AND ONE-HALF MONTHS BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS.

(a) Section 407(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding the paragraphs by striking out ''two months'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''two and one-half months''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 1997.

SEC. 624. ALLOWANCE FOR TRAVEL PERFORMED IN CONNECTION WITH LEAVE BETWEEN CONSECUTIVE OVERSEAS TOURS.

(a) ADDITIONAL DEFERRAL.—Section 411b(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''If the member is unable to undertake the travel before the end of such one-year period as a result of the participation of the member in a critical operational mission, as determined by the Secretary concerned, the member may defer the travel, under the regulations referred to in paragraph (1), for a period not to exceed one year after the date on which the member's participation in the critical operational mission ends.''.

(b) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENT.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to members of the uniformed services participating, on or after November 1, 1995, in critical operational missions designated by the Secretary of Defense.

Subtitle D—Retired Pay, Survivior Benefits, and Related Matters

SEC. 631. INCREASE IN ANNUAL LIMIT ON DAYS OF INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING CREDITABLE TOWARDS RESERVE RETIREMENT.

(a) INCREASE IN LIMIT.—Section 12733(3) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''before the year in which the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 occurs and not more than 75 days in any subsequent year''.

(b) TRACKING SYSTEM FOR AWARD OF RETIREMENT POINTS.—To better enable the Secretary of Defense and Congress to assess the cost and the effect on readiness of the amendment made by subsection (a) and of other potential changes to the Reserve retirement system under chapter 1223 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense shall require the Secretary of each military department to implement a system to monitor the award of retirement points for purposes of that chapter by categories in accordance with the recommendation set forth in the August 1988 report of the Sixth Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of

this Act, the recommendations of the Secretary with regard to the adoption of the following Reserve retirement initiatives recommended in the August 1988 report of the Sixth Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation:

(1) Elimination of membership points under subparagraph (C) of section 12732(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, in conjunction with a decrease from 50 to 35 in the number of points required for a satisfactory year under that section.

(2) Limitation to 60 in any year on the number of points that may be credited under subparagraph (B) of section 12732(a)(2) of such title at two points per day.

(3) Limitation to 360 in any year on the total number of retirement points countable for purposes of section 12733 of such title.

SEC. 632. AUTHORITY FOR RETIREMENT IN GRADE IN WHICH A MEMBER HAS BEEN SELECTED FOR PROMOTION WHEN A PHYSICAL DISABILITY INTERVENES.

Section 1372 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''his physical examination for promotion'' in paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof ''a physical examination''.

SEC. 633. ELIGIBILITY FOR RESERVE DISABILITY RETIREMENT FOR RESERVES INJURED WHILE AWAY FROM HOME OVERNIGHT FOR INACTIVE-DUTY TRAINING.

Section 1204(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ''or is incurred in line of duty while remaining overnight, between successive periods of inactive-duty training, at or in the vicinity of the site of the inactive-duty training, if the site is outside reasonable commuting distance from the member's residence''.

SEC. 634. RETIREMENT OF RESERVE ENLISTED MEMBERS WHO QUALIFY FOR ACTIVE DUTY RETIREMENT AFTER ADMINISTRATIVE REDUCTION IN ENLISTED GRADE.

(a) ARMY.—(1) Chapter 369 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3962 the following new section:

''§ 3963. Highest grade held satisfactorily: Reserve enlisted members reduced in grade not as a result of the member's misconduct

''(a) A Reserve enlisted member of the Army described in subsection (b) who is retired under section 3914 of this title shall be retired in the highest enlisted grade in which the member served on active duty satisfactorily (or, in the case of a member of the National Guard, in which the member served on full-time duty satisfactorily), as determined by the Secretary of the Army.

''(b) This section applies to a Reserve enlisted member who—

''(1) at the time of retirement is serving on active duty (or, in the case of a member of the National Guard, on full-time National Guard duty) in a grade lower than the highest enlisted grade held by the member while on active duty (or full-time National Guard duty); and

''(2) was previously administratively reduced in grade not as a result of the member's own misconduct, as determined by the Secretary of the Army.

''(c) This section applies with respect to Reserve enlisted members who are retired under section 3914 of this title after September 30, 1996.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3962 the following new item:

''3963. Highest grade held satisfactorily: Reserve enlisted members reduced in grade not as a result of the member's misconduct.''.

(b) NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.—(1) Chapter 571 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 6336. Highest grade held satisfactorily: Reserve enlisted members reduced in grade not as a result of the member's misconduct

''(a) A member of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve described in subsection (b) who is transferred to the Fleet Reserve or the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve under section 6330 of this title shall be transferred in the highest enlisted grade in which the member served on active duty satisfactorily, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

''(b) This section applies to a Reserve enlisted member who—

''(1) at the time of transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve is serving on active duty in a grade lower than the highest enlisted grade held by the member while on active duty; and

''(2) was previously administratively reduced in grade not as a result of the member's own misconduct, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

''(c) This section applies with respect to enlisted members of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve who are transferred to the Fleet Reserve or the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve after September 30, 1996.''.

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

''6336. Highest grade held satisfactorily: Reserve enlisted members reduced in grade not as a result of the member's misconduct.''.

(c) AIR FORCE.—(1) Chapter 869 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 8962 the following new section:

''§ 8963. Highest grade held satisfactorily: Reserve enlisted members reduced in grade not as a result of the member's misconduct

''(a) A Reserve enlisted member of the Air Force described in subsection (b) who is retired under section 8914 of this title shall be retired in the highest enlisted grade in which the member served on active duty satisfactorily (or, in the case of a member of the National Guard, in which the member served on full-time duty satisfactorily), as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

''(b) This section applies to a Reserve enlisted member who—

''(1) at the time of retirement is serving on active duty (or, in the case of a member of the National Guard, on full-time National Guard duty) in a grade lower than the highest enlisted grade held by the member while on active duty (or full-time National Guard duty); and

''(2) was previously administratively reduced in grade not as a result of the member's own misconduct, as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

''(c) This section applies with respect to Reserve enlisted members who are retired under section 8914 of this title after September 30, 1996.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 8962 the following new item:

''8963. Highest grade held satisfactorily: Reserve enlisted members reduced in grade not as a result of the member's misconduct.''.

(d) COMPUTATION OF RETIRED AND RETAINER PAY BASED UPON RETIRED GRADE.—(1) Section 3991 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETIRED RESERVE ENLISTED MEMBERS COVERED BY SECTION 3963.—In the case of a Reserve enlisted member retired under section 3914 of this title whose retired grade is determined under section 3963 of this title and who first became a member of a uniformed service before October 1, 1980, the retired pay base of the member (notwithstanding section 1406(a)(1) of this title) is the amount of the monthly basic pay of the member's retired grade (determined based upon the rates of basic pay applicable on the date of the member's retirement), and that amount shall be used for the purposes of subsection (a)(1)(A) rather than the amount computed under section 1406(c) of this title.''.

(2) Section 6333 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) In the case of a Reserve enlisted member whose grade upon transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve is determined under section 6336 of this title and who first became a member of a uniformed service before October 1, 1980, the retainer pay base of the member (notwithstanding section 1406(a)(1) of this title) is the amount of the monthly basic pay of the grade in which the member is so transferred (determined based upon the rates of basic pay applicable on the date of the member's transfer), and that amount shall be used for the purposes of the table in subsection (a) rather than the amount computed under section 1406(d) of this title.''.

(3) Section 8991 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETIRED RESERVE ENLISTED MEMBERS COVERED BY SECTION 8963.—In the case of a Reserve enlisted member retired under section 8914 of this title whose retired grade is determined under section 8963 of this title and who first became a member of a uniformed service before October 1, 1980, the retired pay base of the member (notwithstanding section 1406(a)(1) of this title) is the amount of the monthly basic pay of the member's retired grade (determined based upon the rates of basic pay applicable on the date of the member's retirement), and that amount shall be used for the purposes of subsection (a)(1)(A) rather than the amount computed under section 1406(e) of this title.''.

SEC. 635. CLARIFICATION OF INITIAL COMPUTATION OF RETIREE COLAS AFTER RETIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1401a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsections (c) and (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections:

''(c) FIRST COLA ADJUSTMENT FOR MEMBERS WITH RETIRED PAY COMPUTED USING FINAL BASIC PAY.—

''(1) FIRST ADJUSTMENT WITH INTERVENING INCREASE IN BASIC PAY.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), if a person described in paragraph (3) becomes entitled to retired pay based on rates of monthly basic pay that became effective after the last day of the calendar quarter of the base index, the retired pay of the member or former member shall be increased on the effective date of the next adjustment of retired pay under subsection (b) only by the percent (adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent) by which—

''(A) the price index for the base quarter of that year, exceeds

''(B) the price index for the calendar quarter immediately before the calendar quarter in which the rates of monthly basic pay on which the retired pay is based became effective.

''(2) FIRST ADJUSTMENT WITH NO INTERVENING INCREASE IN BASIC PAY.—If a person described in paragraph (3) becomes entitled to retired pay on or after the effective date of an adjustment in retired pay under subsection (b) but before the effective date of the next increase in the rates of monthly basic pay, the retired pay of the member or former member shall be increased, effective on the date the member becomes entitled to that pay, by the percent (adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent) by which—

''(A) the base index, exceeds

''(B) the price index for the calendar quarter immediately before the calendar quarter in which the rates of monthly basic pay on which the retired pay is based became effective.

''(3) MEMBERS COVERED.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) apply to a member or former member of an armed force who first became a member of a uniformed service before August 1, 1986, and whose

retired pay base is determined under section 1406 of this title.

''(d) FIRST COLA ADJUSTMENT FOR MEMBERS WITH RETIRED PAY COMPUTED USING HIGH-THREE.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), the retired pay of a member or former member of an armed force who first became a member of a uniformed service before August 1, 1986, and whose retired pay base is determined under section 1407 of this title shall be increased on the effective date of the first adjustment of retired pay under subsection (b) after the member or former member becomes entitled to retired pay by the percent (adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent) equal to the difference between the percent by which—

''(1) the price index for the base quarter of that year, exceeds

''(2) the price index for the calendar quarter immediately before the calendar quarter during which the member became entitled to retired pay.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only to adjustments of retired and retainer pay effective after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 636. TECHNICAL CORRECTION TO PRIOR AUTHORITY FOR PAYMENT OF BACK PAY TO CERTAIN PERSONS.

Section 634 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 366) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking out ''Island of Bataan'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''peninsula of Bataan or island of Corregidor''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by inserting after the first sentence the following: ''For the purposes of this subsection, the Secretary of War shall be deemed to have determined that conditions in the Philippines during the specified period justified payment under applicable regulations of quarters and subsistence allowances at the maximum special rate for duty where emergency conditions existed.''.

SEC. 637. AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIFORMED SERVICES FORMER SPOUSES' PROTECTION ACT.

(a) MANNER OF SERVICE OF PROCESS.—Subsection (b)(1)(A) of section 1408 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''certified or registered mail, return receipt requested'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''facsimile or electronic transmission or by mail''.

(b) SUBSEQUENT COURT ORDER FROM ANOTHER STATE.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6)(A) The Secretary concerned may not accept service of a court order that is an out-of State modification, or comply with the provisions of such a court order, unless the court issuing that order has jurisdiction in the manner specified in subsection (c)(4) over both the member and the spouse or former spouse involved.

''(B) A court order shall be considered to be an out-of-State modification for purposes of this paragraph if the order—

''(i) modifies a previous court order under this section upon which payments under this subsection are based; and

''(ii) is issued by a court of a State other than the State of the court that issued the previous court order.''.

SEC. 638. ADMINISTRATION OF BENEFITS FOR SO-CALLED MINIMUM INCOME WIDOWS.

(a) PAYMENTS TO BE MADE BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Section 4 of Public Law 92–425 (10 U.S.C. 1448 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) Payment of annuities under this section shall be made by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. If appropriate for administrative convenience (or otherwise determined appropriate by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs), that Secretary may combine a payment to any person for any month under this section with any other payment for that month under laws administered by the Secretary so as to provide that person with a single payment for that month.

''(2) The Secretary concerned shall annually transfer to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs such amounts as may be necessary for payments by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under this section and for costs of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in administering this section. Such transfers shall be made from amounts that would otherwise be used for payment of annuities by the Secretary concerned under this section. The authority to make such a transfer is in addition to any other authority of the Secretary concerned to transfer funds for a purpose other than the purpose for which the funds were originally made available. In the case of a transfer by the Secretary of a military department, the provisions of section 2215 of this title do not apply.

''(3) The Secretary concerned shall promptly notify the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of any change in beneficiaries under this section.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (e) of section 4 of Public Law 92–425, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to payments of benefits for any month after June 1997.

SEC. 639. NONSUBSTANTIVE RESTATEMENT OF SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN STATUTE.

Subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''SUBCHAPTER II—SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN

''§1447. Definitions

''In this subchapter:

''(1) PLAN.—The term 'Plan' means the Survivor Benefit Plan established by this subchapter.

''(2) STANDARD ANNUITY.—The term 'standard annuity' means an annuity provided by virtue of eligibility under section 1448(a)(1)(A) of this title.

''(3) RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY.—The term 'reserve-component annuity' means an annuity provided by virtue of eligibility under section 1448(a)(1)(B) of this title.

''(4) RETIRED PAY.—The term 'retired pay' includes retainer pay paid under section 6330 of this title.

''(5) RESERVE-COMPONENT RETIRED PAY.—The term 'reserve-component retired pay' means retired pay under chapter 1223 of this title (or under chapter 67 of this title as in effect before the effective date of the Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act).

''(6) BASE AMOUNT.—The term 'base amount' means the following:

''(A) FULL AMOUNT UNDER STANDARD ANNUITY.—In the case of a person who dies after becoming entitled to retired pay, such term means the amount of monthly retired pay (determined without regard to any reduction under section 1409(b)(2) of this title) to which the person—

''(i) was entitled when he became eligible for that pay; or

''(ii) later became entitled by being advanced on the retired list, performing active duty, or being transferred from the temporary disability retired list to the permanent disability retired list.

''(B) FULL AMOUNT UNDER RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY.—In the case of a person who would have become eligible for reserve-component retired pay but for the fact that he died before becoming 60 years of age, such term means the amount of monthly retired pay for which the person would have been eligible—

''(i) if he had been 60 years of age on the date of his death, for purposes of an annuity to become effective on the day after his death in accordance with a designation made under section 1448(e) of this title.

''(ii) upon becoming 60 years of age (if he had lived to that age), for purposes of an annuity to become effective on the 60th anniversary of his birth in accordance with a designation made under section 1448(e) of this title.

''(C) REDUCED AMOUNT.—Such term means any amount less than the amount otherwise applicable under subparagraph (A) or (B) with respect to an annuity provided under the Plan but which is not less than $300 and which is designated by the person (with the concurrence of the person's spouse, if required under section 1448(a)(3) of this title) providing the annuity on or before—

''(i) the first day for which he becomes eligible for retired pay, in the case of a person providing a standard annuity, or

''(ii) the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which he receives the notification required by section 12731(d) of this title that he has completed the years of service required for eligibility for reserve-component retired pay, in the case of a person providing a reserve-component annuity.

''(7) WIDOW.—The term 'widow' means the surviving wife of a person who, if not married to the person at the time he became eligible for retired pay—

''(A) was married to the person for at least one year immediately before the person's death; or

''(B) is the mother of issue by that marriage.

''(8) WIDOWER.—The term 'widower' means the surviving husband of a person who, if not married to the person at the time she became eligible for retired pay—

''(A) was married to her for at least one year immediately before her death; or

''(B) is the father of issue by that marriage.

''(9) SURVIVING SPOUSE.—The term 'surviving spouse' means a widow or widower.

''(10) FORMER SPOUSE.—The term 'former spouse' means the surviving former husband or wife of a person who is eligible to participate in the Plan.

''(11) DEPENDENT CHILD.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'dependent child' means a person who—

''(i) is unmarried;

''(ii) is (I) under 18 years of age, (II) at least 18, but under 22, years of age and pursuing a full-time course of study or training in a high school, trade school, technical or vocational institute, junior college, college, university, or comparable recognized educational institution, or (III) incapable of self support because of a mental or physical incapacity existing before the person's eighteenth birthday or incurred on or after that birthday, but before the person's twenty-second birthday, while pursuing such a full-time course of study or training; and

''(iii) is the child of a person to whom the Plan applies, including (I) an adopted child, and (II) a stepchild, foster child, or recognized natural child who lived with that person in a regular parent-child relationship.

''(B) SPECIAL RULES FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS.—For the purpose of subparagraph (A), a child whose twenty-second birthday occurs before July 1 or after August 31 of a calendar year, and while regularly pursuing such a course of study or training, is considered to have become 22 years of age on the first day of July after that birthday. A child who is a student is considered not to have ceased to be a student during an interim between school years if the interim is not more than 150 days and if the child shows to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Defense that the child has a bona fide intention of continuing to pursue a course of study or training in the same or a different school during the school semester (or other period into which the school year is divided) immediately after the interim.

''(C) FOSTER CHILDREN.—A foster child, to qualify under this paragraph as the dependent

child of a person to whom the Plan applies, must, at the time of the death of that person, also reside with, and receive over one-half of his support from, that person, and not be cared for under a social agency contract. The temporary absence of a foster child from the residence of that person, while a student as described in this paragraph, shall not be considered to affect the residence of such a foster child.

''(12) COURT.—The term 'court' has the meaning given that term by section 1408(a)(1) of this title.

''(13) COURT ORDER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'court order' means a court's final decree of divorce, dissolution, or annulment or a court ordered, ratified, or approved property settlement incident to such a decree (including a final decree modifying the terms of a previously issued decree of divorce, dissolution, annulment, or legal separation, or of a court ordered, ratified, or approved property settlement agreement incident to such previously issued decree).

''(B) FINAL DECREE.—The term 'final decree' means a decree from which no appeal may be taken or from which no appeal has been taken within the time allowed for the taking of such appeals under the laws applicable to such appeals, or a decree from which timely appeal has been taken and such appeal has been finally decided under the laws applicable to such appeals.

''(C) REGULAR ON ITS FACE.—The term 'regular on its face', when used in connection with a court order, means a court order that meets the conditions prescribed in section 1408(b)(2) of this title.

''§ 1448. Application of plan

''(a) GENERAL RULES FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PLAN.—

''(1) NAME OF PLAN; ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—The program established by this subchapter shall be known as the Survivor Benefit Plan. The following persons are eligible to participate in the Plan:

''(A) Persons entitled to retired pay.

''(B) Persons who would be eligible for reserve-component retired pay but for the fact that they are under 60 years of age.

''(2) PARTICIPANTS IN THE PLAN.—The Plan applies to the following persons, who shall be participants in the Plan:

''(A) STANDARD ANNUITY PARTICIPANTS.—A person who is eligible to participate in the Plan under paragraph (1)(A) and who is married or has a dependent child when he becomes entitled to retired pay, unless he elects (with his spouse's concurrence, if required under paragraph (3)) not to participate in the Plan before the first day for which he is eligible for that pay.

''(B) RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY PARTICIPANTS.—A person who (i) is eligible to participate in the Plan under paragraph (1)(B), (ii) is married or has a dependent child when he is notified under section 12731(d) of this title that he has completed the years of service required for eligibility for reserve-component retired pay, and (iii) elects to participate in the Plan (and makes a designation under subsection (e)) before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date he receives such notification.

A person described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (B) who does not elect to participate in the Plan before the end of the 90-day period referred to in that clause remains eligible, upon reaching 60 years of age and otherwise becoming entitled to retired pay, to participate in the Plan in accordance with eligibility under paragraph (1)(A).

''(3) ELECTIONS.—

''(A) SPOUSAL CONSENT FOR CERTAIN ELECTIONS RESPECTING STANDARD ANNUITY.—A married person who is eligible to provide a standard annuity may not without the concurrence of the person's spouse elect—

''(i) not to participate in the Plan;

''(ii) to provide an annuity for the person's spouse at less than the maximum level; or

''(iii) to provide an annuity for a dependent child but not for the person's spouse.

''(B) SPOUSAL CONSENT FOR CERTAIN ELECTIONS RESPECTING RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY.—A married person who elects to provide a reserve-component annuity may not without the concurrence of the person's spouse elect—

''(i) to provide an annuity for the person's spouse at less than the maximum level; or

''(ii) to provide an annuity for a dependent child but not for the person's spouse.

''(C) EXCEPTION WHEN SPOUSE UNAVAILABLE.—A person may make an election described in subparagraph (A) or (B) without the concurrence of the person's spouse if the person establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary concerned—

''(i) that the spouse's whereabouts cannot be determined; or

''(ii) that, due to exceptional circumstances, requiring the person to seek the spouse's consent would otherwise be inappropriate.

''(D) CONSTRUCTION WITH FORMER SPOUSE ELECTION PROVISIONS.—This paragraph does not affect any right or obligation to elect to provide an annuity for a former spouse (or for a former spouse and dependent child) under subsection (b)(2).

''(E) NOTICE TO SPOUSE OF ELECTION TO PROVIDE FORMER SPOUSE ANNUITY.—If a married person who is eligible to provide a standard annuity elects to provide an annuity for a former spouse (or for a former spouse and dependent child) under subsection (b)(2), that person's spouse shall be notified of that election.

''(4) IRREVOCABILITY OF ELECTIONS.—

''(A) STANDARD ANNUITY.—An election under paragraph (2)(A) not to participate in the Plan is irrevocable if not revoked before the date on which the person first becomes entitled to retired pay.

''(B) RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY.—An election under paragraph (2)(B) to participate in the Plan is irrevocable if not revoked before the end of the 90-day period referred to in that paragraph.

''(5) PARTICIPATION BY PERSON MARRYING AFTER RETIREMENT, ETC.—

''(A) ELECTION TO PARTICIPATE IN PLAN.—A person who is not married and has no dependent child upon becoming eligible to participate in the Plan but who later marries or acquires a dependent child may elect to participate in the Plan.

''(B) MANNER AND TIME OF ELECTION.—Such an election must be written, signed by the person making the election, and received by the Secretary concerned within one year after the date on which that person marries or acquires that dependent child.

''(C) LIMITATION ON REVOCATION OF ELECTION.—Such an election may not be revoked except in accordance with subsection (b)(3).

''(D) EFFECTIVE DATE OF ELECTION.—The election is effective as of the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which the election is received by the Secretary concerned.

''(E) DESIGNATION IF RCSBP ELECTION.—In the case of a person providing a reserve-component annuity, such an election shall include a designation under subsection (e).

''(6) ELECTION OUT OF PLAN BY PERSON WITH SPOUSE COVERAGE WHO REMARRIES.—

''(A) GENERAL RULE.—A person—

''(i) who is a participant in the Plan and is providing coverage under the Plan for a spouse (or a spouse and child);

''(ii) who does not have an eligible spouse beneficiary under the Plan; and

''(iii) who remarries,

may elect not to provide coverage under the Plan for the person's spouse.

''(B) EFFECT OF ELECTION ON RETIRED PAY.—If such an election is made, reductions in the retired pay of that person under section 1452 of this title shall not be made.

''(C) TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF ELECTION.—An election under this paragraph—

''(i) is irrevocable;

''(ii) shall be made within one year after the person's remarriage; and

''(iii) shall be made in such form and manner as may be prescribed in regulations under section 1455 of this title.

''(D) NOTICE TO SPOUSE.—If a person makes an election under this paragraph—

''(i) not to participate in the Plan;

''(ii) to provide an annuity for the person's spouse at less than the maximum level; or

''(iii) to provide an annuity for a dependent child but not for the person's spouse,

the person's spouse shall be notified of that election.

''(E) CONSTRUCTION WITH FORMER SPOUSE ELECTION PROVISIONS.—This paragraph does not affect any right or obligation to elect to provide an annuity to a former spouse under subsection (b).

''(b) INSURABLE INTEREST AND FORMER SPOUSE COVERAGE.—

''(1) COVERAGE FOR PERSON WITH INSURABLE INTEREST.—

''(A) GENERAL RULE.—A person who is not married and does not have a dependent child upon becoming eligible to participate in the Plan may elect to provide an annuity under the Plan to a natural person with an insurable interest in that person. In the case of a person providing a reserve-component annuity, such an election shall include a designation under subsection (e).

''(B) TERMINATION OF COVERAGE.—An election under subparagraph (A) for a beneficiary who is not the former spouse of the person providing the annuity may be terminated. Any such termination shall be made by a participant by the submission to the Secretary concerned of a request to discontinue participation in the Plan, and such participation in the Plan shall be discontinued effective on the first day of the first month following the month in which the request is received by the Secretary concerned. Effective on such date, the Secretary concerned shall discontinue the reduction being made in such person's retired pay on account of participation in the Plan or, in the case of a person who has been required to make deposits in the Treasury on account of participation in the Plan, such person may discontinue making such deposits effective on such date.

''(C) FORM FOR DISCONTINUATION.—A request under subparagraph (B) to discontinue participation in the Plan shall be in such form and shall contain such information as may be required under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

''(D) WITHDRAWAL OF REQUEST FOR DISCONTINUATION.—The Secretary concerned shall furnish promptly to each person who submits a request under subparagraph (B) to discontinue participation in the Plan a written statement of the advantages and disadvantages of participating in the Plan and the possible disadvantages of discontinuing participation. A person may withdraw the request to discontinue participation if withdrawn within 30 days after having been submitted to the Secretary concerned.

''(E) CONSEQUENCES OF DISCONTINUATION.—Once participation is discontinued, benefits may not be paid in conjunction with the earlier participation in the Plan and premiums paid may not be refunded. Participation in the Plan may not later be resumed except through a qualified election under paragraph (5) of subsection (a).

''(2) FORMER SPOUSE COVERAGE UPON BECOMING A PARTICIPANT IN THE PLAN.—

''(A) GENERAL RULE.—A person who has a former spouse upon becoming eligible to participate in the Plan may elect to provide an annuity to that former spouse.

''(B) EFFECT OF FORMER SPOUSE ELECTION ON SPOUSE OR DEPENDENT CHILD.—In the case of a person with a spouse or a dependent child, such an election prevents payment of an annuity to that spouse or child (other than a child who is

a beneficiary under an election under paragraph (4)), including payment under subsection (d).

''(C) DESIGNATION IF MORE THAN ONE FORMER SPOUSE.—If there is more than one former spouse, the person shall designate which former spouse is to be provided the annuity.

''(D) DESIGNATION IF RCSBP ELECTION.—In the case of a person providing a reserve-component annuity, such an election shall include a designation under subsection (e).

''(3) FORMER SPOUSE COVERAGE BY PERSONS ALREADY PARTICIPATING IN PLAN.—

''(A) ELECTION OF COVERAGE.—

''(i) AUTHORITY FOR ELECTION.—A person—

''(I) who is a participant in the Plan and is providing coverage for a spouse or a spouse and child (even though there is no beneficiary currently eligible for such coverage), and

''(II) who has a former spouse who was not that person's former spouse when that person became eligible to participate in the Plan,

may (subject to subparagraph (B)) elect to provide an annuity to that former spouse.

''(ii) TERMINATION OF PREVIOUS COVERAGE.—Any such election terminates any previous coverage under the Plan.

''(iii) MANNER AND TIME OF ELECTION.—Any such election must be written, signed by the person making the election, and received by the Secretary concerned within one year after the date of the decree of divorce, dissolution, or annulment.

''(B) LIMITATION ON ELECTION.—A person may not make an election under subparagraph (A) to provide an annuity to a former spouse who that person married after becoming eligible for retired pay unless—

''(i) the person was married to that former spouse for at least one year, or

''(ii) that former spouse is the parent of issue by that marriage.

''(C) IRREVOCABILITY, EFFECTIVE DATE, ETC.—An election under this paragraph may not be revoked except in accordance with section 1450(f) of this title. Such an election is effective as of the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which it is received by the Secretary concerned. This paragraph does not provide the authority to change a designation previously made under subsection (e).

''(D) NOTICE TO SPOUSE.—If a person who is married makes an election to provide an annuity to a former spouse under this paragraph, that person's spouse shall be notified of the election.

''(4) FORMER SPOUSE AND CHILD COVERAGE.—A person who elects to provide an annuity for a former spouse under paragraph (2) or (3) may, at the time of the election, elect to provide coverage under that annuity for both the former spouse and a dependent child, if the child resulted from the person's marriage to that former spouse.

''(5) DISCLOSURE OF WHETHER ELECTION OF FORMER SPOUSE COVERAGE IS REQUIRED.—A person who elects to provide an annuity to a former spouse under paragraph (2) or (3) shall, at the time of making the election, provide the Secretary concerned with a written statement (in a form to be prescribed by that Secretary and signed by such person and the former spouse) setting forth—

''(A) whether the election is being made pursuant to the requirements of a court order; or

''(B) whether the election is being made pursuant to a written agreement previously entered into voluntarily by such person as a part of, or incident to, a proceeding of divorce, dissolution, or annulment and (if so) whether such voluntary written agreement has been incorporated in, or ratified or approved by, a court order.

''(c) PERSONS ON TEMPORARY DISABILITY RETIRED LIST.—The application of the Plan to a person whose name is on the temporary disability retired list terminates when his name is removed from that list and he is no longer entitled to disability retired pay.

''(d) COVERAGE FOR SURVIVORS OF RETIREMENT-ELIGIBLE MEMBERS WHO DIE ON ACTIVE DUTY.—

''(1) SURVIVING SPOUSE ANNUITY.—The Secretary concerned shall pay an annuity under this subchapter to the surviving spouse of a member who dies on active duty after—

''(A) becoming eligible to receive retired pay;

''(B) qualifying for retired pay except that he has not applied for or been granted that pay; or

''(C) completing 20 years of active service but before he is eligible to retire as a commissioned officer because he has not completed 10 years of active commissioned service.

''(2) DEPENDENT CHILD ANNUITY.—The Secretary concerned shall pay an annuity under this subchapter to the dependent child of a member described in paragraph (1) if there is no surviving spouse or if the member's surviving spouse subsequently dies.

''(3) MANDATORY FORMER SPOUSE ANNUITY.—If a member described in paragraph (1) is required under a court order or spousal agreement to provide an annuity to a former spouse upon becoming eligible to be a participant in the Plan or has made an election under subsection (b) to provide an annuity to a former spouse, the Secretary—

''(A) may not pay an annuity under paragraph (1) or (2); but

''(B) shall pay an annuity to that former spouse as if the member had been a participant in the Plan and had made an election under subsection (b) to provide an annuity to the former spouse, or in accordance with that election, as the case may be, if the Secretary receives a written request from the former spouse concerned that the election be deemed to have been made in the same manner as provided in section 1450(f)(3) of this title.

''(4) PRIORITY.—An annuity that may be provided under this subsection shall be provided in preference to an annuity that may be provided under any other provision of this subchapter on account of service of the same member.

''(5) COMPUTATION.—The amount of an annuity under this subsection is computed under section 1451(c) of this title.

''(e) DESIGNATION FOR COMMENCEMENT OF RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY.—In any case in which a person electing to participate in the Plan is required to make a designation under this subsection, the person making such election shall designate whether, in the event he dies before becoming 60 years of age, the annuity provided shall become effective on—

''(1) the day after the date of his death; or

''(2) the 60th anniversary of his birth.

''(f) COVERAGE OF SURVIVORS OF PERSONS DYING WHEN ELIGIBLE TO ELECT RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY.—

''(1) SURVIVING SPOUSE ANNUITY.—The Secretary concerned shall pay an annuity under this subchapter to the surviving spouse of a person who is eligible to provide a reserve-component annuity and who dies—

''(A) before being notified under section 12731(d) of this title that he has completed the years of service required for eligibility for reserve-component retired pay; or

''(B) during the 90-day period beginning on the date he receives notification under section 12731(d) of this title that he has completed the years of service required for eligibility for reserve-component retired pay if he had not made an election under subsection (a)(2)(B) to participate in the Plan.

''(2) DEPENDENT CHILD ANNUITY.—The Secretary concerned shall pay an annuity under this subchapter to the dependent child of a person described in paragraph (1) if there is no surviving spouse or if the person's surviving spouse subsequently dies.

''(3) MANDATORY FORMER SPOUSE ANNUITY.—If a person described in paragraph (1) is required under a court order or spousal agreement to provide an annuity to a former spouse upon becoming eligible to be a participant in the Plan or has made an election under subsection (b) to provide an annuity to a former spouse, the Secretary—

''(A) may not pay an annuity under paragraph (1) or (2); but

''(B) shall pay an annuity to that former spouse as if the person had been a participant in the Plan and had made an election under subsection (b) to provide an annuity to the former spouse, or in accordance with that election, as the case may be, if the Secretary receives a written request from the former spouse concerned that the election be deemed to have been made in the same manner as provided in section 1450(f)(3) of this title.

''(4) COMPUTATION.—The amount of an annuity under this subsection is computed under section 1451(c) of this title.

''(g) ELECTION TO INCREASE COVERAGE UPON REMARRIAGE.—

''(1) ELECTION.—A person—

''(A) who is a participant in the Plan and is providing coverage under subsection (a) for a spouse or a spouse and child, but at less than the maximum level; and

''(B) who remarries,

may elect, within one year of such remarriage, to increase the level of coverage provided under the Plan to a level not in excess of the current retired pay of that person.

''(2) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—Such an election shall be contingent on the person paying to the United States the amount determined under paragraph (3) plus interest on such amount at a rate determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

''(3) AMOUNT TO BE PAID.—The amount referred to in paragraph (2) is the amount equal to the difference between—

''(A) the amount that would have been withheld from such person's retired pay under section 1452 of this title if the higher level of coverage had been in effect from the time the person became a participant in the Plan; and

''(B) the amount of such person's retired pay actually withheld.

''(4) MANNER OF MAKING ELECTION.—An election under paragraph (1) shall be made in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe and shall become effective upon receipt of the payment required by paragraph (2).

''(5) DISPOSITION OF PAYMENTS.—A payment received under this subsection by the Secretary of Defense shall be deposited into the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund. Any other payment received under this subsection shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

''§ 1449. Mental incompetency of member

''(a) ELECTION BY SECRETARY CONCERNED ON BEHALF OF MENTALLY INCOMPETENT MEMBER.—If a person to whom section 1448 of this title applies is determined to be mentally incompetent by medical officers of the armed force concerned or of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or by a court of competent jurisdiction, an election described in subsection (a)(2) or (b) of section 1448 of this title may be made on behalf of that person by the Secretary concerned.

''(b) REVOCATION OF ELECTION BY MEMBER.—

''(1) AUTHORITY UPON SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATION OF MENTAL COMPETENCE.—If a person for whom the Secretary has made an election under subsection (a) is later determined to be mentally competent by an authority named in that subsection, that person may, within 180 days after that determination, revoke that election.

''(2) DEDUCTIONS FROM RETIRED PAY NOT TO BE REFUNDED.—Any deduction made from retired pay by reason of such an election may not be refunded.

''§ 1450. Payment of annuity: beneficiaries

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective as of the first day after the death of a person to whom section 1448 of this title applies (or on such other day as that

person may provide under subsection (j)), a monthly annuity under section 1451 of this title shall be paid to the person's beneficiaries under the Plan, as follows:

''(1) SURVIVING SPOUSE OR FORMER SPOUSE.—The eligible surviving spouse or the eligible former spouse.

''(2) SURVIVING CHILDREN.—The surviving dependent children in equal shares, if the eligible surviving spouse or the eligible former spouse is dead, dies, or otherwise becomes ineligible under this section.

''(3) DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—The dependent children in equal shares if the person to whom section 1448 of this title applies (with the concurrence of the person's spouse, if required under section 1448(a)(3) of this title) elected to provide an annuity for dependent children but not for the spouse or former spouse.

''(4) NATURAL PERSON DESIGNATED UNDER 'INSURABLE INTEREST' COVERAGE.—The natural person designated under section 1448(b)(1) of this title, unless the election to provide an annuity to the natural person has been changed as provided in subsection (f).

''(b) TERMINATION OF ANNUITY FOR DEATH, REMARRIAGE BEFORE AGE 55, ETC.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—An annuity payable to the beneficiary terminates effective as of the first day of the month in which eligibility is lost.

''(2) TERMINATION OF SPOUSE ANNUITY UPON DEATH OR REMARRIAGE BEFORE AGE 55.—An annuity for a surviving spouse or former spouse shall be paid to the surviving spouse or former spouse while the surviving spouse or former spouse is living or, if the surviving spouse or former spouse remarries before reaching age 55, until the surviving spouse or former spouse remarries.

''(3) EFFECT OF TERMINATION OF SUBSEQUENT MARRIAGE BEFORE AGE 55.—If the surviving spouse or former spouse remarries before reaching age 55 and that marriage is terminated by death, annulment, or divorce, payment of the annuity shall be resumed effective as of the first day of the month in which the marriage is so terminated. However, if the surviving spouse or former spouse is also entitled to an annuity under the Plan based upon the marriage so terminated, the surviving spouse or former spouse may not receive both annuities but must elect which to receive.

''(c) OFFSET FOR AMOUNT OF DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.—

''(1) REQUIRED OFFSET.—If, upon the death of a person to whom section 1448 of this title applies, the surviving spouse or former spouse of that person is also entitled to dependency and indemnity compensation under section 1311(a) of title 38, the surviving spouse or former spouse may be paid an annuity under this section, but only in the amount that the annuity otherwise payable under this section would exceed that compensation.

''(2) EFFECTIVE DATE OF OFFSET.—A reduction in an annuity under this section required by paragraph (1) shall be effective on the date of the commencement of the period of payment of such dependency and indemnity compensation under title 38.

''(d) LIMITATION ON PAYMENT OF ANNUITIES WHEN COVERAGE UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ELECTED.—If, upon the death of a person to whom section 1448 of this title applies, that person had in effect a waiver of that person's retired pay for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, an annuity under this section shall not be payable unless, in accordance with section 8339(j) of title 5, that person notified the Office of Personnel Management that he did not desire any spouse surviving him to receive an annuity under section 8341(b) of that title.

''(e) REFUND OF AMOUNTS DEDUCTED FROM RETIRED PAY WHEN DIC OFFSET IS APPLICABLE.—

''(1) FULL REFUND WHEN DIC GREATER THAN SBP ANNUITY.—If an annuity under this section is not payable because of subsection (c), any amount deducted from the retired pay of the deceased under section 1452 of this title shall be refunded to the surviving spouse or former spouse.

''(2) PARTIAL REFUND WHEN SBP ANNUITY REDUCED BY DIC.—If, because of subsection (c), the annuity payable is less than the amount established under section 1451 of this title, the annuity payable shall be recalculated under that section. The amount of the reduction in the retired pay required to provide that recalculated annuity shall be computed under section 1452 of this title, and the difference between the amount deducted before the computation of that recalculated annuity and the amount that would have been deducted on the basis of that recalculated annuity shall be refunded to the surviving spouse or former spouse.

''(f) CHANGE IN ELECTION OF INSURABLE INTEREST OR FORMER SPOUSE BENEFICIARY.—

''(1) AUTHORIZED CHANGES.—

''(A) ELECTION IN FAVOR OF SPOUSE OR CHILD.—A person who elects to provide an annuity to a person designated by him under section 1448(b) of this title may, subject to paragraph (2), change that election and provide an annuity to his spouse or dependent child.

''(B) NOTICE.—The Secretary concerned shall notify the former spouse or other natural person previously designated under section 1448(b) of this title of any change of election under subparagraph (A).

''(C) PROCEDURES, EFFECTIVE DATE, ETC.—Any such change of election is subject to the same rules with respect to execution, revocation, and effectiveness as are set forth in section 1448(a)(5) of this title (without regard to the eligibility of the person making the change of election to make such an election under that section).

''(2) LIMITATION ON CHANGE IN BENEFICIARY WHEN FORMER SPOUSE COVERAGE IN EFFECT.—A person who, incident to a proceeding of divorce, dissolution, or annulment, is required by a court order to elect under section 1448(b) of this title to provide an annuity to a former spouse (or to both a former spouse and child), or who enters into a written agreement (whether voluntary or required by a court order) to make such an election, and who makes an election pursuant to such order or agreement, may not change that election under paragraph (1) unless, of the following requirements, whichever are applicable in a particular case are satisfied:

''(A) In a case in which the election is required by a court order, or in which an agreement to make the election has been incorporated in or ratified or approved by a court order, the person—

''(i) furnishes to the Secretary concerned a certified copy of a court order which is regular on its face and which modifies the provisions of all previous court orders relating to such election, or the agreement to make such election, so as to permit the person to change the election; and

''(ii) certifies to the Secretary concerned that the court order is valid and in effect.

''(B) In a case of a written agreement that has not been incorporated in or ratified or approved by a court order, the person—

''(i) furnishes to the Secretary concerned a statement, in such form as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, signed by the former spouse and evidencing the former spouse's agreement to a change in the election under paragraph (1); and

''(ii) certifies to the Secretary concerned that the statement is current and in effect.

''(3) REQUIRED FORMER SPOUSE ELECTION TO BE DEEMED TO HAVE BEEN MADE.—

''(A) DEEMED ELECTION UPON REQUEST BY FORMER SPOUSE.—If a person described in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 1448(b) of this title is required (as described in subparagraph (B)) to elect under section 1448(b) of this title to provide an annuity to a former spouse and such person then fails or refuses to make such an election, such person shall be deemed to have made such an election if the Secretary concerned receives the following:

''(i) REQUEST FROM FORMER SPOUSE.—A written request, in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe, from the former spouse concerned requesting that such an election be deemed to have been made.

''(ii) COPY OF COURT ORDER OR OTHER OFFICIAL STATEMENT.—Either—

''(I) a copy of the court order, regular on its face, which requires such election or incorporates, ratifies, or approves the written agreement of such person; or

''(II) a statement from the clerk of the court (or other appropriate official) that such agreement has been filed with the court in accordance with applicable State law.

''(B) PERSONS REQUIRED TO MAKE ELECTION.—A person shall be considered for purposes of subparagraph (A) to be required to elect under section 1448(b) of this title to provide an annuity to a former spouse if—

''(i) the person enters, incident to a proceeding of divorce, dissolution, or annulment, into a written agreement to make such an election and the agreement (I) has been incorporated in or ratified or approved by a court order, or (II) has been filed with the court of appropriate jurisdiction in accordance with applicable State law; or

''(ii) the person is required by a court order to make such an election.

''(C) TIME LIMIT FOR REQUEST BY FORMER SPOUSE.—An election may not be deemed to have been made under subparagraph (A) in the case of any person unless the Secretary concerned receives a request from the former spouse of the person within one year of the date of the court order or filing involved.

''(D) EFFECTIVE DATE OF DEEMED ELECTION.—An election deemed to have been made under subparagraph (A) shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins after the date of the court order or filing involved.

''(4) FORMER SPOUSE COVERAGE MAY BE REQUIRED BY COURT ORDER.—A court order may require a person to elect (or to enter into an agreement to elect) under section 1448(b) of this title to provide an annuity to a former spouse (or to both a former spouse and child).

''(g) LIMITATION ON CHANGING OR REVOKING ELECTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An election under this section may not be changed or revoked.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to—

''(A) a revocation of an election under section 1449(b) of this title; or

''(B) a change in an election under subsection (f).

''(h) TREATMENT OF ANNUITIES UNDER OTHER LAWS.—Except as provided in section 1451 of this title, an annuity under this section is in addition to any other payment to which a person is entitled under any other provision of law. Such annuity shall be considered as income under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

''(i) ANNUITIES EXEMPT FROM CERTAIN LEGAL PROCESS.—Except as provided in subsection (l)(3)(B), an annuity under this section is not assignable or subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

''(j) EFFECTIVE DATE OF RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITIES.—

''(1) PERSONS MAKING SECTION 1448(e) DESIGNATION.—An annuity elected by a person providing a reserve-component annuity shall be effective in accordance with the designation made by such person under section 1448(e) of this title.

''(2) PERSONS DYING BEFORE MAKING SECTION 1448(e) DESIGNATION.—An annuity payable under section 1448(f) of this title shall be effective on the day after the date of the death of the person upon whose service the right to the annuity is based.

''(k) ADJUSTMENT OF SPOUSE OR FORMER SPOUSE ANNUITY UPON LOSS OF DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.—

''(1) READJUSTMENT IF BENEFICIARY 55 YEARS OF AGE OR MORE.—If a surviving spouse or former spouse whose annuity has been adjusted under subsection (c) subsequently loses entitlement to dependency and indemnity compensation under section 1311(a) of title 38 because of the remarriage of the surviving spouse, or former spouse, and if at the time of such remarriage the surviving spouse or former spouse is 55 years of age or more, the amount of the annuity of the surviving spouse or former spouse shall be readjusted, effective on the effective date of such loss of dependency and indemnity compensation, to the amount of the annuity which would be in effect with respect to the surviving spouse or former spouse if the adjustment under subsection (c) had never been made.

''(2) REPAYMENT OF AMOUNTS PREVIOUSLY REFUNDED.—

''(A) GENERAL RULE.—A surviving spouse or former spouse whose annuity is readjusted under paragraph (1) shall repay any amount refunded under subsection (e) by reason of the adjustment under subsection (c).

''(B) INTEREST REQUIRED IF REPAYMENT NOT A LUMP SUM.—If the repayment is not made in a lump sum, the surviving spouse or former spouse shall pay interest on the amount to be repaid. Such interest shall commence on the date on which the first such payment is due and shall be applied over the period during which any part of the repayment remains to be paid.

''(C) MANNER OF REPAYMENT; RATE OF INTEREST.—The manner in which such repayment shall be made, and the rate of any such interest, shall be prescribed in regulations under section 1455 of this title.

''(D) DEPOSIT OF AMOUNTS REPAID.—An amount repaid under this paragraph (including any such interest) received by the Secretary of Defense shall be deposited into the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund. Any other amount repaid under this paragraph shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

''(l) PARTICIPANTS IN THE PLAN WHO ARE MISSING.—

''(1) AUTHORITY TO PRESUME DEATH OF MISSING PARTICIPANT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon application of the beneficiary of a participant in the Plan who is missing, the Secretary concerned may determine for purposes of this subchapter that the participant is presumed dead.

''(B) PARTICIPANT WHO IS MISSING.—A participant in the Plan is considered to be missing for purposes of this subsection if—

''(i) the retired pay of the participant has been suspended on the basis that the participant is missing; or

''(ii) in the case of a participant in the Plan who would be eligible for reserve-component retired pay but for the fact that he is under 60 years of age, his retired pay, if he were entitled to retired pay, would be suspended on the basis that he is missing.

''(C) REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO PRESUMPTION OF DEATH.—Any such determination shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed under section 1455 of this title. The Secretary concerned may not make a determination for purposes of this subchapter that a participant who is missing is presumed dead unless the Secretary finds that—

''(i) the participant has been missing for at least 30 days; and

''(ii) the circumstances under which the participant is missing would lead a reasonably prudent person to conclude that the participant is dead.

''(2) COMMENCEMENT OF ANNUITY.—Upon a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to a participant in the Plan, an annuity otherwise payable under this subchapter shall be paid as if the participant died on the date as of which the retired pay of the participant was suspended.

''(3) EFFECT OF PERSON NOT BEING DEAD.—

''(A) TERMINATION OF ANNUITY.—If, after a determination under paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned determines that the participant is alive—

''(i) any annuity being paid under this subchapter by reason of this subsection shall be terminated; and

''(ii) the total amount of any annuity payments made by reason of this subsection shall constitute a debt to the United States.

''(B) COLLECTION FROM PARTICIPANT OF ANNUITY AMOUNTS ERRONEOUSLY PAID.—A debt under subparagraph (A)(ii) may be collected or offset—

''(i) from any retired pay otherwise payable to the participant;

''(ii) if the participant is entitled to compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, from that compensation; or

''(iii) if the participant is entitled to any other payment from the United States, from that payment.

''(C) COLLECTION FROM BENEFICIARY.—If the participant dies before the full recovery of the amount of annuity payments described in subparagraph (A)(ii) has been made by the United States, the remaining amount of such annuity payments may be collected from the participant's beneficiary under the Plan if that beneficiary was the recipient of the annuity payments made by reason of this subsection.

''§ 1451. Amount of annuity

''(a) COMPUTATION OF ANNUITY FOR A SPOUSE, FORMER SPOUSE, OR CHILD.—

''(1) STANDARD ANNUITY.—In the case of a standard annuity provided to a beneficiary under section 1450(a) of this title (other than under section 1450(a)(4)), the monthly annuity payable to the beneficiary shall be determined as follows:

''(A) BENEFICIARY UNDER 62 YEARS OF AGE.—If the beneficiary is under 62 years of age or is a dependent child when becoming entitled to the annuity, the monthly annuity shall be the amount equal to 55 percent of the base amount.

''(B) BENEFICIARY 62 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER.—

''(i) GENERAL RULE.—If the beneficiary (other than a dependent child) is 62 years of age or older when becoming entitled to the annuity, the monthly annuity shall be the amount equal to 35 percent of the base amount.

''(ii) RULE IF BENEFICIARY ELIGIBLE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY OFFSET COMPUTATION.—If the beneficiary is eligible to have the annuity computed under subsection (e) and if, at the time the beneficiary becomes entitled to the annuity, computation of the annuity under that subsection is more favorable to the beneficiary than computation under clause (i), the annuity shall be computed under that subsection rather than under clause (i).

''(2) RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY—In the case of a reserve-component annuity provided to a beneficiary under section 1450(a) of this title (other than under section 1450(a)(4)), the monthly annuity payable to the beneficiary shall be determined as follows:

''(A) BENEFICIARY UNDER 62 YEARS OF AGE.—If the beneficiary is under 62 years of age or is a dependent child when becoming entitled to the annuity, the monthly annuity shall be the amount equal to a percentage of the base amount that—

''(i) is less than 55 percent; and

''(ii) is determined under subsection (f).

''(B) BENEFICIARY 62 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER.—

''(i) GENERAL RULE.—If the beneficiary (other than a dependent child) is 62 years of age or older when becoming entitled to the annuity, the monthly annuity shall be the amount equal to a percentage of the base amount that—

''(I) is less than 35 percent; and

''(II) is determined under subsection (f).

''(ii) RULE IF BENEFICIARY ELIGIBLE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY OFFSET COMPUTATION.—If the beneficiary is eligible to have the annuity computed under subsection (e) and if, at the time the beneficiary becomes entitled to the annuity, computation of the annuity under that subsection is more favorable to the beneficiary than computation under clause (i), the annuity shall be computed under that subsection rather than under clause (i).

''(b) INSURABLE INTEREST BENEFICIARY.—

''(1) STANDARD ANNUITY.—In the case of a standard annuity provided to a beneficiary under section 1450(a)(4) of this title, the monthly annuity payable to the beneficiary shall be the amount equal to 55 percent of the retired pay of the person who elected to provide the annuity after the reduction in that pay in accordance with section 1452(c) of this title.

''(2) RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY.—In the case of a reserve-component annuity provided to a beneficiary under section 1450(a)(4) of this title, the monthly annuity payable to the beneficiary shall be the amount equal to a percentage of the retired pay of the person who elected to provide the annuity after the reduction in such pay in accordance with section 1452(c) of this title that—

''(A) is less than 55 percent; and

''(B) is determined under subsection (f).

''(3) COMPUTATION OF RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY WHEN PARTICIPANT DIES BEFORE AGE 60.—For the purposes of paragraph (2), a person—

''(A) who provides an annuity that is determined in accordance with that paragraph;

''(B) who dies before becoming 60 years of age; and

''(C) who at the time of death is otherwise entitled to retired pay,

shall be considered to have been entitled to retired pay at the time of death. The retired pay of such person for the purposes of such paragraph shall be computed on the basis of the rates of basic pay in effect on the date on which the annuity provided by such person is to become effective in accordance with the designation of such person under section 1448(e) of this title.

''(c) ANNUITIES FOR SURVIVORS OF CERTAIN PERSONS DYING DURING A PERIOD OF SPECIAL ELIGIBILITY FOR SBP.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an annuity provided under section 1448(d) or 1448(f) of this title, the amount of the annuity shall be determined as follows:

''(A) BENEFICIARY UNDER 62 YEARS OF AGE.—If the person receiving the annuity is under 62 years of age or is a dependent child when the member or former member dies, the monthly annuity shall be the amount equal to 55 percent of the retired pay to which the member or former member would have been entitled if the member or former member had been entitled to that pay based upon his years of active service when he died.

''(B) BENEFICIARY 62 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER.—

''(i) GENERAL RULE.—If the person receiving the annuity (other than a dependent child) is 62 years of age or older when the member or former member dies, the monthly annuity shall be the amount equal to 35 percent of the retired pay to which the member or former member would have been entitled if the member or former member had been entitled to that pay based upon his years of active service when he died.

''(ii) RULE IF BENEFICIARY ELIGIBLE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY OFFSET COMPUTATION.—If the beneficiary is eligible to have the annuity computed under subsection (e) and if, at the time the beneficiary becomes entitled to the annuity, computation of the annuity under that subsection is more favorable to the beneficiary than computation under clause (i), the annuity shall be computed under that subsection rather than under clause (i).

''(2) DIC OFFSET.—An annuity computed under paragraph (1) that is paid to a surviving spouse shall be reduced by the amount of dependency and indemnity compensation to which

the surviving spouse is entitled under section 1311(a) of title 38. Any such reduction shall be effective on the date of the commencement of the period of payment of such compensation under title 38.

''(3) OFFICER WITH ENLISTED SERVICE WHO IS NOT YET ELIGIBLE TO RETIRE AS AN OFFICER.—In the case of an annuity provided by reason of the service of a member described in section 1448(d)(1)(B) or 1448(d)(1)(C) of this title who first became a member of a uniformed service before September 8, 1980, the retired pay to which the member would have been entitled when he died shall be determined for purposes of paragraph (1) based upon the rate of basic pay in effect at the time of death for the grade in which the member was serving at the time of death, unless (as determined by the Secretary concerned) the member would have been entitled to be retired in a higher grade.

''(4) RATE OF PAY TO BE USED IN COMPUTING ANNUITY.—In the case of an annuity paid under section 1448(f) of this title by reason of the service of a person who first became a member of a uniformed service before September 8, 1980, the retired pay of the person providing the annuity shall for the purposes of paragraph (1) be computed on the basis of the rates of basic pay in effect on the effective date of the annuity.

''(d) REDUCTION OF ANNUITIES AT AGE 62.—

''(1) REDUCTION REQUIRED.—The annuity of a person whose annuity is computed under subparagraph (A) of subsection (a)(1), (a)(2), or (c)(1) shall be reduced on the first day of the month after the month in which the person becomes 62 years of age.

''(2) AMOUNT OF ANNUITY AS REDUCED.—

''(A) 35 PERCENT ANNUITY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the reduced amount of the annuity shall be the amount of the annuity that the person would be receiving on that date if the annuity had initially been computed under subparagraph (B) of that subsection.

''(B) SAVINGS PROVISION FOR BENEFICIARIES ELIGIBLE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY OFFSET COMPUTATION.—In the case of a person eligible to have an annuity computed under subsection (e) and for whom, at the time the person becomes 62 years of age, the annuity computed with a reduction under subsection (e)(3) is more favorable than the annuity with a reduction described in subparagraph (A), the reduction in the annuity shall be computed in the same manner as a reduction under subsection (e)(3).

''(e) SAVINGS PROVISION FOR CERTAIN BENEFICIARIES.—

''(1) PERSONS COVERED.—The following beneficiaries under the Plan are eligible to have an annuity under the Plan computed under this subsection:

''(A) A beneficiary receiving an annuity under the Plan on October 1, 1985, as the surviving spouse or former spouse of the person providing the annuity.

''(B) A spouse or former spouse beneficiary of a person who on October 1, 1985—

''(i) was a participant in the Plan;

''(ii) was entitled to retired pay or was qualified for that pay except that he had not applied for and been granted that pay; or

''(iii) would have been eligible for reserve-component retired pay but for the fact that he was under 60 years of age.

''(2) AMOUNT OF ANNUITY.—Subject to paragraph (3), an annuity computed under this subsection is determined as follows:

''(A) STANDARD ANNUITY.—In the case of the beneficiary of a standard annuity, the annuity shall be the amount equal to 55 percent of the base amount.

''(B) RESERVE COMPONENT ANNUITY.—In the case of the beneficiary of a reserve-component annuity, the annuity shall be the percentage of the base amount that—

''(i) is less than 55 percent; and

''(ii) is determined under subsection (f).

''(C) BENEFICIARIES OF PERSONS DYING DURING A PERIOD OF SPECIAL ELIGIBILITY FOR SBP.—In the case of the beneficiary of an annuity under section 1448(d) or 1448(f) of this title, the annuity shall be the amount equal to 55 percent of the retired pay of the person providing the annuity (as that pay is determined under subsection (c)).

''(3) SOCIAL SECURITY OFFSET.—An annuity computed under this subsection shall be reduced by the lesser of the following:

''(A) SOCIAL SECURITY COMPUTATION.—The amount of the survivor benefit, if any, to which the surviving spouse (or the former spouse, in the case of a former spouse beneficiary who became a former spouse under a divorce that became final after November 29, 1989) would be entitled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) based solely upon service by the person concerned as described in section 210(l)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 410(l)(1)) and calculated assuming that the person concerned lives to age 65.

''(B) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF REDUCTION.—40 percent of the amount of the monthly annuity as determined under paragraph (2).

''(4) SPECIAL RULES FOR SOCIAL SECURITY OFFSET COMPUTATION.—

''(A) TREATMENT OF DEDUCTIONS MADE ON ACCOUNT OF WORK.—For the purpose of paragraph (3), a surviving spouse (or a former spouse, in the case of a person who becomes a former spouse under a divorce that becomes final after November 29, 1989) shall not be considered as entitled to a benefit under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) to the extent that such benefit has been offset by deductions under section 203 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 403) on account of work.

''(B) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PERIODS FOR WHICH SOCIAL SECURITY REFUNDS ARE MADE.—In the computation of any reduction made under paragraph (3), there shall be excluded any period of service described in section 210(l)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 410(l)(1))—

''(i) which was performed after December 1, 1980; and

''(ii) which involved periods of service of less than 30 continuous days for which the person concerned is entitled to receive a refund under section 6413(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 of the social security tax which the person had paid.

''(f) DETERMINATION OF PERCENTAGES APPLICABLE TO COMPUTATION OF RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITIES.—The percentage to be applied in determining the amount of an annuity computed under subsection (a)(2), (b)(2), or (e)(2)(B) shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. Such regulations shall be prescribed taking into consideration the following:

''(1) The age of the person electing to provide the annuity at the time of such election.

''(2) The difference in age between such person and the beneficiary of the annuity.

''(3) Whether such person provided for the annuity to become effective (in the event he died before becoming 60 years of age) on the day after his death or on the 60th anniversary of his birth.

''(4) Appropriate group annuity tables.

''(5) Such other factors as the Secretary considers relevant.

''(g) ADJUSTMENTS TO ANNUITIES.—

''(1) PERIODIC ADJUSTMENTS FOR COST-OF-LIVING.—

''(A) INCREASES IN ANNUITIES WHEN RETIRED PAY INCREASED.—Whenever retired pay is increased under section 1401a of this title (or any other provision of law), each annuity that is payable under the Plan shall be increased at the same time.

''(B) PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE.—The increase shall, in the case of any annuity, be by the same percent as the percent by which the retired pay of the person providing the annuity would have been increased at such time if the person were alive (and otherwise entitled to such pay).

''(C) CERTAIN REDUCTIONS TO BE DISREGARDED.—The amount of the increase shall be based on the monthly annuity payable before any reduction under section 1450(c) of this title or under subsection (c)(2).

''(2) ROUNDING DOWN.—The monthly amount of an annuity payable under this subchapter, if not a multiple of $1, shall be rounded to the next lower multiple of $1.

''(h) ADJUSTMENTS TO BASE AMOUNT.—

''(1) PERIODIC ADJUSTMENTS FOR COST-OF-LIVING.—

''(A) INCREASES IN BASE AMOUNT WHEN RETIRED PAY INCREASED.—Whenever retired pay is increased under section 1401a of this title (or any other provision of law), the base amount applicable to each participant in the Plan shall be increased at the same time.

''(B) PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE.—The increase shall be by the same percent as the percent by which the retired pay of the participant is so increased.

''(2) RECOMPUTATION AT AGE 62.—When the retired pay of a person who first became a member of a uniformed service on or after August 1, 1986, and who is a participant in the Plan is recomputed under section 1410 of this title upon the person's becoming 62 years of age, the base amount applicable to that person shall be recomputed (effective on the effective date of the recomputation of such retired pay under section 1410 of this title) so as to be the amount equal to the amount of the base amount that would be in effect on that date if increases in such base amount under paragraph (1) had been computed as provided in paragraph (2) of section 1401a(b) of this title (rather than under paragraph (3) of that section).

''(3) DISREGARDING OF RETIRED PAY REDUCTIONS FOR RETIREMENT BEFORE 30 YEARS OF SERVICE.—Computation of a member's retired pay for purposes of this section shall be made without regard to any reduction under section 1409(b)(2) of this title.

''(i) RECOMPUTATION OF ANNUITY FOR CERTAIN BENEFICIARIES.—In the case of an annuity under the Plan which is computed on the basis of the retired pay of a person who would have been entitled to have that retired pay recomputed under section 1410 of this title upon attaining 62 years of age, but who dies before attaining that age, the annuity shall be recomputed, effective on the first day of the first month beginning after the date on which the member or former member would have attained 62 years of age, so as to be the amount equal to the amount of the annuity that would be in effect on that date if increases under subsection (h)(1) in the base amount applicable to that annuity to the time of the death of the member or former member, and increases in such annuity under subsection (g)(1), had been computed as provided in paragraph (2) of section 1401a(b) of this title (rather than under paragraph (3) of that section).

''§1452. Reduction in retired pay

''(a) SPOUSE AND FORMER SPOUSE ANNUITIES.—

''(1) REQUIRED REDUCTION IN RETIRED PAY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the retired pay of a participant in the Plan who is providing spouse coverage (as described in paragraph (5)) shall be reduced as follows:

''(A) STANDARD ANNUITY.—If the annuity coverage being providing is a standard annuity, the reduction shall be as follows:

''(i) DISABILITY AND NONREGULAR SERVICE RETIREES.—In the case of a person who is entitled to retired pay under chapter 61 or chapter 1223 of this title, the reduction shall be in whichever of the alternative reduction amounts is more favorable to that person.

''(ii) MEMBERS AS OF ENACTMENT OF FLAT-RATE REDUCTION.—In the case of a person who first became a member of a uniformed service before March 1, 1990, the reduction shall be in whichever of the alternative reduction amounts is more favorable to that person.

''(iii) NEW ENTRANTS AFTER ENACTMENT OF FLAT-RATE REDUCTION.—In the case of a person

who first becomes a member of a uniformed service on or after March 1, 1990, and who is entitled to retired pay under a provision of law other than chapter 61 or chapter 1223 of this title, the reduction shall be in an amount equal to 6½ percent of the base amount.

''(iv) ALTERNATIVE REDUCTION AMOUNTS.—For purposes of clauses (i) and (ii), the alternative reduction amounts are the following:

''(I) FLAT-RATE REDUCTION.—An amount equal to 6½ percent of the base amount.

''(II) AMOUNT UNDER PRE-FLAT-RATE REDUCTION.—An amount equal to 2½ percent of the first $421 (as adjusted under paragraph (4)) of the base amount plus 10 percent of the remainder of the base amount.

''(B) RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY.—If the annuity coverage being provided is a reserve-component annuity, the reduction shall be in whichever of the following amounts is more favorable to that person:

''(i) FLAT-RATE REDUCTION.—An amount equal to 6½ percent of the base amount plus an amount determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense as a premium for the additional coverage provided through reserve-component annuity coverage under the Plan.

''(ii) AMOUNT UNDER PRE-FLAT-RATE REDUCTION.—An amount equal to 2½ percent of the first $421 (as adjusted under paragraph (4)) of the base amount plus 10 percent of the remainder of the base amount plus an amount determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense as a premium for the additional coverage provided through reserve-component annuity coverage under the Plan.

''(2) ADDITIONAL REDUCTION FOR CHILD COVERAGE.—If there is a dependent child as well as a spouse or former spouse, the amount prescribed under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount prescribed under regulations of the Secretary of Defense.

''(3) NO REDUCTION WHEN NO BENEFICIARY.—The reduction in retired pay prescribed by paragraph (1) shall not be applicable during any month in which there is no eligible spouse or former spouse beneficiary.

''(4) PERIODIC ADJUSTMENTS.—

''(A) ADJUSTMENTS FOR INCREASES IN RATES OF BASIC PAY.—Whenever there is an increase in the rates of basic pay of members of the uniformed services effective after January 1, 1996, the amounts under paragraph (1) with respect to which the percentage factor of 2½ is applied shall be increased by the overall percentage of such increase in the rates of basic pay. The increase under the preceding sentence shall apply only with respect to persons whose retired pay is computed based on the rates of basic pay in effect on or after the date of such increase in rates of basic pay.

''(B) ADJUSTMENTS FOR RETIRED PAY COLAS.—In addition to the increase under subparagraph (A), the amounts under paragraph (1) with respect to which the percentage factor of 2½ is applied shall be further increased at the same time and by the same percentage as an increase in retired pay under section 1401a of this title effective after January 1, 1996. Such increase under the preceding sentence shall apply only with respect to a person who initially participates in the Plan on a date which is after both the effective date of such increase under section 1401a and the effective date of the rates of basic pay upon which that person's retired pay is computed.

''(5) SPOUSE COVERAGE DESCRIBED.—For the purposes of paragraph (1), a participant in the Plan who is providing spouse coverage is a participant who—

''(A) has (i) a spouse or former spouse, or (ii) a spouse or former spouse and a dependent child; and

''(B) has not elected to provide an annuity to a person designated by him under section 1448(b)(1) of this title or, having made such an election, has changed his election in favor of his spouse under section 1450(f) of this title.

''(b) CHILD-ONLY ANNUITIES.—

''(1) REQUIRED REDUCTION IN RETIRED PAY.—The retired pay of a participant in the Plan who is providing child-only coverage (as described in paragraph (4)) shall be reduced by an amount prescribed under regulations by the Secretary of Defense.

''(2) NO REDUCTION WHEN NO CHILD.—There shall be no reduction in retired pay under paragraph (1) for any month during which the participant has no eligible dependent child.

''(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN RCSBP PARTICIPANTS.—In the case of a participant in the Plan who is participating in the Plan under an election under section 1448(a)(2)(B) of this title and who provided child-only coverage during a period before the participant becomes entitled to receive retired pay, the retired pay of the participant shall be reduced by an amount prescribed under regulations by the Secretary of Defense to reflect the coverage provided under the Plan during the period before the participant became entitled to receive retired pay. A reduction under this paragraph is in addition to any reduction under paragraph (1) and is made without regard to whether there is an eligible dependent child during a month for which the reduction is made.

''(4) CHILD-ONLY COVERAGE DEFINED.—For the purposes of this subsection, a participant in the Plan who is providing child-only coverage is a participant who has a dependent child and who—

''(A) does not have an eligible spouse or former spouse; or

''(B) has a spouse or former spouse but has elected to provide an annuity for dependent children only.

''(c) REDUCTION FOR INSURABLE INTEREST COVERAGE.—

''(1) REQUIRED REDUCTION IN RETIRED PAY.—The retired pay of a person who has elected to provide an annuity to a person designated by him under section 1450(a)(4) of this title shall be reduced as follows:

''(A) STANDARD ANNUITY.—In the case of a person providing a standard annuity, the reduction shall be by 10 percent plus 5 percent for each full five years the individual designated is younger than that person.

''(B) RESERVE COMPONENT ANNUITY.—In the case of a person providing a reserve-component annuity, the reduction shall be by an amount prescribed under regulations of the Secretary of Defense.

''(2) LIMITATION ON TOTAL REDUCTION.—The total reduction under paragraph (1) may not exceed 40 percent.

''(3) DURATION OF REDUCTION.—The reduction in retired pay prescribed by this subsection shall continue during the lifetime of the person designated under section 1450(a)(4) of this title or until the person receiving retired pay changes his election under section 1450(f) of this title.

''(4) RULE FOR COMPUTATION.—Computation of a member's retired pay for purposes of this subsection shall be made without regard to any reduction under section 1409(b)(2) of this title.

''(d) DEPOSITS TO COVER PERIODS WHEN RETIRED PAY NOT PAID.—

''(1) REQUIRED DEPOSITS.—If a person who has elected to participate in the Plan has been awarded retired pay and is not entitled to that pay for any period, that person must deposit in the Treasury the amount that would otherwise have been deducted from his pay for that period.

''(2) DEPOSITS NOT REQUIRED WHEN PARTICIPANT ON ACTIVE DUTY.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to a person with respect to any period when that person is on active duty under a call or order to active duty for a period of more than 30 days.

''(e) DEPOSITS NOT REQUIRED FOR CERTAIN PARTICIPANTS IN CSRS.—When a person who has elected to participate in the Plan waives that person's retired pay for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, that person shall not be required to make the deposit otherwise required by subsection (d) as long as that waiver is in effect unless, in accordance with section 8339(i) of title 5, that person has notified the Office of Personnel Management that he does not desire a spouse surviving him to receive an annuity under section 8331(b) of title 5.

''(f) REFUNDS OF DEDUCTIONS NOT ALLOWED.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—A person is not entitled to refund of any amount deducted from retired pay under this section.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) does not apply—

''(A) in the case of a refund authorized by section 1450(e) of this title; or

''(B) in case of a deduction made through administrative error.

''(g) DISCONTINUATION OF PARTICIPATION BY PARTICIPANTS WHOSE SURVIVING SPOUSES WILL BE ENTITLED TO DIC.—

''(1) DISCONTINUATION.—

''(A) CONDITIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subchapter but subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), a person who has elected to participate in the Plan and who is suffering from a service-connected disability rated by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as totally disabling and has suffered from such disability while so rated for a continuous period of 10 or more years (or, if so rated for a lesser period, has suffered from such disability while so rated for a continuous period of not less than 5 years from the date of such person's last discharge or release from active duty) may discontinue participation in the Plan by submitting to the Secretary concerned a request to discontinue participation in the Plan.

''(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Participation in the Plan of a person who submits a request under subparagraph (A) shall be discontinued effective on the first day of the first month following the month in which the request under subparagraph (A) is received by the Secretary concerned. Effective on such date, the Secretary concerned shall discontinue the reduction being made in such person's retired pay on account of participation in the Plan or, in the case of a person who has been required to make deposits in the Treasury on account of participation in the Plan, such person may discontinue making such deposits effective on such date.

''(C) FORM FOR REQUEST FOR DISCONTINUATION.—Any request under this paragraph to discontinue participation in the Plan shall be in such form and shall contain such information as the Secretary concerned may require by regulation.

''(2) CONSENT OF BENEFICIARIES REQUIRED.—A person described in paragraph (1) may not discontinue participation in the Plan under such paragraph without the written consent of the beneficiary or beneficiaries of such person under the Plan.

''(3) INFORMATION ON PLAN TO BE PROVIDED BY SECRETARY CONCERNED.—

''(A) INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED PROMPTLY TO PARTICIPANT.—The Secretary concerned shall furnish promptly to each person who files a request under paragraph (1) to discontinue participation in the Plan a written statement of the advantages of participating in the Plan and the possible disadvantages of discontinuing participation.

''(B) RIGHT TO WITHDRAW DISCONTINUATION REQUEST.—A person may withdraw a request made under paragraph (1) if it is withdrawn within 30 days after having been submitted to the Secretary concerned.

''(4) REFUND OF DEDUCTIONS FROM RETIRED PAY.—Upon the death of a person described in paragraph (1) who discontinued participation in the Plan in accordance with this subsection, any amount deducted from the retired pay of that person under this section shall be refunded to the person's surviving spouse.

''(5) RESUMPTION OF PARTICIPATION IN PLAN.—

''(A) CONDITIONS FOR RESUMPTION.—A person described in paragraph (1) who discontinued participation in the Plan may elect to participate again in the Plan if—

''(i) after having discontinued participation in the Plan the Secretary of Veterans Affairs reduces that person's service-connected disability rating to a rating of less than total; and

''(ii) that person applies to the Secretary concerned, within such period of time after the reduction in such person's service-connected disability rating has been made as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, to again participate in the Plan and includes in such application such information as the Secretary concerned may require.

''(B) EFFECTIVE DATE OF RESUMED COVERAGE.—Such person's participation in the Plan under this paragraph is effective beginning on the first day of the month after the month in which the Secretary concerned receives the application for resumption of participation in the Plan.

''(C) RESUMPTION OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—When a person elects to participate in the Plan under this paragraph, the Secretary concerned shall begin making reductions in that person's retired pay, or require such person to make deposits in the Treasury under subsection (d), as appropriate, effective on the effective date of such participation under subparagraph (B).

''(h) INCREASES IN REDUCTION WITH INCREASES IN RETIRED PAY.—Whenever retired pay is increased under section 1401a of this title (or any other provision of law), the amount of the reduction to be made under subsection (a) or (b) in the retired pay of any person shall be increased at the same time and by the same percentage as such retired pay is so increased.

''(i) RECOMPUTATION OF REDUCTION UPON RECOMPUTATION OF RETIRED PAY.—When the retired pay of a person who first became a member of a uniformed service on or after August 1, 1986, and who is a participant in the Plan is recomputed under section 1410 of this title upon the person's becoming 62 years of age, the amount of the reduction in such retired pay under this section shall be recomputed (effective on the effective date of the recomputation of such retired pay under section 1410 of this title) so as to be the amount equal to the amount of such reduction that would be in effect on that date if increases in such retired pay under section 1401a(b) of this title, and increases in reductions in such retired pay under subsection (h), had been computed as provided in paragraph (2) of section 1401a(b) of this title (rather than under paragraph (3) of that section).

''§1453. Recovery of amounts erroneously paid

''(a) RECOVERY.—In addition to any other method of recovery provided by law, the Secretary concerned may authorize the recovery of any amount erroneously paid to a person under this subchapter by deduction from later payments to that person.

''(b) AUTHORITY TO WAIVE RECOVERY.—Recovery of an amount erroneously paid to a person under this subchapter is not required if, in the judgment of the Secretary concerned and the Comptroller General—

''(1) there has been no fault by the person to whom the amount was erroneously paid; and

''(2) recovery of such amount would be contrary to the purposes of this subchapter or against equity and good conscience.

''§1454. Correction of administrative errors

''(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary concerned may, under regulations prescribed under section 1455 of this title, correct or revoke any election under this subchapter when the Secretary considers it necessary to correct an administrative error.

''(b) FINALITY.—Except when procured by fraud, a correction or revocation under this section is final and conclusive on all officers of the United States.

''§1455. Regulations

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall prescribe regulations to carry out this subchapter. Those regulations shall, so far as practicable, be uniform for the uniformed services.

''(b) NOTICE OF ELECTIONS.—Regulations prescribed under this section shall provide that before the date on which a member becomes entitled to retired pay—

''(1) if the member is married, the member and the member's spouse shall be informed of the elections available under section 1448(a) of this title and the effects of such elections; and

''(2) if the notification referred to in section 1448(a)(3)(E) of this title is required, any former spouse of the member shall be informed of the elections available and the effects of such elections.

''(c) PROCEDURE FOR DEPOSITING CERTAIN RECEIPTS.—Regulations prescribed under this section shall establish procedures for depositing the amounts referred to in sections 1448(g), 1450(k)(2), and 1452(d) of this title.

''(d) PAYMENTS TO GUARDIANS AND FIDUCIARIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Regulations prescribed under this section shall provide procedures for the payment of an annuity under this subchapter in the case of—

''(A) a person for whom a guardian or other fiduciary has been appointed; and

''(B) a minor, mentally incompetent, or otherwise legally disabled person for whom a guardian or other fiduciary has not been appointed.

''(2) AUTHORIZED PROCEDURES.—The regulations under paragraph (1) may include provisions for the following:

''(A) In the case of an annuitant referred to in paragraph (1)(A), payment of the annuity to the appointed guardian or other fiduciary.

''(B) In the case of an annuitant referred to in paragraph (1)(B), payment of the annuity to any person who, in the judgment of the Secretary concerned, is responsible for the care of the annuitant.

''(C) Subject to subparagraphs (D) and (E), a requirement for the payee of an annuity to spend or invest the amounts paid on behalf of the annuitant solely for benefit of the annuitant.

''(D) Authority for the Secretary concerned to permit the payee to withhold from the annuity payment such amount, not in excess of 4 percent of the annuity, as the Secretary concerned considers a reasonable fee for the fiduciary services of the payee when a court appointment order provides for payment of such a fee to the payee for such services or the Secretary concerned determines that payment of a fee to such payee is necessary in order to obtain the fiduciary services of the payee.

''(E) Authority for the Secretary concerned to require the payee to provide a surety bond in an amount sufficient to protect the interests of the annuitant and to pay for such bond out of the annuity.

''(F) A requirement for the payee of an annuity to maintain and, upon request, to provide to the Secretary concerned an accounting of expenditures and investments of amounts paid to the payee.

''(G) In the case of an annuitant referred to in paragraph (1)(B)—

''(i) procedures for determining incompetency and for selecting a payee to represent the annuitant for the purposes of this section, including provisions for notifying the annuitant of the actions being taken to make such a determination and to select a representative payee, an opportunity for the annuitant to review the evidence being considered, and an opportunity for the annuitant to submit additional evidence before the determination is made; and

''(ii) standards for determining incompetency, including standards for determining the sufficiency of medical evidence and other evidence.

''(H) Provisions for any other matter that the President considers appropriate in connection with the payment of an annuity in the case of a person referred to in paragraph (1).

''(3) LEGAL EFFECT OF PAYMENT TO GUARDIAN OR FIDUCIARY.—An annuity paid to a person on behalf of an annuitant in accordance with the regulations prescribed pursuant to paragraph (1) discharges the obligation of the United States for payment to the annuitant of the amount of the annuity so paid.''.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 651. TECHNICAL CORRECTION CLARIFYING ABILITY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS TO ELECT NOT TO OCCUPY GOVERNMENT QUARTERS.

Effective July 1, 1996, section 403(b)(3) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''A member'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''Subject to the provisions of subsection (j), a member''.

SEC. 652. TECHNICAL CORRECTION CLARIFYING LIMITATION ON FURNISHING CLOTHING OR ALLOWANCES FOR ENLISTED NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS.

Section 418(c) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''for which a uniform allowance is paid under section 415 or 416 of this title'', and inserting in lieu thereof ''for which clothing is furnished or a uniform allowance is paid under this section''.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Health Care Services

SEC. 701. MEDICAL AND DENTAL CARE FOR RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS IN A DUTY STATUS.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF MEDICAL AND DENTAL CARE.—(1) Section 1074a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§1074a. Medical and dental care: reserve component members in a duty status

''(a) HEALTH CARE DESCRIBED.—A person described in subsection (b) is entitled to the medical and dental care appropriate for the treatment of the injury, illness, or disease of the person until the person completes treatment and is physically able to resume the military duties of the person or has completed processing in accordance with chapter 61 of this title.

''(b) MEMBERS ENTITLED TO CARE.—Under joint regulations prescribed by the administering Secretaries, the following persons are entitled to the benefits described in this section:

''(1) Each member of a reserve component who incurs or aggravates an injury, illness, or disease in the line of duty while performing—

''(A) active duty, including active duty for training and annual training duty, or full-time National Guard duty; or

''(B) inactive-duty training, regardless of whether the member is in a pay or nonpay status.

''(2) Each member of a reserve component who incurs or aggravates an injury, illness, or disease while traveling directly to or from the place at which that member is to perform or has performed—

''(A) active duty, including active duty for training and annual training duty, or full-time National Guard duty, or

''(B) inactive-duty training, regardless of whether the member is in a pay or nonpay status.

''(3) Each member of a reserve component who incurs or aggravates an injury, illness, or disease in the line of duty while remaining overnight, between successive periods of inactive-duty training, at or in the vicinity of the site of the inactive-duty training, if the site of inactive-duty training is outside reasonable commuting distance from the member's residence.

''(c) ADDITIONAL BENEFITS.—(1) At the request of a person described in paragraph (1)(A) or (2)(A) of subsection (b), the person may continue on active duty or full-time National Guard duty during any period of hospitalization resulting from the injury, illness, or disease.

''(2) A person described in subsection (b) is entitled to the pay and allowances authorized in

accordance with subsections (g) and (h) of section 204 of title 37.

''(d) LIMITATION.—A person described in subsection (b) is not entitled to benefits under this section if the injury, illness, or disease, or aggravation of the injury, illness, or disease, is the result of the gross negligence or misconduct of the person.''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''1074a. Medical and dental care: reserve component members in a duty status.''.

(b) ANNUAL MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCREENINGS AND CARE FOR CERTAIN SELECTED RESERVE MEMBERS.—Section 10206 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c)(1) The Secretary of the Army shall provide to members of the Selected Reserve of the Army who are assigned to units scheduled for deployment within 75 days after mobilization the following medical and dental services:

''(A) An annual medical screening.

''(B) For members who are over 40 years of age, a full physical examination not less often than once every two years.

''(C) An annual dental screening.

''(D) The dental care identified in an annual dental screening as required to ensure that a member meets the dental standards required for deployment in the event of mobilization.

''(2) The services provided under this subsection shall be provided at no cost to the member.''.

Subtitle B—TRICARE Program

SEC. 711. DEFINITION OF TRICARE PROGRAM.

For purposes of this subtitle, the term ''TRICARE program'' means the managed health care program that is established by the Secretary of Defense under the authority of chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, principally section 1097 of such title, and includes the competitive selection of contractors to financially underwrite the delivery of health care services under the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services.

SEC. 712. CHAMPUS PAYMENT LIMITS FOR TRICARE PRIME ENROLLEES.

Section 1079(h)(4) of title 10, United States Code, is amended in the second sentence by striking ''emergency''.

SEC. 713. IMPROVED INFORMATION EXCHANGE BETWEEN MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITIES AND TRICARE PROGRAM CONTRACTORS.

(a) UNIFORM INTERFACES.—With respect to the automated medical information system being developed by the Department of Defense and known as the Composite Health Care System, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Composite Health Care System provides for uniform interfaces between information systems of military treatment facilities and private contractors under managed care programs of the TRICARE program. The uniform interface shall provide for a full electronic two-way exchange of health care information between the military treatment facilities and contractor information systems, including enrollment information, information regarding eligibility determinations, provider network information, appointment information, and information regarding the existence of third-party payers.

(b) AMENDMENT OF EXISTING CONTRACTS.—To assure a single consistent source of information throughout the health care delivery system of the uniformed services, the Secretary of Defense shall amend each TRICARE program contract, with the consent of the TRICARE program contractor and notwithstanding any requirement for competition, to require the contractor—

(1) to use software furnished under the Composite Health Care System to record military treatment facility provider appointments; and

(2) to record TRICARE program enrollment through direct use of the Composite Health Care System software or through the uniform two-way interface between the contractor and military treatment facilities systems, where applicable.

(c) PHASED IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall test the uniform version of the Composite Health Care System required under subsection (a) in one region of the TRICARE program for six months before deploying the information system throughout the health care delivery system of the uniformed services.

Subtitle C—Uniformed Services Treatment Facilities

SEC. 721. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) The term ''administering Secretaries'' means the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(2) The term ''agreement'' means the agreement required under section 722(b) between the Secretary of Defense and a designated provider.

(3) The term ''capitation payment'' means an actuarially sound payment for a defined set of health care services that is established on a per enrollee per month basis.

(4) The term ''covered beneficiary'' means a beneficiary under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, other than a beneficiary under section 1074(a) of such title.

(5) The term ''designated provider'' means a public or nonprofit private entity that was a transferee of a Public Health Service hospital or other station under section 987 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 97–35; 95 Stat. 603) and that, before the date of the enactment of this Act, was deemed to be a facility of the uniformed services for the purposes of chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code. The term includes any legal successor in interest of the transferee.

(6) The term ''enrollee'' means a covered beneficiary who enrolls with a designated provider.

(7) The term ''health care services'' means the health care services provided under the health plan known as the TRICARE PRIME option under the TRICARE program.

(8) The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Defense.

(9) The term ''TRICARE program'' means the managed health care program that is established by the Secretary of Defense under the authority of chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, principally section 1097 of such title, and includes the competitive selection of contractors to financially underwrite the delivery of health care services under the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services.

SEC. 722. INCLUSION OF DESIGNATED PROVIDERS IN UNIFORMED SERVICES HEALTH CARE DELIVERY SYSTEM.

(a) INCLUSION IN SYSTEM.—The health care delivery system of the uniformed services shall include the designated providers.

(b) AGREEMENTS TO PROVIDE MANAGED HEALTH CARE SERVICES.—(1) After consultation with the other administering Secretaries, the Secretary of Defense shall negotiate and enter into an agreement with each designated provider, under which the designated provider will provide managed health care services to covered beneficiaries who enroll with the designated provider.

(2) The agreement shall be entered into on a sole source basis. The Federal Acquisition Regulation, except for those requirements regarding competition, issued pursuant to section 25(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421(c)) shall apply to the agreements as acquisitions of commercial items.

(3) The implementation of an agreement is subject to availability of funds for such purpose.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE OF AGREEMENTS.—(1) Unless an earlier effective date is agreed upon by the Secretary and the designated provider, the agreement shall take effect upon the later of the following:

(A) The date on which a managed care support contract under the TRICARE program is implemented in the service area of the designated provider.

(B) October 1, 1997.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the designated provider whose service area includes Seattle, Washington, shall implement its agreement as soon as the agreement permits.

(d) TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF EXISTING PARTICIPATION AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary shall extend the participation agreement of a designated provider in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act under section 718(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 104 Stat. 1587) until the agreement required by this section takes effect under subsection (c).

(e) SERVICE AREA.—The Secretary may not reduce the size of the service area of a designated provider below the size of the service area in effect as of September 30, 1996.

(f) COMPLIANCE WITH ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS.—(1) Unless otherwise agreed upon by the Secretary and a designated provider, the designated provider shall comply with necessary and appropriate administrative requirements established by the Secretary for other providers of health care services and requirements established by the Secretary of Health and Human Services for risk-sharing contractors under section 1876 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395mm). The Secretary and the designated provider shall determine and apply only such administrative requirements as are minimally necessary and appropriate. A designated provider shall not be required to comply with a law or regulation of a State government requiring licensure as a health insurer or health maintenance organization.

(2) A designated provider may not contract out more than five percent of its primary care enrollment without the approval of the Secretary, except in the case of primary care contracts between a designated provider and a primary care contractor in force on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 723. PROVISION OF UNIFORM BENEFIT BY DESIGNATED PROVIDERS.

(a) UNIFORM BENEFIT REQUIRED.—A designated provider shall offer to enrollees the health benefit option prescribed and implemented by the Secretary under section 731 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 10 U.S.C. 1073 note), including accompanying cost-sharing requirements.

(b) TIME FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF BENEFIT.—A designated provider shall offer the health benefit option described in subsection (a) to enrollees upon the later of the following:

(1) The date on which health care services within the health care delivery system of the uniformed services are rendered through the TRICARE program in the region in which the designated provider operates.

(2) October 1, 1996.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary may establish a later date under subsection (b)(2) or prescribe reduced cost-sharing requirements for enrollees.

SEC. 724. ENROLLMENT OF COVERED BENEFICIARIES.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 1997 LIMITATION.—(1) During fiscal year 1997, the number of covered beneficiaries who are enrolled in managed care plans offered by designated providers may not exceed the number of such enrollees as of October 1, 1995.

(2) The Secretary may waive the limitation under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that additional enrollment authority for a designated provider is required to accommodate covered beneficiaries who are dependents of members of the uniformed services entitled to health care under section 1074(a) of title 10, United States Code.

(b) PERMANENT LIMITATION.—For each fiscal year after fiscal year 1997, the number of enrollees in managed care plans offered by designated providers may not exceed 110 percent of the number of such enrollees as of the first day of the immediately preceding fiscal year. The Secretary may waive this limitation as provided in subsection (a)(2).

(c) RETENTION OF CURRENT ENROLLEES.—An enrollee in the managed care program of a designated provider as of September 30, 1997, or such earlier date as the designated provider and the Secretary may agree upon, shall continue receiving services from the designated provider pursuant to the agreement entered into under section 722 unless the enrollee disenrolls from the designated provider. Except as provided in subsection (e), the administering Secretaries may not disenroll such an enrollee unless the disenrollment is agreed to by the Secretary and the designated provider.

(d) ADDITIONAL ENROLLMENT AUTHORITY.—Other covered beneficiaries may also receive health care services from a designated provider, except that the designated provider may market such services to, and enroll, only those covered beneficiaries who—

(1) do not have other primary health insurance coverage (other than medicare coverage) covering basic primary care and inpatient and outpatient services; or

(2) are enrolled in the direct care system under the TRICARE program, regardless of whether the covered beneficiaries were users of the health care delivery system of the uniformed services in prior years.

(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARIES.—If a covered beneficiary who desires to enroll in the managed care program of a designated provider is also entitled to hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395c et seq.), the covered beneficiary shall elect whether to receive health care services as an enrollee or under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act. The Secretary may disenroll an enrollee who subsequently violates the election made under this subsection and receives benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

(f) INFORMATION REGARDING ELIGIBLE COVERED BENEFICIARIES.—The Secretary shall provide, in a timely manner, a designated provider with an accurate list of covered beneficiaries within the marketing area of the designated provider to whom the designated provider may offer enrollment.

SEC. 725. APPLICATION OF CHAMPUS PAYMENT RULES.

(a) APPLICATION OF PAYMENT RULES.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary shall require a private facility or health care provider that is a health care provider under the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services to apply the payment rules described in section 1074(c) of title 10, United States Code, in imposing charges for health care that the private facility or provider provides to enrollees of a designated provider.

(b) AUTHORIZED ADJUSTMENTS.—The payment rules imposed under subsection (a) shall be subject to such modifications as the Secretary considers appropriate. The Secretary may authorize a lower rate than the maximum rate that would otherwise apply under subsection (a) if the lower rate is agreed to by the designated provider and the private facility or health care provider.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to implement this section after consultation with the other administering Secretaries.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1074 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (d).

SEC. 726. PAYMENTS FOR SERVICES.

(a) FORM OF PAYMENT.—Unless otherwise agreed to by the Secretary and a designated provider, the form of payment for services provided by a designated provider shall be full risk capitation. The capitation payments shall be negotiated and agreed upon by the Secretary and the designated provider. In addition to such other factors as the parties may agree to apply, the capitation payments shall be based on the utilization experience of enrollees and competitive market rates for equivalent health care services for a comparable population to such enrollees in the area in which the designated provider is located.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL PAYMENTS.—Total capitation payments to a designated provider shall not exceed an amount equal to the cost that would have been incurred by the Government if the enrollees had received their care through a military treatment facility, the TRICARE program, or the medicare program, as the case may be.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF PAYMENT RATES ON ANNUAL BASIS.—The Secretary and a designated provider shall establish capitation payments on an annual basis, subject to periodic review for actuarial soundness and to adjustment for any adverse or favorable selection reasonably anticipated to result from the design of the program.

(d) ALTERNATIVE BASIS FOR CALCULATING PAYMENTS.—After September 30, 1999, the Secretary and a designated provider may mutually agree upon a new basis for calculating capitation payments.

SEC. 727. REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED AUTHORITIES.

(a) REPEALS.—The following provisions of law are repealed:

(1) Section 911 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1982 (42 U.S.C. 248c).

(2) Section 1252 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1984 (42 U.S.C. 248d).

(3) Section 718(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 42 U.S.C. 248c note).

(4) Section 726 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 42 U.S.C. 248c note).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1997.

Subtitle D—Other Changes to Existing Laws Regarding Health Care Management

SEC. 731. AUTHORITY TO WAIVE CHAMPUS EXCLUSION REGARDING NONMEDICALLY NECESSARY TREATMENT IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN CLINICAL TRIALS.

(a) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Paragraph (13) of section 1079(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out ''any service'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''Any service'';

(2) by striking out the semicolon at the end and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: ''Pursuant to an agreement with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, the Secretary of Defense may waive the operation of this paragraph in connection with clinical trials sponsored or approved by the National Institutes of Health if the Secretary of Defense determines that such a waiver will promote access by covered beneficiaries to promising new treatments and contribute to the development of such treatments.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking out ''except that—'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''except as follows:'';

(2) by capitalizing the first letter of the first word of each of paragraphs (1) through (17);

(3) by striking out the semicolon at the end of each of paragraphs (1) through (15) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(4) in paragraph (16), by striking out ''; and'' and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 732. AUTHORITY TO WAIVE OR REDUCE CHAMPUS DEDUCTIBLE AMOUNTS FOR RESERVISTS CALLED TO ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

Section 1079(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively;

(2) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(b)'';

(3) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, by striking out ''clause (3)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''subparagraph (C)'';

(4) in subparagraph (D), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking out ''this clause'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''this subparagraph''; and

(B) by striking out ''clauses (2) and (3)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''subparagraphs (B) and (C)''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Secretary of Defense may waive or reduce the deductible amounts required by subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) in the case of the dependents of a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services who serves on active duty in support of a contingency operation under a call or order to active duty of less than one year.''.

SEC. 733. EXCEPTION TO MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL HEALTH-CARE PROVIDERS UNDER CHAMPUS.

Section 1079(h) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) Except in an area in which the Secretary of Defense has entered into an at-risk contract for the provision of health care services, the Secretary may authorize the commander of a facility of the uniformed services, the lead agent (if other than the commander), and the health care contractor to modify the payment limitations under paragraph (1) for certain health care providers when necessary to ensure both the availability of certain services for covered beneficiaries and costs lower than standard CHAMPUS for the required services.''.

SEC. 734. CODIFICATION OF ANNUAL AUTHORITY TO CREDIT CHAMPUS REFUNDS TO CURRENT YEAR APPROPRIATION.

(a) CODIFICATION.—(1) Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1079 the following new section:

''§ 1079a. CHAMPUS: treatment of refunds and other amounts collected

''All refunds and other amounts collected in the administration of the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services shall be credited to the appropriation supporting the program in the year in which the amount is collected.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1079 the following new item:

''1079a. CHAMPUS: treatment of refunds and other amounts collected.''.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 8094 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104–61; 109 Stat. 671), is repealed.

SEC. 735. EXCEPTIONS TO REQUIREMENTS REGARDING OBTAINING NONAVAILABILITY-OF-HEALTH-CARE STATEMENTS.

(a) REFERENCE TO INPATIENT MEDICAL CARE.—(1) Section 1080(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''inpatient'' before ''medical care'' in the first sentence.

(2) Section 1086(e) of such title is amended in the first sentence by striking out ''benefits'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''inpatient medical care''.

(b) WAIVERS AND EXCEPTIONS TO REQUIREMENTS.—(1) Section 1080 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) WAIVERS AND EXCEPTIONS TO REQUIREMENTS.—(1) A covered beneficiary enrolled in a managed care plan offered pursuant to any contract or agreement under this chapter for the provision of health care services shall not be required to obtain a nonavailability-of-health-care statement as a condition for the receipt of health care.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirement to obtain nonavailability-of-health-care statements following an evaluation of the effectiveness of such statements in optimizing the use of facilities of the uniformed services.''.

(2) Section 1086(e) of such title is amended in the last sentence by striking out ''section 1080(b)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''subsections (b) and (c) of section 1080''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1080(b) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking out ''NONAVAILABILITY OF HEALTH CARE STATEMENTS'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''NONAVAILABILITY-OF-HEALTH-CARE STATEMENTS; and

(2) by striking out ''nonavailability of health care statement'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''nonavailability of health care statement''.

SEC. 736. EXPANSION OF COLLECTION AUTHORITIES FROM THIRD-PARTY PAYERS.

(a) EXPANSION OF COLLECTION AUTHORITIES.—Section 1095 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)(1), by inserting ''or through'' after ''provided at'';

(2) in subsection (h)(1), by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ''and a workers' compensation program or plan''; and

(3) in subsection (h)(2)—

(A) by striking ''organization and'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''organization,''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and personal injury protection or medical payments benefits in cases involving personal injuries resulting from operation of a motor vehicle''.

(b) INCLUSION OF THIRD PARTY PAYER IN COLLECTION EFFORTS.—Section 1079(j)(1) of such title is amended by inserting after ''or health plan'' the following: ''(including any plan offered by a third-party payer (as defined in section 1095(h)(1) of this title))''.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 741. ALTERNATIVES TO ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE OBLIGATION UNDER ARMED FORCES HEALTH PROFESSIONS SCHOLARSHIP AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES.

(a) ARMED FORCES HEALTH PROFESSIONS SCHOLARSHIP AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Subsection (e) of section 2123 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(e)(1) A member of the program who is relieved of the member's active duty obligation under this subchapter before the completion of that active duty obligation may be given, with or without the consent of the member, any of the following alternative obligations, as determined by the Secretary of the military department concerned:

''(A) A service obligation in a component of the Selected Reserve for a period not less than twice as long as the member's remaining active duty service obligation.

''(B) A service obligation as a civilian employee employed as a health care professional in a facility of the uniformed services for a period of time equal to the member's remaining active duty service obligation.

''(C) With the concurrence of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transfer of the active duty service obligation to an obligation equal in time in the National Health Service Corps under section 338C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254m) and subject to all requirements and procedures applicable to obligated members of the National Health Service Corps.

''(D) Repayment to the Secretary of Defense of a percentage of the total cost incurred by the Secretary under this subchapter on behalf of the member equal to the percentage of the member's total active duty service obligation being relieved, plus interest.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations describing the manner in which an alternative obligation may be given under paragraph (1).''.

(b) UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES.—Section 2114 of title 10, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) A graduate of the University who is relieved of the graduate's active-duty service obligation under subsection (b) before the completion of that active-duty service obligation may be given, with or without the consent of the graduate, an alternative obligation comparable to the alternative obligations authorized in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 2123(e)(1) of this title for members of the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance program.''.

(c) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to individuals who first become members of the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance program or students of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences on or after October 1, 1996.

(d) TRANSITION PROVISION.—(1) In the case of any member of the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance program who, as of October 1, 1996, is serving an active duty obligation under the program or is incurring an active duty obligation as a participant in the program, and who is subsequently relieved of the active duty obligation before the completion of the obligation, the alternative obligations authorized by the amendment made by subsection (a) may be used by the Secretary of the military department concerned with the agreement of the member.

(2) In the case of any person who, as of October 1, 1996, is serving an active-duty service obligation as a graduate of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences or is incurring an active-duty service obligation as a student of the University, and who is subsequently relieved of the active-duty service obligation before the completion of the obligation, the alternative obligations authorized by the amendment made by subsection (b) may be implemented by the Secretary of Defense with the agreement of the person.

SEC. 742. EXCEPTION TO STRENGTH LIMITATIONS FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

Section 206 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 207) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) In computing the maximum number of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service authorized by law or administrative determination to serve on active duty, there may be excluded from such computation officers who are assigned to duty in the Department of Defense.''.

SEC. 743. CONTINUED OPERATION OF UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES.

(a) CLOSURE PROHIBITED.—In light of the important role of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences in providing trained health care providers for the uniformed services, Congress reaffirms the requirement contained in section 922 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat 2829) that the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences may not be closed.

(b) BUDGETARY COMMITMENT TO CONTINUATION.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should budget for the operation of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences during fiscal year 1998 at a level at least equal to the level of operations conducted at the University during fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 744. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TAX TREATMENT OF ARMED FORCES HEALTH PROFESSIONS SCHOLARSHIP AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should work with the Secretary of the Treasury to interpret section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 so that the limitation on the amount of a qualified scholarship or qualified tuition reduction excluded from gross income does not apply to any portion of a scholarship or financial assistance provided by the Secretary of Defense to a person enrolled in the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance program under subchapter I of chapter 105 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 745. REPORT REGARDING SPECIALIZED TREATMENT FACILITY PROGRAM.

Not later than April 1, 1997, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report evaluating the impact on the military health care system of limiting the service area of a facility designated as part of the specialized treatment facility program under section 1105 of title 10, United States Code, to not more than 100 miles from the facility.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Acquisition Management

SEC. 801. AUTHORITY TO WAIVE CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS FOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PILOT PROGRAMS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may waive sections 2399, 2403, 2432, and 2433 of title 10, United States Code, in accordance with this section for any defense acquisition program designated by the Secretary of Defense for participation in the defense acquisition pilot program authorized by section 809 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2340 note).

(b) OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements for operational test and evaluation for such a defense acquisition program as set forth in section 2399 of title 10, United States Code, if the Secretary—

(1) determines (without delegation) that such test would be unreasonably expensive or impractical;

(2) develops a suitable alternate operational test program for the system concerned;

(3) describes in the test and evaluation master plan, as approved by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, the method of evaluation that will be used to evaluate whether the system will be effective and suitable for combat; and

(4) submits to the congressional defense committees a report containing the determination that was made under paragraph (1), a justification for that determination, and a copy of the plan required by paragraph (3).

(c) CONTRACTOR GUARANTEES FOR MAJOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of section 2403 of title 10, United States Code, for such a defense acquisition program if an alternative guarantee is used that ensures high quality weapons systems.

(d) SELECTED ACQUISITION REPORTS.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of sections 2432 and 2433 of title 10, United States Code, for such a defense acquisition

program if the Secretary provides a single annual report to Congress at the end of each fiscal year that describes the status of the program in relation to the baseline description for the program established under section 2435 of such title.

SEC. 802. EXCLUSION FROM CERTAIN POST-EDUCATION DUTY ASSIGNMENTS FOR MEMBERS OF ACQUISITION CORPS.

Section 663(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) The Secretary of Defense may exclude from the requirements of paragraph (1) or (2) an officer who is a member of an Acquisition Corps established pursuant to 1731 of this title if the officer—

''(A) has graduated from a senior level course of instruction designed for personnel serving in critical acquisition positions; and

''(B) is assigned, upon graduation, to a critical acquisition position designated pursuant to section 1733 of this title.''.

SEC. 803. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN PROTOTYPE PROJECTS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 845(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 107 Stat. 1721) is amended by inserting after ''Agency'' the following: '', the Secretary of a military department, or any other official designated by the Secretary of Defense''.

(b) PERIOD OF AUTHORITY.—Section 845(c) of such Act is amended by striking out ''3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''on September 30, 1999''.

(c) CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 845 of such Act is further amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking out ''(c)(2) and (c)(3) of such section 2371, as redesignated by section 827(b)(1)(B),'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''(e)(2) and (e)(3) of such section 2371''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting after ''Director'' the following: '', Secretary, or other official''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking out ''of the Director''.

SEC. 804. INCREASE IN THRESHOLD AMOUNTS FOR MAJOR SYSTEMS.

Section 2302(5) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out ''$75,000,000 (based on fiscal year 1980 constant dollars)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$115,000,000 (based on fiscal year 1990 dollars)'';

(2) by striking out ''$300,000,000 (based on fiscal year 1980 constant dollars)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$540,000,000 (based on fiscal year 1990 constant dollars)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: ''The Secretary of Defense may adjust the amounts and the base fiscal year provided in clause (A) on the basis of Department of Defense escalation rates. An adjustment under this paragraph shall be effective after the Secretary transmits to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a written notification of the adjustment.''.

SEC. 805. REVISIONS IN INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE INCLUDED IN SELECTED ACQUISITION REPORTS.

Section 2432 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking out ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B);

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph (C):

''(C) the current procurement unit cost for each major defense acquisition program included in the report and the history of that cost from the date the program was first included in a Selected Acquisition Report to the end of the quarter for which the current report is submitted; and''; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking out paragraph (8) and redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (8).

SEC. 806. INCREASE IN SIMPLIFIED ACQUISITION THRESHOLD FOR HUMANITARIAN OR PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

Section 2302(7) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(7)'';

(2) by inserting after ''contingency operation'' the following: ''or a humanitarian or peacekeeping operation''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) In subparagraph (A), the term 'humanitarian or peacekeeping operation' means a military operation in support of the provision of humanitarian or foreign disaster assistance or in support of a peacekeeping operation under chapter VI or VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The term does not include routine training, force rotation, or stationing.''.

SEC. 807. EXPANSION OF AUDIT RECIPROCITY AMONG FEDERAL AGENCIES TO INCLUDE POST-AWARD AUDITS.

(a) ARMED SERVICES ACQUISITIONS.—Subsection (d) of section 2313 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(d) LIMITATION ON AUDITS RELATING TO INDIRECT COSTS.—The head of an agency may not perform an audit of indirect costs under a contract, subcontract, or modification before or after entering into the contract, subcontract, or modification in any case in which the contracting officer determines that the objectives of the audit can reasonably be met by accepting the results of an audit that was conducted by any other department or agency of the Federal Government within one year preceding the date of the contracting officer's determination.''.

(b) CIVILIAN AGENCY ACQUISITIONS.—Subsection (d) of section 304C of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254d) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) LIMITATION ON AUDITS RELATING TO INDIRECT COSTS.—An executive agency may not perform an audit of indirect costs under a contract, subcontract, or modification before or after entering into the contract, subcontract, or modification in any case in which the contracting officer determines that the objectives of the audit can reasonably be met by accepting the results of an audit that was conducted by any other department or agency of the Federal Government within one year preceding the date of the contracting officer's determination.''.

(c) GUIDELINES FOR ACCEPTANCE OF AUDITS BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS RECEIVING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.—The Director of the Office and Management and Budget shall issue guidelines to ensure that an audit of indirect costs performed by the Federal Government is accepted by State and local governments that receive Federal funds under contracts, grants, or other Federal assistance programs.

SEC. 808. EXTENSION OF PILOT MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.

Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 831(j) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note) are each amended by striking out ''1996'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''1997''.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

SEC. 821. AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEM UNDER INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT REFORM ACT OF 1995.

Section 5142(a) of the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996 (division E of Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 689; 40 U.S.C. 1452) is amended—

(1) by striking out ''or'' at the end of paragraph (4);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) involves the storage, processing, or forwarding of classified information and is protected at all times by procedures established for the handling of classified information.''.

SEC. 822. PROHIBITION ON RELEASE OF CONTRACTOR PROPOSALS UNDER FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.

(a) ARMED SERVICES ACQUISITIONS.—Section 2305 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) PROHIBITION ON RELEASE OF CONTRACTOR PROPOSALS.—(1) A proposal in the possession or control of the Department of Defense may not be made available to any person under section 552 of title 5.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'proposal' means any proposal, including a technical, management, or cost proposal, submitted by a contractor in response to the requirements of a solicitation for a competitive proposal.''.

(b) CIVILIAN AGENCY ACQUISITIONS.—Section 303B of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253b) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(m) PROHIBITION ON RELEASE OF CONTRACTOR PROPOSALS.—(1) A proposal in the possession or control of an executive agency may not be made available to any person under section 552 of title 5.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'proposal' means any proposal, including a technical, management, or cost proposal, submitted by a contractor in response to the requirements of a solicitation for a competitive proposal.''.

SEC. 823. REPEAL OF ANNUAL REPORT BY ADVOCATE FOR COMPETITION.

Section 20(b) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 418(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking out ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3)(B);

(2) by striking out paragraph (4); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

SEC. 824. REPEAL OF BIANNUAL REPORT ON PROCUREMENT REGULATORY ACTIVITY.

Subsection (g) of section 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421) is repealed.

SEC. 825. REPEAL OF MULTIYEAR LIMITATION ON CONTRACTS FOR INSPECTION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR.

Paragraph (14) of section 210(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(a)) is amended by striking out ''for periods not exceeding three years''.

SEC. 826. STREAMLINED NOTICE REQUIREMENTS TO CONTRACTORS AND EMPLOYEES REGARDING TERMINATION OR SUBSTANTIAL REDUCTION IN CONTRACTS UNDER MAJOR DEFENSE PROGRAMS.

(a) ELIMINATION OF UNNECESSARY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4471 of the Defense Conversion, Reinvestment, and Transition Assistance Act of 1992 (division D of Public Law 102–484; 10 U.S.C. 2501 note) is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (a);

(2) by striking out subsection (f), except paragraph (4);

(3) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (g) as subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (f), respectively; and

(4) by redesignating such paragraph (4) as subsection (e).

(b) NOTICE TO CONTRACTORS.—Subsection (a) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3), is amended by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

''(1) shall identify each contract (if any) under major defense programs of the Department of Defense that will be terminated or substantially reduced as a result of the funding levels provided in that Act; and

''(2) shall ensure that notice of the termination of, or substantial reduction in, the funding of the contract is provided—

''(A) directly to the prime contractor under the contract; and

''(B) directly to the Secretary of Labor.''.

(c) NOTICE TO SUBCONTRACTORS.—Subsection (b) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3), is amended—

(1) by striking out ''As soon as'' and all that follows through ''that program,'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof ''Not later than 60 days after the date on which the prime contractor for a contract under a major defense program receives notice under subsection (a),'';

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking out ''for that program under a contract'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''for that prime contract for subcontracts''; and

(B) by striking out ''for the program''; and

(3) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking out ''for the program under a contract'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''for subcontracts''.

(d) NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES AND STATE DISLOCATED WORKER UNIT.—Subsection (c) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3), is amended by striking out ''under subsection (a)(1)'' and all that follows through ''a defense program,'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof ''under subsection (a),''.

(e) CROSS REFERENCES AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsection (d) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3), is amended—

(A) by striking out ''a major defense program provided under subsection (d)(1)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''a defense contract provided under subsection (c)(1)''; and

(B) by striking out ''the program'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''the contract''.

(2) Subsection (e) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(4), is amended—

(A) by striking out ''ELIGIBILITY'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''ELIGIBILITY''; and

(B) by striking out ''under paragraph (3)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''or cancellation of the termination of, or substantial reduction in, contract funding''.

(3) Subsection (f) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3), is amended in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''a defense contract under'' before ''a major defense program''; and

(B) by striking out ''contracts under the program'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''the funds obligated by the contract''.

SEC. 827. REPEAL OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBSTANTIALLY OR SERIOUSLY AFFECTED PARTIES IN DOWNSIZING EFFORTS.

Sections 4101 and 4201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 104 Stat. 1850, 1851; 10 U.S.C. 2391 note) are repealed.

SEC. 828. TESTING OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2366 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out ''survivability'' each place it appears (including in the section heading) and inserting in lieu thereof ''vulnerability''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking out ''Survivability'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''Vulnerability''; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) Testing should begin at the component, subsystem, and subassembly level, culminating with tests of the complete system configured for combat.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 139 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''2366. Major systems and munitions programs: vulnerability testing and lethality testing required before full-scale production.''.

SEC. 829. DEPENDENCY OF NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL BASE ON SUPPLIES AVAILABLE ONLY FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) NATIONAL SECURITY OBJECTIVES FOR NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL BASE.—Section 2501(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) Providing for the development, manufacture, and supply of items and technologies critical to the production and sustainment of advanced military weapon systems with minimal reliance on items for which the source of supply, manufacture, or technology is outside of the United States and Canada and for which there is no immediately available source in the United States or Canada.''.

(b) ASSESSMENT OF EXTENT OF UNITED STATES DEPENDENCY ON FOREIGN SOURCE ITEMS.—Subsection (c) of section 2505 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(c) ASSESSMENT OF EXTENT OF DEPENDENCY ON FOREIGN SOURCE ITEMS.—Each assessment under subsection (a) shall include a separate discussion and presentation regarding the extent to which the national technology and industrial base is dependent on items for which the source of supply, manufacture, or technology is outside of the United States and Canada and for which there is no immediately available source in the United States or Canada. The discussion and presentation shall include the following:

''(1) An assessment of the overall degree of dependence by the national technology and industrial base on such foreign items, including a comparison with the degree of dependence identified in the preceding assessment.

''(2) Identification of major systems (as defined in section 2302 of this title) under development or production containing such foreign items, including an identification of all such foreign items for each system.

''(3) An analysis of the production or development risks resulting from the possible disruption of access to such foreign items, including consideration of both peacetime and wartime scenarios.

''(4) An analysis of the importance of retaining domestic production sources for the items specified in section 2534 of this title.

''(5) A discussion of programs and initiatives in place to reduce dependence by the national technology and industrial base on such foreign items.

''(6) A discussion of proposed policy or legislative initiatives recommended to reduce the dependence of the national technology and industrial base on such foreign items.''.

(c) TIME FOR COMPLETION OF NEXT DEFENSE CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT.—Notwithstanding the schedule prescribed by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (d) of section 2505 of title 10, United States Code, the National Defense Technology and Industrial Base Council shall complete the next defense capability assessment required under such section not later than March 1, 1997.

SEC. 830. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TREATMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CABLE TELEVISION FRANCHISE AGREEMENTS.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States Court of Federal Claims should transmit to Congress the report required by section 823 of Public Law 104–106 (110 Stat. 399) on or before the date specified in that section.

SEC. 831. EXTENSION OF DOMESTIC SOURCE LIMITATION FOR VALVES AND MACHINE TOOLS.

Subparagraph (C) of section 2534(c)(2) is amended by striking out ''1996'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''2001''.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

SEC. 901. ADDITIONAL REQUIRED REDUCTION IN DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE.

Section 906(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 405) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking out ''during fiscal year 1996'' and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof ''so that—

''(A) the total number of such positions as of October 1, 1996, is less than the baseline number by at least 15,000; and

''(B) the total number of such positions as of October 1, 1997, is less than the baseline number by at least 40,000.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'baseline number' means the total number of defense acquisition personnel positions as of October 1, 1995.''.

SEC. 902. REDUCTION OF PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

(a) PERMANENT LIMITATION ON OSD PERSONNEL.—Effective October 1, 1999, the number of OSD personnel may not exceed 75 percent of the baseline number.

(b) PHASED REDUCTION.—The number of OSD personnel—

(1) as of October 1, 1997, may not exceed 85 percent of the baseline number; and

(2) as of October 1, 1998, may not exceed 80 percent of the baseline number.

(c) BASELINE NUMBER.—For purposes of this section, the term ''baseline number'' means the number of OSD personnel as of October 1, 1994.

(d) OSD PERSONNEL DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ''OSD personnel'' means military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense who are assigned to, or employed in, functions in the Office of the Secretary of Defense (including Direct Support Activities of that Office and the Washington Headquarters Services of the Department of Defense).

(e) LIMITATION ON REASSIGNMENT OF FUNCTIONS.—In carrying out reductions in the number of personnel assigned to, or employed in, the Office of the Department of Defense in order to comply with this section, the Secretary of Defense may not reassign functions solely in order to evade the requirements contained in this section.

(f) FLEXIBILITY.—If the Secretary of Defense determines, and certifies to Congress, that the limitation in subsection (b) with respect to any fiscal year would adversely affect United States national security, the limitation under that subsection with respect to that fiscal year may be waived. If the Secretary of Defense determines, and certifies to Congress, that the limitation in subsection (a) during fiscal year 1999 would adversely affect United States national security, the limitation under that subsection with respect to that fiscal year may be waived. The authority under this subsection may be used only once, with respect to a single fiscal year.

(g) REPEAL OF PRIOR REQUIREMENT.—Section 901(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 410) is repealed.

SEC. 903. REPORT ON MILITARY DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS STAFFS.

(a) REVIEW BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review of the size, mission, organization, and functions of the military department headquarters staffs. This review shall include the following:

(1) An assessment on the adequacy of the present organization structure to efficiently and effectively support the mission of the military departments.

(2) An assessment of options to reduce the number of personnel assigned to the military department headquarters staffs.

(3) An assessment of the extent of unnecessary duplication of functions between the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military department headquarters staffs.

(4) An assessment of the possible benefits that could be derived from further functional consolidation between the civilian secretariat of the military departments and the staffs of the military service chiefs.

(5) An assessment of the possible benefits that could be derived from reducing the number of civilian officers in the military departments who are appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 1997, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing—

(1) the findings and conclusions of the Secretary resulting from the review under subsection (a); and

(2) a plan for implementing resulting recommendations, including proposals for legislation (with supporting rationale) that would be required as result of the review.

(c) REDUCTION IN TOTAL NUMBER OF PERSONNEL ASSIGNED.—In developing the plan under subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall make every effort to provide for significant reductions in the overall number of military and civilian personnel assigned to or serving in the military department headquarters staffs.

(d) MILITARY DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS STAFFS DEFINED.—For the purposes of this section, the term ''military department headquarters staffs'' means the offices, organizations, and other elements of the Department of Defense comprising the following:

(1) The Office of the Secretary of the Army.

(2) The Army Staff.

(3) The Office of the Secretary of the Air Force.

(4) The Air Staff.

(5) The Office of the Secretary of the Navy.

(6) The Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

(7) Headquarters, Marine Corps.

SEC. 904. EXTENSION OF EFFECTIVE DATE FOR CHARTER FOR JOINT REQUIREMENTS OVERSIGHT COUNCIL.

Section 905(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 404) is amended by striking out ''January 31, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''January 31, 1998''.

SEC. 905. REMOVAL OF SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FROM MEMBERSHIP ON THE FOREIGN TRADE ZONE BOARD.

The first section of the Act of June 18, 1934 (Public Law Numbered 397, Seventy-third Congress; 48 Stat. 998) (19 U.S.C. 81a), popularly known as the ''Foreign Trade Zones Act'', is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking out ''the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of War'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''and the Secretary of the Treasury''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking out ''Alaska, Hawaii,''.

SEC. 906. MEMBERSHIP OF THE AMMUNITION STORAGE BOARD.

Section 172(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''a joint board of officers selected by them'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''a joint board selected by them composed of officers, civilian officers and employees of the Department of Defense, or both''.

SEC. 907. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DISBURSING OFFICIAL CHECK CASHING AND EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS.

Section 3342(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon;

(2) by striking out ''and'' at the end of paragraph (5);

(3) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof ''; or''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) a Federal credit union that at the request of the Secretary of Defense is operating on a United States military installation in a foreign country, but only if that country does not permit contractor-operated military banking facilities to operate on such installations.''.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

SEC. 1001. TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AUTHORIZATIONS.—(1) Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may transfer amounts of authorizations made available to the Department of Defense in this division for fiscal year 1997 between any such authorizations for that fiscal year (or any subdivisions thereof). Amounts of authorizations so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the authorization to which transferred.

(2) The total amount of authorizations that the Secretary of Defense may transfer under the authority of this section may not exceed $2,000,000,000.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The authority provided by this section to transfer authorizations—

(1) may only be used to provide authority for items that have a higher priority than the items from which authority is transferred; and

(2) may not be used to provide authority for an item that has been denied authorization by Congress.

(c) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION AMOUNTS.—A transfer made from one account to another under the authority of this section shall be deemed to increase the amount authorized for the account to which the amount is transferred by an amount equal to the amount transferred.

(d) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall promptly notify Congress of each transfer made under subsection (a).

SEC. 1002. INCORPORATION OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.

(a) STATUS OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The Classified Annex prepared by the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives to accompany the bill H.R. 3230 of the One Hundred Fourth Congress and transmitted to the President is hereby incorporated into this Act.

(b) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS OF ACT.—The amounts specified in the Classified Annex are not in addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated by other provisions of this Act.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization contained in this Act that are made available for a program, project, or activity referred to in the Classified Annex may only be expended for such program, project, or activity in accordance with such terms, conditions, limitations, restrictions, and requirements as are set out for that program, project, or activity in the Classified Annex.

(d) DISTRIBUTION OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The President shall provide for appropriate distribution of the Classified Annex, or of appropriate portions of the annex, within the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 1003. AUTHORITY FOR OBLIGATION OF CERTAIN UNAUTHORIZED FISCAL YEAR 1996 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The amounts described in subsection (b) may be obligated and expended for programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Defense in accordance with fiscal year 1996 defense appropriations.

(b) COVERED AMOUNTS.—The amounts referred to in subsection (a) are the amounts provided for programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1996 defense appropriations that are in excess of the amounts provided for such programs, projects, and activities in fiscal year 1996 defense authorizations.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) FISCAL YEAR 1996 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS.—The term ''fiscal year 1996 defense appropriations'' means amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996 in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104–61).

(2) FISCAL YEAR 1996 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS.—The term ''fiscal year 1996 defense authorizations'' means amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996 in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106).

SEC. 1004. AUTHORIZATION OF PRIOR EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.

Amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996 in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) are hereby adjusted, with respect to any such authorized amount, by the amount by which appropriations pursuant to such authorization were increased (by a supplemental appropriation) or decreased (by a rescission), or both, in the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–134).

SEC. 1005. FORMAT FOR BUDGET REQUESTS FOR NAVY/MARINE CORPS AND AIR FORCE AMMUNITION ACCOUNTS.

Section 114 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) In each budget submitted by the President to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, amounts requested for procurement of ammunition for the Navy and Marine Corps, and for procurement of ammunition for the Air Force, shall be set forth separately from other amounts requested for procurement.''.

SEC. 1006. FORMAT FOR BUDGET REQUESTS FOR DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that in the budget justification documents for any fiscal year there is set forth separately amounts requested for each program, project, or activity within the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Program, with a unique program element provided for funds requested for research, development, test, and evaluation for each such program, project, or activity and a unique procurement line item provided for funds requested for procurement for each such program, project, or activity.

(b) DEFENSE BUDGET.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term ''budget justification documents'' means the supporting budget documentation submitted to the congressional defense committees in support of the budget of the Department of Defense for a fiscal year as included in the budget of the President submitted under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, for that fiscal year.

Subtitle B—Reports and Studies

SEC. 1021. ANNUAL REPORT ON OPERATION PROVIDE COMFORT AND OPERATION ENHANCED SOUTHERN WATCH.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on Operation Provide Comfort and Operation Enhanced Southern Watch.

(b) MATTERS RELATING TO OPERATION PROVIDE COMFORT.—Each report under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to Operation Provide Comfort, the following:

(1) A detailed presentation of the projected costs to be incurred by the Department of Defense for that operation during the fiscal year in which the report is submitted and projected for the following fiscal year, together with a discussion of missions and functions expected to be performed by the Department as part of that operation during each of those fiscal years.

(2) A detailed presentation of the projected costs to be incurred by other departments and agencies of the Federal Government participating in or providing support to that operation during each of those fiscal years.

(3) A discussion of options being pursued to reduce the involvement of the Department of Defense in those aspects of that operation that are not directly related to the military mission of the Department of Defense.

(4) A discussion of the exit strategy for United States involvement in, and support for, that operation.

(5) A description of alternative approaches to accomplishing the mission of that operation that are designed to limit the scope and cost to the Department of Defense of accomplishing that mission while maintaining mission success.

(6) The contributions (both in-kind and actual) by other nations to the costs of conducting that operation.

(7) A detailed presentation of significant Iraqi military activity (including specific violations of the no-fly zone) determined to jeopardize the security of the Kurdish population in northern Iraq.

(c) MATTERS RELATING TO OPERATION ENHANCED SOUTHERN WATCH.—Each report under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to Operation Enhanced Southern Watch, the following:

(1) The expected duration and annual costs of the various elements of that operation.

(2) The political and military objectives associated with that operation.

(3) The contributions (both in-kind and actual) by other nations to the costs of conducting that operation.

(4) A description of alternative approaches to accomplishing the mission of that operation that are designed to limit the scope and cost of accomplishing that mission while maintaining mission success.

(5) A comprehensive discussion of the political and military objectives and initiatives that the Department of Defense has pursued, and intends to pursue, in order to reduce United States involvement in that operation.

(6) A detailed presentation of significant Iraqi military activity (including specific violations of the no-fly zone) determined to jeopardize the security of the Shiite population in southern Iraq.

(d) TERMINATION OF REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The requirement under subsection (a) shall cease to apply with respect to an operation named in that subsection upon the termination of United States involvement in that operation.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) OPERATION ENHANCED SOUTHERN WATCH.—The term ''Operation Enhanced Southern Watch'' means the operation of the Department of Defense that as of October 30, 1995, is designated as Operation Enhanced Southern Watch.

(2) OPERATION PROVIDE COMFORT.—The term ''Operation Provide Comfort'' means the operation of the Department of Defense that as of October 30, 1995, is designated as Operation Provide Comfort.

SEC. 1022. REPORT ON PROTECTION OF NATIONAL INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the national policy on protecting the national information infrastructure against strategic attacks.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report shall include the following:

(1) A description of the national policy and plans to meet essential Government and civilian needs during a national security emergency associated with a strategic attack on elements of the national infrastructure the functioning of which depend on networked computer systems.

(2) The identification of information infrastructure functions that must be performed during such an emergency.

(3) The assignment of responsibilities to Federal departments and agencies, and a description of the roles of Government and industry, relating to indications and warning of, assessment of, response to, and reconstitution after, potential strategic attacks on the critical national infrastructures described under paragraph (1).

(c) OUTSTANDING ISSUES.—The report shall also identify any outstanding issues in need of further study and resolution, such as technology and funding shortfalls, and legal and regulatory considerations.

SEC. 1023. REPORT ON WITNESS INTERVIEW PROCEDURES FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) SURVEY OF MILITARY DEPARTMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a survey of the policies and practices of the military criminal investigative organizations with respect to the manner in which interviews of suspects and witnesses are conducted in connection with criminal investigations. The purpose of the survey shall be to ascertain whether or not investigators and agents from those organizations engage in illegal, unnecessary, or inappropriate harassment and intimidation of individuals being interviewed.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a report concerning the survey under subsection (a). The report shall specifically address the following:

(1) The extent to which investigators of the military criminal investigative organizations engage in illegal or inappropriate practices in connection with interviews of suspects in or witnesses to crimes.

(2) The extent to which the interview policies established by the Department of Defense directive or service regulation are adequate to instruct and guide investigators in the proper conduct of subject and witness interviews.

(3) The desirability and feasibility of requiring the video and audio recording of all interviews.

(4) The desirability and feasibility of making such recordings or written transcriptions of interviews, or both, available on demand to the subject or witness interviewed.

(5) The extent to which existing directives or regulations specify a prohibition against the display by agents of those organizations of weapons during interviews and the extent to which agents conducting interviews inappropriately display weapons during interviews.

(6) The extent to which existing directives or regulations forbid agents of those organizations from making judgmental statements during interviews regarding the guilt of the interviewee or the consequences of failing to cooperate with investigators, and the extent to which agents conducting interviews nevertheless engage in such practices.

(7) Any recommendation for legislation to ensure that investigators and agents of the military criminal investigative organizations use legal and proper tactics during interviews in connection with Department of Defense criminal investigations.

(c) RESULTS OF INTERVIEWS AND SURVEYS.—The Comptroller General shall include in the report under subsection (b) the results of interviews and surveys conducted under subsection (a) with persons who were witnesses or subjects in investigations conducted by military criminal investigative organizations.

(d) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this section, the term ''military criminal investigative organization'' means any of the following:

(1) The Army Criminal Investigation Command.

(2) The Air Force Office of Special Investigations.

(3) The Naval Criminal Investigative Service.

(4) The Defense Criminal Investigative Service.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

SEC. 1031. INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM.

(a) ALLOCATION.—Of the amounts appropriated for the Department of Defense for the Defense Information Infrastructure for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall allocate to an information systems security program, under a separate program element, amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 1998, 2.5 percent.

(2) For fiscal year 1999, 3.0 percent.

(3) For fiscal year 2000, 3.5 percent.

(4) For fiscal year 2001, 4.0 percent.

(b) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER AMOUNTS.—Amounts allocated under subsection (a) are in addition to amounts appropriated to the National Security Agency and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency for information security development, acquisition, and operations.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committee and congressional intelligence committees a report not later than April 15 of each year from 1998 through 2002 that describes information security objectives of the Department of Defense, the progress made during the previous year in meeting those objectives, and plans of the Secretary with respect to meeting those objectives for the next fiscal year.

SEC. 1032. AVIATION AND VESSEL WAR RISK INSURANCE.

(a) AVIATION RISK INSURANCE.—(1) Chapter 931 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 9514. Indemnification of Department of Transportation for losses covered by defense-related aviation insurance

''(a) PROMPT INDEMNIFICATION REQUIRED.—In the event of a loss that is covered by defense-related aviation insurance, the Secretary of Defense shall promptly indemnify the Secretary of Transportation for the amount of the loss. The Secretary of Defense shall make such indemnification—

''(1) in the case of a claim for the loss of an aircraft hull, not later than 30 days following the date of the presentment of the claim to the Secretary of Transportation; and

''(2) in the case of any other claim, not later than 180 days after the date on which the claim is determined by the Secretary of Transportation to be payable.

''(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR PAYMENT OF INDEMNITY.—The Secretary may pay an indemnity described in subsection (a) from any funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, and such sums as may be necessary for payment of such indemnity are hereby authorized to be transferred to the Secretary of Transportation for such purpose.

''(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—In the event of a loss that is covered by defense-related aviation insurance in the case of an incident in which the covered loss is (or is expected to be) in an amount in excess of $1,000,000, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress—

''(1) notification of the loss as soon after the occurrence of the loss as possible and in no event more than 30 days after the date of the loss; and

''(2) semiannual reports thereafter updating the information submitted under paragraph (1) and showing with respect to losses arising from such incident the total amount expended to cover such losses, the source of those funds, pending litigation, and estimated total cost to the Government.

''(d) IMPLEMENTING MATTERS.—(1) Payment of indemnification under this section is not subject to section 2214 or 2215 of this title or any other provision of law requiring notification to Congress before funds may be transferred.

''(2) Consolidation of claims arising from the same incident is not required before indemnification of the Secretary of Transportation for

payment of a claim may be made under this section.

''(e) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Authority to transfer funds under this section is in addition to any other authority provided by law to transfer funds (whether enacted before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this section) and is not subject to any dollar limitation or notification requirement contained in any other such authority to transfer funds.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) DEFENSE-RELATED AVIATION INSURANCE.—The term 'defense-related aviation insurance' means aviation insurance and reinsurance provided through policies issued by the Secretary of Transportation under chapter 443 of title 49 that pursuant to section 44305(b) of that title is provided by that Secretary without premium at the request of the Secretary of Defense and is covered by an indemnity agreement between the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense.

''(2) LOSS.—The term 'loss' includes damage to or destruction of property, personal injury or death, and other liabilities and expenses covered by the defense-related aviation insurance.''.

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

''9514. Indemnification of Department of Transportation for losses covered by defense-related aviation insurance.''.

(b) VESSEL WAR RISK INSURANCE.—(1) Chapter 157 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 2644, as added by section 364(a), the following new section:

''§ 2645. Indemnification of Department of Transportation for losses covered by vessel war risk insurance

''(a) PROMPT INDEMNIFICATION REQUIRED.—In the event of a loss that is covered by vessel war risk insurance, the Secretary of Defense shall promptly indemnify the Secretary of Transportation for the amount of the loss. The Secretary of Defense shall make such indemnification—

''(1) in the case of a claim for a loss to a vessel, not later than 90 days following the date of the adjudication or settlement of the claim by the Secretary of Transportation; and

''(2) in the case of any other claim, not later than 180 days after the date on which the claim is determined by the Secretary of Transportation to be payable.

''(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR PAYMENT OF INDEMNITY.—The Secretary may pay an indemnity described in subsection (a) from any funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, and such sums as may be necessary for payment of such indemnity are hereby authorized to be transferred to the Secretary of Transportation for such purpose.

''(c) DEPOSIT OF FUNDS.—(1) Any amount transferred to the Secretary of Transportation under this section shall be deposited in, and merged with amounts in, the Vessel War Risk Insurance Fund as provided in the second sentence of section 1208(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1288(a)).

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'Vessel War Risk Insurance Fund' means the insurance fund referred to in the first sentence of section 1208(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1288(a)).

''(d) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—In the event of a loss that is covered by vessel war risk insurance in the case of an incident in which the covered loss is (or is expected to be) in an amount in excess of $1,000,000, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress—

''(1) notification of the loss as soon after the occurrence of the loss as possible and in no event more than 30 days after the date of the loss; and

''(2) semiannual reports thereafter updating the information submitted under paragraph (1) and showing with respect to losses arising from such incident the total amount expended to cover such losses, the source of such funds, pending litigation, and estimated total cost to the Government.

''(e) IMPLEMENTING MATTERS.—(1) Payment of indemnification under this section is not subject to section 2214 or 2215 of this title or any other provision of law requiring notification to Congress before funds may be transferred.

''(2) Consolidation of claims arising from the same incident is not required before indemnification of the Secretary of Transportation for payment of a claim may be made under this section.

''(f) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Authority to transfer funds under this section is in addition to any other authority provided by law to transfer funds (whether enacted before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this section) and is not subject to any dollar limitation or notification requirement contained in any other such authority to transfer funds.

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) VESSEL WAR RISK INSURANCE.—The term 'vessel war risk insurance' means insurance and reinsurance provided through policies issued by the Secretary of Transportation under title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1281 et seq.), that is provided by that Secretary without premium at the request of the Secretary of Defense and is covered by an indemnity agreement between the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense.

''(2) LOSS.—The term 'loss' includes damage to or destruction of property, personal injury or death, and other liabilities and expenses covered by the vessel war risk insurance.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2644, as added by section 364(c)(3), the following new item:

''2645. Indemnification of Department of Transportation for losses covered by vessel war risk insurance.''.

SEC. 1033. AIRCRAFT ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION BOARDS.

(a) INDEPENDENCE AND OBJECTIVITY OF BOARDS.—(1) Chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2255. Aircraft accident investigation boards: independence and objectivity

''(a) REQUIRED MEMBERSHIP OF BOARDS.—Whenever the Secretary of a military department convenes a aircraft accident investigation board to conduct an accident investigation of an accident involving an aircraft under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, the Secretary shall select the membership of the board so that—

''(1) a majority of the voting members of the board are selected from units outside the chain of command of the mishap unit; and

''(2) at least one voting member of the board is an officer or an employee assigned to the relevant service safety center.

''(b) DETERMINATION OF UNITS OUTSIDE SAME CHAIN OF COMMAND.—For purposes of this section, a unit shall be considered to be outside the chain of command of another unit if the two units do not have a common commander in their respective chains of command below a position for which the authorized grade is major general or rear admiral.

''(c) MISHAP UNIT DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'mishap unit', with respect to an aircraft accident investigation, means the unit of the armed forces (at the squadron level or equivalent) to which was assigned the flight crew of the aircraft that sustained the accident that is the subject of the investigation.

''(d) SERVICE SAFETY CENTER.—For purposes of this section, a service safety center is the single office or separate operating agency of a military department that has responsibility for the management of aviation safety matters for that military department.''.

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

''2255. Aircraft accident investigation boards: independence and objectivity.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2255 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to any aircraft accident investigation board convened by the Secretary of a military department after the end of the six-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1034. AUTHORITY FOR USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR RECRUITING FUNCTIONS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Chapter 31 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 520c. Recruiting functions: use of funds

''Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, funds appropriated to the Department of Defense may be expended for small meals and snacks during recruiting functions for the following persons:

''(1) Persons who have entered the Delayed Entry Program under section 513 of this title and other persons who are the subject of recruiting efforts.

''(2) Persons in communities who assist the military departments in recruiting efforts.

''(3) Military or civilian personnel whose attendance at such functions is mandatory.

''(4) Other persons whose presence at recruiting functions will contribute to recruiting efforts.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''520c. Recruiting functions: use of funds.''.

SEC. 1035. AUTHORITY FOR AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO CERTAIN AFRICAN AMERICAN SOLDIERS WHO SERVED DURING WORLD WAR II.

(a) INAPPLICABILITY OF TIME LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding the time limitations in section 3744(b) of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation, the President may award the Medal of Honor to the persons specified in subsection (b), each of whom has been found by the Secretary of the Army to have distinguished himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving in the United States Army during World War II.

(b) PERSONS ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE THE MEDAL OF HONOR.—The persons referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) Vernon J. Baker, who served as a first lieutenant in the 370th Infantry Regiment, 92nd Infantry Division.

(2) Edward A. Carter, who served as a staff sergeant in the 56th Armored Infantry Battalion, Twelfth Armored Division.

(3) John R. Fox, who served as a first lieutenant in the 366th Infantry Regiment, 92nd Infantry Division.

(4) Willy F. James, Jr., who served as a private first class in 413th Infantry Regiment, 104th Infantry Division.

(5) Ruben Rivers, who served as a staff sergeant in the 761st Tank Battalion.

(6) Charles L. Thomas, who served as a first lieutenant in the 614th Tank Destroyer Battalion.

(7) George Watson, who served as a private in the 29th Quartermaster Regiment.

(c) POSTHUMOUS AWARD.—The Medal of Honor may be awarded under this section posthumously, as provided in section 3752 of title 10, United States Code.

(d) PRIOR AWARD.—The Medal of Honor may be awarded under this section for service for which a Distinguished-Service Cross, or other award, has been awarded.

SEC. 1036. COMPENSATION FOR PERSONS AWARDED PRISONER OF WAR MEDAL WHO DID NOT PREVIOUSLY RECEIVE COMPENSATION AS A PRISONER OF WAR.

(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE PAYMENTS.—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall make payments in the manner provided in section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 2005) to (or on behalf of) any person described in subsection (b) who submits an application for such payment in accordance with subsection (d).

(b) ELIGIBLE PERSONS.—This section applies with respect to a member or former member of the Armed Forces who—

(1) has received the prisoner of war medal under section 1128 of title 10, United States Code; and

(2) has not previously received a payment under section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 2005) with respect to the period of internment for which the person received the prisoner of war medal.

(c) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The amount of the payment to any person under this section shall be determined based upon the provisions of section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 that are applicable with respect to the period of time during which the internment occurred for which the person received the prisoner of war medal.

(d) ONE-YEAR PERIOD FOR SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS.—A payment may be made by reason of this section only in the case of a person who submits an application to the Secretary concerned for such payment during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act. Any such application shall be submitted in such form and manner as the Secretary may require.

SEC. 1037. GEORGE C. MARSHALL EUROPEAN CENTER FOR STRATEGIC SECURITY STUDIES.

(a) ACCEPTANCE OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary of Defense may accept, on behalf of the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies, from any foreign nation any contribution of money or services made by such nation to defray the cost of, or enhance the operations of, the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies. Such contributions may include guest lecturers, faculty services, research materials, and other donations through foundations or similar sources.

(b) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress if total contributions of money under subsection (a) exceed $2,000,000 in any fiscal year. Any such notice shall list the nations and the amounts of each such contribution.

(c) MARSHALL CENTER ATTENDANCE AND REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may authorize participation by a European or Eurasian nation in Marshall Center programs if—

(A) the Secretary determines, after consultation with the Secretary of State, that such participation is in the national interest of the United States; and

(B) the Secretary determines that such participation (notwithstanding any other provision of law) by that nation in Marshall Center programs will materially contribute to the reform of the electoral process or development of democratic institutions or democratic political parties in that nation.

(2) The Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress of such determination not less than 90 days in advance of any such participation by such nation pursuant to the determination concerning that nation.

(3) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress an annual report on the participation of European and Eurasian nations in programs of the Marshall Center.

(d) MARSHALL CENTER BOARD OF VISITORS.—(1) In the case of any United States citizen invited to serve without compensation on the Marshall Center Board of Visitors, the Secretary of Defense may waive any requirement for financial disclosure that would otherwise be applicable to that person by reason of service on such Board of Visitors.

(2) Notwithstanding section 219 of title 18, United States Code, a non-United States citizen may serve on the Board even though registered as a foreign agent.

SEC. 1038. PARTICIPATION OF MEMBERS, DEPENDENTS, AND OTHER PERSONS IN CRIME PREVENTION EFFORTS AT INSTALLATIONS.

(a) CRIME PREVENTION.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations intended to require members of the Armed Forces, dependents of members, civilian employees of the Department of Defense, and employees of defense contractors performing work at military installations to report to an appropriate military law enforcement agency any crime or criminal activity that the person reasonably believes occurred on a military installation.

(b) SANCTIONS.—As part of the regulations, the Secretary shall consider the feasibility of imposing sanctions against a person described in subsection (a), particularly a member of the Armed Forces, who fails to report the occurrence of a crime or criminal activity as required by the regulations.

(c) REPORT REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than February 1, 1997, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the plans of the Secretary to implement this section.

SEC. 1039. TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) CORRECTIONS IN STATUTORY REFERENCES.—

(1) REFERENCE TO COMMAND FORMERLY KNOWN AS THE NORTH AMERICAN AIR DEFENSE COMMAND.—Section 162(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''North American Air Defense Command'' in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof ''North American Aerospace Defense Command''.

(2) REFERENCES TO FORMER NAVAL RECORDS AND HISTORY OFFICE AND FUND.—(A) Section 7222 of title 10, United States Code, is amended in subsections (a) and (c) by striking out ''Office of Naval Records and History'' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof ''Naval Historical Center''.

(B)(i) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 7222. Naval Historical Center Fund''.

(ii) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 631 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''7222. Naval Historical Center Fund.''.

(C) Section 2055(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking out paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

''(4) For treatment of gifts and bequests for the benefit of the Naval Historical Center as gifts or bequests to or for the use of the United States, see section 7222 of title 10, United States Code.''.

(3) CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMISSIONS.—Section 172 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2341; 50 U.S.C. 1521 note) is amended by striking out ''Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Logistics, and Environment)'' in subsections (b) and (f) and inserting in lieu thereof ''Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition)''.

(b) MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, United States Code.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 129(a) is amended by striking out ''the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''February 10, 1996,''.

(2) Section 401 is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(4), by striking out ''Armed Forces'' both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof ''armed forces''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by inserting ''any of the following'' after ''means''.

(3) Section 528(b) is amended by striking out ''(1)'' after ''(b)'' and inserting ''(1)'' before ''The limitation''.

(4) Section 1078a(a) is amended by striking out ''Beginning on October 1, 1994, the'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''The''.

(5) Section 1161(b)(2) is amended by striking out ''section 1178'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''section 1167''.

(6) Section 1167 is amended by striking out ''person'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''member''.

(7) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 81 is amended by striking out ''Sec.'' in the item relating to section 1599a.

(8) Section 1588(d)(1)(C) is amended by striking out ''Section 522a'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''Section 552a''.

(9) Chapter 87 is amended—

(A) in section 1723(a), by striking out the second sentence;

(B) in section 1724, by striking out '', beginning on October 1, 1993,'' in subsections (a) and (b);

(C) in section 1733(a), by striking out ''On and after October 1, 1993, a'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''A''; and

(D) in section 1734—

(i) in subsection (a)(1), by striking out '', on and after October 1, 1993,''; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(1)(A), by striking out '', on and after October 1, 1991,''.

(10) Section 2216, as added by section 371 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 107 Stat. 277), is redesignated as section 2216a, and the item relating to that section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 131 is revised so as to reflect such redesignation.

(11) Section 2305(b)(6) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking out ''of this section'' and ''of this paragraph'';

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking out ''this subsection'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''subparagraph (A)''; and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking out ''pursuant to this subsection'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''under subparagraph (A)''.

(12) Section 2306a(h)(3) is amended by inserting ''(41 U.S.C. 403(12))'' before the period at the end.

(13) Section 2323a(a) is amended by striking out ''section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 (10 U.S.C. 2301 note)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''section 2323 of this title''.

(14) Section 2534(c)(4) is amended by striking out ''the date occurring two years after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''February 10, 1998''.

(15) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 155 is amended by striking out the item relating to section 2609.

(16) Section 2610(e) is amended by striking out ''two years after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''on February 10, 1998''.

(17) Sections 2824(c) and 2826(i)(1) are amended by striking out ''the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''February 10, 1996''.

(18) Section 3036(d) is amended by striking out ''For purposes of this subsection,'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''In this subsection,''.

(19) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 641 is amended by striking out the item relating to section 7434.

(20) Section 10542(b)(21) is amended by striking out ''261'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''12001''.

(21) Section 12205(a) is amended by striking out ''After September 30, 1995, no person'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''No person''.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 104–106.—The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 186 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 561(d)(1) (110 Stat. 322) is amended by inserting ''of such title'' after ''Section 1405(c)''.

(2) Section 903(e)(1) (110 Stat. 402) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking out ''paragraphs (6) and (8)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''paragraph (6)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''(8),'' after ''(7),'' and by striking out ''and (9),'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''(9), and (10),''.

(3) Section 1092(b)(2) (110 Stat. 460) is amended by striking out the period at the end and inserting in lieu thereof ''; and''.

(4) Section 4301(a)(1) (110 Stat. 656) is amended by inserting ''of subsection (a)'' after ''in paragraph (2)''.

(5) Section 5601 (110 Stat. 699) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting ''of title 10, United States Code,'' before ''is amended''; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking out ''use of equipment or services, if'' in the second quoted matter therein and inserting in lieu thereof ''use of the equipment or services''.

(d) PROVISIONS EXECUTED BEFORE ENACTMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 104–106.—

(1) Section 533(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 315) shall apply as if enacted as of December 31, 1995.

(2) The authority provided under section 942(f) of title 10, United States Code, shall be effective as if section 1142 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 467) had been enacted on September 29, 1995.

(e) AMENDMENTS TO OTHER ACTS.—

(1) The last section of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 434), as added by section 5202 of Public Law 104–106 (110 Stat. 690), is redesignated as section 38, and the item appearing after section 34 in the table of contents in the first section of that Act is transferred to the end of such table of contents and revised so as to reflect such redesignation.

(2) Section 1412(g)(2) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521(g)(2)), is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking out ''shall contain—'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''shall include the following:'';

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking out ''a'' before ''site-by-site'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''A''; and

(ii) by striking out the semicolon at the end and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(C) in subparagraphs (B) and (C), by striking out ''an'' at the beginning of the subparagraph and and inserting in lieu thereof ''An''.

(f) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AMENDMENTS.—For purposes of applying amendments made by provisions of this Act other than provisions of this section, this section shall be treated as having been enacted immediately before the other provisions of this Act.

SEC. 1040. PROHIBITION ON CARRYING OUT SR–71 STRATEGIC RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM DURING FISCAL YEAR 1997.

The Secretary of Defense may not carry out any aerial reconnaissance program during fiscal year 1997 using the SR–71 aircraft.

TITLE XI—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF FORMER SOVIET UNION

SEC. 1101. SPECIFICATION OF COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 301 and other provisions of this Act, Cooperative Threat Reduction programs are the programs specified in subsection (b).

(b) SPECIFIED PROGRAMS.—The programs referred to in subsection (a) are the following programs with respect to states of the former Soviet Union:

(1) Programs to facilitate the elimination, and the safe and secure transportation and storage, of nuclear, chemical, and other weapons and their delivery vehicles.

(2) Programs to facilitate the safe and secure storage of fissile materials derived from the elimination of nuclear weapons.

(3) Programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapons-related technology and expertise.

(4) Programs to expand military-to-military and defense contacts.

SEC. 1102. FISCAL YEAR 1997 FUNDING ALLOCATIONS.

Of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 301 for Cooperative Threat Reduction programs, not more than the following amounts may be obligated for the purposes specified:

(1) For planning and design of a chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia, $74,500,000.

(2) For elimination of strategic offensive weapons in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan, $52,000,000.

(3) For nuclear infrastructure elimination in Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan, $47,000,000.

(4) For planning and design of a storage facility for Russian fissile material, $46,000,000.

(5) For fissile material containers in Russia, $38,500,000.

(6) For weapons storage security in Russia, $15,000,000.

(7) For activities designated as Defense and Military-to-Military Contacts in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan, $10,000,000.

(8) For activities designated as Other Assessments/Administrative Support $19,900,000.

SEC. 1103. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR SPECIFIED PURPOSES.

None of the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization in section 301 for Cooperative Threat Reduction programs, or appropriated for such programs for any prior fiscal year and remaining available for obligation, may be obligated or expended for any of the following purposes:

(1) Conducting with Russia any peacekeeping exercise or other peacekeeping-related activity.

(2) Provision of housing.

(3) Provision of assistance to promote defense conversion.

(4) Provision of assistance to promote environmental restoration.

(5) Provision of assistance to promote job retraining.

SEC. 1104. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS UNTIL SPECIFIED REPORTS ARE SUBMITTED.

None of the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization in section 301 for Cooperative Threat Reduction programs may be obligated or expended until 15 days after the date which is the latest of the following:

(1) The date on which the President submits to Congress the determinations required under subsection (c) of section 211 of Public Law 102–228 (22 U.S.C. 2551 note) with respect to any certification transmitted to Congress under subsection (b) of that section before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress the first report under section 1206(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 471).

(3) The date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress the report for fiscal year 1997 required under section 1205(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 2883).

SEC. 1105. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 301 for Cooperative Threat Reduction programs shall be available for obligation for three fiscal years.

TITLE XII—RESERVE FORCES REVITALIZATION

SEC. 1201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Reserve Forces Revitalization Act of 1996''.

SEC. 1202. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to revise the basic statutory authorities governing the organization and administration of the reserve components of the Armed Forces in order to recognize the realities of reserve component partnership in the Total Force and to better prepare the American citizen-soldier, sailor, airman, and Marine in time of peace for duties in war.

Subtitle A—Reserve Component Structure

SEC. 1211. RESERVE COMPONENT COMMANDS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—(1) Part I of subtitle E of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 1005 the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 1006—RESERVE COMPONENT COMMANDS

''§ 10171. Army Reserve Command

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMAND.—The Secretary of the Army, with the advice and assistance of the Chief of Staff of the Army, shall establish a United States Army Reserve Command. The Army Reserve Command shall be operated as a separate command of the Army.

''(b) COMMANDER.—The Chief of Army Reserve is the commander of the Army Reserve Command. The commander of the Army Reserve Command reports directly to the Chief of Staff of the Army.

''(c) ASSIGNMENT OF FORCES.—The Secretary of the Army—

''(1) shall assign to the Army Reserve Command all forces of the Army Reserve stationed in the continental United States other than forces assigned to the unified combatant command for special operations forces established pursuant to section 167 of this title; and

''(2) except as otherwise directed by the Secretary of Defense in the case of forces assigned to carry out functions of the Secretary of the Army specified in section 3013 of this title, shall assign all such forces assigned to the Army Reserve Command under paragraph (1) to the commanders of the combatant commands in the manner specified by the Secretary of Defense.

''§ 10172. Naval Reserve Force

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMAND.—The Secretary of the Navy, with the advice and assistance of the Chief of Naval Operations, shall establish a Naval Reserve Force. The Naval Reserve Force shall be operated as a separate command of the Navy.

''(b) COMMANDER.—The Chief of Naval Reserve shall be the commander of the Naval Reserve Force. The commander of the Naval Reserve Force reports directly to the Chief of Naval Operations.

''(c) ASSIGNMENT OF FORCES.—The Secretary of the Navy—

''(1) shall assign to the Naval Reserve Force specified portions of the Naval Reserve other than forces assigned to the unified combatant command for special operations forces established pursuant to section 167 of this title; and

''(2) except as otherwise directed by the Secretary of Defense in the case of forces assigned to carry out functions of the Secretary of the Navy specified in section 5013 of this title, shall assign to the combatant commands all such forces assigned to the Naval Reserve Force under paragraph (1) in the manner specified by the Secretary of Defense.

''§ 10173. Marine Forces Reserve

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Navy, with the advice and assistance of the Commandant of the Marine Corps, shall establish in the Marine Corps a command known as the Marine Forces Reserve.

''(b) COMMANDER.—The Marine Forces Reserve is commanded by the Commander, Marine Forces Reserve. The Commander, Marine Forces Reserve, reports directly to the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

''(c) ASSIGNMENT OF FORCES.—The Commandant of the Marine Corps—

''(1) shall assign to the Marine Forces Reserve the forces of the Marine Corps Reserve stationed in the continental United States other than forces assigned to the unified combatant command for special operations forces established pursuant to section 167 of this title; and

''(2) except as otherwise directed by the Secretary of Defense in the case of forces assigned to carry out functions of the Secretary of the Navy specified in section 5013 of this title, shall assign to the combatant commands (through the Marine Corps component commander for each such command) all such forces assigned to the Marine Forces Reserve under paragraph (1) in the manner specified by the Secretary of Defense.

''§ 10174. Air Force Reserve Command

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMAND.—The Secretary of the Air Force, with the advice and assistance of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, shall establish an Air Force Reserve Command. The Air Force Reserve Command shall be operated as a separate command of the Air Force.

''(b) COMMANDER.—The Chief of Air Force Reserve is the Commander of the Air Force Reserve Command. The commander of the Air Force Reserve Command reports directly to the Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

''(c) ASSIGNMENT OF FORCES.—The Secretary of the Air Force—

''(1) shall assign to the Air Force Reserve Command all forces of the Air Force Reserve stationed in the continental United States other than forces assigned to the unified combatant command for special operations forces established pursuant to section 167 of this title; and

''(2) except as otherwise directed by the Secretary of Defense in the case of forces assigned to carry out functions of the Secretary of the Air Force specified in section 8013 of this title, shall assign to the combatant commands all such forces assigned to the Air Force Reserve Command under paragraph (1) in the manner specified by the Secretary of Defense.''.

(2) The tables of chapters at the beginning of part I of such subtitle and at the beginning of such subtitle are each amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 1005 the following new item:

''1006. Reserve Component Commands 10171".

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 903 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 3074 note) is repealed.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE.—Implementation of chapter 1006 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall begin not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall be completed not later than one year after such date.

SEC. 1212. RESERVE COMPONENT CHIEFS.

(a) CHIEF OF ARMY RESERVE.—Section 3038 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(d) BUDGET.—The Chief of Army Reserve is the official within the executive part of the Department of the Army who, subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff, is responsible for justification and execution of the personnel, operation and maintenance, and construction budgets for the Army Reserve. As such, the Chief of Army Reserve is the director and functional manager of appropriations made for the Army Reserve in those areas.

''(e) FULL-TIME SUPPORT PROGRAM.—The Chief of Army Reserve manages, with respect to the Army Reserve, the personnel program of the Department of Defense known as the Full Time Support Program.

''(f) ANNUAL REPORT.—(1) The Chief of Army Reserve shall submit to the Secretary of Defense, through the Secretary of the Army, an annual report on the state of the Army Reserve and the ability of the Army Reserve to meet its missions. The report shall be prepared in conjunction with the Chief of Staff of the Army and may be submitted in classified and unclassified versions.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense shall transmit the annual report of the Chief of Army Reserve under paragraph (1) to Congress, together with such comments on the report as the Secretary considers appropriate. The report shall be transmitted at the same time each year that the annual report of the Secretary under section 113 of this title is submitted to Congress.''.

(b) CHIEF OF NAVAL RESERVE.—(1) Chapter 513 of such title is amended by inserting after section 5142a the following new section:

''§ 5143. Office of Naval Reserve: appointment of Chief

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE: CHIEF OF NAVAL RESERVE.—There is in the executive part of the Department of the Navy, on the staff of the Chief of Naval Operations, an Office of the Naval Reserve, which is headed by a Chief of Naval Reserve. The Chief of Naval Reserve—

''(1) is the principal adviser on Naval Reserve matters to the Chief of Naval Operations; and

''(2) is the commander of the Naval Reserve Force.

''(b) APPOINTMENT.—The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint the Chief of Naval Reserve from officers who—

''(1) have had at least 10 years of commissioned service;

''(2) are in a grade above captain; and

''(3) have been recommended by the Secretary of the Navy.

''(c) GRADE.—(1) The Chief of Naval Reserve holds office for a term determined by the Chief of Naval Operations, normally four years, but may be removed for cause at any time. He is eligible to succeed himself.

''(2) The Chief of Naval Reserve, while so serving, has a grade above rear admiral (lower half), without vacating the officer's permanent grade.

''(d) BUDGET.—The Chief of Naval Reserve is the official within the executive part of the Department of the Navy who, subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations, is responsible for preparation, justification, and execution of the personnel, operation and maintenance, and construction budgets for the Naval Reserve. As such, the Chief of Naval Reserve is the director and functional manager of appropriations made for the Naval Reserve in those areas.

''(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—(1) The Chief of Naval Reserve shall submit to the Secretary of Defense, through the Secretary of the Navy, an annual report on the state of the Naval Reserve and the ability of the Naval Reserve to meet its missions. The report shall be prepared in conjunction with the Chief of Naval Operations and may be submitted in classified and unclassified versions.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense shall transmit the annual report of the Chief of Naval Reserve under paragraph (1) to Congress, together with such comments on the report as the Secretary considers appropriate. The report shall be transmitted at the same time each year that the annual report of the Secretary under section 113 of this title is submitted to Congress.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5142a the following new item:

''5143. Office of Naval Reserve: appointment of Chief.''.

(c) CHIEF OF MARINE FORCES RESERVE.—(1) Chapter 513 of such title is amended by inserting after section 5143 (as added by subsection (b)) the following new section:

''§ 5144. Office of Marine Forces Reserve: appointment of Commander

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE; COMMANDER, MARINE FORCES RESERVE.—There is in the executive part of the Department of the Navy an Office of the Marine Forces Reserve, which is headed by the Commander, Marine Forces Reserve. The Commander, Marine Forces Reserve is the principal adviser to the Commandant on Marine Forces Reserve matters.

''(b) APPOINTMENT.—The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint the Commander, Marine Forces Reserve, from officers of the Marine Corps who—

''(1) have had at least 10 years of commissioned service;

''(2) are in a grade above colonel; and

''(3) have been recommended by the Secretary of the Navy.

''(c) TERM OF OFFICE; GRADE.—(1) The Commander, Marine Forces Reserve, holds office for a term determined by the Commandant of the Marine Corps, normally four years, but may be removed for cause at any time. He is eligible to succeed himself.

''(2) The Commander, Marine Forces Reserve, while so serving, has a grade above brigadier general, without vacating the officer's permanent grade.

''(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—(1) The Commander, Marine Forces Reserve, shall submit to the Secretary of Defense, through the Secretary of the Navy, an annual report on the state of the Marine Corps Reserve and the ability of the Marine Corps Reserve to meet its missions. The report shall be prepared in conjunction with the Commandant of the Marine Corps and may be submitted in classified and unclassified versions.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense shall transmit the annual report of the Commander, Marine Forces Reserve, under paragraph (1) to Congress, together with such comments on the report as the Secretary considers appropriate. The report shall be transmitted at the same time each year that the annual report of the Secretary under section 113 of this title is submitted to Congress.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5143 (as added by subsection (b)) the following new item:

''5144. Office of Marine Forces Reserve: appointment of Commander.''.

(d) CHIEF OF AIR FORCE RESERVE.—Section 8038 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(d) BUDGET.—The Chief of Air Force Reserve is the official within the executive part of the Department of the Air Force who, subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff, is responsible for preparation, justification, and execution of the personnel, operation and maintenance, and construction budgets for the Air Force Reserve. As such, the Chief of Air Force Reserve is the director and functional manager of appropriations made for the Air Force Reserve in those areas.

''(e) FULL TIME SUPPORT PROGRAM.—(1) The Chief of Air Force Reserve manages, with respect to the Air Force Reserve, the personnel program of the Department of Defense known as the Full Time Support Program.

''(f) ANNUAL REPORT.—(1) The Chief of Air Force Reserve shall submit to the Secretary of Defense, through the Secretary of the Air Force, an annual report on the state of the Air Force Reserve and the ability of the Air Force Reserve to meet its missions. The report shall be prepared in conjunction with the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and may be submitted in classified and unclassified versions.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense shall transmit the annual report of the Chief of Air Force Reserve under paragraph (1) to Congress, together with such comments on the report as the Secretary considers appropriate. The report shall be transmitted at the same time each year that the annual report of the Secretary under section 113 of this title is submitted to Congress.''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 641(1)(B) of such title is amended by inserting ''5143, 5144,'' after ''3038,''.

SEC. 1213. REVIEW OF ACTIVE DUTY AND RESERVE GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICER AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report containing any recommendations of the Secretary (together with the rationale of the Secretary for the recommendations) concerning the following:

(1) Revision of the limitations on general and flag officer grade authorizations and distribution in grade prescribed by sections 525, 526, and 12004 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Statutory designation of the positions and grades of any additional general and flag officers in the commands and offices created by sections 1211 and 1212.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The Secretary shall include in the report under subsection (a) the Secretary's views on whether current limitations referred to in subsection (a)—

(1) permit the Secretaries of the military departments, in view of increased requirements for assignment of general and flag officers in positions external to their organic services, to meet adequately both internal and external requirements for general and flag officers;

(2) adequately recognize the significantly increased role of the reserve components in both service-specific and joint operations; and

(3) permit the Secretaries of the military departments and reserve components to assign general and flag officers to active and reserve component positions with grades commensurate with the scope of duties and responsibilities of the position.

(c) EXEMPTIONS FROM ACTIVE-DUTY CEILINGS.—(1) The Secretary shall include in the report under subsection (a) the Secretary's recommendations regarding the merits of exempting from any active-duty ceiling (established by law or administrative action) the following officers:

(A) Reserve general and flag officers assigned to positions specified in the organizations created by this title.

(B) Reserve general and flag officers serving on active duty, but who are excluded from the active-duty list.

(2) If the Secretary determines under paragraph (1) that any Reserve general or flag officers should be exempt from active duty limits, the Secretary shall include in the report under subsection (a) the Secretary's recommendations for—

(A) the effective management of those Reserve general and flag officers; and

(B) revision of active duty ceilings so as to prevent an increase in the numbers of active general and flag officers authorizations due solely to the removal of Reserve general and flag officers from under the active duty authorizations.

(3) If the Secretary determines under paragraph (1) that active and reserve general officers on active duty should continue to be managed under a common ceiling, the Secretary shall make recommendations for the appropriate apportionment of numbers for general and flag officers among active and reserve officers.

(d) RESERVE FORCES POLICY BOARD PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Reserve Forces Policy Board participates in the internal Department of Defense process for development of the recommendations of the Secretary contained in the report under subsection (a). If the Board submits to the Secretary any comments or recommendations for inclusion in the report, the Secretary shall transmit them to Congress, with the report, in the same form as that in which they were submitted to the Secretary.

(e) GAO REVIEW.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall assess the criteria used by the Secretary of Defense to develop recommendations for purposes of the report under this section and shall submit to Congress, not later than 30 days after the date on which the report of the Secretary under this section is submitted, a report setting forth the Comptroller General's conclusions concerning the adequacy and completeness of the recommendations made by the Secretary in the report.

SEC. 1214. GUARD AND RESERVE TECHNICIANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 10216 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 413, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a), (b), and (c) as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively;

(2) by inserting after the section heading the following new subsection (a):

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Military technicians are Federal civilian employees hired under title 5 and title 32 who are required to maintain dual-status as drilling reserve component members as a condition of their Federal civilian employment. Such employees shall be authorized and accounted for as a separate category of dual-status civilian employees, exempt as specified in subsection (b)(3) from any general or regulatory requirement for adjustments in Department of Defense civilian personnel.''; and

(3) in paragraph (3) of subsection (b), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking out ''in high-priority units and organizations specified in paragraph (1)''.

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Accessibility

SEC. 1231. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON MEASURES TO IMPROVE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE ABILITY TO RESPOND TO EMERGENCIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report regarding reserve component responsiveness to both domestic emergencies and national contingency operations. The report shall set forth the measures taken, underway, and projected to be taken to improve the timeliness, adequacy, and effectiveness of reserve component responses to such emergencies and operations.

(b) MATTERS RELATED TO RESPONSIVENESS TO DOMESTIC EMERGENCIES.—The report shall address the following:

(1) The need to expand the time period set by section 12301(b) of title 10, United States Code, which permits the involuntary recall at any time to active duty of units and individuals for up to 15 days per year.

(2) The recommendations of the 1995 report of the RAND Corporation entitled ''Assessing the State and Federal Missions of the National Guard'', as follows:

(A) That Federal law be clarified and amended to authorize Presidential use of the Federal reserves of all military services for domestic emergencies and disasters without any time constraint.

(B) That the Secretary of Defense develop and support establishment of an appropriate national level compact for interstate sharing of resources, including the domestic capabilities of the national guards of the States, during emergencies and disasters.

(C) That Federal level contingency stocks be created to support the National Guard in domestic disasters.

(D) That Federal funding and regulatory support be provided for Federal-State disaster emergency response planning exercises.

(c) MATTERS RELATED TO PRESIDENTIAL RESERVE CALL-UP AUTHORITY.—The report under this section shall specifically address matters related to the authority of the President to activate for service on active duty units and members of reserve components under sections 12301, 12302, and 12304 of title 10, United States Code, including—

(1) whether such authority is adequate to meet the full range of reserve component missions for the 21st century, particularly with regard to the time periods for which such units and members may be on active duty under those authorities and the ability to activate both units and individual members; and

(2) whether the three-tiered set of statutory authorities (under such sections 12301, 12302, and 12304) should be consolidated, modified, or in part eliminated in order to facilitate current and future use of Reserve units and individual reserve component members for a broader range of missions, and, if so, in what manner.

(d) MATTERS RELATED TO RELEASE FROM ACTIVE DUTY.—The report under this section shall include findings and recommendations (based upon a review of current policies and procedures) concerning procedures for release from active duty of units and members of reserve components who have been involuntarily called or ordered to active duty under section 12301, 12302, or 12304 of title 10, United States Code, with specific recommendations concerning the desirability of statutory provisions to—

(1) establish specific guidelines for when it is appropriate (or inappropriate) to retain on active duty such reserve component units when active component units are available to perform the mission being performed by the reserve component unit;

(2) minimize the effects of frequent mobilization of the civilian employers, as well as the effects of frequent mobilization on recruiting and retention in the reserve components; and

(3) address other matters relating to the needs of such members of reserve components, their employers, and (in the case of such members who own businesses) their employees, while such members are on active duty.

(e) RESERVE FORCES POLICY BOARD PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Reserve Forces Policy Board participates in the internal Department of Defense process for development of the recommendations of the Secretary contained in the report under subsection (a). If the Board submits to the Secretary any comments or recommendations for inclusion in the report, the Secretary shall transmit them to Congress, with the report, in the same form as that in which they were submitted to the Secretary.

(f) GAO REVIEW.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall assess the criteria used by the Secretary of Defense to develop recommendations for purposes of the report under this section and shall submit to Congress, not later than 30 days after the date on which the report of the Secretary under this section is submitted, a report setting forth the Comptroller General's conclusions concerning the adequacy and completeness of the recommendations made by the Secretary in the report.

SEC. 1232. REPORT TO CONGRESS CONCERNING TAX INCENTIVES FOR EMPLOYERS OF MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth a draft of legislation to provide tax incentives to employers of members of reserve components in order to compensate employers for absences of those employees due to required training and for absences due to performance of active duty.

SEC. 1233. REPORT TO CONGRESS CONCERNING INCOME INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR ACTIVATED RESERVISTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth legislative recommendations for changes to chapter 1214 of title 10, United States Code. Such recommendations shall in particular provide, in the case of a mobilized member who

owns a business, income replacement for that business and for employees of that member or business who have a loss of income during the period of such activation attributable to the activation of the member.

SEC. 1234. REPORT TO CONGRESS CONCERNING SMALL BUSINESS LOANS FOR MEMBERS RELEASED FROM RESERVE SERVICE DURING CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth a draft of legislation to establish a small business loan program to provide members of reserve components who are ordered to active duty or active Federal service (other than for training) during a contingency operation (as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code) low-cost loans to assist those members in retaining or rebuilding businesses that were affected by their service on active duty or in active Federal service.

Subtitle C—Reserve Forces Sustainment

SEC. 1251. REPORT CONCERNING TAX DEDUCTIBILITY OF NONREIMBURSABLE EXPENSES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth a draft of legislation to restore the tax deductibility of nonreimbursable expenses incurred by members of reserve components in connection with military service.

SEC. 1252. CODIFICATION OF ANNUAL AUTHORITY TO PAY TRANSIENT HOUSING CHARGES OR PROVIDE LODGING IN KIND FOR MEMBERS PERFORMING ACTIVE DUTY FOR TRAINING OR INACTIVE-DUTY TRAINING.

(a) CODIFICATION.—Section 404(j) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking out ''annual training duty'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''active duty for training''; and

(B) by striking out ''the Secretary concerned may'' and all that follows through the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following ''the Secretary concerned—

''(A) may reimburse the member for housing service charge expenses incurred by the member in occupying transient government housing during the performance of such duty; or

''(B) if transient government quarters are unavailable, may provide the member with contract quarters as lodging in kind as if the member were entitled to such an allowance under subsection (a).''; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''and expenses for contract quarters'' after ''service charge expenses''.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 8057 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104–61; 109 Stat. 663), is repealed.

SEC. 1253. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING QUARTERS ALLOWANCE DURING SERVICE ON ACTIVE DUTY FOR TRAINING.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to pay members of reserve components appropriate quarters allowances during periods of service on active duty for training.

SEC. 1254. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING MILITARY LEAVE POLICY.

It is the sense of Congress that military leave policies in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to members of the reserve components should not be changed.

SEC. 1255. COMMENDATION OF RESERVE FORCES POLICY BOARD.

(a) COMMENDATION.—The Congress commends the Reserve Forces Policy Board, created by the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 82–476), for its fine work in the past as an independent source of advice to the Secretary of Defense on all matters pertaining to the reserve components.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Reserve Forces Policy Board and the reserve forces policy committees for the individual branches of the Armed Forces should continue to perform the vital role of providing the civilian leadership of the Department of Defense with independent advice on matters pertaining to the reserve components.

SEC. 1256. REPORT ON PARITY OF BENEFITS FOR ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE AND RESERVE SERVICE.

No later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report providing recommendations for changes in law that the Secretary considers necessary, feasible, and affordable to reduce the disparities in pay and benefits that occur between active component members of the Armed Forces and reserve component members as a result of eligibility based on length of time on active duty.

TITLE XIII—ARMS CONTROL AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Miscellaneous Matters

SEC. 1301. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF COUNTERPROLIFERATION AUTHORITIES.

Section 1505 of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Control Act of 1992 (title XV of Public Law 102–484; 22 U.S.C. 5859a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(3), by striking out ''or'' after ''fiscal year 1995,'' and by inserting '', or $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1997'' before the period at the end; and

(2) in subsection (f), by striking out ''1996'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''1997''.

SEC. 1302. LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT OR DISMANTLEMENT OF STRATEGIC NUCLEAR DELIVERY SYSTEMS.

(a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds available to the Department of Defense may not be obligated or expended during fiscal year 1997 for retiring or dismantling, or for preparing to retire or dismantle, any of the strategic nuclear delivery systems specified in subsection (b).

(b) SPECIFIED SYSTEMS.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to the following systems:

(1) B–52H bomber aircraft.

(2) Trident ballistic missile submarines.

(3) Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles.

(4) Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missiles.

SEC. 1303. CERTIFICATION REQUIRED BEFORE OBSERVANCE OF MORATORIUM ON USE BY ARMED FORCES OF ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINES.

Any moratorium imposed by law (whether enacted before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act) on the use of antipersonnel landmines by the Armed Forces may be implemented only if (and after) the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, certifies to Congress that—

(1) the moratorium will not adversely affect the ability of United States forces to defend against attack on land by hostile forces; and

(2) the Armed Forces have systems that are effective substitutes for antipersonnel landmines.

SEC. 1304. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEMINING PROGRAM.

Section 401(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

''(2) In the case of assistance described in subsection (e)(5), expenses that may be paid out of funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) include—

''(A) expenses for travel, transportation, and subsistence of members of the armed forces participating in activities described in that subsection; and

''(B) the cost of equipment, supplies, and services acquired for the purpose of carrying out or directly supporting activities described in that subsection.''.

SEC. 1305. REPORT ON MILITARY CAPABILITIES OF PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall prepare a report, in both classified and unclassified form, on the future pattern of military modernization of the People's Republic of China. The report shall address both the probable course of military-technological development in the People's Liberation Army and the development of Chinese military strategy and operational concepts.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report shall include analyses and forecasts of the following:

(1) Trends that would lead the People's Republic of China toward the development of advanced intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities, including gaining access to commercial or third-party systems with military significance.

(2) Efforts by the People's Republic of China to develop highly accurate and stealthy ballistic and cruise missiles, particularly in numbers sufficient to conduct attacks capable of overwhelming projected defense capabilities in the region.

(3) Development by the People's Republic of China of command and control networks, particularly those capable of battle management of long-range precision strikes.

(4) Programs of the People's Republic of China involving unmanned aerial vehicles, particularly those with extended ranges or loitering times.

(5) Exploitation by the People's Republic of China of the Global Positioning System or other similar systems for military purposes, including commercial land surveillance satellites, particularly those signs indicative of an attempt to increase accuracy of weapons or situational awareness of operating forces.

(6) Development by the People's Republic of China of capabilities for denial of sea control, such as advanced sea mines or improved submarine capabilities.

(7) Continued development by the People's Republic of China of follow-on forces, particularly those capable of rapid air or amphibious assault.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—The report shall be submitted to Congress not later than February 1, 1997.

SEC. 1306. UNITED STATES-PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA JOINT DEFENSE CONVERSION COMMISSION.

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1997 or any prior fiscal year may be obligated or expended for any activity associated with the United States-People's Republic of China Joint Defense Conversion Commission until 15 days after the date on which the first semiannual report required by section 1343 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 487) is received by Congress.

SEC. 1307. AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT SERVICES FROM FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES.

Section 2608(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and may accept from any foreign government or international organization any contribution of services made by such foreign government or international organization for use by the Department of Defense''.

SEC. 1308. REVIEW BY DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ESTIMATE 95–19

(a) REVIEW.—The Director of Central Intelligence shall conduct a review of the underlying assumptions and conclusions of the National Intelligence Estimate designated as NIE 95–19 and entitled ''Emerging Missile Threats to North America During the Next 15 Years'', released by the Director in November 1995.

(b) METHODOLOGY FOR REVIEW.—The Director shall carry out the review under subsection (a) through a panel of independent, nongovernmental individuals with appropriate expertise and experience. Such a panel shall be convened by the Director not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) REPORT.—The Director shall submit the findings resulting from the review under subsection (a), together with any comments of the Director on the review and the findings, to Congress not later than three months after the appointment of the Commission under section 1321.

Subtitle B—Commission to Assess the Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States

SEC. 1321. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a commission to be known as the ''Commission to Assess the Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States'' (hereinafter in this subtitle referred to as the ''Commission'').

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of nine members appointed by the Director of Central Intelligence. In selecting individuals for appointment to the Commission, the Director should consult with—

(1) the Speaker of the House of Representatives concerning the appointment of three of the members of the Commission;

(2) the majority leader of the Senate concerning the appointment of three of the members of the Commission; and

(3) minority leader of the House of Representatives and the minority leader of the Senate concerning the appointment of three of the members of the Commission.

(c) QUALIFICATIONS.—Members of the Commission shall be appointed from among private United States citizens with knowledge and expertise in the political and military aspects of proliferation of ballistic missiles and the ballistic missile threat to the United States.

(d) CHAIRMAN.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the majority leader of the Senate and the minority leaders of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall designate one of the members of the Commission to serve as chairman of the Commission.

(e) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(f) SECURITY CLEARANCES.—All members of the Commission shall hold appropriate security clearances.

(g) INITIAL ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—(1) All appointments to the Commission shall be made not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The Commission shall convene its first meeting not later than 30 days after the date as of which all members of the Commission have been appointed, but not earlier than October 15, 1996.

SEC. 1322. DUTIES OF COMMISSION.

(a) REVIEW OF BALLISTIC MISSILE THREAT.—The Commission shall assess the nature and magnitude of the existing and emerging ballistic missile threat to the United States.

(b) COOPERATION FROM GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.—In carrying out its duties, the Commission should receive the full and timely cooperation of the Secretary of Defense, the Director of Central Intelligence, and any other United States Government official responsible for providing the Commission with analyses, briefings, and other information necessary for the fulfillment of its responsibilities.

SEC. 1323. REPORT.

The Commission shall, not later than six months after the date of its first meeting, submit to the Congress a report on its findings and conclusions.

SEC. 1324. POWERS.

(a) HEARINGS.—The Commission or, at its direction, any panel or member of the Commission, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subtitle, hold hearings, sit and act at times and places, take testimony, receive evidence, and administer oaths to the extent that the Commission or any panel or member considers advisable.

(b) INFORMATION.—The Commission may secure directly from the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and any other Federal department or agency information that the Commission considers necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its responsibilities under this subtitle.

SEC. 1325. COMMISSION PROCEDURES.

(a) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman.

(b) QUORUM.—(1) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum other than for the purpose of holding hearings.

(2) The Commission shall act by resolution agreed to by a majority of the members of the Commission.

(c) COMMISSION.—The Commission may establish panels composed of less than full membership of the Commission for the purpose of carrying out the Commission's duties. The actions of each such panel shall be subject to the review and control of the Commission. Any findings and determinations made by such a panel shall not be considered the findings and determinations of the Commission unless approved by the Commission.

(d) AUTHORITY OF INDIVIDUALS TO ACT FOR COMMISSION.—Any member or agent of the Commission may, if authorized by the Commission, take any action which the Commission is authorized to take under this subtitle.

SEC. 1326. PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) PAY OF MEMBERS.—Members of the Commission shall serve without pay by reason of their work on the Commission.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—(1) The chairman of the Commission may, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, appoint a staff director and such additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The appointment of a staff director shall be subject to the approval of the Commission.

(2) The chairman of the Commission may fix the pay of the staff director and other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay fixed under this paragraph for the staff director may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title and the rate of pay for other personnel may not exceed the maximum rate payable for grade GS–15 of the General Schedule.

(d) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Upon request of the chairman of the Commission, the head of any Federal department or agency may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, any personnel of that department or agency to the Commission to assist it in carrying out its duties.

(e) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The chairman of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

SEC. 1327. MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) POSTAL AND PRINTING SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails and obtain printing and binding services in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(b) MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Director of Central Intelligence shall furnish the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, any administrative and support services requested by the Commission.

SEC. 1328. FUNDING.

Funds for activities of the Commission shall be provided from amounts appropriated for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities for fiscal year 1997. Upon receipt of a written certification from the Chairman of the Commission specifying the funds required for the activities of the Commission, the Secretary of Defense shall promptly disburse to the Commission, from such amounts, the funds required by the Commission as stated in such certification.

SEC. 1329. TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate 60 days after the date of the submission of its report.

TITLE XIV—SIKES ACT IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 1401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Sikes Act Improvement Amendments of 1996''.

SEC. 1402. DEFINITION OF SIKES ACT FOR PURPOSES OF AMENDMENTS.

In this title, the term ''Sikes Act'' means the Act entitled ''An Act to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations'', approved September 15, 1960 (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.), commonly referred to as the ''Sikes Act''.

SEC. 1403. CODIFICATION OF SHORT TITLE OF ACT.

The Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is amended by inserting before title I the following new section:

''SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

''This Act may be cited as the 'Sikes Act'.''.

SEC. 1404. INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.

(a) PLANS REQUIRED.—Section 101(a) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out ''is authorized to'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''shall'';

(2) by striking out ''in each military reservation in accordance with a cooperative plan'' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ''on military installations. Under the program, the Secretary shall prepare and implement for each military installation in the United States an integrated natural resource management plan'';

(3) by inserting after ''reservation is located'' the following: '', except that the Secretary is not required to prepare such a plan for a military installation if the Secretary determines that preparation of such a plan for the installation is not appropriate''; and

(4) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(a)'' and adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) Consistent with essential military requirements to enhance the national security of the United States, the Secretary of Defense shall manage each military installation to provide—

''(A) for the conservation of fish and wildlife on the military installation and sustained multipurpose uses of those resources, including hunting, fishing, and trapping; and

''(B) public access that is necessary or appropriate for those uses.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Title I of the Sikes Act is amended—

(1) in section 101(b) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)), in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking out ''cooperative plan'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''integrated natural resource management plan'';

(2) in section 101(b)(4) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(4)), by striking out ''cooperative plan'' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof ''integrated natural resource management plan'';

(3) in section 101(c) (16 U.S.C. 670a(c)), in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking out ''a cooperative plan'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''an integrated natural resource management plan'';

(4) in section 101(d) (16 U.S.C. 670a(d)), in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking out ''cooperative plans'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''integrated natural resource management plans'';

(5) in section 101(e) (16 U.S.C. 670a(e)), by striking out ''Cooperative plans'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''Integrated natural resource management plans'';

(6) in section 102 (16 U.S.C. 670b), by striking out ''a cooperative plan'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''an integrated natural resource management plan'';

(7) in section 103 (16 U.S.C. 670c), by striking out ''a cooperative plan'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''an integrated natural resource management plan'';

(8) in section 106(a) (16 U.S.C. 670f(a)), by striking out ''cooperative plans'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''integrated natural resource management plans''; and

(9) in section 106(c) (16 U.S.C. 670f(c)), by striking out ''cooperative plans'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''integrated natural resource management plans''.

(c) CONTENTS OF PLANS.—Section 101(b) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking out ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking out the semicolon at the end and inserting in lieu thereof a comma; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(E) wetland protection and restoration, and wetland creation where necessary, for support of fish or wildlife,

''(F) consideration of conservation needs for all biological communities, and

''(G) the establishment of specific natural resource management goals, objectives, and timeframes for proposed actions;'';

(2) by striking out paragraph (3);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) shall for the military installation for which it is prepared—

''(A) address the needs for fish and wildlife management, land management, forest management, and wildlife-oriented recreation,

''(B) ensure the integration of, and consistency among, the various activities conducted under the plan,

''(C) ensure that there is no net loss in the capability of installation lands to support the military mission of the installation,

''(D) provide for sustained use by the public of natural resources, to the extent that such use is not inconsistent with the military mission of the installation or the needs of fish and wildlife management,

''(E) provide the public access to the installation that is necessary or appropriate for that use, to the extent that access is not inconsistent with the military mission of the installation, and

''(F) provide for professional enforcement of natural resource laws and regulations;''; and

(5) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking out ''collect the fees therefor,'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''collect, spend, administer, and account for fees therefor,''.

(d) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Section 101 of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide an opportunity for public comment on each integrated natural resource management plan prepared under subsection (a).''.

SEC. 1405. REVIEW FOR PREPARATION OF INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.

(a) REVIEW OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Secretary of each military department shall, by not later than nine months after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) review each military installation in the United States that is under the jurisdiction of that Secretary to determine the military installations for which the preparation of an integrated natural resource management plan under section 101 of the Sikes Act, as amended by this title, is appropriate; and

(B) submit to the Secretary of Defense a report on those determinations.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall, by not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Congress a report on the reviews conducted under paragraph (1). The report shall include—

(A) a list of those military installations reviewed under paragraph (1) for which the Secretary of Defense determines the preparation of an integrated natural resource management plan is not appropriate; and

(B) for each of the military installations listed under subparagraph (A), an explanation of the reasons such a plan is not appropriate.

(b) DEADLINE FOR INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Not later than two years after the date of the submission of the report required under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of Defense shall, for each military installation for which the Secretary has not determined under subsection (a)(2)(A) that preparation of an integrated natural resource management plan is not appropriate—

(1) prepare and begin implementing such a plan mutually agreed to by the Secretary of the Interior and the head of the appropriate State agencies under section 101(a) of the Sikes Act, as amended by this title; or

(2) in the case of a military installation for which there is in effect a cooperative plan under section 101(a) of the Sikes Act on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, complete negotiations with the Secretary of the Interior and the heads of the appropriate State agencies regarding changes to that plan that are necessary for the plan to constitute an integrated natural resource plan that complies with that section, as amended by this title.

(c) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide an opportunity for the submission of public comments on—

(1) integrated natural resource management plans proposed pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(2) changes to cooperative plans proposed pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

SEC. 1406. ANNUAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS.

Section 101 of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a) is amended by adding after subsection (f) (as added by section 1404(d)) the following new subsection:

''(g) REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—

''(1) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall, by not later than March 1 of each year, review the extent to which integrated natural resource management plans were prepared or in effect and implemented in accordance with this Act in the preceding year, and submit a report on the findings of that review to the committees. Each report shall include—

''(A) the number of integrated natural resource management plans in effect in the year covered by the report, including the date on which each plan was issued in final form or most recently revised;

''(B) the amount of moneys expended on conservation activities conducted pursuant to those plans in the year covered by the report, including amounts expended under the Legacy Resource Management Program established under section 8120 of the Act of November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101–511; 104 Stat. 1905); and

''(C) an assessment of the extent to which the plans comply with the requirements of subsection (b)(1) and (2), including specifically the extent to which the plans ensure in accordance with subsection (b)(2)(C) that there is no net loss of lands to support the military missions of military installations.

''(2) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The Secretary of the Interior, by not later than March 1 of each year and in consultation with State agencies responsible for conservation or management of fish or wildlife, shall submit a report to the committees on the amount of moneys expended by the Department of the Interior and those State agencies in the year covered by the report on conservation activities conducted pursuant to integrated natural resource management plans.

''(3) COMMITTEES DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'committees' means the Committee on Resources and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.''.

SEC. 1407. TRANSFER OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION FEES FROM CLOSED MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

Section 101(b)(4)(B) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(4)(B)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', unless that military installation is subsequently closed, in which case the fees may be transferred to another military installation to be used for the same purposes''.

SEC. 1408. FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT OF INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS AND ENFORCEMENT OF OTHER LAWS.

Title I of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 106, as amended by section 1404(b), as section 109; and

(2) by inserting after section 105 the following new section:

''SEC. 106. FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT OF OTHER LAWS.

''All Federal laws relating to the conservation of natural resources on Federal lands may be enforced by the Secretary of Defense with respect to violations of those laws which occur on military installations within the United States.''.

SEC. 1409. NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SERVICES.

Title I of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 106 (as added by section 1408) the following new section:

''SEC. 107. NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SERVICES.

''The Secretary of each military department shall ensure that sufficient numbers of professionally trained natural resource management personnel and natural resource law enforcement personnel are available and assigned responsibility to perform tasks necessary to comply with this Act, including the preparation and implementation of integrated natural resource management plans.''.

SEC. 1410. DEFINITIONS.

Title I of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 107 (as added by section 1409) the following new section:

''SEC. 108. DEFINITIONS.

''In this title:

''(1) MILITARY INSTALLATION.—The term 'military installation'—

''(A) means any land or interest in land owned by the United States and administered by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department; and

''(B) includes all public lands withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under public land

laws and reserved for use by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department.

''(2) STATE FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCY.—The term 'State fish and wildlife agency' means an agency of State government that is responsible under State law for managing fish or wildlife resources.

''(3) UNITED STATES.—The term 'United States' means the States, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions of the United States.''.

SEC. 1411. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

(a) COST SHARING.—Section 103a(b) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670c–1(b)) is amended by striking out ''matching basis'' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof ''cost-sharing basis''.

(b) ACCOUNTING.—Section 103a(c) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670c–1(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and shall not be subject to section 1535 of that title''.

SEC. 1412. REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED PROVISION.

Section 2 of the Act of October 27, 1986 (Public Law 99–651; 16 U.S.C. 670a–1), is repealed.

SEC. 1413. CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

Title I of the Sikes Act, as amended by this title, is amended—

(1) in the heading for the title by striking out ''MILITARY RESERVATIONS'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''MILITARY INSTALLATIONS'';

(2) in section 101(a) (16 U.S.C. 670a(a)), by striking out ''the reservation'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''the installation'';

(3) in section 101(b)(4) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(4))—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking out ''the reservation'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''the installation''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking out ''the military reservation'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''the military installation'';

(4) in section 101(c) (16 U.S.C. 670a(c))—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking out ''a military reservation'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''a military installation''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking out ''the reservation'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''the installation'';

(5) in section 102 (16 U.S.C. 670b), by striking out ''military reservations'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''military installations''; and

(6) in section 103 (16 U.S.C. 670c)—

(A) by striking out ''military reservations'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''military installations''; and

(B) by striking out ''such reservations'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''such installations''.

SEC. 1414. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) PROGRAMS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—Subsections (b) and (c) of section 109 of the Sikes Act (as redesignated by section 1408) are each amended by striking out ''1983'' and all that follows through ''1993,'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''1983 through 1998,''.

(b) PROGRAMS ON PUBLIC LANDS.—Section 209 of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670o) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking out ''the sum of $10,000,000'' and all that follows through ''to enable the Secretary of the Interior'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 and 1998, to enable the Secretary of the Interior''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking out ''the sum of $12,000,000'' and all that follows through ''to enable the Secretary of Agriculture'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 and 1998, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture''.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997''.

TITLE XXI—ARMY

SEC. 2101. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a)(1), the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army: Inside the United States

State	Installation or location	Total
Arizona	Fort Huachuca	$21,000,000
California	Army project, Naval Weapons Station, Concord	$27,000,000
	Camp Roberts	$5,500,000
	Fort Irwin	$7,000,000
Colorado	Fort Carson	$17,550,000
District of Columbia	Fort McNair	$6,900,000
Georgia	Fort Benning	$53,400,000
	Fort McPherson	$9,100,000
	Fort Stewart, Hunter Army Air Field	$6,000,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	$26,000,000
Kentucky	Fort Campbell	$51,100,000
	Fort Knox	$20,500,000
New Jersey	Picatinny Arsenal	$7,500,000
New Mexico	White Sands Missile Range	$10,000,000
New York	Fort Drum	$11,400,000
North Carolina	Fort Bragg	$14,000,000
Texas	Fort Hood	$52,700,000
Virginia	Fort Eustis	$3,550,000
Washington	Fort Lewis	$54,600,000
CONUS Classified	Classified Location	$4,600,000
	Total	$409,400,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a)(2), the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or location	Total
Germany	Lincoln Village	$7,300,000
	Spinelli Barracks	$8,100,000
	Taylor Barracks	$9,300,000
Italy	Camp Ederle, Vincenza	$3,100,000
Korea	Camp Casey	$16,000,000
	Camp Red Cloud	$14,000,000
Overseas Classified	Classified Location	$64,000,000
	Total	$121,800,000

SEC. 2102. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Army may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition) at the installations, for the purposes, and in the amounts set forth in the following table:

Army: Family Housing

State	Installation	Purpose	Total
Alabama	Redstone Arsenal	70 Units	$8,000,000
Hawaii	Schofield Barracks	54 Units	$10,000,000
North Carolina	Fort Bragg	88 Units	$9,800,000
Pennsylvania	Tobyhanna Army Depot	200 Units	$890,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	85 Units	$12,000,000
	Fort Hood	140 Units	$18,500,000

Army: Family Housing—Continued

State	Installation	Purpose	Total
		Total:	$59,190,000

(b) PLANNING AND DESIGN.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Army may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of family housing units in an amount not to exceed $2,963,000.

SEC. 2103. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in sections 2104(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Army may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $114,450,000.

SEC. 2104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army in the total amount of $2,037,653,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2101(a), $409,400,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 2101(b), $121,800,000.

(3) For unspecified minor military construction projects authorized by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $8,000,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $54,384,000.

(5) For demolition of excess facilities under section 2814 of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 2802, $10,000,000.

(6) For military family housing functions:

(A) For construction and acquisition, planning and design, and improvement of military family housing and facilities, $176,603,000.

(B) For support of military family housing (including the functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $1,257,466,000.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2101 of this Act may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

SEC. 2105. CORRECTION IN AUTHORIZED USES OF FUNDS, FORT IRWIN, CALIFORNIA.

In the case of amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a)(1) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (division B of Public Law 103–337) and section 2104(a)(1) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–106) for a military construction project for Fort Irwin, California, involving the construction of an air field for the National Training Center at Barstow-Daggett, California, the Secretary of the Army may use such amounts for the construction of a heliport at the same location.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

SEC. 2201. AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a)(1), the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy: Inside the United States

State	Installation or location	Amount
Arizona	Navy Detachment, Camp Navajo	$3,920,000
	Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma	$14,600,000
California	Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms	$4,020,000
	Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton	$6,240,000
	Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton	$51,630,000
	Naval Air Station, North Island	$86,502,000
	Naval Facility, San Clemente Island	$17,000,000
	Naval Station, San Diego	$7,050,000
	Naval Command Control & Ocean Surveillance Center, San Diego	$1,960,000
Connecticut	Naval Submarine Base, New London	$13,830,000
District of Columbia	Naval District, Washington	$19,300,000
Florida	Naval Air Station, Key West	$2,250,000
	Naval Station, Mayport	$2,800,000
Georgia	Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany	$1,630,000
	Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay	$1,550,000
Hawaii	Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay	$20,080,000
	Naval Station, Pearl Harbor	$19,600,000
	Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor	$35,890,000
Idaho	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Bayview	$7,150,000
Illinois	Naval Hospital, Great Lakes	$15,200,000
	Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	$22,900,000
Indiana	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane	$5,000,000
Maryland	Naval Air Warfare Center, Patuxent River	$1,270,000
Nevada	Naval Air Station, Fallon	$16,200,000
North Carolina	Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point	$1,630,000
	Marine Corps Air Station, New River	$20,290,000
	Marine Corps Base, Camp LeJeune	$20,750,000
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia Naval Shipyard	$8,300,000
South Carolina	Marine Corps Recruit Detachment, Parris Island	$4,990,000
Texas	Naval Station, Ingleside	$16,850,000
	Naval Air Station, Kingsville	$1,810,000
Virginia	Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk	$12,900,000
	Fleet Combat Training Command, Dam Neck	$7,000,000
	Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico	$14,570,000
	Naval Station, Norfolk	$56,120,000
	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren	$8,030,000
Washington	Naval Station, Everett	$25,740,000
	Naval Undersea Warfare Center	$6,800,000
CONUS Various	Defense access roads	$300,000
	Total	$583,652,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a)(2), the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or location	Amount
Bahrain	Administrative Support Unit, Bahrain	$5,980,000
Greece	Naval Support Activity, Souda Bay	$11,050,000
Italy	Naval Air Station, Sigonella	$15,700,000
	Naval Support Activity, Naples	$8,620,000
United Kingdom	Joint Maritime Communications Center, St. Mawgan	$4,700,000

Navy: Outside the United States—Continued

Country	Installation or location	Amount
	Total	$46,050,000

SEC. 2202. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Navy may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition) at the installations, for the purposes, and in the amounts set forth in the following table:

Navy: Family Housing

State	Installation	Purpose	Amount
Arizona	Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma	Ancillary Facility	$709,000
California	Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms	Ancillary Facility	$2,938,000
	Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton	202 Units	$29,483,000
	Naval Air Station, Lemoore	276 Units	$39,837,000
	Navy Public Works Center, San Diego	466 Units	$63,429,000
Florida	Naval Station, Mayport	100 Units	$10,000,000
Hawaii	Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay	54 Units	$11,676,000
	Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor	264 Units	$52,586,000
Maine	Naval Air Station, Brunswick	92 Units	$10,925,000
Maryland	Naval Air Warfare Center, Patuxent River	Ancillary Facility	$1,233,000
North Carolina	Marine Corps Base, Camp LeJeune	Ancillary Facility	$845,000
	Marine Corps Base, Camp LeJeune	125 Units	$13,360,000
South Carolina	Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort	200 Units	$19,110,000
Texas	Corpus Christi Naval Complex	156 Units	$17,425,000
	Naval Air Station, Kingsville	48 Units	$7,550,000
Virginia	AEGIS Combat Systems Center, Wallops Island	20 Units	$2,975,000
	Naval Security Group Activity, Northwest	Ancillary Facility	$741,000
Washington	Naval Station, Everett	100 Units	$15,015,000
	Naval Submarine Base, Bangor	Ancillary Facility	$934,000
		Total	$300,771,000

(b) PLANNING AND DESIGN.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Navy may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $22,552,000.

SEC. 2203. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Navy may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $209,133,000.

SEC. 2204. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy in the total amount of $2,309,273,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2201(a), $583,652,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 2201(b), $46,050,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects authorized by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $8,115,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $50,959,000.

(5) For demolition of excess facilities under section 2814 of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 2802, $10,000,000.

(6) For military family housing functions:

(A) For construction and acquisition, planning and design, and improvement of military family housing and facilities, $532,456,000.

(B) For support of military housing (including functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $1,058,241,000.

(7) For the construction of a bachelor enlisted quarters at the Naval Construction Batallion Center, Port Hueneme, California, authorized by section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 525), $7,700,000.

(8) For the construction of a Strategic Maritime Research Center at the Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island, authorized by section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (division B of Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 3031), $8,000,000.

(9) For the construction of the large anachoic chamber facility at the Patuxent River Naval Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Maryland, authorized by section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (division B of Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2590), $10,000,000.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2201 of this Act may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

(c) ADJUSTMENT.—The total amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (9) of subsection (a) is the sum of the amounts authorized to be appropriated in such paragraphs, reduced by $12,000,000, which represents the combination of project savings resulting from favorable bids, reduced overhead costs, and cancellations due to force structure changes.

SEC. 2205. BEACH REPLENISHMENT, NAVAL AIR STATION, NORTH ISLAND, CALIFORNIA.

(a) COST-SHARING AGREEMENT.—With regard to the portion of the military construction project for Naval Air Station, North Island, California, authorized by section 2201(a) and involving on-shore and near-shore beach replenishment, the Secretary of the Navy shall endeavor to enter into an agreement with the State of California and local governments in the vicinity of the project, under which the State and local governments agree to cover not less than 50 percent of the cost incurred by the Secretary to carry out the beach replenishment portion of the project.

(b) ACTIVITIES PENDING AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall not delay commencement of, or activities under, the construction project described in subsection (a), including the beach replenishment portion of the project, pending the execution of the cost-sharing agreement, except that, within amounts appropriated for the project, Federal expenditures may not exceed $9,630,000 for beach replenishment.

SEC. 2206. LEASE TO FACILITATE CONSTRUCTION OF RESERVE CENTER, NAVAL AIR STATION, MERIDIAN, MISSISSIPPI.

(a) LEASE OF PROPERTY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF RESERVE CENTER.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may lease, without reimbursement, to the State of Mississippi (in this section referred to as the ''State''), approximately five acres of real property located at Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi. The State shall use the property to construct a reserve center of approximately 22,000 square feet and ancillary supporting facilities.

(2) The term of the lease under this subsection shall expire on the same date that the lease authorized by subsection (b) expires.

(b) LEASEBACK OF RESERVE CENTER.—(1) The Secretary may lease from the State the property and improvements constructed pursuant to subsection (a) for a five-year period. The term of the lease shall begin on the date on which the improvements are available for occupancy, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) Rental payments under the lease under paragraph (1) may not exceed $200,000 per year, and the total amount of the rental payments for the entire period may not exceed 20 percent of the total cost of constructing the reserve center and ancillary supporting facilities.

(3) Subject to the availability of appropriations for this purpose, the Secretary may use funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations for the operation and maintenance of the Naval Reserve to make rental payments required under this subsection.

(c) EFFECT OF TERMINATION OF LEASES.—At the end of the lease term under subsection (b), the State shall convey, without reimbursement, to the United States all right, title, and interest of the State in the reserve center and ancillary supporting facilities subject to the lease.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the leases under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

SEC. 2301. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(1), the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Inside the United States

State	Installation or location	Amount
Alabama	Maxwell Air Force Base	$7,875,000
Alaska	Elmendorf Air Force Base	$21,530,000
Arizona	Davis–Monthan Air Force Base	$9,920,000
	Luke Air Force Base	$6,700,000
Arkansas	Little Rock Air Force Base	$18,105,000
California	Beale Air Force Base	$14,425,000
	Edwards Air Force Base	$20,080,000
	Travis Air Force Base	$16,230,000
	Vandenberg Air Force Base	$3,290,000
Colorado	Buckley Air National Guard Base	$17,960,000
	Falcon Air Force Station	$2,095,000
	Peterson Air Force Base	$20,720,000
	United States Air Force Academy	$12,165,000
Delaware	Dover Air Force Base	$7,980,000
Florida	Eglin Air Force Base	$4,590,000
	Eglin Auxiliary Field 9	$6,825,000
	Patrick Air Force Base	$2,595,000
	Tyndall Air Force Base	$3,600,000
Georgia	Robins Air Force Base	$22,645,000
Idaho	Mountain Home Air Force Base	$15,845,000
Kansas	McConnell Air Force Base	$15,580,000
Louisiana	Barksdale Air Force Base	$4,890,000
Maryland	Andrews Air Force Base	$5,990,000
Mississippi	Keesler Air Force Base	$14,465,000
Nevada	Indian Springs Air Force Auxiliary Air Field	$4,690,000
New Jersey	McGuire Air Force Base	$8,080,000
North Carolina	Pope Air Force Base	$5,915,000
	Seymour Johnson Air Force Base	$11,280,000
North Dakota	Grand Forks Air Force Base	$12,470,000
	Minot Air Force Base	$3,940,000
Ohio	Wright–Patterson Air Force Base	$7,400,000
Oklahoma	Tinker Air Force Base	$9,880,000
South Carolina	Charleston Air Force Base	$37,410,000
	Shaw Air Force Base	$5,665,000
Tennessee	Arnold Engineering Development Center	$12,481,000
Texas	Brooks Air Force Base	$5,400,000
	Dyess Air Force Base	$12,295,000
	Kelly Air Force Base	$3,250,000
	Lackland Air Force Base	$9,413,000
	Sheppard Air Force Base	$9,400,000
Utah	Hill Air Force Base	$3,690,000
Virginia	Langley Air Force Base	$8,005,000
Washington	Fairchild Air Force Base	$18,155,000
	McChord Air Force Base	$57,065,000
Wyoming	F. E. Warren Air Force Base	$3,700,000
	Total	$525,684,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(2), the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or location	Amount
Germany	Ramstein Air Force Base	$5,370,000
	Spangdahlem Air Base	$1,890,000
Italy	Aviano Air Base	$10,060,000
Korea	Osan Air Base	$9,780,000
Turkey	Incirlik Air Base	$7,160,000
United Kingdom	Croughton Royal Air Force Base	$1,740,000
	Lakenheath Royal Air Force Base	$17,525,000
	Mildenhall Royal Air Force Base	$6,195,000
Overseas Classified	Classified Locations	$18,395,000
	Total	$78,115,000

SEC. 2302. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Air Force may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition) at the installations, for the purposes, and in the amounts set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Family Housing

State	Installation	Purpose	Amount
Alaska	Eielson Air Force Base	72 units	$21,127,000
	Eielson Air Force Base	Ancillary Facility	$2,950,000
California	Beale Air Force Base	56 units	$8,893,000
	Los Angeles Air Force Base	25 units	$6,425,000
	Travis Air Force Base	70 units	$8,631,000
	Vandenberg Air Force Base	112 units	$20,891,000
District of Columbia	Bolling Air Force Base	40 units	$5,000,000
Florida	Eglin Auxiliary Field 9	1 units	$249,000
	MacDill Air Force Base	56 units	$8,822,000
	Patrick Air Force Base	Ancillary Facility	$2,430,000
	Tyndall Air Force Base	42 Units	$6,000,000

Air Force: Family Housing—Continued

State	Installation	Purpose	Amount
Georgia	Robins Air Force Base	46 units	$5,252,000
Louisiana	Barksdale Air Force Base	80 units	$9,570,000
Maryland	Hanscom Air Force Base	32 units	$5,100,000
Missouri	Whiteman Air Force Base	68 units	$9,600,000
Nevada	Nellis Air Force Base	50 units	$7,955,000
New Mexico	Kirtland Air Force Base	50 units	$5,450,000
North Dakota	Grand Forks Air Force Base	66 units	$7,784,000
	Minot Air Force Base	46 units	$8,740,000
Texas	Lackland Air Force Base	132 units	$11,500,000
	Lackland Air Force Base	Ancillary Facility	$800,000
Washington	McChord Air Force Base	50 units	$5,659,000
		Total	$168,828,000

(b) PLANNING AND DESIGN.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $9,590,000.

SEC. 2303. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Air Force may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $125,650,000.

SEC. 2304. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force in the total amount of $1,823,456,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2301(a), $525,684,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 2301(b), $78,115,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects authorized by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $12,328,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $47,387,000.

(5) For demolition of excess facilities under section 2814 of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 2802, $10,000,000.

(6) For military housing functions:

(A) For construction and acquisition, planning and design, and improvement of military family housing and facilities, $304,068,000.

(B) For support of military family housing (including the functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $840,474,000.

(7) For the construction of a corrosion control facility at Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, authorized by section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 530), $5,400,000.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2301 of this Act may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 2401. AUTHORIZED DEFENSE AGENCIES CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2406(a)(1), and, in the case of the projects described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2406(b), other amounts appropriated pursuant to authorizations enacted after this Act for such projects, the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Inside the United States

Agency	Installation or location	Amount
Chemical Demilitarization Program	Pueblo Chemical Activity, Colorado	$179,000,000
Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Charleston, South Carolina	$6,200,000
	Gentile Air Force Station, Ohio	$11,400,000
	Griffiss Air Force Base, New York	$10,200,000
	Loring Air Force Base, Maine	$6,900,000
	Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida	$2,600,000
	Norton Air Force Base, California	$13,800,000
	Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska	$7,000,000
	Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois	$14,400,000
Defense Intelligence Agency	Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia	$6,790,000
Defense Logistics Agency	Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma	$3,200,000
	Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland	$12,100,000
	Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana	$4,300,000
	Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio	$600,000
	Defense Distribution, San Diego, California	$15,700,000
	Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska	$18,000,000
	McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas	$2,200,000
	Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California	$5,700,000
	Naval Air Station, Fallon, Nevada	$2,100,000
	Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia	$1,500,000
	Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina	$2,900,000
	Travis Air Force Base, California	$15,200,000
Defense Medical Facility Office	Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland	$15,500,000
	Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina	$1,300,000
	Fort Bliss, Texas	$6,600,000
	Fort Bragg, North Carolina	$11,400,000
	Fort Hood, Texas	$1,950,000
	Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California	$3,300,000
	Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama	$25,000,000
	Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida	$15,200,000
	Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia	$1,250,000
	Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California	$38,000,000
Special Operations Command	Fort Bragg, North Carolina	$14,000,000
	Fort Campbell, Kentucky	$4,200,000
	MacDill Air Force Base, Florida	$9,600,000
	Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California	$7,700,000
	Naval Station, Ford Island, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii	$12,800,000
	Total	$509,590,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2406(a)(2), the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Outside the United States

Agency	Installation or location	Amount
Defense Logistics Agency	Moron Air Base, Spain	$12,958,000
	Naval Air Station, Sigonella, Italy	$6,100,000
Defense Medical Facility Office	Administrative Support Unit, Bahrain, Bahrain	$4,600,000
	Total	$23,658,000

SEC. 2402. MILITARY HOUSING PLANNING AND DESIGN.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriation in section 2406(a)(14)(A), the Secretary of Defense may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $500,000.

SEC. 2403. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriation in section 2406(a)(14)(A), the Secretary of Defense may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $3,871,000.

SEC. 2404. MILITARY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CREDIT TO FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND.—(1) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 2406(a)(14)(C), $35,000,000 shall be available for credit to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund established by section 2883(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 2406(a)(14)(D), $10,000,000 shall be available for credit to the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund established by section 2883(a)(2) of such title.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may use funds credited to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund under subsection (a)(1) to carry out any activities authorized by subchapter IV of chapter 169 of such title with respect to military family housing.

(2) The Secretary of Defense may use funds credited to the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund under subsection (a)(2) to carry out any activities authorized by subchapter IV of chapter 169 of such title with respect to military unaccompanied housing.

SEC. 2405. ENERGY CONSERVATION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2406(a)(12), the Secretary of Defense may carry out energy conservation projects under section 2865 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 2406. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), in the total amount of $3,431,670,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2401(a), $346,487,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 2401(b), $23,658,000.

(3) For military construction projects at Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia, hospital replacement, authorized by section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (division B of Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1640), $24,000,000.

(4) For military construction projects at Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Maryland, hospital replacement, authorized by section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (division B of Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2599), $72,000,000.

(5) For military construction projects at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, hospital replacement, authorized by section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (106 Stat. 2599), $89,000,000.

(6) For military construction projects at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, authorized by section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (division B of the Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 3040), $46,000,000.

(7) For military construction projects at Umatilla Army Depot, Oregon, authorized by section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (108 Stat. 3040), $64,000,000.

(8) For military construction projects at Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Columbus, Ohio, authorized by section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 535), $20,822,000.

(9) For contingency construction projects of the Secretary of Defense under section 2804 of title 10, United States Code, $16,874,000.

(10) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $9,500,000.

(11) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $12,239,000.

(12) For energy conservation projects under section 2865 of title 10, United States Code, $47,765,000.

(13) For base closure and realignment activities as authorized by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), $2,507,476,000.

(14) For military family housing functions:

(A) For improvement and planning of military family housing and facilities, $4,371,000.

(B) For support of military housing (including functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $30,963,000, of which not more than $25,637,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units worldwide.

(C) For credit to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund as authorized by section 2404(a)(1) of this Act, $35,000,000.

(D) For credit to the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund as authorized by section 2404(a)(2) of this Act, $10,000,000.

(E) For the Homeowners Assistance Program as authorized by section 2832 of title 10, United States Code, $36,181,000, to remain available until expended.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variation authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2401 of this Act may not exceed—

(1) the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a);

(2) $161,503,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of this Act for the construction of a chemical demilitarization facility at Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado); and

(3) $1,600,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of this Act for the construction of a replacement facility for the medical and dental clinic, Key West Naval Air Station, Florida).

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 2501. AUTHORIZED NATO CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

The Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, in an amount not to exceed the sum of the amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose in section 2502 and the amount collected from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a result of construction previously financed by the United States.

SEC. 2502. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATO.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, for contributions by the Secretary of Defense under section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, for the share of the United States of the cost of projects for the North Atlantic Treaty Security Investment Program as authorized by section 2501, in the amount of $177,000,000.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 2601. AUTHORIZED GUARD AND RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, for the costs of acquisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), the following amounts:

(1) For the Department of the Army—

(A) for the Army National Guard of the United States, $41,316,000; and

(B) for the Army Reserve, $50,159,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy, for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, $33,169,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force—

(A) for the Air National Guard of the United States, $118,394,000; and

(B) for the Air Force Reserve, $51,655,000.

TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2701. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW.

(a) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AFTER THREE YEARS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), all authorizations contained in titles XXI through XXVI for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor) shall expire on the later of—

(1) October 1, 1999; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2000.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to authorizations for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor), for which appropriated funds have been obligated before the later of—

(1) October 1, 1999; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for fiscal year 2000 for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, or contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure program.

SEC. 2702. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 1994 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSIONS.—Notwithstanding section 2701 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (division B of Public Law 103–160; 107 Stat. 1880), authorizations for the projects set forth in the tables in subsection (b), as provided in section 2101, 2102, 2201, 2301, or 2601 of that Act, shall remain in effect until October 1, 1997, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 1998, whichever is later.

(b) TABLES.—The tables referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

Army: Extension of 1994 Project Authorizations

State	Installation or location	Project	Amount
New Jersey	Picatinny Arsenal	Advance Warhead Development Facility	$4,400,000
North Carolina	Fort Bragg	Land Acquisition	$15,000,000
Wisconsin	Fort McCoy	Family Housing Construction (16 units)	$2,950,000

Navy: Extension of 1994 Project Authorizations

State or Location	Installation or location	Project	Amount
California	Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base	Sewage Facility	$7,930,000
Connecticut	New London Naval Submarine Base	Hazardous Waste Transfer Facility	$1,450,000
New Jersey	Earle Naval Weapons Station	Explosives Holding Yard	$1,290,000
Virginia	Oceana Naval Air Station	Jet Engine Test Cell Replacement	$5,300,000
Various Locations	Various Locations	Land Acquisition Inside the United States	$540,000
Various Locations	Various Locations	Land Acquisition Outside the United States	$800,000

Air Force: Extension of 1994 Project Authorizations

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Alaska	Eielson Air Force Base	Upgrade Water Treatment Plant	$3,750,000
	Elmendorf Air Force Base	Corrosion Control Facility	$5,975,000
California	Beale Air Force Base	Educational Center	$3,150,000
Florida	Tyndall Air Force Base	Base Supply Logistics Center	$2,600,000
Mississippi	Keesler Air Force Base	Upgrade Student Dormitory	$4,500,000
North Carolina	Pope Air Force Base	Add To and Alter Dormitories	$4,300,000
Virginia	Langley Air Force Base	Fire Station	$3,850,000

Army National Guard: Extension of 1994 Project Authorizations

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Alabama	Birmingham	Aviation Support Facility	$4,907,000
Arizona	Marana	Organizational Maintenance Shop	$553,000
	Marana	Dormitory/Dining Facility	$2,919,000
California	Fresno	Organizational Maintenance Shop Modification	$905,000
	Van Nuys	Armory Addition	$6,518,000
New Mexico	White Sands Missile Range	Organizational Maintenance Shop	$2,940,000
		Tactical Site	$1,995,000
		MATES	$3,570,000
Pennsylvania	Indiantown Gap	State Military Building	$9,200,000
	Johnstown	Armory Addition/Flight Facility	$5,004,000
	Johnstown	Armory	$3,000,000

SEC. 2703. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 1993 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSIONS.—Notwithstanding section 2701 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (division B of Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2602), authorizations for the projects set forth in the tables in subsection (b), as provided in section 2101, 2301, or 1601 of that Act and extended by section 2702 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 541), shall remain in effect until October 1, 1997, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 1998, whichever is later.

(b) TABLES.—The tables referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

Army: Extension of 1993 Project Authorization

State	Installation or location	Project	Amount
Arkansas	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Ammunition Demilitarization Support Facility	$15,000,000

Air Force: Extension of 1993 Project Authorization

Country	Installation or location	Project	Amount
Portugal	Lajes Field	Water Wells	$865,000

Army National Guard: Extension of 1993 Project Authorizations

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Alabama	Tuscaloosa	Armory	$2,273,000
	Union Springs	Armory	$813,000

SEC. 2704. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 1992 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSIONS.—Notwithstanding section 2701 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1992 (division B of Public Law 102–190; 105 Stat. 1535), authorizations for the projects set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2201 of that Act and extended by section 2702(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (division B of Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 3047) and section 2703(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 543), shall remain in effect until October 1, 1997, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 1998, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Army: Extension of 1992 Project Authorizations

State	Installation or location	Project	Amount
Oregon	Umatilla Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Support Facility	$3,600,000
	Umatilla Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Utilities	$7,500,000

SEC. 2705. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, and XXVI shall take effect on the later of—

(1) October 1, 1996; or

(2) the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction and Military Family Housing

SEC. 2801. NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM.

(a) CHANGE IN REFERENCE TO EARLIER PROGRAM.—(1) Section 2806(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out ''North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure program'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program''.

(2) Section 2861(b)(3) of such title is amended by striking out ''North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure program'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of section 2806 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§2806. Contributions for North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 169 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''2806. Contributions for North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.''.

SEC. 2802. AUTHORITY TO DEMOLISH EXCESS FACILITIES.

(a) DEMOLITION AUTHORIZED.—Subchapter I of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§2814. Demolition of excess facilities

''(a) DEMOLITION USING MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS.—Within an amount equal to 125 percent of the amount appropriated for such purpose in the military construction account, the Secretary concerned may carry out the demolition of a facility on a military installation when the facility is determined by the Secretary concerned to be—

''(1) excess to the needs of the military department or Defense Agency concerned; and

''(2) not suitable for reuse.

''(b) DEMOLITIONS USING OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS.—Using funds available to the Secretary concerned for operation and maintenance, the Secretary concerned may carry out a demolition project involving an excess facility described in subsection (a), except that the amount obligated on the project may not exceed the maximum amount authorized for a minor construction project under section 2805(c)(1) of this title.

''(c) ADVANCE APPROVAL OF CERTAIN PROJECTS.—(1) A demolition project under this section that would cost more than $500,000 may not be carried out under this section unless approved in advance by the Secretary concerned.

''(2) When a decision is made to demolish a facility covered by paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned shall submit a report in writing to the appropriate committees of Congress on that decision. Each such report shall include—

''(A) the justification for the demolition and the current estimate of its costs, and

''(B) the justification for carrying out the project under this section.

''(3) The demolition project may be carried out only after the end of the 21-day period beginning on the date the notification is received by such committees.

''(d) CERTAIN PROJECTS PROHIBITED.—(1) A demolition project involving military family housing may not be carried out under the authority of this section.

''(2) A demolition project required as a result of a base closure action authorized by title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) or the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) may not be carried out under the authority of this section.

''(3) A demolition project required as a result of environmental contamination shall be carried out under the authority of the environmental restoration program under section 2701(b)(3) of this title.

''(e) DEMOLITION INCLUDED IN SPECIFIC MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT.—Nothing in this section is intended to preclude the inclusion of demolition of facilities as an integral part of a specific military construction project when the demolition is required for accomplishment of the intent of that construction project.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2814. Demolition of excess facilities.''.

SEC. 2803. IMPROVEMENTS TO FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

(a) AUTHORIZED IMPROVEMENTS.—Subsection (a)(2) of section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''major'' before ''maintenance''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''Such term does not include day-to-day maintenance and repair.''.

(b) LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) of such is amended by striking out paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraph:

''(2) In determining the applicability of the limitation contained in paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned shall include as part of the cost of the improvement the following:

''(A) The cost of major maintenance or repair work (excluding day-to-day maintenance and repair) undertaken in connection with the improvement.

''(B) Any cost, beyond the five-foot line of a housing unit, in connection with—

''(i) the furnishing of electricity, gas, water, and sewage disposal;

''(ii) the construction or repair of roads, drives, and walks; and

''(iii) grading and drainage work.''.

Subtitle B—Defense Base Closure and Realignment

SEC. 2811. RESTORATION OF AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN INTRAGOVERNMENT TRANSFERS UNDER 1988 BASE CLOSURE LAW.

Section 204(b)(2) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

''(D) The Secretary of Defense may transfer real property or facilities located at a military installation to be closed or realigned under this title, with or without reimbursement, to a military department or other entity (including a nonappropriated fund instrumentality) within the Department of Defense or the Coast Guard.''.

SEC. 2812. CONTRACTING FOR CERTAIN SERVICES AT FACILITIES REMAINING ON CLOSED INSTALLATIONS.

(a) 1988 LAW.—Section 204(b)(8)(A) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (title II of Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), is amended by inserting ''or at facilities remaining on installations closed under this title'' after ''under this title''.

(b) 1990 LAW.—Section 2905(b)(8)(A) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), is amended by inserting ''or at facilities remaining on installations closed under this part'' after ''under this part''.

SEC. 2813. AUTHORITY TO COMPENSATE OWNERS OF MANUFACTURED HOUSING.

(a) 1988 LAW.—Section 204 of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (title II of Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) ACQUISITION OF MANUFACTURED HOUSING.—(1) In closing or realigning any military installation under this title, the Secretary may purchase any or all right, title, and interest of a member of the Armed Forces and any spouse of the member in manufactured housing located at a manufactured housing park established at an installation closed or realigned under this title, or make a payment to the member to relocate the manufactured housing to a suitable new site, if the Secretary determines that—

''(A) it is in the best interests of the Federal Government to eliminate or relocate the manufactured housing park; and

''(B) the elimination or relocation of the manufactured housing park would result in an unreasonable financial hardship to the owners of the manufactured housing.

''(2) Any payment made under this subsection shall not exceed 90 percent of the purchase price of the manufactured housing, as paid by the member or any spouse of the member, plus the cost of any permanent improvements subsequently made to the manufactured housing by the member or spouse of the member.

''(3) The Secretary shall dispose of manufactured housing acquired under this subsection through resale, donation, trade or otherwise within one year of acquisition.''.

(b) 1990 LAW.—Section 2905 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) ACQUISITION OF MANUFACTURED HOUSING.—(1) In closing or realigning any military installation under this part, the Secretary may purchase any or all right, title, and interest of a member of the Armed Forces and any spouse of the member in manufactured housing located at a manufactured housing park established at an installation closed or realigned under this part, or make a payment to the member to relocate the manufactured housing to a suitable new site, if the Secretary determines that—

''(A) it is in the best interests of the Federal Government to eliminate or relocate the manufactured housing park; and

''(B) the elimination or relocation of the manufactured housing park would result in an unreasonable financial hardship to the owners of the manufactured housing.

''(2) Any payment made under this subsection shall not exceed 90 percent of the purchase price of the manufactured housing, as paid by the member or any spouse of the member, plus the cost of any permanent improvements subsequently made to the manufactured housing by the member or spouse of the member.

''(3) The Secretary shall dispose of manufactured housing acquired under this subsection through resale, donation, trade or otherwise within one year of acquisition.''.

SEC. 2814. ADDITIONAL PURPOSE FOR WHICH ADJUSTMENT AND DIVERSIFICATION ASSISTANCE IS AUTHORIZED.

Section 2391(b)(5) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(5)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) The Secretary of Defense may also make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds in order to assist a State in enhancing its capacities—

''(i) to assist communities, businesses, and workers adversely affected by an action described in paragraph (1);

''(ii) to support local adjustment and diversification initiatives; and

''(iii) to stimulate cooperation between statewide and local adjustment and diversification efforts.''.

SEC. 2815. PAYMENT OF STIPULATED PENALTIES ASSESSED UNDER CERCLA IN CONNECTION WITH LORING AIR FORCE BASE, MAINE.

From amounts in the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), the Secretary of Defense may expend not more than $50,000 to pay stipulated civil penalties assessed under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) against Loring Air Force Base, Maine.

Subtitle C—Land Conveyances

PART I—ARMY CONVEYANCES

SEC. 2821. TRANSFER AND EXCHANGE OF JURISDICTION, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA.

(a) TRANSFER OF CERTAIN SECTION 29 LANDS.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior shall transfer to the Secretary of the Army administrative jurisdiction over the following lands located in section 29 of the unit of the National Park System known as Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia:

(A) The lands known as the Arlington National Cemetery Interment Zone.

(B) The lands known as the Robert E. Lee Memorial Preservation Zone, except those lands in the preservation zone that the Secretary of the Interior determines to retain because of the historical significance of the lands.

(2) The transfer of lands under paragraph (1) shall be carried out in accordance with the Interagency Agreement entered into by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior on February 22, 1995.

(b) EXCHANGE OF ADDITIONAL LAND.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior shall transfer to the Secretary of the Army administrative jurisdiction over a parcel of land, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 2.43 acres, located in the Memorial Drive entrance area to Arlington National Cemetery.

(2) In exchange for the transfer under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Army shall transfer to the Secretary of the Interior administrative jurisdiction over a parcel of land, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 0.17 acres, located at Arlington National Cemetery, and known as the Old Administrative Building site. The Secretary of the Army shall grant to the Secretary of the Interior a perpetual right of ingress and egress to the parcel transferred this paragraph.

(c) LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and legal descriptions of the lands to be transferred pursuant to this section shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army. The costs of the surveys shall be borne by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 2822. LAND CONVEYANCE, ARMY RESERVE CENTER, RUSHVILLE, INDIANA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Army may convey, without consideration, to the City of Rushville, Indiana (in this section referred to as the ''City''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of excess real property, including improvements thereon, that is located in Rushville, Indiana, and contains the Rushville Army Reserve Center.

(b) CONDITION OF CONVEYANCE.—The conveyance authorized under subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the City retain the conveyed property for the use and benefit of the Rushville Police Department.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the City.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2823. LAND CONVEYANCE, ARMY RESERVE CENTER, ANDERSON, SOUTH CAROLINA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Army may convey, without consideration, to the County of Anderson, South Carolina (in this section referred to as the ''County''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, that is located at 805 East Whitner Street in Anderson, South Carolina, and contains an Army Reserve Center.

(b) CONDITION OF CONVEYANCE.—The conveyance authorized under subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the County retain the conveyed property for the use and benefit of the Anderson County Department of Education.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the County.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

PART II—NAVY CONVEYANCES

SEC. 2831. RELEASE OF CONDITION ON RECONVEYANCE OF TRANSFERRED LAND, GUAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 818(b)(2) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1981 (Public Law 96–418; 94 Stat. 1782), relating to a condition on disposal by Guam of lands conveyed to Guam by the United States, shall have no force or effect and is repealed.

(b) EXECUTION OF INSTRUMENTS.—The Secretary of the Navy and the Administrator of General Services shall execute all instruments necessary to implement this section.

SEC. 2832. LAND EXCHANGE, ST. HELENA ANNEX, NORFOLK NAVAL SHIPYARD, VIRGINIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may convey to such private person as the Secretary considers appropriate (in this section referred to as the ''transferee'') all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property that is located at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Virginia, and, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, is a portion of the property leased to the Norfolk Shipbuilding and Drydock Company pursuant to the Department of the Navy lease N00024–84–L–0004, effective October 1, 1984, as extended.

(2) Pending completion of the conveyance authorized by paragraph (1), the Secretary may lease the real property to the transferee upon such terms as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), including any interim lease authorized by such subsection, the transferee shall—

(1) convey to the United States all right, title, and interest to a parcel or parcels of real property, together with any improvements thereon, located in the area of Portsmouth, Virginia, which are determined to be acceptable to the Secretary; and

(2) pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the amount, if any, by which the fair market value of the parcel conveyed by the Secretary under subsection (a) exceeds the fair market value of the parcel conveyed to the United States under paragraph (1).

(c) USE OF RENTAL AMOUNTS.—The Secretary may use the amounts received as rent from any lease entered into under the authority of subsection (a)(2) to fund environmental studies of the parcels of real property to be conveyed under this section.

(d) IN-KIND CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary and the transferee may agree that, in lieu of all or any part of the consideration required by subsection (b)(2), the transferee may provide and the Secretary may accept the improvement, maintenance, protection, repair, or restoration of real property under the control of the Secretary in the area of Hampton Roads, Virginia.

(e) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE AND PROPERTY DESCRIPTION.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the parcels of real property to be conveyed under subsections (a) and (b)(1). The exact acreage and legal description of the parcels shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the transferee.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyances under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2833. LAND CONVEYANCE, CALVERTON PINE BARRENS, NAVAL WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL RESERVE PLANT, CALVERTON, NEW YORK.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Navy may convey, without consideration,

to the Department of Environmental Conservation of the State of New York (in this section referred to as the ''Department''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Calverton Pine Barrens located at the Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant, Calverton, New York.

(b) EFFECT ON OTHER CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—The conveyance authorized by this subsection shall not affect the transfer of jurisdiction of a portion of the Calverton Pine Barrens authorized by section 2865 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 576).

(c) CONDITION OF CONVEYANCE.—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the Department agree—

(1) to maintain the conveyed property as a nature preserve, as required by section 2854 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (division B of Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2626), as amended by section 2823 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (division B of Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 3058);

(2) to designate the conveyed property as the ''Otis G. Pike Preserve''; and

(3) to continue to allow the level of sporting activities on the conveyed property as permitted at the time of the conveyance.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the Department.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(f) CALVERTON PINE BARRENS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Calverton Pine Barrens'' has the meaning given that term in section 2854(d)(1) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (division B of Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2626).

PART III—AIR FORCE CONVEYANCES

SEC. 2841. CONVEYANCE OF PRIMATE RESEARCH COMPLEX, HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force may dispose of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the primate research complex at Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico. The conveyance may include the colony of chimpanzees owned by the Air Force that are housed at or managed from the primate research complex. The conveyance may not include the real property on which the primate research complex is located.

(b) COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall use competitive procedures in making the conveyance authorized by subsection (a).

(c) CARE AND USE STANDARDS.—As part of the solicitation of bids for the conveyance authorized by subsection (a), the Secretary shall develop standards for the care and use of the primate research complex, and of chimpanzees. The Secretary shall develop the standards in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the National Institutes of Health.

(d) CONDITIONS OF CONVEYANCE.—The conveyance authorized by subsection (a) shall be subject to the followings conditions:

(1) That the recipient of the primate research complex—

(A) utilize any chimpanzees included in the conveyance for scientific research or medical research purposes; or

(B) retire and provide adequate care for such chimpanzees.

(2) That the recipient of the primate research complex assume from the Secretary any leases at the primate research complex that are in effect at the time of the conveyance.

(e) DESCRIPTION OF COMPLEX.—The exact legal description of the primate research complex to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey or other means satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of any survey or other services performed at the direction of the Secretary under the authority in the preceding sentence shall be borne by the recipient of the primate research complex.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2842. LAND CONVEYANCE, RADAR BOMB SCORING SITE, BELLE FOURCHE, SOUTH DAKOTA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Air Force may convey, without consideration, to the Belle Fourche School District, Belle Fourche, South Dakota (in this section referred to as the ''District''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, together with any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 37 acres located in Belle Fourche, South Dakota, which has served as the location of a support complex and housing facilities for Detachment 21 of the 554th Range Squadron, an Air Force Radar Bomb Scoring Site located in Belle Fourche, South Dakota. The conveyance may not include any portion of the radar bomb scoring site located in the State of Wyoming.

(b) CONDITION OF CONVEYANCE.—The conveyance authorized under subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the District—

(1) use the property and facilities conveyed under such subsection for education, economic development, and housing purposes; or

(2) enter into an agreement with an appropriate public or private entity to sell or lease the property and facilities to such entity for such purposes.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the District.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

PART IV—OTHER CONVEYANCES

SEC. 2851. LAND CONVEYANCE, TATUM SALT DOME TEST SITE, MISSISSIPPI.

(a) TRANSFER.—The Secretary of Energy may convey, without compensation, to the State of Mississippi (in this section referred to as the ''State'') the property known as the Tatum Salt Dome Test Site, as generally depicted on the map of the Department of Energy numbered 301913.104.02 and dated June 25, 1993.

(b) CONDITION ON CONVEYANCE.—The conveyance under this section shall be subject to the condition that the State use the conveyed property as a wilderness area and working demonstration forest.

(c) DESIGNATION.—The property to be conveyed is hereby designated as the ''Jamie Whitten Wilderness Area''.

(d) RETAINED RIGHTS.—The conveyance under this section shall be subject to each of the following rights to be retained by the United States:

(1) Retention by the United States of the subsurface estate below a specified depth. The specified depth shall be 1000 feet below sea level unless a lesser depth is agreed upon by the Secretary and the State.

(2) Retention by the United States of rights of access, by easement or otherwise, for such purposes as the Secretary considers appropriate, including access to monitoring wells for sampling.

(3) Retention by the United States of the right to install wells additional to those identified in the remediation plan for the property to the extent such additional wells are considered necessary by the Secretary to monitor potential pathways of contaminant migration. Such wells shall be in such locations as specified by the Secretary.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under this section as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2852. LAND CONVEYANCE, WILLIAM LANGER JEWEL BEARING PLANT, ROLLA, NORTH DAKOTA.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—The Administrator of General Services may convey, without consideration, to the Job Development Authority of the City of Rolla, North Dakota (in this section referred to as the ''Authority''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, with improvements thereon and all associated personal property, consisting of approximately 9.77 acres and comprising the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant in Rolla, North Dakota.

(b) CONDITION OF CONVEYANCE.—The conveyance authorized under subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the Authority—

(1) use the real and personal property and improvements conveyed under that subsection for economic development relating to the jewel bearing plant;

(2) enter into an agreement with an appropriate public or private entity or person to lease such property and improvements to that entity or person for such economic development; or

(3) enter into an agreement with an appropriate public or private entity or person to sell such property and improvements to that entity or person for such economic development.

(c) PREFERENCE FOR DOMESTIC DISPOSAL OF JEWEL BEARINGS.—(1) In offering to enter into agreements pursuant to any provision of law for the disposal of jewel bearings from the National Defense Stockpile, the President shall give a right of first refusal on all such offers to the Authority or to the appropriate public or private entity or person with which the Authority enters into an agreement under subsection (b).

(2) For the purposes of this section, the term ''National Defense Stockpile'' means the stockpile provided for in section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98(c)).

(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR MAINTENANCE AND CONVEYANCE OF PLANT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available in fiscal year 1995 for the maintenance of the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant in Public Law 103–335 shall be available for the maintenance of that plant in fiscal year 1996, pending conveyance, and for the conveyance of that plant under this section.

(e) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Administrator. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the Administrator.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Administrator may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under this section as the Administrator determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 2861. EASEMENTS FOR RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

Section 2668(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out ''and'' at the end of paragraph (9);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (10) as paragraph (12);

(3) in paragraph (12), as so redesignated, by striking out ''or by the Act of March 4, 1911 (43 U.S.C. 961)''; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

''(10) poles and lines for the transmission and distribution of electrical power;

''(11) poles and lines for communication purposes, and for radio, television, and other forms of communication transmitting, relay, and receiving structures and facilities; and''.

SEC. 2862. AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF CULTURAL RESOURCES ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.—Chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2683 the following new section:

''§2684. Cooperative agreements for management of cultural resources

''(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department may enter into a cooperative agreement with a State, local government, or other entity for the preservation, management, maintenance, and improvement of cultural resources on military installations and for the conducting of research regarding the cultural resources. Activities under the cooperative agreement shall be subject to the availability of funds to carry out the cooperative agreement.

''(b) APPLICATION OF OTHER LAWS.—Section 1535 and chapter 63 of title 31 shall not apply to a cooperative agreement entered into under this section.

''(c) CULTURAL RESOURCE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'cultural resource' means any of the following:

''(1) Any building, structure, site, district, or object included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places under section 101 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470a).

''(2) Cultural items, as defined in section 2(3) of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001(3)).

''(3) An archaeological resource, as defined in section 3(1) of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470bb(1)).

''(4) Archaeological artifact collections and associated records, as defined in section 79 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2683 the following new item:

''2684. Cooperative agreements for management of cultural resources.''.

SEC. 2863. DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR INSTALLATION AND OPERATION OF ELECTRIC POWER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM AT YOUNGSTOWN AIR RESERVE STATION, OHIO.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Air Force may carry out a demonstration project to assess the feasibility and advisability of permitting private entities to install, operate, and maintain electric power distribution systems at military installations. The Secretary shall carry out the demonstration project through an agreement under subsection (b).

(b) AGREEMENT.—(1) In order to carry out the demonstration project, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with an electric utility or other company in the Youngstown, Ohio, area, consistent with State law, under which the utility or company installs, operates, and maintains (in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary and the utility or company) an electric power distribution system at Youngstown Air Reserve Station, Ohio.

(2) The Secretary may not enter into an agreement under this subsection until—

(A) the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a report on the agreement to be entered into, including the costs to be incurred by the United States under the agreement; and

(B) a period of 30 days has elapsed from the date of the receipt of the report by the committees.

(c) LICENSES AND EASEMENTS.—In order to facilitate the installation, operation, and maintenance of the electric power distribution system under the agreement under subsection (b), the Secretary may grant the utility or company with which the Secretary enters into the agreement such licenses, easements, and rights-of-way, consistent with State law, as the Secretary and the utility or company jointly determine necessary for such purposes.

(d) OWNERSHIP OF SYSTEM.—The agreement between the Secretary and the utility or company under subsection (b) may provide that the utility or company shall own the electric power distribution system installed under the agreement.

(e) RATE.—The rate charged by the utility or company for providing and distributing electric power at Youngstown Air Reserve Station through the electric power distribution system installed under the agreement under subsection (b) shall be the rate established by the appropriate Federal or State regulatory authority.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in the agreement under subsection (b) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2864. DESIGNATION OF MICHAEL O'CALLAGHAN MILITARY HOSPITAL.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Nellis Federal Hospital, a Federal building located at 4700 North Las Vegas Boulevard, Las Vegas, Nevada, shall be known and designated as the ''Michael O'Callaghan Military Hospital''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Michael O'Callaghan Military Hospital''.

TITLE XXIX—MILITARY LAND WITHDRAWALS

Subtitle A—Fort Carson-Pinon Canyon Military Lands Withdrawal

SEC. 2901. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Fort Carson-Pinon Canyon Military Lands Withdrawal Act''.

SEC. 2902. WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF LANDS AT FORT CARSON MILITARY RESERVATION.

(a) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, the lands at the Fort Carson Military Reservation, Colorado, that are described in subsection (c) are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, the mineral and geothermal leasing laws, and the mineral materials disposal laws.

(b) RESERVATION.—The lands withdrawn under subsection (a) are reserved for use by the Secretary of the Army—

(1) for military maneuvering, training and weapons firing; and

(2) for other defense related purposes consistent with the uses specified in paragraph (1).

(c) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The lands referred to in subsection (a) comprise 3,133.02 acres of public land and 11,415.16 acres of federally-owned minerals in El Paso, Pueblo, and Fremont Counties, Colorado, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Fort Carson Proposed Withdrawal—Fort Carson Base'', dated February 6, 1992, and published in accordance with section 4.

SEC. 2903. WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF LANDS AT PINON CANYON MANEUVER SITE.

(a) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, the lands at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site, Colorado, that are described in subsection (c) are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, the mineral and geothermal leasing laws, and the mineral materials disposal laws.

(b) RESERVATION.—The lands withdrawn under subsection (a) are reserved for use by the Secretary of the Army—

(1) for military maneuvering and training; and

(2) for other defense related purposes consistent with the uses specified in paragraph (1).

(c) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The lands referred to in subsection (a) comprise 2,517.12 acres of public lands and 130,139 acres of federally-owned minerals in Las Animas County, Colorado, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Fort Carson Proposed Withdrawal—Fort Carson Maneuver Area—Pinon Canyon site'', dated February 6, 1992, and published in accordance with section 2904.

SEC. 2904. MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.

(a) PREPARATION OF MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this subtitle, the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare maps depicting the lands withdrawn and reserved by this subtitle and publish in the Federal Register a notice containing the legal description of such lands.

(b) LEGAL EFFECT.—Such maps and legal descriptions shall have the same force and effect as if they were included in this subtitle, except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct clerical and typographical errors in such maps and legal descriptions.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—Copies of such maps and legal descriptions shall be available for public inspection in the offices of the Colorado State Director and the Canon City District Manager of the Bureau of Land Management and in the offices of the Commander of Fort Carson, Colorado.

(d) COSTS.—The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse the Secretary of the Interior for the costs of implementing this section.

SEC. 2905. MANAGEMENT OF WITHDRAWN LANDS.

(a) MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES.—

(1) MANAGEMENT BY SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.—Except as provided in section 6, during the period of withdrawal, the Secretary of the Army shall manage for military purposes the lands covered by this subtitle and may authorize use of the lands by the other military departments and agencies of the Department of Defense, and the National Guard, as appropriate.

(2) ACCESS RESTRICTIONS.—When military operations, public safety, or national security, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, require the closure of roads and trails on the lands withdrawn by this subtitle commonly in public use, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to take such action, except that such closures shall be limited to the minimum areas and periods required for the purposes specified in this subsection. Appropriate warning notices shall be kept posted during closures.

(3) SUPPRESSION OF FIRES.—The Secretary of the Army shall take necessary precautions to prevent and suppress brush and range fires occurring within and outside the lands as a result of military activities and may seek assistance from the Bureau of Land Management in suppressing such fires. The memorandum of understanding required by this section shall provide for Bureau of Land Management assistance in the suppression of such fires, and for a transfer of funds from the Department of the Army to the Bureau of Land Management as compensation for such assistance.

(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, shall develop a plan for the management of acquired lands and lands withdrawn under sections 2902 and 2903 for the period of withdrawal. The plan shall—

(A) be consistent with applicable law;

(B) include such provisions as may be necessary for proper resource management and protection of the natural, cultural, and other resources and values of such lands; and

(C) identify those withdrawn and acquired lands, if any, which are to be open to mining or mineral and geothermal leasing, including mineral materials disposal.

(2) TIME FOR DEVELOPMENT.—The management plan required by this subsection shall be developed not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this subtitle.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior shall enter into a memorandum of understanding to implement the management plan developed under subsection (b).

(2) DURATION.—The duration of any such memorandum of understanding shall be the same as the period of withdrawal specified in section 8(a).

(3) AMENDMENT.—The memorandum of understanding may be amended by agreement of both Secretaries.

(d) USE OF CERTAIN RESOURCES.—The Secretary of the Army is authorized to utilize sand, gravel, or similar mineral or mineral material resources from the lands withdrawn by this subtitle when the use of such resources is required for construction needs of the Fort Carson Reservation or Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

SEC. 2906. MANAGEMENT OF WITHDRAWN AND ACQUIRED MINERAL RESOURCES.

Except as provided in section 2905(d), the Secretary of the Interior shall manage all withdrawn and acquired mineral resources within the boundaries of the Fort Carson Military Reservation and Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site in the same manner as provided in section 12 of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–606; 100 Stat. 3466) for mining and mineral leasing on certain lands withdrawn by that Act from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws.

SEC. 2907. HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.

All hunting, fishing, and trapping on the lands withdrawn and reserved by this subtitle shall be conducted in accordance with section 2671 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 2908. TERMINATION OF WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION.

(a) TERMINATION DATE.—The withdrawal and reservation made by this subtitle shall terminate 15 years after the date of the enactment of this subtitle.

(b) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED.—

(1) DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—At least three years before the termination under subsection (a) of the withdrawal and reservation established by this subtitle, the Secretary of the Army shall advise the Secretary of the Interior as to whether or not the Department of the Army will have a continuing military need for any of the lands after the termination date.

(2) METHOD OF MAKING DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary of the Army concludes under paragraph (1) that there will be a continuing military need for any of the lands after the termination date established by subsection (a), the Secretary of the Army, in accordance with applicable law, shall—

(A) evaluate the environmental effects of renewal of such withdrawal and reservation;

(B) hold at least one public hearing in Colorado concerning such evaluation; and

(C) file, after completing the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B), an application for extension of the withdrawal and reservation of such lands in accordance with the regulations and procedures of the Department of the Interior applicable to the extension of withdrawals for military uses.

(3) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall notify the Congress concerning a filing under paragraph (3)(C).

(c) EARLY RELINQUISHMENT OF WITHDRAWAL.—If the Secretary of the Army concludes under subsection (b) that before the termination date established by subsection (a) there will be no military need for all or any part of the lands withdrawn and reserved by this subtitle, or if, during the period of withdrawal, the Secretary of the Army otherwise decides to relinquish any or all of the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle, the Secretary of the Army shall file with the Secretary of the Interior a notice of intention to relinquish such lands.

(d) ACCEPTANCE OF LANDS PROPOSED FOR RELINQUISHMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior, upon deciding that it is in the public interest to accept jurisdiction over the lands proposed for relinquishment, may revoke the withdrawal and reservation established by this subtitle as it applies to the lands proposed for relinquishment. Should the decision be made to revoke the withdrawal and reservation, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register an appropriate order which shall—

(1) terminate the withdrawal and reservation;

(2) constitute official acceptance of full jurisdiction over the lands by the Secretary of the Interior; and

(3) state the date upon which the lands will be opened to the operation of the public land laws, including the mining laws if appropriate.

SEC. 2909. DETERMINATION OF PRESENCE OF CONTAMINATION AND EFFECT OF CONTAMINATION.

(a) DETERMINATION OF PRESENCE OF CONTAMINATION.—

(1) BEFORE RELINQUISHMENT NOTICE.—Before filing a relinquishment notice under section 2908(c), the Secretary of the Army shall prepare a written determination as to whether and to what extent the lands to be relinquished are contaminated with explosive, toxic, or other hazardous materials. A copy of the determination made by the Secretary of the Army shall be supplied with the relinquishment notice. Copies of both the relinquishment notice and the determination under this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register by the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) UPON TERMINATION OF WITHDRAWAL.—At the expiration of the withdrawal period made by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine whether and to what extent the lands withdrawn by this subtitle are contaminated to an extent which prevents opening such contaminated lands to operation of the public land laws.

(b) PROGRAM OF DECONTAMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Throughout the duration of the withdrawal and reservation made by this subtitle, the Secretary of the Army, to the extent funds are made available, shall maintain a program of decontamination of the lands withdrawn by this subtitle at least at the level of effort carried out during fiscal year 1992.

(2) DECONTAMINATION OF LANDS TO BE RELINQUISHED.—In the case of lands subject to a relinquishment notice under section 2908(c) that are contaminated, the Secretary of the Army shall decontaminate the land to the extent that funds are appropriated for such purpose if the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, determines that—

(A) decontamination of the lands is practicable and economically feasible, taking into consideration the potential future use and value of the land; and

(B) upon decontamination, the land could be opened to the operation of some or all of the public land laws, including the mining laws.

(c) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO REFUSE CONTAMINATED LANDS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to accept lands proposed for relinquishment if the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior conclude that—

(1) decontamination of any or all of the lands proposed for relinquishment is not practicable or economically feasible;

(2) the lands cannot be decontaminated sufficiently to allow them to be opened to the operation of the public land laws; or

(3) insufficient funds are appropriated for the purpose of decontaminating the lands.

(d) EFFECT OF CONTINUED CONTAMINATION.—If the Secretary of the Interior declines under subsection (c) to accept jurisdiction of lands proposed for relinquishment or if the Secretary of the Interior determines under subsection (a)(2) that some of the lands withdrawn by this subtitle are contaminated to an extent that prevents opening the contaminated lands to operation of the public land laws—

(1) the Secretary of the Army shall take appropriate steps to warn the public of the contaminated state of such lands and any risks associated with entry onto such lands;

(2) after the expiration of the withdrawal, the Secretary of the Army shall undertake no activities on such lands except in connection with decontamination of such lands; and

(3) the Secretary of the Army shall report to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Congress concerning the status of such lands and all actions taken under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(e) EFFECT OF SUBSEQUENT DECONTAMINATION.—If the lands described in subsection (d) are subsequently decontaminated, upon certification by the Secretary of the Army that the lands are safe for all nonmilitary uses, the Secretary of the Interior shall reconsider accepting jurisdiction over the lands.

(f) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this subtitle shall affect, or be construed to affect, the obligations of the Secretary of the Army, if any, to decontaminate lands withdrawn by this subtitle pursuant to applicable law, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.).

SEC. 2910. DELEGATION.

The functions of the Secretary of the Army under this subtitle may be delegated. The functions of the Secretary of the Interior under this subtitle may be delegated, except that the order referred to in section 2908(d) may be approved and signed only by the Secretary of the Interior, the Deputy Secretary of the Interior, or an Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2911. HOLD HARMLESS.

Any party conducting any mining, mineral, or geothermal leasing activity on lands comprising the Fort Carson Reservation or Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site shall indemnify the United States against any costs, fees, damages, or other liabilities (including costs of litigation) incurred by the United States and arising from or relating to such mining activities, including costs of mineral materials disposal, whether arising under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, the Solid Waste Disposal Act, or otherwise.

SEC. 2912. AMENDMENT TO MILITARY LANDS WITHDRAWAL ACT OF 1986.

(a) USE OF CERTAIN RESOURCES.—Section 3(f) of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–606; 100 Stat. 3461) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary of the military department concerned may utilize sand, gravel, or similar mineral or material resources when the use of such resources is required for construction needs on the respective lands withdrawn by this Act.''.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 9(b) of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–606; 100 Stat. 3466) is amended by striking ''section 7(f)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''section 8(f)''.

SEC. 2913. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subtitle.

Subtitle B—El Centro Naval Air Facility Ranges Withdrawal

SEC. 2921. SHORT TITLE AND DEFINITIONS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This subtitle may be cited as the ''El Centro Naval Air Facility Ranges Withdrawal Act''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this subtitle:

(1) The term ''El Centro'' means the Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California.

(2) The term ''cooperative agreement'' means the cooperative agreement entered into between the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of the Navy, dated June 29, 1987, with regard to the defense-related uses of Federal lands to further the mission of El Centro.

(3) The term ''relinquishment notice'' means a notice of intention by the Secretary of the Navy under section 2928(a) to relinquish, before the termination date specified in section 2925, the withdrawal and reservation of certain lands withdrawn under this subtitle.

SEC. 2922. WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF LANDS FOR EL CENTRO.

(a) WITHDRAWALS.—Subject to valid existing rights, and except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, the Federal lands utilized in the mission of the Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California, that are described in subsection (c) are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, but not the mineral leasing or geothermal leasing laws or the mineral materials sales laws.

(b) RESERVATION.—The lands withdrawn under subsection (a) are reserved for the use by the Secretary of the Navy—

(1) for defense-related purposes in accordance with the cooperative agreement; and

(2) subject to notice to the Secretary of the Interior under section 2924(e), for other defense-related purposes determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF WITHDRAWN LANDS.—The lands withdrawn and reserved under subsection (a) are—

(1) the Federal lands comprising approximately 46,600 acres in Imperial County, California, as generally depicted in part on a map entitled ''Exhibit A, Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California, Land Acquisition Map, Range 2510 (West Mesa)'' and dated March 1993 and in part on a map entitled ''Exhibit B, Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California, Land Acquisition Map Range 2512 (East Mesa)'' and dated March 1993; and

(2) and all other areas within the boundaries of such lands as depicted on such maps that may become subject to the operation of the public land laws.

SEC. 2923. MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.

(a) PUBLICATION AND FILING REQUIREMENTS.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this subtitle, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) publish in the Federal Register a notice containing the legal description of the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle; and

(2) file maps and the legal description of the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and with the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) LEGAL EFFECT.—The maps and legal description prepared under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if they were included in this subtitle, except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct clerical and typographical errors in the maps and legal description.

(c) AVAILABILITY FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION.—Copies of the maps and legal description prepared under subsection (a) shall be available for public inspection in—

(1) the Office of the State Director, California State Office of the Bureau of Land Management, Sacramento, California;

(2) the Office of the District Manager, California Desert District of the Bureau of Land Management, Riverside, California; and

(3) the Office of the Commanding Officer, Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona.

(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary of Navy shall reimburse the Secretary of the Interior for the cost of implementing this section.

SEC. 2924. MANAGEMENT OF WITHDRAWN LANDS.

(a) MANAGEMENT CONSISTENT WITH COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—The lands and resources shall be managed in accordance with the cooperative agreement, revised as necessary to conform to the provisions of this subtitle. The parties to the cooperative agreement shall review the cooperative agreement for conformance with this subtitle and amend the cooperative agreement, if appropriate, within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this subtitle. The term of the cooperative agreement shall be amended so that its duration is at least equal to the duration of the withdrawal made by section 2925. The cooperative agreement may be reviewed and amended by the managing agencies as necessary.

(b) MANAGEMENT BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—

(1) GENERAL MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY.—During the period of withdrawal, the Secretary of the Interior shall manage the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and other applicable laws, including this subtitle.

(2) SPECIFIC AUTHORITIES.—To the extent consistent with applicable laws, Executive orders, and the cooperative agreement, the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle may be managed in a manner permitting—

(A) protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat;

(B) control of predatory and other animals;

(C) the prevention and appropriate suppression of brush and range fires resulting from nonmilitary activities; and

(D) geothermal leasing and development and related power production, mineral leasing and development, and mineral material sales.

(3) EFFECT OF WITHDRAWAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall manage the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle, in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy, such that all nonmilitary use of such lands, including the uses described in paragraph (2), shall be subject to such conditions and restrictions as may be necessary to permit the military use of such lands for the purposes specified in the cooperative agreement or authorized pursuant to this subtitle.

(c) CERTAIN ACTIVITIES SUBJECT TO CONCURRENCE OF NAVY.—The Secretary of the Interior may issue a lease, easement, right-of-way, or other authorization with respect to the nonmilitary use of the withdrawn lands only with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Navy and under the terms of the cooperative agreement.

(d) ACCESS RESTRICTIONS.—If the Secretary of the Navy determines that military operations, public safety, or national security require the closure to public use of any road, trail, or other portion of the lands withdrawn under this subtitle, the Secretary may take such action as the Secretary determines necessary or desirable to effect and maintain such closure. Any such closure shall be limited to the minimum areas and periods which the Secretary of the Navy determines are required to carry out this subsection. Before and during any closure under this subsection, the Secretary of the Navy shall keep appropriate warning notices posted and take appropriate steps to notify the public concerning such closures.

(e) ADDITIONAL MILITARY USES.—Lands withdrawn under this subtitle may be used for defense-related uses other than those specified in the cooperative agreement. The Secretary of the Navy shall promptly notify the Secretary of the Interior in the event that the lands withdrawn under this subtitle will be used for additional defense-related purposes. Such notification shall indicate the additional use or uses involved, the proposed duration of such uses, and the extent to which such additional military uses of the withdrawn lands will require that additional or more stringent conditions or restrictions be imposed on otherwise-permitted nonmilitary uses of all or any portion of the withdrawn lands.

SEC. 2925. DURATION OF WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION.

The withdrawal and reservation made under this subtitle shall terminate 25 years after the date of the enactment of this subtitle.

SEC. 2926. CONTINUATION OF ONGOING DECONTAMINATION ACTIVITIES.

Throughout the duration of the withdrawal and reservation made under this subtitle, and subject to the availability of funds, the Secretary of the Navy shall maintain a program of decontamination of the lands withdrawn under this subtitle at least at the level of decontamination activities performed on such lands in fiscal year 1995. Such activities shall be subject to applicable laws, such as the amendments made by the Federal Facility Compliance Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–386; 106 Stat. 1505) and the Defense Environmental Restoration Program established under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 2927. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXTENSION.

(a) NOTICE OF CONTINUED MILITARY NEED.—Not later than five years before the termination date specified in section 2925, the Secretary of the Navy shall advise the Secretary of the Interior as to whether or not the Navy will have a continuing military need for any or all of the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle after the termination date.

(b) APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION.—If the Secretary of the Navy determines that there will be a continuing military need for any or all of the withdrawn lands after the termination date specified in section 2925, the Secretary of the Navy shall file an application for extension of the withdrawal and reservation of the lands in accordance with the then existing regulations and procedures of the Department of the Interior applicable to extension of withdrawal of lands for military purposes and that are consistent with this subtitle. Such application shall be filed with the Department of the Interior not later than four years before the termination date.

(c) EXTENSION PROCESS.—The withdrawal and reservation established by this subtitle may not be extended except by an Act or Joint Resolution of Congress.

SEC. 2928. EARLY RELINQUISHMENT OF WITHDRAWAL.

(a) FILING OF RELINQUISHMENT NOTICE.—If, during the period of withdrawal and reservation specified in section 2925, the Secretary of the Navy decides to relinquish all or any portion of the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle, the Secretary of the Navy shall file a notice of intention to relinquish with the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) DETERMINATION OF PRESENCE OF CONTAMINATION.—Before transmitting a relinquishment notice under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Navy, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall prepare a written determination concerning whether and to what extent the lands to be relinquished are contaminated with explosive, toxic, or other hazardous wastes and substances. A copy of such determination shall be transmitted with the relinquishment notice.

(c) DECONTAMINATION AND REMEDIATION.—In the case of contaminated lands which are the subject of a relinquishment notice, the Secretary of the Navy shall decontaminate or remediate the land to the extent that funds are appropriated for such purpose if the Secretary of the

Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, determines that—

(1) decontamination or remediation of the lands is practicable and economically feasible, taking into consideration the potential future use and value of the land; and

(2) upon decontamination or remediation, the land could be opened to the operation of some or all of the public land laws, including the mining laws.

(d) DECONTAMINATION AND REMEDIATION ACTIVITIES SUBJECT TO OTHER LAWS.—The activities of the Secretary of the Navy under subsection (c) are subject to applicable laws and regulations, including the Defense Environmental Restoration Program established under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code, the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), and the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.).

(e) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO REFUSE CONTAMINATED LANDS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to accept lands specified in a relinquishment notice if the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, concludes that—

(1) decontamination or remediation of any land subject to the relinquishment notice is not practicable or economically feasible;

(2) the land cannot be decontaminated or remediated sufficiently to be opened to operation of some or all of the public land laws; or

(3) a sufficient amount of funds are not appropriated for the decontamination of the land.

(f) STATUS OF CONTAMINATED LANDS.—If, because of the condition of the lands, the Secretary of the Interior declines to accept jurisdiction of lands proposed for relinquishment or, if at the expiration of the withdrawal made under this subtitle, the Secretary of the Interior determines that some of the lands withdrawn under this subtitle are contaminated to an extent which prevents opening such contaminated lands to operation of the public land laws—

(1) the Secretary of the Navy shall take appropriate steps to warn the public of the contaminated state of such lands and any risks associated with entry onto such lands;

(2) after the expiration of the withdrawal, the Secretary of the Navy shall retain jurisdiction over the withdrawn lands, but shall undertake no activities on such lands except in connection with the decontamination or remediation of such lands; and

(3) the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Congress concerning the status of such lands and all actions taken under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(g) SUBSEQUENT DECONTAMINATION OR REMEDIATION.—If lands covered by subsection (f) are subsequently decontaminated or remediated and the Secretary of the Navy certifies that the lands are safe for nonmilitary uses, the Secretary of the Interior shall reconsider accepting jurisdiction over the lands.

(h) REVOCATION AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon deciding that it is in the public interest to accept jurisdiction over lands specified in a relinquishment notice, the Secretary of the Interior may revoke the withdrawal and reservation made under this subtitle as it applies to such lands. If the decision be made to accept the relinquishment and to revoke the withdrawal and reservation, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register an appropriate order which shall—

(1) terminate the withdrawal and reservation;

(2) constitute official acceptance of full jurisdiction over the lands by the Secretary of the Interior; and

(3) state the date upon which the lands will be opened to the operation of the public land laws, including the mining laws, if appropriate.

SEC. 2929. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY.—The functions of the Secretary of the Navy under this subtitle may be delegated.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR.—The functions of the Secretary of the Interior under this subtitle may be delegated, except that an order described in section 2928(h) may be approved and signed only by the Secretary of the Interior, the Deputy Secretary of the Interior, or an Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2930. HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.

All hunting, fishing, and trapping on the lands withdrawn under this subtitle shall be conducted in accordance with section 2671 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 2931. HOLD HARMLESS.

Any party conducting any mining, mineral, or geothermal leasing activity on lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle shall indemnify the United States against any costs, fees, damages, or other liabilities (including costs of litigation) incurred by the United States and arising from or relating to such mining activities, including costs of mineral materials disposal, whether arising under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, the Solid Waste Disposal Act, or otherwise.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

SEC. 3101. WEAPONS ACTIVITIES.

(a) STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for stockpile stewardship in carrying out weapons activities necessary for national security programs in the amount of $1,676,767,000, to be allocated as follows:

(1) For core stockpile stewardship, $1,250,907,000 for fiscal year 1997, to be allocated as follows:

(A) For operation and maintenance, $1,162,570,000.

(B) For plant projects (including maintenance, restoration, planning, construction, acquisition, modification of facilities, and the continuation of projects authorized in prior years, and land acquisition related thereto), $88,337,000, to be allocated as follows:

Project 96–D–102, stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations, $19,250,000.

Project 96–D–103, ATLAS, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $15,100,000.

Project 96–D–104, processing and environmental technology laboratory (PETL), Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $14,100,000.

Project 96–D–105, contained firing facility addition, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, $17,100,000.

Project 95–D–102, Chemical and Metallurgy Research Building upgrades project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $15,000,000.

Project 94–D–102, nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization, Phase V, various locations, $7,787,000.

(2) For inertial fusion, $366,460,000, to be allocated as follows:

(A) For operation and maintenance, $234,560,000.

(B) For plant projects (including maintenance, restoration, planning, construction, acquisition, modification of facilities, and the continuation of projects authorized in prior years, and land acquisition related thereto), $131,900,000 to be allocated as follows:

Project 96–D–111, national ignition facility, TBD, $131,900,000.

(3) For technology transfer and education, $59,400,000.

(b) STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for stockpile management in carrying out weapons activities necessary for national security programs in the amount of $1,923,831,000, to be allocated as follows:

(1) For operation and maintenance, $1,829,470,000.

(2) For plant projects (including maintenance, restoration, planning, construction, acquisition, modification of facilities, and the continuation of projects authorized in prior years, and land acquisition related thereto), $94,361,000, to be allocated as follows:

Project 97–D–121, consolidation pit packaging system, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $870,000.

Project 97–D–122, nuclear materials storage facility renovation, LANL, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $4,000,000.

Project 97–D–123, structural upgrades, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, Missouri, $1,400,000.

Project 97–D–124, steam plant wastewater treatment facility upgrade, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $600,000.

Project 96–D–122, sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU), Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $100,000.

Project 96–D–123, retrofit HVAC and chillers for ozone protection, Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $7,000,000.

Project 96–D–125, Washington measurements operations facility, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, $3,825,000.

Project 95–D–122, sanitary sewer upgrade, Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $10,900,000.

Project 94–D–124, hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $4,900,000.

Project 94–D–125, upgrade life safety, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, Missouri, $5,200,000.

Project 94–D–127, emergency notification system, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $2,200,000.

Project 93–D–122, life safety upgrades, Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $7,200,000.

Project 93–D–123, complex-21, various locations, $14,487,000.

Project 88–D–122, facilities capability assurance program, various locations, $21,940,000.

Project 88–D–123, security enhancement, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $9,739,000.

(c) PROGRAM DIRECTION.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for program direction in carrying out weapons activities necessary for national security programs in the amount of $334,404,000.

SEC. 3102. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT.

(a) ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION.—Subject to subsection (i), funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for environmental restoration in carrying out environmental restoration and waste management activities necessary for national security programs in the amount of $1,812,194,000, of which $376,648,000 shall be allocated to the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund.

(b) WASTE MANAGEMENT.—Subject to subsection (i), funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for waste management in carrying out environmental restoration and waste management activities necessary for national security programs in the amount of $1,536,653,000, to be allocated as follows:

(1) For operation and maintenance, $1,448,326,000.

(2) For plant projects (including maintenance, restoration, planning, construction, acquisition, modification of facilities, and the continuation of projects authorized in prior years, and land acquisition related thereto), $88,327,000, to be allocated as follows:

Project 97–D–402, tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, Washington, $7,584,000.

Project 96–D–408, waste management upgrades, various locations, $11,246,000.

Project 95–D–402, install permanent electrical service for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, Carlsbad, New Mexico, $752,000.

Project 95–D–405, industrial landfill V and construction/demolition landfill VII, Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $200,000.

Project 94–D–404, Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $6,345,000.

Project 94–D–407, initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, Washington, $12,600,000.

Project 93–D–182, replacement of cross-site transfer system, Richland, Washington, $8,100,000.

Project 93–D–187, high-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina, $20,000,000.

Project 89–D–174, replacement high-level waste evaporator, Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina, $11,500,000.

Project 86–D–103, decontamination and waste treatment facility, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, $10,000,000.

(c) NUCLEAR MATERIALS AND FACILITIES STABILIZATION.—Subject to subsection (i), funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for nuclear materials and facilities stabilization in carrying out environmental restoration and waste management activities necessary for national security programs in the amount of $1,269,290,000 to be allocated as follows:

(1) For operation and maintenance, $1,151,718,000.

(2) For plant projects (including maintenance, restoration, planning, construction, acquisition, modification of facilities, and the continuation of projects authorized in prior years, and land acquisition related thereto), $117,572,000, to be allocated as follows:

Project 97–D–450, Actinide packaging and storage facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina, $7,900,000.

Project 97–D–451, B-Plant safety class ventilation upgrades, Richland, Washington, $1,500,000.

Project 97–D–470, environmental monitoring laboratory, Savannah River, Aiken, South Carolina, $2,500,000.

Project 97–D–473, health physics site support facility, Savannah River, Aiken, South Carolina, $2,000,000.

Project 96–D–406, spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, Washington, $60,672,000.

Project 96–D–461, electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $6,790,000.

Project 96–D–464, electrical and utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $10,440,000.

Project 96–D–471, CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina, $8,541,000.

Project 95–E–600, hazardous materials management and emergency response training center, Richland, Washington, $7,900,000.

Project 95–D–155, upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, South Carolina, $4,137,000.

Project 95–D–456, security facilities consolidation, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $4,645,000.

Project 94–D–401, emergency response facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $547,000.

(d) PROGRAM DIRECTION.—Subject to subsection (i), funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for program direction in carrying out environmental restoration and waste management activities necessary for national security programs in the amount of $375,511,000.

(e) TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.—Subject to subsection (i), funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for technology development in carrying out environmental restoration and waste management activities necessary for national security programs in the amount of $303,771,000.

(f) POLICY AND MANAGEMENT.—Subject to subsection (i), funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for policy and management in carrying out environmental restoration and waste management activities necessary for national security programs in the amount of $23,155,000.

(g) ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE PROGRAM.—Subject to subsection (i), funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for the environmental science program in carrying out environmental restoration and waste management activities necessary for national security programs in the amount of $62,136,000.

(h) ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION.—Subject to subsection (i), funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for environmental management privatization in carrying out environmental restoration and waste management activities necessary for national security programs in the amount of $185,000,000.

(i) ADJUSTMENTS.—The total amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section is the sum of the amounts specified in subsections (a) through (h) reduced by the sum of—

(1) $150,400,000, for use of prior year balances; and

(2) $8,000,000 for Savannah River Pension Refund.

SEC. 3103. DEFENSE FIXED ASSET ACQUISITION.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for the defense fixed asset acquisition/privatization program in the amount of $182,000,000.

SEC. 3104. OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for other defense activities in carrying out programs necessary for national security in the amount of $1,487,800,000, to be allocated as follows:

(1) For verification and control technology, $399,648,000, to be allocated as follows:

(A) For nonproliferation and verification research and development, $194,919,000.

(B) For arms control, $169,544,000.

(C) For intelligence, $35,185,000.

(2) For nuclear safeguards and security, $47,208,000.

(3) For security investigations, $22,000,000.

(4) For emergency management, $16,794,000.

(5) For program direction, nonproliferation, and national security, $95,622,000.

(6) For environment, safety, and health, defense, $63,800,000.

(7) For worker and community transition assistance, $67,000,000.

(8) For fissile materials disposition, $93,796,000, to be allocated as follows:

(A) For operations and maintenance, $76,796,000.

(B) For the following plant project (including maintenance, restoration, planning, construction, acquisition, modification of facilities, and the continuation of projects authorized in prior years, and land acquisition related thereto):

Project 97–D–140, consolidated special nuclear materials storage facility, site to be determined, $17,000,000.

(9) For naval reactors development, $681,932,000, to be allocated as follows:

(A) For operation and infrastructure, $649,330,000.

(B) For program direction, $18,902,000.

(C) For plant projects (including maintenance, restoration, planning, construction, acquisition, modification of facilities, and the continuation of projects authorized in prior years, and land acquisition related thereto), $13,700,000, to be allocated as follows:

Project 97–D–201, advanced test reactor secondary coolant refurbishment, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $400,000.

Project 95–D–200, laboratory systems and hot cell upgrades, various locations, $4,800,000.

Project 95–D–201, advanced test reactor radioactive waste system upgrades, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $500,000.

Project 90–N–102, expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors facility, Idaho, $8,000,000.

SEC. 3105. DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 for payment to the Nuclear Waste Fund established in section 302(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222(c)) in the amount of $200,000,000.

Subtitle B—Recurring General Provisions

SEC. 3121. REPROGRAMMING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Until the Secretary of Energy submits to the congressional defense committees the report referred to in subsection (b) and a period of 30 days has elapsed after the date on which such committees receive the report, the Secretary may not use amounts appropriated pursuant to this title for any program—

(1) in amounts that exceed, in a fiscal year—

(A) 110 percent of the amount authorized for that program by this title; or

(B) $1,000,000 more than the amount authorized for that program by this title; or

(2) which has not been presented to, or requested of, Congress.

(b) REPORT.—(1) The report referred to in subsection (a) is a report containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action.

(2) In the computation of the 30-day period under subsection (a), there shall be excluded any day on which either House of Congress is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—(1) In no event may the total amount of funds obligated pursuant to this title exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this title.

(2) Funds appropriated pursuant to this title may not be used for an item for which Congress has specifically denied funds.

SEC. 3122. LIMITS ON GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy may carry out any construction project under the general plant projects authorized by this title if the total estimated cost of the construction project does not exceed $2,000,000.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—If, at any time during the construction of any general plant project authorized by this title, the estimated cost of the project is revised because of unforeseen cost variations and the revised cost of the project exceeds $2,000,000, the Secretary shall immediately furnish a complete report to the congressional defense committees explaining the reasons for the cost variation.

SEC. 3123. LIMITS ON CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), construction on a construction project may not be started or additional obligations incurred in connection with the project above the total estimated cost, whenever the current estimated cost of the construction project, which is authorized by section 3101, 3102, or 3103, or which is in support of national security programs of the Department of Energy and was authorized by any previous Act, exceeds by more than 25 percent the higher of—

(A) the amount authorized for the project; or

(B) the amount of the total estimated cost for the project as shown in the most recent budget justification data submitted to Congress.

(2) An action described in paragraph (1) may be taken if—

(A) the Secretary of Energy has submitted to the congressional defense committees a report on the actions and the circumstances making such action necessary; and

(B) a period of 30 days has elapsed after the date on which the report is received by the committees.

(3) In the computation of the 30-day period under paragraph (2), there shall be excluded any day on which either House of Congress is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any construction project which has a current estimated cost of less than $5,000,000.

SEC. 3124. FUND TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

(a) TRANSFER TO OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Secretary of Energy may transfer funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy pursuant to this title to other Federal agencies for the performance of work for which the funds were authorized. Funds so transferred may be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same period as the authorizations of the Federal agency to which the amounts are transferred.

(b) TRANSFER WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY; LIMITATIONS.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Energy may transfer funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy pursuant to this title between any such authorizations. Amounts of authorizations so transferred may be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same period as the authorization to which the amounts are transferred.

(2) Not more than five percent of any such authorization may be transferred between authorizations under paragraph (1). No such authorization may be increased or decreased by more than five percent by a transfer under such paragraph.

(3) The authority provided by this section to transfer authorizations—

(A) may only be used to provide funds for items relating to weapons activities necessary for national security programs that have a higher priority than the items from which the funds are transferred; and

(B) may not be used to provide authority for an item that has been denied funds by Congress.

(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Energy shall promptly notify the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives of any transfer of funds to or from authorizations under this title.

SEC. 3125. AUTHORITY FOR CONCEPTUAL AND CONSTRUCTION DESIGN.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR CONCEPTUAL DESIGN.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2) and except as provided in paragraph (3), before submitting to Congress a request for funds for a construction project that is in support of a national security program of the Department of Energy, the Secretary of Energy shall complete a conceptual design for that project.

(2) If the estimated cost of completing a conceptual design for a construction project exceeds $3,000,000, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a request for funds for the conceptual design before submitting a request for funds for the construction project.

(3) The requirement in paragraph (1) does not apply to a request for funds—

(A) for a construction project the total estimated cost of which is less than $2,000,000; or

(B) for emergency planning, design, and construction activities under section 3126.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR CONSTRUCTION DESIGN.—(1) Within the amounts authorized by this title, the Secretary of Energy may carry out construction design (including architectural and engineering services) in connection with any proposed construction project if the total estimated cost for such design does not exceed $600,000.

(2) If the total estimated cost for construction design in connection with any construction project exceeds $600,000, funds for such design must be specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 3126. AUTHORITY FOR EMERGENCY PLANNING, DESIGN, AND CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Energy may use any funds available to the Department of Energy pursuant to an authorization in this title, including those funds authorized to be appropriated for advance planning and construction design under sections 3101, 3102, and 3103, to perform planning, design, and construction activities for any Department of Energy national security program construction project that, as determined by the Secretary, must proceed expeditiously in order to protect public health and safety, to meet the needs of national defense, or to protect property.

(b) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not exercise the authority under subsection (a) in the case of any construction project until the Secretary has submitted to the congressional defense committees a report on the activities that the Secretary intends to carry out under this section and the circumstances making such activities necessary.

(c) SPECIFIC AUTHORITY.—The requirement of section 3125(b)(2) does not apply to emergency planning, design, and construction activities conducted under this section.

SEC. 3127. FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR ALL NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

Subject to the provisions of appropriations Acts and section 3121, amounts appropriated pursuant to this title for management and support activities and for general plant projects are available for use, when necessary, in connection with all national security programs of the Department of Energy.

SEC. 3128. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

When so specified in an appropriation Act, amounts appropriated for operation and maintenance or for plant projects may remain available until expended.

Subtitle C—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

SEC. 3131. STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) FUNDING.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy pursuant to section 3101, $100,000,000 shall be available to carry out the following activities within the stockpile stewardship program:

(1) $20,000,000 for enhanced surveillance involving the nuclear production plants and the nuclear weapons design laboratories.

(2) $15,000,000 for a production capability assurance program for critical non-nuclear components.

(3) $25,000,000 for an accelerated capability to produce prototype war reserve-quality plutonium pits.

(4) $20,000,000 for dual revalidation of warheads in the nuclear weapons stockpile.

(5) $20,000,000 for the stockpile life extension program.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than October 15, 1996, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the obligations the Secretary has incurred, and plans to incur, during fiscal year 1997 for the stockpile stewardship program.

SEC. 3132. MANUFACTURING INFRASTRUCTURE FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS STOCKPILE.

(a) FUNDING.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy pursuant to section 3101, $125,000,000 shall be available to carry out the stockpile manufacturing infrastructure program.

(b) REQUIRED CAPABILITIES.—The manufacturing infrastructure established under the program shall include the capabilities listed in subsection (b) of section 3137 of Public Law 104–106 (110 Stat. 620).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than October 15, 1996, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the obligations the Secretary has incurred, and plans to incur, during fiscal year 1997 for the stockpile manufacturing infrastructure program.

(d) STOCKPILE MANUFACTURING INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM.—In this section, the term ''stockpile manufacturing infrastructure program'' means the program carried out pursuant to section 3137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 620).

SEC. 3133. PRODUCTION OF HIGH EXPLOSIVES.

The manufacture and fabrication of high explosives and energetic materials for use as components in nuclear weapons systems shall be carried out at the Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Energy may be used to move, or prepare to move, the manufacture and fabrication of high explosives and energetic materials for use as components in nuclear weapons systems from the Pantex Plant to any other site or facility of the Department of Energy.

SEC. 3134. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS BY LABORATORIES FOR LABORATORY-DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) REDUCTION OF FUNDING.—Section 3132(c) of Public Law 101–510 (104 Stat. 1832) is amended by striking out ''6 percent'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''2 percent''.

(b) LIMITATION.—None of the funds provided in a fiscal year, beginning with fiscal year 1997, by the Secretary of Energy to be used by laboratories for laboratory-directed research and development pursuant to section 3132(c) of Public Law 101–510 (42 U.S.C. 7257a(c)) may be obligated or expended by such laboratories until a period of 15 days has expired after the Secretary of Energy submits to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth in detail information about the manner in which such funds are planned to be used during that fiscal year. The report shall include a description and justification of the planned uses of the funds.

SEC. 3135. PROHIBITION ON FUNDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS ACTIVITIES WITH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) FUNDING PROHIBITION.—Funds authorized to be appropriated to, or otherwise available to, the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 may not be obligated or expended for any activity associated with the conduct of cooperative programs relating to nuclear weapons or nuclear weapons technology, including stockpile stewardship, safety, and use control, with the People's Republic of China.

(b) REPORT.—(1) The Secretary of Energy shall prepare, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, a report containing a description of all discussions and activities between the United States and the People's Republic of China regarding nuclear weapons matters that have occurred before the date of the enactment of this Act and that are planned to occur after such date. For each such discussion or activity, the report shall include—

(A) the authority under which the discussion or activity took or will take place;

(B) the subject of the discussion or activity;

(C) participants or likely participants;

(D) the source and amount of funds used or to be used to pay for the discussion or activity; and

(E) a description of the actions taken or to be taken to ensure that no classified or restricted data were or will be revealed, and a determination of whether classified or restricted data was revealed in previous discussions.

(2) The report shall be submitted to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives not later than October 15, 1996.

SEC. 3136. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP PROGRAMS.

(a) FUNDING PROHIBITION.—Funds authorized to be appropriated to, or otherwise available to, the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997 may not be obligated or expended to conduct any activities associated with international cooperative stockpile stewardship.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply with respect to such activities conducted between the United States and the United Kingdom, and between the United States and France.

SEC. 3137. TEMPORARY AUTHORITY RELATING TO TRANSFERS OF DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT FUNDS.

(a) TRANSFER AUTHORITY FOR DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT FUNDS.—The Secretary of Energy shall provide the manager of each field office of the Department of Energy with the authority to transfer defense environmental management funds from a program or project under the jurisdiction of the office to another such program or project. Any such transfer may be done only one time in a fiscal year to or from each program or project, and the amount transferred to or from the program or project may not exceed $5,000,000 in a fiscal year.

(b) DETERMINATION.—A transfer may not be carried out by a manager of a field office pursuant to the authority provided under subsection (a) unless the manager determines that such transfer is necessary to address a risk to health, safety, or the environment or to assure the most efficient use of defense environmental management funds at that field office.

(c) EXEMPTION FROM REPROGRAMMING REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of section 3121 shall not apply to transfers of funds pursuant to subsection (a).

(d) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management, shall notify Congress of any transfer of funds pursuant to subsection (a) not later than 30 days after such a transfer occurs.

(e) LIMITATION.—Funds transferred pursuant to subsection (a) may not be used for an item for which Congress has specifically denied funds or for a new program or project that has not been authorized by Congress.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''program or project'' means, with respect to a field office of the Department of Energy, any of the following:

(A) A project listed in subsection (b) or (c) of section 3102 being carried out by the office.

(B) A program referred to in subsection (a), (b), (c), (e), (g), or (h) of section 3102 being carried out by the office.

(C) A project or program not described in subparagraph (A) or (B) that is for environmental restoration or waste management activities necessary for national security programs of the Department of Energy, that is being carried out by the office, and for which defense environmental management funds have been authorized and appropriated before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The term ''defense environmental management funds'' means funds appropriated to the Department of Energy pursuant to an authorization for carrying out environmental restoration and waste management activities necessary for national security programs.

(g) DURATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority provided under subsection (a) to a manager of a field office shall be in effect from the date of the enactment of this Act to September 30, 1997.

SEC. 3138. MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS PRODUCTION FACILITIES AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS LABORATORIES.

(a) LIMITATION ON DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of Energy, in carrying out national security programs, may delegate specific management and planning authority over matters relating to site operation of the facilities and laboratories covered by this section only to the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs. Such Assistant Secretary may redelegate such authority only to managers of area offices of the Department of Energy located at such facilities and laboratories.

(2) Nothing in this section may be construed as affecting the delegation by the Secretary of Energy of authority relating to reporting, management, and oversight of matters relating to the Department of Energy generally, or safety, environment, and health at such facilities and laboratories.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO CONSULT WITH AREA OFFICES.—The Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs, in exercising any delegated authority to oversee management of matters relating to site operation of a facility or laboratory, shall exercise such authority only after direct consultation with the manager of the area office of the Department of Energy located at the facility or laboratory.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR DIRECT COMMUNICATION FROM AREA OFFICES.—The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs, shall require the head of each area office of the Department of Energy located at each facility and laboratory covered by this section to report on matters relating to site operation other than those matters set forth in subsection (a)(2) directly to the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs, without obtaining the approval or concurrence of any other official within the Department of Energy.

(d) DEFENSE PROGRAMS REORGANIZATION PLAN AND REPORT.—(1) The Secretary of Energy shall develop a plan to reorganize the field activities and management of the national security functions of the Department of Energy.

(2) Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the plan developed under paragraph (1). The report shall specifically identify all significant functions performed by the operations offices relating to any of the facilities and laboratories covered by this section and which of those functions could be performed—

(A) by the area offices of the Department of Energy located at the facilities and laboratories covered by this section; or

(B) by the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs.

(3) The report also shall address and make recommendations with respect to other internal streamlining and reorganization initiatives that the Department could pursue with respect to military or national security programs.

(e) DEFENSE PROGRAMS MANAGEMENT COUNCIL.—The Secretary of Energy shall establish a Defense Programs Management Council to advise the Secretary on policy matters, operational concerns, strategic planning, and development of priorities relating to the national security functions of the Department of Energy. The Council shall be composed of the directors of the facilities and laboratories and shall report directly to the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs.

(f) COVERED SITE OPERATIONS.—For purposes of this section, matters relating to site operation of a facility or laboratory include matters relating to personnel, budget, and procurement in national security programs.

(g) COVERED FACILITIES AND LABORATORIES.—This section applies to the following facilities and laboratories of the Department of Energy:

(1) The Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, Missouri.

(2) The Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas.

(3) The Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

(4) The Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina.

(5) Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico.

(6) Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

(7) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California.

(8) The Nevada Test Site, Nevada.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 3141. REPORT ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS STOCKPILE MEMORANDUM.

(a) SUBMISSION OF COPY OF MEMORANDUM.—Not less than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the congressional defense committees a copy of the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum approved by the President in April 1996.

(b) SUBMISSION OF COPY OF MEMORANDUM AND REPORT.—Not less than 30 days after the President has approved any update to the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum, the President shall submit to the congressional defense committees a copy of that Memorandum, together with a report describing the changes to the Memorandum compared to the previous submission.

(c) FORM.—The submissions required by this section shall be in classified and unclassified form.

SEC. 3142. REPORT ON PLUTONIUM PIT PRODUCTION AND REMANUFACTURING PLANS.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Energy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on plans for achieving the capability to produce and remanufacture plutonium pits. The report shall include a description of the baseline plan of the Department of Energy for achieving such capability, including the following:

(1) The funding necessary, by fiscal year, to achieve the capability.

(2) The schedule necessary to achieve the capability, including important technical and programmatic milestones.

(3) Siting, capacity for expansion, and other issues included in the baseline plan.

(b) DEADLINE.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3143. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO BASELINE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT REPORTS.

Section 3153 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160;107 Stat. 1950) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking out the first word in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof ''BIENNIAL''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting before ''year after 1995'' the following: ''odd-numbered''; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking out the first word in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof ''BIENNIAL''; and

(B) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking out ''in each year thereafter'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''in each odd-numbered year thereafter''.

SEC. 3144. REQUIREMENT TO DEVELOP FUTURE USE PLANS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DEVELOP FUTURE USE PLANS.—The Secretary may develop future use plans for any defense nuclear facility at which environmental restoration and waste management activities are occurring.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO DEVELOP FUTURE USE PLANS.—The Secretary of Energy shall develop a future use plan for each of the following defense nuclear facilities:

(1) Hanford Site, Richland, Washington.

(2) Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado.

(3) Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina.

(4) Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.

(c) FUTURE USE ADVISORY BOARD.—(1) At a defense nuclear facility where the Secretary of

Energy intends to develop a future use plan and no citizen advisory board has been established, the Secretary shall establish a future use advisory board.

(2) The Secretary may prescribe regulations regarding the establishment, characteristics, composition, and funding of future use advisory boards pursuant to this subsection.

(3) The Secretary may authorize the manager of a defense nuclear facility for which a future use plan is developed (or, if there is no such manager, an appropriate official of the Department of Energy designated by the Secretary) to pay routine administrative expenses of a future use advisory board established for that site. Such payments shall be made from funds available to the Secretary for program direction in carrying out environmental restoration and waste management activities necessary for national security programs.

(d) REQUIREMENT TO CONSULT WITH FUTURE USE ADVISORY BOARD.—In developing a future use plan under this section with respect to a defense nuclear facility, the Secretary of Energy shall consult with a future use advisory board established pursuant to subsection (c) or a similar advisory board already in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act for such facility, affected local governments (including any local future use redevelopment authorities), and other appropriate State agencies.

(e) 50-YEAR PLANNING PERIOD.—A future use plan developed under this section shall cover a period of at least 50 years.

(f) DEADLINES.—For each site listed in subsection (b), the Secretary shall develop a draft plan by October 1, 1997, and a final plan by March 15, 1998.

(g) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after completing development of a final plan for a site listed in subsection (b), the Secretary of Energy shall submit to Congress a report on the plan. The report shall describe the plan and contain such findings and recommendations with respect to the site as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(h) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—(1) Nothing in this section or in a future use plan developed under this section with respect to a defense nuclear facility shall be construed as requiring any modification to a future use plan that was developed before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Nothing in this section may be construed to affect statutory requirements for an environmental restoration or waste management activity or project or to modify or otherwise affect applicable statutory or regulatory environmental restoration and waste management requirements, including substantive standards intended to protect public health and the environment, nor shall anything in this section be construed to preempt or impair any local land use planning or zoning authority or State authority.

Subtitle E—Defense Nuclear Environmental Cleanup and Management

SEC. 3151. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to provide for the expedited environmental restoration and waste management of Department of Energy defense nuclear facilities through the use of cost-effective management mechanisms and innovative technologies.

SEC. 3152. COVERED DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES.

(a) APPLICABILITY.—This subtitle applies to any defense nuclear facility of the Department of Energy for which the fiscal year 1996 environmental management budget was $350,000,000 or more.

(b) DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITY DEFINED.—In this subtitle, the term ''defense nuclear facility'' means a former or current defense nuclear production facility that is owned and managed by the Department of Energy.

SEC. 3153. SITE MANAGER.

(a) APPOINTMENT.—The Secretary of Energy shall expeditiously appoint a Site Manager for each Department of Energy defense nuclear facility (in this subtitle referred to as the ''Site Manager'').

(b) SCOPE.—(1) In addition to other authorities provided for in this Act, the Secretary of Energy may delegate to the Site Manager of a defense nuclear facility authority to oversee and direct environmental management operations at the facility, including the authority to—

(A) enter into and modify contractual agreements to enhance environmental restoration and waste management at the facility;

(B) request that the Department of Energy headquarters submit to Congress a reprogramming package shifting funds among accounts in order to facilitate the most efficient and timely environmental restoration and waste management of the facility, and, in the event that the Department headquarters does not act upon the request within 60 days, submit such request to the appropriate congressional committees for review;

(C) subject to paragraph (2), negotiate amendments to environmental agreements for the Department of Energy;

(D) manage Department of Energy personnel at the facility;

(E) consider the costs, risk reduction benefits, and other benefits for the purposes of ensuring protection of human health and the environment or safety, with respect to any environmental remediation activity the cost of which exceeds $25,000,000; and

(F) have assessments prepared for environmental restoration activities (in several documents or a single document, as determined by the Site Manager).

(2) In using the authority described in paragraph (1)(C), a Site Manager may not negotiate an amendment that is expected to result in additional significant life cycle costs to the Department of Energy without the approval of the Secretary of Energy.

(3) In using any authority described in paragraph (1), a Site Manager of a facility shall consult with the State where the facility is located and the advisory board for the facility.

(4) The delegation of any authority pursuant to this subsection shall not be construed as restricting the Secretary of Energy's authority to delegate other authorities as necessary.

(c) INFORMATION TO SECRETARY OF ENERGY.—The Site Manager of a defense nuclear facility shall regularly inform the Secretary of Energy, Congress, and the advisory board for the facility of the progress made by the Site Manager to achieve the expedited environmental restoration and waste management of the facility.

SEC. 3154. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ORDERS.

An order imposed after the date of the enactment of this Act relating to the execution of environmental restoration, waste management, or technology development activities at a defense nuclear facility under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) may be imposed by the Secretary of Energy at the defense nuclear facility only if the Secretary finds that the order is necessary for the protection of human health and the environment or safety, or the fulfillment of current legal requirements.

SEC. 3155. DEPLOYMENT OF TECHNOLOGY FOR REMEDIATION OF DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy shall encourage the Site Manager of each defense nuclear facility to promote the deployment of innovative environmental technologies for remediation of defense nuclear waste at the facility.

(b) CRITERIA.—To carry out subsection (a), the Secretary shall encourage the Site Manager of a defense nuclear facility to establish a program at the facility to enhance the deployment of innovative environmental technologies at the facility. The Secretary may require the Site Manager, in establishing such a program—

(1) to establish a simplified, standardized, and timely process for the acceptance and deployment of environmental technologies;

(2) to solicit applications to deploy environmental technologies suitable for environmental restoration and waste management activities at the facility, including prevention, control, characterization, treatment, and remediation of contamination;

(3) to enter into contracts and other agreements with other public and private entities to deploy environmental technologies at the facility; and

(4) to include incentives, such as product performance specifications, in contracts to encourage the implementation of innovative environmental technologies.

SEC. 3156. PERFORMANCE-BASED CONTRACTING.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Energy shall develop and implement a program for performance-based contracting for contracts entered into for environmental remediation at defense nuclear facilities. The program shall ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable and appropriate, such contracts include the following:

(1) Clearly stated and results oriented performance criteria and measures.

(2) Appropriate incentives for contractors to meet and exceed the performance criteria effectively and efficiently.

(3) Appropriate criteria and incentives for contractors to seek and engage subcontractors who may more effectively and efficiently perform either unique and technologically challenging tasks or routine and interchangeable services.

(4) Specific incentives for cost savings.

(5) Financial accountability.

(6) When appropriate, allocation of fee or profit reduction for failure to meet minimum performance criteria and standards.

(b) CRITERIA AND MEASURES.—Performance criteria and measures should take into consideration, at a minimum, the following: managerial control; elimination or reduction of risk to public health and the environment; workplace safety; financial control; goal-oriented work scope; use of innovative and alternative technologies and techniques that result in cleanups being performed less expensively, more quickly, and within quality parameters; and performing within benchmark cost estimates.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In implementing this section, the Secretary of Energy shall consult with interested parties.

(d) DEADLINE.—The Secretary of Energy shall implement this section not later than October 1, 1997, unless the Secretary submits to Congress before that date a report with a schedule for completion of action under this section.

SEC. 3157. DESIGNATION OF DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES AS NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP DEMONSTRATION AREAS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary of Energy, upon receipt of a request from a Governor of a State in which a defense nuclear facility is situated, may designate the facility as a ''National Environmental Cleanup Demonstration Area'' to carry out the purposes of this subtitle.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Federal and State regulatory agencies, members of the community surrounding the facilities designated under subsection (a), and other affected parties should work to develop expedited and streamlined processes and systems for cleaning up the facilities, to eliminate unnecessary bureaucratic delay, and to proceed expeditiously with environmental restoration activities.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SEC. 3201. AUTHORIZATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997, $17,000,000 for the operation of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board under chapter 21 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286 et seq.).

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Disposals and Use of Funds

SEC. 3301. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) The term ''National Defense Stockpile'' means the stockpile provided for in section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98c).

(2) The term ''National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund'' means the fund in the Treasury of the United States established under section 9(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98h(a)).

SEC. 3302. AUTHORIZED USES OF STOCKPILE FUNDS.

(a) OBLIGATION OF STOCKPILE FUNDS.—During fiscal year 1997, the National Defense Stockpile Manager may obligate up to $60,000,000 of the funds in the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund for the authorized uses of such funds under section 9(b)(2) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98h(b)(2)).

(b) ADDITIONAL OBLIGATIONS.—The National Defense Stockpile Manager may obligate amounts in excess of the amount specified in subsection (a) if the National Defense Stockpile Manager notifies Congress that extraordinary or emergency conditions necessitate the additional obligations. The National Defense Stockpile Manager may make the additional obligations described in the notification after the end of the 45-day period beginning on the date Congress receives the notification.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The authorities provided by this section shall be subject to such limitations as may be provided in appropriations Acts.

Subtitle B—Programmatic Change

SEC. 3311. BIENNIAL REPORT ON STOCKPILE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) NATIONAL EMERGENCY PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS.—Section 14 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98h–5) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

(2) by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

''(b) Each report under this section shall set forth the national emergency planning assumptions used by the Secretary in making the Secretary's recommendations under subsection (a)(1) with respect to stockpile requirements. The Secretary shall base the national emergency planning assumptions on a military conflict scenario consistent with the scenario used by the Secretary in budgeting and defense planning purposes. The assumptions to be set forth include assumptions relating to each of the following:

''(1) The length and intensity of the assumed military conflict.

''(2) The military force structure to be mobilized.

''(3) The losses anticipated from enemy action.

''(4) The military, industrial, and essential civilian requirements to support the national emergency.

''(5) The availability of supplies of strategic and critical materials from foreign sources during the mobilization period, the military conflict, and the subsequent period of replenishment, taking into consideration possible shipping losses.

''(6) The domestic production of strategic and critical materials during the mobilization period, the military conflict, and the subsequent period of replenishment, taking into consideration possible shipping losses.

''(7) Civilian austerity measures required during the mobilization period and military conflict.

''(c) The stockpile requirements shall be based on those strategic and critical materials necessary for the United States to replenish or replace, within three years of the end of the military conflict scenario required under subsection (b), all munitions, combat support items, and weapons systems that would be consumed or exhausted during such a military conflict.

''(d) The Secretary shall also include in each report under this section an examination of the effect that alternative mobilization periods under the military conflict scenario required under subsection (b), as well as a range of other military conflict scenarios addressing potentially more serious threats to national security, would have on the Secretary's recommendations under subsection (a)(1) with respect to stockpile requirements.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 98a) is amended by striking out subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

''(c) The purpose of the National Defense Stockpile is to serve the interest of national defense only. The National Defense Stockpile is not to be used for economic or budgetary purposes.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1996.

SEC. 3312. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) PROPOSED CHANGES IN STOCKPILE QUANTITIES.—Section 3(c)(2) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking out ''effective on or after the 30th legislative day following'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''after the end of the 45-day period beginning on''; and

(2) by striking out the last sentence.

(b) WAIVER OF ACQUISITION AND DISPOSAL REQUIREMENTS.—Section 6(d)(1) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(d)(1)) is amended by striking out ''thirty days'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''45 days''.

(c) TIME TO BEGIN DISPOSAL.—Section 6(d)(2) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(d)(2)) is amended by striking out ''thirty days'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''45 days''.

SEC. 3313. IMPORTATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS.

Section 13 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98h–4) is amended—

(1) by striking out ''as a Communist-dominated country or area''; and

(2) by striking out ''such Communist-dominated countries or areas'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''a country or area listed in such general note''.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

SEC. 3401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy $149,500,000 for fiscal year 1997 for the purpose of carrying out activities under chapter 641 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the naval petroleum reserves (as defined in section 7420(2) of such title). Funds appropriated pursuant to such authorization shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 3402. PRICE REQUIREMENT ON SALE OF CERTAIN PETROLEUM DURING FISCAL YEAR 1997.

Notwithstanding section 7430(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, during fiscal year 1997, any sale of any part of the United States share of petroleum produced from Naval Petroleum Reserves Numbered 1, 2, and 3 shall be made at a price not less than 90 percent of the current sales price, as estimated by the Secretary of Energy, of comparable petroleum in the same area.

TITLE XXXV—PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 3501. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1997''.

SEC. 3502. AUTHORIZATION OF EXPENDITURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Panama Canal Commission is authorized to use amounts in the Panama Canal Commission Revolving Fund to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to it in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments, as may be necessary under the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) for the operation, maintenance, improvement, and administration of the Panama Canal for fiscal year 1997.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—For fiscal year 1997, the Panama Canal Commission may expend funds in the Panama Canal Commission Revolving Fund not more than $73,000 for reception and representation expenses, of which—

(1) not more than $18,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses of the Supervisory Board of the Commission;

(2) not more than $10,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses of the Secretary of the Commission; and

(3) not more than $45,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses of the Administrator of the Commission.

SEC. 3503. PURCHASE OF VEHICLES.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the funds available to the Commission shall be available for the purchase and transportation to the Republic of Panama, of passenger motor vehicles built in the United States, including large, heavy-duty vehicles.

SEC. 3504. EXPENDITURES ONLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH TREATIES.

Expenditures authorized under this subtitle may be made only in accordance with the Panama Canal Treaties of 1977 and any law of the United States implementing those treaties.

Subtitle B—Amendments to Panama Canal Act of 1979

SEC. 3521. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This subtitle may be cited as the ''Panama Canal Act Amendments of 1996''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this subtitle an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.).

SEC. 3522. DEFINITIONS AND RECOMMENDATION FOR LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In section 3 (22 U.S.C. 3602)—

(1) the heading is amended to read as follows:

''DEFINITIONS

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (4), by striking the semicolon at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting a period, and striking paragraphs (6) and (7); and

(3) by striking subsection (d).

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 is amended in the item relating to section 3 by striking ''and recommendation for legislation''.

SEC. 3523. ADMINISTRATOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1103 (22 U.S.C. 3613) is amended to read as follows:

''ADMINISTRATOR

''SEC. 1103. (a) There shall be an Administrator of the Commission who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President.

''(b) The Administrator shall be paid compensation in an amount, established by the Board, not to exceed level III of the Executive Schedule.''.

(b) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—Nothing in this section (or section 3549(3)) shall be considered to affect—

(1) the tenure of the individual serving as Administrator of the Commission on the day before subsection (a) takes effect; or

(2) until modified under section 1103(b) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979, as amended by subsection (a), the compensation of the individual so serving.

SEC. 3524. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR AND CHIEF ENGINEER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1104 (22 U.S.C. 3614) is amended to read as follows:

''DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR

''SEC. 1104. (a) There shall be a Deputy Administrator of the Commission who shall be appointed by the President. The Deputy Administrator shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Board.

''(b) The Deputy Administrator shall be paid compensation at a rate of pay, established by the Board, which does not exceed the rate of basic pay in effect for level IV of the Executive Schedule, and, if eligible, shall be paid the overseas recruitment and retention difference provided for in section 1217 of this Act.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 is amended in the item relating to section 1104 by striking ''and Chief Engineer''.

(c) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be considered to affect—

(1) the tenure of the individual serving as Deputy Administrator of the Commission on the day before subsection (a) takes effect; or

(2) until modified under section 1104(b) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979, as amended by subsection (a), the compensation of the individual so serving.

SEC. 3525. OFFICE OF OMBUDSMAN.

Section 1113 (22 U.S.C. 3623) is amended by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

SEC. 3526. APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION; DUTIES.

Section 1202 (22 U.S.C. 3642) is amended to read as follows:

''APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION; DUTIES

''SEC. 1202. (a) In accordance with this chapter, the Commission may appoint, fix the compensation of, and define the authority and duties of officers and employees (other than the Administrator and Deputy Administrator) necessary for the management, operation, and maintenance of the Panama Canal and its complementary works, installations, and equipment.

''(b) Individuals serving in any Executive agency (other than the Commission) or the Smithsonian Institution, including individuals in the uniform services, may, if appointed under this section or section 1104 of this Act, serve as officers or employees of the Commission.''.

SEC. 3527. APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1209 (22 U.S.C. 3649) is amended to read as follows:

''APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN BENEFITS

''SEC. 1209. Chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for work injuries, chapters 83 and 84 of such title 5, relating to retirement, chapter 87 of such title 5, relating to life insurance, and chapter 89 of such title 5, relating to health insurance, are applicable to Commission employees, except any individual—

''(1) who is not a citizen of the United States;

''(2) whose initial appointment by the Commission occurs after October 1, 1979; and

''(3) who is covered by the Social Security System of the Republic of Panama pursuant to any provision of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and related agreements.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 1209 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 1209. Applicability of certain benefits.''.

SEC. 3528. TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES.

Section 1210 (22 U.S.C. 3650) is amended to read as follows:

''TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES

''SEC. 1210. (a) Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Commission may pay travel and transportation expenses for employees in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

''(b) For an employee to whom section 1206 applies, the Commission may pay travel and transportation expenses associated with vacation leave for the employee and the immediate family of the employee notwithstanding requirements regarding periods of service established by subchapter II of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, or the regulations promulgated thereunder.

''(c) For an employee to whom section 1206 does not apply, the Commission may pay travel and transportation expenses associated with vacation leave for the employee and the immediate family of the employee notwithstanding requirements regarding a written agreement concerning the duration of a continuing service obligation established by subchapter II of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code or the regulations promulgated thereunder.''.

SEC. 3529. CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF AGENCY.

Subparagraph (B) of section 1211(1) (22 U.S.C. 3651(1)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

''(B) any other Executive agency or the Smithsonian Institution, to the extent of any election in effect under section 1212(b) of this Act;''.

SEC. 3530. PANAMA CANAL EMPLOYMENT SYSTEM; MERIT AND OTHER EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1212 (22 U.S.C. 3652) is amended to read as follows:

''PANAMA CANAL EMPLOYMENT SYSTEM; MERIT AND OTHER EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS

''SEC. 1212. (a) The Commission shall establish a Panama Canal Employment System and prescribe the regulations necessary for its administration. The Panama Canal Employment System shall—

''(1) be established in accordance with and be subject to the provisions of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and related agreements, the provisions of this chapter, and any other applicable provision of law;

''(2) be based on the consideration of the merit of each employee or candidate for employment and the qualifications and fitness of the employee to hold the position concerned;

''(3) conform, to the extent practicable and consistent with the provisions of this Act, to the policies, principles, and standards applicable to the competitive service;

''(4) in the case of employees who are citizens of the United States, provide for the appropriate interchange of those employees between positions under the Panama Canal Employment System and positions in the competitive service; and

''(5) not be subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, unless specifically made applicable by this Act.

''(b)(1) The head of any Executive agency (other than the Commission) and the Smithsonian Institution may elect to have the Panama Canal Employment System made applicable in whole or in part to personnel of that agency in the Republic of Panama.

''(2) Any Executive agency (other than the Commission) and the Smithsonian Institution, to the extent of any election under paragraph (1), shall conduct its employment and pay practices relating to employees in accordance with the Panama Canal Employment System.

''(c) The Commission may exclude any employee or position from coverage under any provision of this subchapter, other than the interchange rights extended under subsection (a)(4).''.

(b) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—The Panama Canal Employment System and all elections, rules, regulations, and orders relating thereto, as last in effect before the amendment made by subsection (a) takes effect, shall continue in effect, according to their terms, until modified, terminated, or superseded under section 1212 of the Panama Canal Act of 1979, as amended by subsection (a).

SEC. 3531. EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS.

Section 1213 (22 U.S.C. 3653) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''The head of each agency'' and inserting ''The Commission''.

SEC. 3532. REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISION REGARDING INTERIM APPLICATION OF CANAL ZONE MERIT SYSTEM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1214 (22 U.S.C. 3654) is repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 1214.

SEC. 3533. REPEAL OF PROVISION RELATING TO RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION REMUNERATION.

Section 1217(d) (22 U.S.C. 3657(d)) is repealed.

SEC. 3534. BENEFITS BASED ON BASIC PAY.

Section 1218(2) (22 U.S.C. 3658(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) benefits under subchapter III of chapter 83 and subchapter II of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, relating to retirement;''.

SEC. 3535. VESTING OF GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY OF COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1223 (22 U.S.C. 3663) is amended to read as follows:

''CENTRAL EXAMINING OFFICE

''SEC. 1223. The Commission shall establish a Central Examining Office. The purpose of the office shall be to implement the provisions of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and related agreements with respect to recruitment, examination, determination of qualification standards, and similar matters relating to employment of the Commission.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 1223 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 1223. Central Examining Office.''.

SEC. 3536. APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1224 (22 U.S.C. 3664) is amended to read as follows:

''APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

''SEC. 1224. The following provisions of title 5, United States Code, apply to the Panama Canal Commission:

''(1) Part I of title 5 (relating to agencies generally).

''(2) Chapter 21 (relating to employee definitions).

''(3) Section 2302(b)(8) (relating to whistleblower protection) and all provisions of title 5 relating to the administration or enforcement or any other aspect thereof, as identified in regulations prescribed by the Commission in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management.

''(4) All provisions relating to preference eligibles.

''(5) Section 5514 (relating to offset from salary).

''(6) Section 5520a (relating to garnishments).

''(7) Sections 5531-5535 (relating to dual pay and employment).

''(8) Subchapter VI of chapter 55 (relating to accumulated and accrued leave).

''(9) Subchapter IX of chapter 55 (relating to severance and back pay).

''(10) Chapter 57 (relating to travel and transportation).

''(11) Chapter 59 (relating to allowances).

''(12) Chapter 63 (relating to leave).

''(13) Section 6323 (relating to military leave; Reserves and National Guardsmen).

''(14) Chapter 71 (relating to labor relations).

''(15) Subchapters II and III of chapter 73 (relating to employment limitations and political activities, respectively) and all provisions of title 5 relating to the administration or enforcement or any other aspect thereof, as identified in regulations prescribed by the Commission in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management.

''(16) Chapter 81 (relating to compensation for work injuries).

''(17) Chapters 83 and 84 (relating to retirement).

''(18) Chapter 85 (relating to unemployment compensation).

''(19) Chapter 87 (relating to life insurance).

''(20) Chapter 89 (relating to health insurance).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 1224 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 1224. Applicability of title 5, United States Code.''.

SEC. 3537. REPEAL OF PROVISION RELATING TO TRANSFERRED OR REEMPLOYED EMPLOYEES.

Section 1231(a)(3) (22 U.S.C. 3671(a)(3)) is repealed.

SEC. 3538. ADMINISTRATION OF SPECIAL DISABILITY BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1245 (22 U.S.C. 3682) is amended by striking so much as precedes subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN DISABILITY BENEFITS

''SEC. 1245. (a)(1) The Commission, or any other United States Government agency or private entity acting pursuant to an agreement with the Commission, under the Act entitled 'An Act authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Panama Canal not coming within the provisions of the Canal Zone Retirement Act', approved July 8, 1937 (50 Stat. 478; 68 Stat. 17), may continue the payments of cash relief to those individual former employees of the Canal Zone Government or Panama Canal Company or their predecessor agencies not coming within the scope of the former Canal Zone Retirement Act whose services were terminated prior to October 5, 1958, because of unfitness for further useful service by reason of mental or physical disability resulting from age or disease.

''(2) Subject to subsection (b), cash relief under this subsection may not exceed $1.50 per month for each year of service of the employees so furnished relief, with a maximum of $45 per month, plus the amount of any cost-of-living increases in such cash relief granted before October 1, 1979, pursuant to section 181 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code (as in effect on September 30, 1979), nor be paid to any employee who, at the time of termination for disability prior to October 5, 1958, had less than 10 years' service with the Canal Zone Government, the Panama Canal Company, or their predecessor agencies on the Isthmus of Panama.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 1245 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 1245. Administration of certain disability benefits.''.

SEC. 3539. PANAMA CANAL REVOLVING FUND.

Section 1302 of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3712) is amended to read as follows:

''PANAMA CANAL REVOLVING FUND

''SEC. 1302. (a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund to be known as 'Panama Canal Revolving Fund'. The Panama Canal Revolving Fund shall, subject to subsection (b), be available to the Commission to carry out the purposes, functions, and powers authorized by this Act, including for—

''(1) the hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft;

''(2) uniforms or allowances therefor;

''(3) official receptions and representation expenses of the Board, the Secretary of the Commission, and the Administrator;

''(4) the operation of guide services;

''(5) a residence for the Administrator;

''(6) disbursements by the Administrator for employee and community projects;

''(7) the procurement of expert and consultant services;

''(8) promotional activities, including the preparation, distribution, or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television, film, or other media presentation designed to promote the Panama Canal as a resource of the world shipping industry; and

''(9) the purchase and transportation to the Republic of Panama of passenger motor vehicles built in the United States, including large, heavy-duty vehicles.

''(b)(1) There shall be deposited in the Panama Canal Revolving Fund, on a continuing basis, toll receipts (other than amounts of toll receipts deposited into the Panama Canal Commission Dissolution Fund under section 1305) and all other receipts of the Commission. Except as provided in section 1303, no funds may be obligated or expended by the Commission in any fiscal year unless such obligation or expenditure has been specifically authorized by law.

''(2) No funds may be authorized for the use of the Commission, or obligated or expended by the Commission in any fiscal year, in excess of—

''(A) the amount of revenues deposited in the Panama Canal Revolving Fund and the Panama Canal Dissolution Fund during such fiscal year, plus

''(B) the amount of revenues deposited in the Panama Canal Revolving Fund before such fiscal year and remaining unobligated at the beginning of such fiscal year; plus

''(C) the $100,000,000 borrowing authority provided for in section 1304 of this Act.

Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to the Congress the amount of revenues deposited in the Panama Canal Revolving Fund during such fiscal year.

''(c) With the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Commission may deposit amounts in the Panama Canal Revolving Fund in any Federal Reserve bank, any depository for public funds, or such other place and in such manner as the Commission and the Secretary may agree.

''(d)(1) It is the sense of the Congress that the additional costs resulting from the implementation of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and related agreements should be kept to the absolute minimum level. To this end, the Congress declares appropriated costs of implementation to be borne by the taxpayers over the life of such Treaty should be kept to a level no greater than the March 1979 estimate of those costs ($870,700,000) presented to the Congress by the executive branch during consideration of this Act by the Congress, less personnel retirement costs of $205,000,000, which were subtracted and charged to tolls, therefore resulting in net taxpayer cost of approximately $665,700,000, plus appropriate adjustments for inflation.

''(2) It is further the sense of the Congress that the actual costs of implementation be consistent with the obligations of the United States to operate the Panama Canal safely and efficiently and keep it secure.''.

SEC. 3540. PRINTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I is amended in chapter 3 (22 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) by adding at the end of subchapter I the following new section:

''PRINTING

''SEC. 1306. (a) Section 501 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to direct purchase by the Commission for its use of printing, binding, and blank-book work in the Republic of Panama when the Commission determines that such direct purchase is in the best interest of the Government.

''(b) This section shall not affect the Commission's authority, under chapter 5 of title 44, United States Code, to operate a field printing plant.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1305 the following new item:

''Sec. 1306. Printing.''.

SEC. 3541. ACCOUNTING POLICIES.

Section 1311 (22 U.S.C. 3721), the first sentence in subsection (a) is amended to read as follows: ''The Commission shall establish and maintain its accounts in accordance with chapter 91 of title 31, United States Code, and the provisions of this chapter.''.

SEC. 3542. INTERAGENCY SERVICES; REIMBURSEMENTS.

Section 1321(e) (22 U.S.C. 3731(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following sentence:

''Notwithstanding section 5924 of title 5, United States Code, the Commission shall by regulation determine the extent to which costs of educational services may be defrayed under this subsection.''.

SEC. 3543. POSTAL SERVICE.

Section 1331 (22 U.S.C. 3741) is amended to read as follows:

''POSTAL SERVICE

''SEC. 1331. (a) The Commission shall take possession of and administer the funds of the Canal Zone postal service and shall assume its obligations.

''(b) Effective December 1, 1999, neither the Commission nor the United States Government shall be responsible for the distribution of any accumulated unpaid balances relating to Canal Zone postal-savings deposits, postal-savings certificates, and postal money orders.

''(c) Mail addressed to the Canal Zone from or through the continental United States may be routed by the United States Postal Service to the military post offices of the United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Panama. Such military post offices shall provide the required directory services and shall accept such mail to the extent permitted under the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and related agreements. The Commission shall furnish personnel, records, and other services to such military post offices to assure wherever appropriate the distribution, rerouting, or return of such mail.''.

SEC. 3544. INVESTIGATION OF ACCIDENTS OR INJURY GIVING RISE TO CLAIM.

Section 1417(1) (22 U.S.C. 3777(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) an investigation of the accident or injury giving rise to the claim has been completed, which shall include a hearing by the Board of Local Inspectors of the Commission; and''.

SEC. 3545. OPERATIONS REGULATIONS.

Section 1801 (22 U.S.C. 3811) is amended by striking ''President'' and inserting ''Commission''.

SEC. 3546. MISCELLANEOUS REPEALS.

(a) REPEALS.—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Section 1605 (22 U.S.C. 3795), relating to interim toll adjustment.

(2) Section 1701 (22 U.S.C. 3801), relating to the authority of the President to prescribe certain regulations.

(3) Section 1702 (22 U.S.C. 3802), relating to the authority of the Panama Canal Commission to prescribe certain regulations.

(4) Title II (22 U.S.C. 3841–3852), relating to the Treaty transition period.

(5) Chapter 1 of title III (22 U.S.C. 3861), relating to cemeteries.

(6) Section 1246, relating to appliances for certain injured employees.

(7) Section 1251, relating to leave for jury or witness service.

(8) Section 1301, relating to Canal Zone Government funds.

(9) Section 1313(c), relating to audits.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 1 is amended in the table of contents by striking each of the items relating to a title, chapter, or section repealed by subsection (a).

SEC. 3547. EXEMPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3302 is amended to read as follows:

''EXEMPTION

''SEC. 3302. The Commission is exempt from the provisions of subchapter II of chapter 6 of title 15, United States Code.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 3302 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 3302. Exemption.''.

SEC. 3548. MISCELLANEOUS CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

Title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 3401(1) by striking clause (v) and redesignating clauses (vi) through (viii) as clauses (v) through (vii), respectively;

(2) in section 5102(a)(1) by striking clause (vi) and redesignating clauses (vii) through (xi) as clauses (vi) through (ix), respectively;

(3) in section 5315 by striking ''Administrator of the Panama Canal Commission.'';

(4) in section 5342(a)(1) by striking subparagraph (G) and redesignating subparagraphs (H) through (L) as subparagraphs (G) through (K), respectively;

(5) in section 5343(a)(5) by striking ''the areas and installations'' and all that follows through ''Panama Canal Act of 1979),'';

(6) in section 5348—

(A) by striking subsection (b) and redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b); and

(B) in subsection (a) by striking ''subsections (b) and (c)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)'';

(7) in section 5373 by striking paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively;

(8) in section 5537(c) by striking ''the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands.'' and inserting ''the District Court of Guam and the District Court of the Virgin Islands.'';

(9) in section 5541(2)(xii)—

(A) by inserting ''or'' after ''Services Administration,''; and

(B) by striking '', or a vessel employee of the Panama Canal Commission'';

(10) in section 7901 by amending subsection (f) to read as follows:

''(f) The health programs conducted by the Tennessee Valley Authority are not affected by this section.'';

(11) in section 5102(c) by repealing paragraph (12);

(12) in section 5924(3) by striking the last sentence thereof; and

(13) in section 6322(a) by striking '', or the Republic of Panama''.

SEC. 3549. REPEAL OF PANAMA CANAL CODE.

Section 3303 (22 U.S.C. 3602 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) The Panama Canal Code is repealed effective on the date of the enactment of the Panama Canal Act Amendments of 1996.''.

SEC. 3550. MISCELLANEOUS CLERICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in section 1 is amended in the items relating to sections 1101, 1102a, 1102b, and 1313 by inserting ''Sec.'' before the section number.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1303 (22 U.S.C. 3713) is amended by striking ''section 1302(c)(1)'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 1302(b)(1)''.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are in order except amendments printed in House Report 104–570 and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 430.

Except as specified in section 4 of the resolution, the amendments shall be considered in the order printed, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

Unless otherwise specified in the report, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, and shall not be subject to amendment, except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment.

By virtue of notice given pursuant to section 4(c) of the resolution, amendments A–1 and A–2 of part A of the report will be considered after other amendments in part A of the report have been disposed of. Consideration of those amendments shall begin with an additional period of general debate, confined to the subject of cooperative threat reduction with the states of the former Soviet Union. That period of debate shall not exceed 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member.

It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on National Security or a designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report or germane modifications of any such amendment.

Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, except that modifications shall be reported, shall be debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The original proponent of an amendment included in amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before disposition of the amendments en bloc.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by the resolution and may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration of any amendment made in order by the resolution out of the order printed, but not sooner than 1 hour after the chairman of the Committee on National Security or a designee announces from the floor a request to that effect.

Pursuant to section 4(c) of the resolution, it is now in order to consider amendment No. A–3 printed in Part A of House Report 104–570.

AMENDMENT NO. A–3 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. DELAURO:

At the end of title VII (page 298, after line 24), insert the following new section:

SEC. . RESTORATION OF PRIOR POLICY REGARDING RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MEDICAL FACILITIES.

Section 1093 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out ''(a) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—''; and

(2) by striking out subsection (b).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] and a Member opposed, each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I offer this bipartisan amendment on behalf of myself, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Our amendment strikes language adopted in last year's defense bills that would prohibit privately funded abortions from being performed at overseas military hospitals. This amendment restores the right to choose for female military personnel and dependents and it ensures that they are not denied safe medical care simply because they are assigned to duties in another country.

I want to emphasize several points about our amendment. First, it simply restores the previous policy that allowed women to use their own funds, let me repeat that, their own funds to pay for abortions in overseas military hospitals.

Second, no medical providers will be forced to perform abortions. This amendment preserves the conscience clause that already exists in the military services.

Third, this is not a new policy. Privately funded abortions were allowed at overseas military facilities from 1973 to 1988, including all but a few months of the Reagan administration, and from 1993 to 1996.

I am a strong supporter of our Nation's defenses, and deeply regret that efforts to advance an extreme social agenda have jeopardized funding for important defense priorities. This amendment simply restores previous policy and assures that women who serve in the Armed Forces have access to safe medical care. I urge support for this amendment.

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, there were some statements prior to now, not by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] but prior to that, that said we should not be discussing abortion yet again on the House floor and that they did not want this in a defense bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is public law. Clinton signed this type of legislation on last year's defense authorization. It went through several appropriations committees and several conferences and he signed it into law and did not even gripe about it. He was busy griping about other things.

It undid one of his five, what the Pope has called, culture of death Executive orders on his first day in office after the inauguration—and then finding their desks the second day—on the 20th anniversary of the fraudulent Roe versus Wade decision based on a rape that never happened and an abortion that never happened, Clinton signed an Executive order allowing abortions in all military hospitals, overseas and domestic, and, yes, it was a Dornan amendment in last year's defense authorization that caused him with his own pen to undo his own order of death. It is a done deed.

So here comes an amendment from the minority on the floor to discuss something they claim they do not want to discuss. Well, then, why are we doing it?

Because there are three other social issues on the defense bill that this chairman of the Subcommittee on Personnel did put in the chairman's mark, going back to the George Washington through Reagan-Bush policy that homosexuality is incompatible with military service. That is in there. No vote in full committee. No vote on the House floor.

The HIV amendment with merciful honorable discharge and even more medical benefits is back again. This is something that America would want if they studied it. A vote where it was like 39 to 13 or 14 in committee. No vote on the House floor. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] announced today they will try and resolve that in star chamber, secret conference but this is not a continuing appropriations conference. This is going to be the type of authorization defense conference that it survived in three weekends of hand-to-hand sort of verbal combat over this.

But the biggest of all, no homosexual in the military, and the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] that they would not vote in full committee on no Hustler magazine on our PX's a facilitator to the tune of almost $20 billion of pushing this kind of pornography, no vote on the House floor on that. Again they think they are going to roll us in conference on this.

So it comes down to one social issue debate, a 40-minute long debate on something that is already public law. They know they are going to lose. They are going to lose by something like in the 230's to 240's to 190 something. Why will they suffer this loss? Because they think that it will widen the gender gap.

But, Mr. Chairman, everybody who is advancing this, with the exception of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], voted for what the Vatican called a brutal act of aggression, infanticide, the so-called partial-birth execution-Mafia-style attack to the base of the baby's brain when it is 80 percent out of the mother's body, that which has been condemned by Rev. Billy Graham to Clinton's face on May 1 of this year and then he alluded to it in his beautiful remarks of May 2 where he said, and I read from where I put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and his full remarks will be in the RECORD today—on the occasion of his getting the Gold Congressional Medal, he says, ''We are a society poised on the brink of self-destruction.''

Mr. Chairman, Mr. TORKILDSEN, everybody in this Chamber, Mr. DELLUMS, do you think the Pope was talking about minimum wage? Do you think Billy Graham is talking about minimum wage when he says we are poised on the brink of self-destruction? Is he talking about the B–2 bomber? Is he talking about a 4.3-cent tax on every gallon of gas? He is talking about the culture of death and the culture of degradation that we have imposed upon ourselves.

Thirty-three people that put Catholic in their bios voted for a brutal act of aggression on this House floor. Not the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN]. Not any Catholic who has the honor to put it in his biography on this side of the aisle. This abortion issue is wrecking our society. It is a brutal act of aggression against living human life with an immortal soul and not a single military doctor, male or female, has written to this chairman, not once, but I have had doctors write to me that we are to defend life in the military, we are here to keep our peace and provide for the common defense of our country, not to snuff out life in mother's wombs. That should not be a part of our defense budget and it is not, thanks to my amendment passing all the way through a star chamber appropriations process and an authorization process last year.

Mr. Chairman, I have more speakers than I can accommodate on our side. I will begin that line-up of speakers starting with Army doctors who are now serving on this side who watched this culture of death in the military and saw it happily ended finally at the end of the Reagan years and during the Bush years.

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

First of all let me just repeat, this simply restores previous policy allowing women to use their own funds. This was current law from 1973 through 1988, a full 7 years under the Reagan administration. Despite what the chairman would like to talk about in terms of new policy, this would restore us to what was current policy before the chairman introduced this into a defense authorization bill. No medical providers are forced to perform abortions. There is a conscience clause that already exists in the military services. This is about denying female members of the military and their dependents what their constitutional rights are in the United States.

If we were to follow what the chairman would like us to follow in doing, we would ask women who served in the military, who give of their time, their effort, their dedication to this Nation, to park their constitutional rights at the water's edge and go to foreign stations and perform their duty without safe and adequate health care and medical care.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN]. I am delighted to have his support on this issue.

□ 1830

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for taking the initiative on this issue and for offering this amendment.

I think the overall defense bill is basically a good bill. It includes things like $428 million more than President Clinton asked for for family housing. But there are some problems in the bill, as I mentioned earlier, and the provision that the woman's amendment seeks to address is one of them. We all understand, whether we agree or not, that safe and legal access to abortion is the law of the land. It is shameful that this Congress has denied thousands of servicewomen, spouses of servicemen, and dependents who serve overseas, the basic law of our country.

The previous Department of Defense policy did not contribute any taxpayer funds for abortion services, and that is important. Also, as has been mentioned, any military personnel could refuse to perform or participate in this procedure.

I am a supporter of the Hyde amendment and I agreed with that previous Department of Defense policy. This amendment before us will simply allow women to use their own funds, let me repeat that, to use their own funds if they personally choose to seek an abortion. It is nothing more and nothing less than that.

Mr. Chairman, let us stop the policy that treats our women in uniform like second class citizens. Let us support this amendment and return common sense in this one very personal area back to our defense policy.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I happily yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the beautiful State of Maryland, Mr. ROSCOE BARTLETT, a fellow grandfather of 10. He and I are in a dead heat here.

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my friend and fellow committee member, Ms. DELAURO. Last year, H.R. 1530, the defense authorization bill, returned us to the policy that stood during the Reagan-Bush years that prohibited abortions from being performed at military hospitals. Today's amendment would strike this section of existing law and restore the radical change to this policy by Bill Clinton when he became President.

Mr. Chairman, it boggles my mind that we are even here today debating such an amendment. The purpose of our military is to save lives, not to take them. Most military doctors believe this so strongly it is next to impossible to find a military doctor who will perform an abortion. But to get around this policy, the pro-abortion forces are attempting to bring civilians into military facilities, who they will pay large sums of money, to perform abortions. Most members of the military medical corps are so outraged by this procedure that they do not feel comfortable being on the same base where abortions are being performed.

Bill Clinton tried social experimentation with the military once before and lost. Let us not make a similar mistake. Let us save innocent life, not take it. Let us abort the DeLauro amendmenmt.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this, and I must say here comes the Congress acting as the moral policeman for our military people. You know, our military people cannot have the Constitution like everybody else. Oh, no, no, no. They are going to get the Congress. The Congress is going to tell them what to read, what to do, how to behave, everything.

But especially women. There is even in here they want to study women again. But if a woman is sent overseas and she is raped or if a woman is sent overseas and becomes seriously ill during her pregnancy, well, too bad. If she thinks she has a Constitution to protect her, no way. She has got the Congress saying she cannot even spend her own money in military installations overseas to deal with those kind of reproductive health programs. I think that is why there is a gender gap. This finger in your face to women constantly saying you may think you have rights, but none if you are in the military, we in the Congress are going to run your life 24 hours a day, that is what this amendment is about, treating them as second class citizens. And I think women are very tired of it.

We hear about the medical profession. As the gentlewoman from Connecticut has said over and over and over again, there is a conscience clause. No military person is ever forced to do something if it is against their conscience. But for crying out loud, why do you force women to check their constitutional rights, to say we totally surrender what you in Congress say we are going to have, and become second class citizens just for joining the military? This is wrong. Vote for the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, out of respect for my worthy adversary, Mrs. SCHROEDER, she opened by saying here we go again preaching for morality to the military, or something like that. You mean like Tailhook, PAT, where I joined you on that? Like your name on a filthy sign at the Top Cat Follies at the beer mart where I joined you in defense of that? You bet we are discussing morality.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my emphatic opposition to the DeLauro amendment. This amendment would establish the practices of elective abortions in our military facilities overseas. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a shame that we have to revisit this issue, since we have addressed it just this last February. In fact, the House has voted three times to prohibit abortions overseas in medical military facilities. Three times, Mr. Chairman. When it comes to this amendment's sponsors, what do you not understand, or what part of it do you not understand?

Mr. Chairman, we should not drag our service men and women into the abortion battle. Our military heroes need places of caring, healing, and strengthening. They need hospitals, not abortion clinics.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the honorable women who serve in the military need safe medical care, and they take care of this without any taxpayer expense. They pay $361 to the Office of the Treasury before any procedure. What we need to be concerned about is the health and safety of American women when they serve overseas.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the DeLauro amendment. When the 1996 Defense authorization bill became law, it banned privately funded abortion to U.S. military hospitals overseas, except in the case of rape or incest. The DeLauro amendment simply strikes this language.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that many of my colleagues disagree that a woman has a right to choose. I also understand many of my colleagues believe that Government funds should not be used to pay for abortions. But, Mr. Chairman, this is not a debate about abortion, and not a debate about Government subsidizing abortion. This is a debate about the safety of our soldiers in our armed services and their dependents.

The issue here is whether we are going to give a woman who is overseas, because we sent her there, her right to use a safe U.S. military medical facility. If a woman can freely use these facilities when she has the flu or appendicitis, why can she not go there for a legal procedure, particularly when she is using her own funds?

Now, the reality is, many of our women are stationed in countries where these medical procedures may be prohibited or where adequate medical facilities are not available. If we deny a woman adequate medical care on base, we may force her to an unsafe facility.

This ban does not make any sense. It makes a difficult decision even more difficult, and it needlessly risks the safety and health of women who are serving our country. I urge my colleagues to support the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier we have former Army doctors serving with us on this side, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], also an Army doctor.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, as was alluded to earlier, this is old ground we are going over today. This amendment has been defeated three times previously, and it is up again. I would urge all my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the DeLauro amendment.

I will say what I have said in the past. I am a former Army physician. I went into the military in 1981, and I can tell you that when I went in, we were very, very pleased with the Reagan administration policy banning abortions at military hospitals. The reason for that is because most doctors, even if they are pro-choice, most nurses, even if they are pro-choice, do not want to have anything to do with this procedure, because once you see it, you know exactly what it is. It is morally wrong to do it.

People go into the military because they want to defend their country. They do not want to be involved with this business. I think it is really wrong to be dragging our military into this debate.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD], who is a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, let me first in response to the gentleman's assertion that people do not want to have anything to do with this procedure remind the gentleman and remind the House that no one has to be involved in this procedure. We have drawn into the law the opportunity for people to opt out, for medical professionals not to be

involved in this procedure if they choose not to.

But I rise in support of our women in uniform serving overseas. This amendment allows women stationed overseas to obtain safe health care at military hospitals with their own money. If enacted, this amendment would reinstate Department of Defense policy that was in place from 1973 until 1988, and was reinstated in 1993, and then banned in last year's authorization bill.

Our military servicewomen and military dependents deserve protection from foreign back alleys by allowing safe, legal, and comprehensive reproductive services.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], one of our subcommittee chairmen.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the recent debate on legislation to ban partial-birth abortion was America's wake-up call on the inherent violence of abortion. Somehow, the euphemisms and attempts to sanitize the killing of unborn kids did not work as well that time as it has in the past.

Somehow, the seemingly benign, always self-assured pro-abortion lobby, including the folks at Planned Parenthood and NARAL, did not look so humane or caring as most in the Congress and a huge majority of American public reacted with shock, dismay and disgust when they learned that some abortionists were routinely delivering babies most of the way, only to stab the child in the back of the head with scissors and then suck the brains out of his or her head.

Most of us recognize child abuse when we see it, which brings me to the DeLauro amendment. When President Clinton issued an Executive order on January 22, 1993, to turn DOD health care facilities into abortion mills, every military obstetrician, nurse, and anesthesiologist refused to comply. In other words, they refused to destroy unborn babies.

That, Mr. Chairman, is moral courage. They, too, recognize child abuse when they see it, because the methods of abortion, the methods of extermination, are not really different from the violence used to kill a child in a partial-birth abortion.

In a suction abortion, Mr. Speaker, the so-called doctor cuts and dismembers the unborn baby with a loop shaped knife connected to a high powered suction device which is between 20 to 30 times more powerful than a household vacuum cleaner. Both the D&C abortion method and a D&E abortion also relies on dismemberment of the child's fragile little body. Limb by limb of an unborn baby, the neck, the torso, are all cut and dismembered—it's shocking and its child abuse.

In a saline abortion, a high concentration salt solution is injected into the baby's amniotic sack. The child breathes in that salt solution—the unborn child ''breathes'' amniotic fluid to develop his or her lungs—and the baby swallows it, and about 2 hours later the baby dies from the corrosive and toxic effects of the salt.

That is a child abuse, I say to my friends. The DeLauro amendment would facilitate the killing of unborn babies by dismemberment and by chemical poisoning.

I urge Members to vote down this misguided amendment, and keep the current law—the Dornan amendment—which allows abortions in military hospitals only in cases of rape, incest, or life of the mother.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, once again, no personnel has to perform the procedure, because there is a conscience clause that exists. Understand that the Constitution of the United States of America allows women the right to an abortion. There is no reason why women who serve in the military have to leave their constitutional rights behind when they are sent overseas to serve this country, and they do it valiantly, and that they are not allowed to have the proper and adequate and safe health care.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

□ 1845

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut and her cosponsors for the wisdom of this amendment.

There is no way, Mr. Chairman, that we could resolve this in an emotionally charged debate, which my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle are attempting to do. This is a fair and evenhanded amendment that simply restores the rights of our military women who are serving this country and dedicating their lives to our freedom, to secure a legal abortion. This is simply a plain and evenhanded manner in which to allow them to use their own funds to protect their bodies and to protect their health.

It is crucial, Mr. Chairman, that we allow those who are in this particular condition to be treated fairly, and to likewise be treated as fairly as we would want those civilians who are not in the United States military.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say to my colleagues who have decided to give us a very descriptive detailing of procedures that are not even included in this particular amendment, that they would do well to be fair to American military women. Give them the right of all women, the right to choose.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the DeLauro amendment. This amendment simply ensures that female military personnel and dependents stationed overseas can exercise the same constitutional right to choose that is available to all women in this country. In its present form the ban discriminates against women who have volunteered to serve their country by prohibiting them from exercising their legally protected right to choose simply because they are stationed overseas.

This ban may also cause a woman stationed overseas who is facing an unintended pregnancy to be forced to delay the procedure for several weeks until she can travel to a location where safe, adequate care is available. For each week an abortion is delayed, the risks to the women's health increases.

Furthermore, prohibiting women from using their own funds to obtain an abortion at overseas military facilities endangers their health. Women stationed overseas depend on their base hospitals for medical care, and are often situated in areas where local facilities are inadequate or unavailable. The current policy may force women facing pregnancy to seek out an illegal, unsafe abortion procedure.

The DeLauro amendment does not in any way, shape or form provide any Federal funds to pay for abortions. It is the patient, not the Federal Government, that would pay for the needed procedure.

Furthermore, this amendment will not force military doctors and health providers to perform abortions if it is in conflict with their beliefs.

This is not a new policy, it was in effect most of the Reagan administration. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing—vote for the DeLauro amendment and restore this reasonable and healthy policy.

Mr DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the D and C, the D and E, which are late-term dismemberment abortion methods, and the saline abortion method are routinely done in abortion mills in this country. There's nothing obscure about that, as suggested by the last speaker. If this language is approved, if the DeLauro amendment is approved, these methods of killing will begin in our military hospitals, turning them into abortion mills. That would be an outrage.

Let's not facilitate abortion. Vote 'no'' on the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. God forbid it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, JOHN HOSTETTLER.

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

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

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.

This amendment would obligate the United States to make sure abortion services and facilities are available at U.S. military bases.

It is the obligation that I believe the House soundly rejected last year on so many occasions, and for good reason we should reject it again.

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.

There is a subsidy, though it may be indirect, because everything in our military medical systems is taxpayer-

funded—from the doctor's and nurse's education and availability, to the electricity powering the facility's equipment, to the very building itself.

In addition, abortion 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.

I think that the core principle at issue today—whether the Government is obligated to provide a right—is a serious issue with significant ramifications.

Does the freedom of the press guaranteed by the first amendment obligate the Federal Government to provide every interested American with a printing press? 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.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, this was national policy between 1973 through 1988. There were no abortion mills. There was no picketing. This was what the law was in this country, and it resumed again in 1993 through 1996.

This is not a new policy. It goes back to what was policy under the Reagan administration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in the debate on the DeLauro amendment. I think this debate is really not about abortion. I think it is about our national security.

National security assumes that you will have personal security. Existing law puts women in uniform at risk with their own health care. This amendment corrects that injustice which prohibits these same women in uniform from access to health care when they are in service abroad, even if they use their own money.

Think about it. Women in uniform have pledged to uphold the Constitution of this country, which grants those women choice in these procedures. But because of existing misguided law, when they serve overseas it is taken away from them. We must not discriminate against women simply because they serve in the defense of our country.

I urge support of the DeLauro-Harman-Ward amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against the DeLauro amendment to the national defense authorization bill.

One of President Clinton's first actions was an executive order that ended the Reagan-Bush ban on abortions in military hospitals overseas.

As I said last year, so much for Mr. Clinton's promise to make abortion safe, legal and rare.

Mr. Chairman, there are profound differences on this issue—in this country, and in this body. I believe abortion is the taking of an innocent life. Others feel differently.

But who believes taxpayers should have to fund military operating facilities that deliver babies in one room and kill them in the next?

Why should military doctors, who sacrifice many productive and lucrative years to serve their country, be put in this position?

Proponents of this bill say doctors can decline to perform abortions—and I'm sure many will. But will that display of conscience hurt their careers? Perhaps.

Our military doctors nurses, and corpsmen did not join the armed services to become abortionists.

While our service men and women may have to take a life in the defense of our country—they should never have to take the life of an innocent baby.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the DeLauro amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], a sponsor of the bill.

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague and friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, [Ms. DELAURO] for her leadership on this issue and stand here once again in defense of a woman's right to choose.

I have always been and continue to be a strong supporter of a strong national defense and I believe that, on balance, this bill contributes to achieving that goal.

But I regret that in crafting it, the committee expended as much as half of its markup time and energies debating divisive social issues, access to abortions, the sale of adult publications and videotapes on military bases, and whether to discharge HIV-infected service personnel.

I believe that the disproportionate amount of time debating these provisions distracted the committee from the central debate on how best to address, with the limited resources available, the serious defense needs our Nation faces as we approach the 21st century. I fear that the house is now embarked on a similar course.

Mr. Chairman, women who volunteer to serve in our Armed Forces already give up many freedoms, forego privacy, and risk their lives to defend our country. They should not have to sacrifice their privacy, their careers, their health, and perhaps even their lives to a policy with no valid military purpose.

Often times, local facilities are not equipped to handle a procedure or medical standards much worse than those in the United States. We are putting some of our own at risk. Even where safe abortions are available in the local economy, a servicewoman needs a leave from duty. The process of obtaining permission to seek nonmilitary medical care grossly violates normal boundaries of medical privacy. She must inform her immediate supervisor and others in the chain of command.

A combination of military regulations and practical hurdles mean that a pregnant servicewoman who needs an abortion may face lengthy travel, serious delays, high expenses, substandard medical options, restricted information, compromised privacy, and career consequences.

This constitutes an undue burden on the woman's right to choose. In Planned Parenthood versus Casey, judges used the term undue burden to analyze what kinds of Government restrictions on abortion improperly interfere with a woman's exercise of her right to choose. The judges defined undue burden as having the purpose or effect of placing a substantial obstacle in the path of a woman seeking an abortion. *Casey*, 505 U.S. at 877. Barring medical military facilities from these procedures definitely places a substantial obstacle in the way of the servicewoman.

To unnecessarily jeopardize readiness in potentially hostile overseas engagements in order to return a servicewoman to the United States, or to force a woman who chooses to bravely serve her country and defend American interests to carry an unintended pregnancy to term, is irrational if not cruel.

This is bad policy—and likely unconstitutional law—and ought to be repealed.

Support the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, it is not provision, it is law, and I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CLIFF STEARNS, who says he can get the truth done in half a minute.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening in strong opposition to the DeLauro-Harman-Ward amendment.

Let me pose this question for the citizens that are watching on television and let me pose this question to the people here in the Chamber. Do we want to be a facilitator for abortions at taxpayers' expense at our military hospitals? That is what the whole question is. Do we want to be facilitators or do we not?

I think the question is that over there, they want to facilitate abortions at taxpayers' expense in military hospitals and the majority of people on this side do not agree. It is that simple.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would apprise the gentleman and other speakers that they are to address the Chair and not the television audience.

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

American women should not have to check their reproductive rights at the door once they enlist in the U.S. military. This amendment would simply allow U.S. servicewomen to spend their own money should they require an abortion.

Thousands of our servicewomen are stationed in countries like Saudi Arabia where abortions are illegal. This leaves them no choice but to have their abortions performed at a U.S. military facility. Why should our servicewomen have their bodies governed by Saudi law and not American law?

If men were the ones getting pregnant, Mr. Chairman, I am certain none of us would even be here right now. We need to pass the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. TODD TIAHRT, a valuable member of my subcommittee.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment. The amendment requires the American people to subsidize facilities for the taking of life of the most helpless among us, the unborn child. Most of the American people do not want to go out of their way to ensure a preborn child is killed, let alone paying for the medical facility in which the abortion is committed.

Our views often do not agree on this issue, but one thing the vast majority do agree on, and that is they do not want their tax dollars going to fund abortions. The Reagan and Bush administrations did not allow abortions in overseas hospitals, Congress has voted three times to prohibit it, once in the DOD appropriations bill and twice in the national security appropriations bill.

I urge my colleagues to once again vote no on the DeLauro amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

There is no taxpayer money involved in this. The women pay for the services themselves. This was law under 7 years of the Reagan administration. This is not new policy. It goes back to what was current policy in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, we must not deny our servicewomen their legal rights when they leave the U.S. soil. The current ban on abortions in military hospitals makes military women second class citizens.

Now, whether we like it or not, abortion is legal. Roe versus Wade is the law of the land, and all women have the right to access a safe abortion, and that includes military women.

For the health and safety of our servicewomen, I urge support for the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to clear up a point here.

Every person who has spoken today, except one, voted for Mafia execution-style assault to the base of the brain so-called partial birth infanticide. So I do not mind telling my colleagues what they are not telling them today, and that is that military hospitals are federally funded. Everything in there from the electricity to the equipment is taxpayer financed.

And, Mr. Chairman, when Clinton ordered the military in 1993 to make abortions available, the Pentagon started looking into hiring civilian abortionists to perform the killing procedure, which means the Clinton administration, a pro abortion, on demand for any reason or no reason at all administration, actually planned on hiring new personnel at our taxpayer expense.

Those are the facts, Jack, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from San Diego, CA, Mr. DUNCAN HUNTER.

□ 1900

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the most important points that has been made in this debate was the statement by Mr. WELDON, who was a military doctor, to the effect that having the abortions in military hospitals was demoralizing. It was demoralizing to the nurses. It was demoralizing to the doctors. And I would say even if we bring in outside doctors, introducing the specter of abortion in military hospitals is going to demoralize the military.

Every great general has talked about the importance of military morale and being fair to soldiers, allowing them to have their own moral code and moral culture. If the gentlewoman says, and I heard her say that stopping abortion is not militarily relevant, I would simply answer to her that abortion itself is not militarily relevant. If we have abortions at the sacrifice of morale, then we have done an injustice to the fighting man. We have done an injustice to the military system.

I hope that my colleagues would vote against this amendment.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the DeLauro amendment and commend the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] for her leadership and courage in bringing this amendment to the floor.

I am pleased to join a long line of women Members of Congress for this amendment to strike the prohibition prohibiting the honorable women serving overseas from using their own funds, I repeat, their own funds to obtain full reproductive rights at military medical facilities, full reproductive services.

Mr. Chairman, addressing the concern expressed by our colleague about the morale in the armed services, what about the morale of the women in the armed services? There was no lessening of morale from 1973 to 1988, when this very policy was in effect. There was no lessening of morale, lowering of morale from 1993 to 1996, when this same policy was in effect.

Mr. Chairman, when a woman chooses to serve her country, she volunteers to risk her life for her country. Her bravery should not be met by a danger to her health and a violation of her constitutional rights.

I urge our colleagues to support the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute and 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out again that, if those on our side had failed last year to make this public law—I wish I had the line and verse where it is public law—and the Congress had not changed the leadership on November 8, 1994, and we are trying to ban partial birth execution style infanticide in military hospitals, the same players would be on the floor with the exception of one who has spoken so far making that case of brutal act of aggression, what Billy Graham said causes us to be poised on the brink of self-destruction, which he told Clinton in the Oval Office on May 1.

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

Mr. DORNAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, what is the gentleman suggesting? I believe in this body we all respect each other's opinions, and we all respect our rights to have differing opinions. Is the gentleman questioning the morality of Members of Congress?

Mr. DORNAN. No, Mr. Chairman. What I am suggesting is that we crossed the Rubicon into infanticide, as Billy Graham suggests, Mother Teresa, the Pope, great bishops of the Protestant faith and every single Catholic bishop. We now have a new issue on this floor, Mafia style execution abortion of a living child.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 second to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, just to respond briefly to my friend, the gentlelady from California. Ms. PELOSI's argument is that prolifers who assert that abortion is morally wrong are trying to set themselves up as being morally superior. Her argument has surface appeal, and is a very nice ploy and distraction, but it does not carry any weight and misses the mark completely.

I believe that our position, not me personally but our position, in favor of defending innocent lives from dismemberment, chemical poisoning and

other brutal, violent methods employed by the abortionists is right and moral and I make absolutely no apologies for that.

I judge no one. I look at the deed—killing babies—and make judgments about the deed and whether this Congress should facilitate this unethical deed.

Ms. PELOSI. Is the gentleman questioning the morality of those who disagree with him?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. On this issue, I question the morality of your position to facilitate the killing of unborn babies.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield I minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the DeLauro amendment, which would restore the guarantee that women serving in our Armed Forces can exercise their full range of constitutionally protected rights.

This amendment is not about using U.S. taxpayers dollars to finance abortion. Rather, it is an effort to assure that servicewomen based in countries that do not allow abortion will be able to access the medical facilities which we provide for them to attend to their own medical needs as they see fit. Even if women are serving in developing countries where abortion is legal, they are not likely to find the same high standards of cleanliness, safety, and medical expertise available at a U.S. facility.

The DeLauro amendment would simply allow servicewomen to obtain the same range of health services at those facilities that they can now obtain at home. This is not a complicated issue. The amendment would assure that women of our Armed Forces that they need not sacrifice their constitutional rights in order to serve their country. It would also assure our military men that their spouses would retain their full rights.

I urge members to support the DeLauro amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, both before and after the dreaded and horrific Dred Scott decision, it was constitutional law in this country to steal people's whole lives and keep them in chains. It was called slavery. In Nazi Germany, it was legal to slaughter men, women, and children according to their religious heritage.

There are things that are legal in this country that are tearing us apart and bringing us, to quote Dr. Graham again, to the brink of self-destruction.

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

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time, and I rise in strong support of the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what we have before us today is yet another attempt to repeal choice, procedure by procedure. The new Republican majority has passed 17 separate antichoice pieces of legislation, chipping away at a woman's right to choose. Today the radical right wants to deny U.S. servicewomen serving overseas the same freedoms they enjoy in the United States: The freedom to pay out of their own pockets to have an abortion. In other words, American servicewomen are overseas protecting our freedom while Congress is busy at home repealing their freedom and constitutional right to have choice.

Enough is enough. Support the DeLauro amendment.

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

My staff has helped me, for those who follow these proceedings, Mr. Chairman, tell the world and the whole country, sea to shining sea, it is number 10 U.S. Code, 1093B. That is Public Law 104–106. It is law.

If I am an extremist, so are most of the bishops in this country, all the Catholic bishops, Mother Teresa, the Pope, and Billy Graham.

Why did everybody on that side of the aisle who maintains this is extremism vote the gold Congressional Medal to Billy Graham, who says this issue is one of many that brings us to the edge of self-destruction?

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

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the DeLauro-Harman amendment and all women who want to exercise their constitutional right to choose. American women are simply sick and tired of men who want to control our bodies, including the Catholic bishops. Our military women are not second-class citizens who can be denied the right to pay for their own abortions.

Mr. Chairman, these women serve our country. It is hypocritical to ask them to defend our Nation but restrict their rights while they are doing it. A military woman may find herself in a position of having no other medical facility available except our own military hospital. If she is willing to pay for abortion services, they certainly should be made available. I know of no medical services that are denied to men. Support the DeLauro amendment. Servicewomen stationed overseas must have the same access to abortion services as do women in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California, [Mr. DORNAN] has 15 seconds remaining and has the right to close, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the DeLauro-Torkildsen-Ward-Harman amendment. This amendment does not impact or require the use of State funds. What this amendment does is put 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 at 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.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to support the DeLauro amendment.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the DeLauro-Harman amendment. I am proud of the women who serve as members of our Nation's military service. Enough is enough. Women in service who do a job for our Nation should be given the opportunity to receive the same legal, medical services as women at home.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the DeLauro-Harman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has 15 seconds remaining for the purpose of closing the debate.

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

Mr. Chairman, just in one service, almost 1,300 women became pregnant during Desert Storm or Desert Shield. They were all sent home to either give birth or kill the fetus inside of them. There was no problem there, no one was put at medical risk.

I urge my colleagues to once again join me in opposition to taxpayer-financed, funded abortions.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the DeLauro amendment. At the outset, let me read what I perceive to be an important legal memorandum: Government regulation of abortion may not constitute an undue burden on the right to choose abortion. The joint opinion in Planned Parenthood versus Casey, adjudicated in 1992, defines an undue burden as having the purpose or effect of placing a substantial obstacle in the path of a woman seeking an abortion. For a law to pass muster, it must have a valid purpose, one not designed to strike at the right itself. It also must not impose a serious barrier to access.

Mr. Chairman, closing military medical facilities to abortion clearly places a substantial obstacle in the path of a servicewoman who needs this procedure. A combination of military regulations and practical hurdles means that a pregnant servicewoman who needs an abortion may now face

lengthy travel, serious delays, high expenses, substandard medical options, restricted information, compromised privacy, career consequences, and an almost complete absence of free choice throughout her decisionmaking process.

Given these circumstances, the facilities ban unconstitutionally burdens the right to choose of American servicewomen.

What I believe this says, Mr. Chairman, beyond the obvious constitutional implications, is that, while the matter that triggers this debate is one of abortion, it is this gentleman's opinion that this is not about abortion. This is an issue of simple fairness.

Mr. Chairman, as I said last year, we applaud women who go into service. We applaud their patriotism. We applaud their courage. We applaud their service to this country.

□ 1915

But when it comes down to their rights and prerogatives, they then become second class citizens.

I think there is something contradictory and hypocritical, unconstitutional and unfair about that. This is an issue of fairness, not about abortions; make no mistake about that. Members have many platforms to debate and to discuss this issue. But the few times we come here to discuss the matter of fairness, we ought to discuss the matter of fairness.

I hope my colleagues will vote in favor of the DeLauro amendment on the basis of fairness and the basis of integrity and applaud the servicewomen who serve this country with great brilliance and great courage.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on National Security for yielding. Let me just say to my colleagues in closing that I want to emphasize that this amendment is not about public funding, nor is it about special treatment. As the ranking member has said, this is a matter of simple fairness. It is about preserving the right to choose and save health care for American military women, women who are far from home, far from their families and who sacrifice, sacrifice their lives every single day, for the United States of America. They are protected under the Constitution of the United States, and if they were to serve their time in this country the right to choose would be protected.

We have said to them, ''We will send you overseas. Fight for the United States, for its freedom and its democracy,'' and yet we would take that freedom and democracy away from them. We ask them to leave their constitutional rights at the border. It is wrong. It is about upholding the Constitution, and it is letting military women and their dependents maintain those rights. It is about fairness for military women.

I urge the support of this amendment, and I would just say to my colleagues this is antiwomen. Make no mistake about what is being done here. We have an obligation and we have a commitment to those who serve on our behalf, men and women. Do not deny women in this country their constitutional rights because they want to serve and they willingly serve on our behalf.

This is at their own expense. There is a conscience clause. No doctor, no nurse has to provide this kind of a service. The women pay for it themselves. We have made sure that not a dime of taxpayers' money is being spent on their behalf. They make their checks out to the U.S. Treasury.

Let us protect women's rights, let us make sure they have safe and healthy health care when they are abroad.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I have the vote on the DeLauro amendment last year when she was beaten 230 to 196, and this amendment became, my amendment became, public law to protect human life. The vote was 230 to 196. We know it is not going to change much. I know we are engaging in Presidential politics here, trying to widen the gender gap. But I think that if people will listen to a repeat of my former remarks that I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, which answers all of the taxpayer funding provisions, all of the safety provisions for women getting military air transport to come home and do what they will, it solves all of those problems.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN].

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one point.

I have talked to hundreds of military doctors, and the fact is they do not care to perform abortions, they do not want to perform abortions. This is the practice today, that we do not do this in military hospitals. Military physicians do not wish to perform this procedure, and so it should be stopped there. People who perform abortions in this country do it because they so want to, and physicians as a group, the military physicians, have chosen not to perform this procedure.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I will not use all of my 2 minutes. I would like to yield again to one of the many Republican women from the freshman class on this side to make a very brief point. But first I want to read in slight detail Dr. Billy Graham's words in the rotunda when by a unanimous vote he got the Gold Medal of Freedom from Congress. He says:

> Tensions threaten to rip apart our cities and neighborhoods. Crime and violence is of epidemic proportions in most of our cities among the young. Children take weapons to school. Broken families, poverty, drugs, teenage pregnancy, corruption; the list is almost endless.

Would the first recipients of the congressional award and he referred to George Washington in his opening, even recognize our society that they sacrificed to establish? Doctor Graham says:

> I fear not. We have confused liberty with license, and we are paying the awful price. We are a society poised on the brink of self destruction.

The culture of death involving abortion, Mr. chairman, is why this country is unraveling.

Mr. SPENCE. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In response to a comment made by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], I just wanted to say that this issue is not an issue that is antiwoman. I am a freshman woman, and I want the RECORD to show that this is not an antiwoman issue. This issue is plain and simple. This is an issue that asks the question do we want Federal taxpayers' money paying for abortions in military hospitals overseas?

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment poses a question of single justice and decency for the members of this House: should the women in our armed forces, who willing place their lives on the line to defend our freedom be entitled to the same rights as everyone else?

These women are not asking for any special privileges, or for publicly funded abortions. All they seek is the right to use their own personal money, and receive medical services which are the constitutionally protected right of every American woman.

Now I know that this is an election year.

I know that some of our colleagues need to do a little grandstanding for the extremist right.

I know that American service women are not a potent voting or fundraising bloc.

But for all the loud rhetoric we hear from the self-styled patriots day after day on this floor, you would think a little respect, and a little decency, might creep into their actions.

Honor our women in uniform with more than just rhetoric. Leave politics at the door just this once. Support the DeLauro amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind this Congress that the Constitution applies to all Americans, including women in the Armed Forces.

But, current law prohibits women in the armed services from paying for abortions in military hospitals. This is an assault on the spirit of Roe. Plain and simple.

Roe versus Wade is the law of the land. In spite of that, military policy states that if you

are a woman, and you need an abortion, but happen to serve our country in the military overseas—tough luck.

To all my colleagues, regardless of your position on choice, ask yourself a question. What would you want for your daughter, or your sister, or your wife? If she were stationed overseas, wouldn't you want her to go to the hospital of her choice? Wouldn't you want her to go to an American military hospital?

Vote yes on the DeLauro amendment, and cast a vote for women in the military.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the DeLauro, Torkildsen, Harman, and Ward amendment to the Defense Department authorization fiscal year 1997 that would reinstate the rights of American citizens to make decisions about their personal and reproductive health when they are overseas and to otherwise receive their medical care at a U.S. military medical facility.

This amendment will correct a provision inserted in the Defense Department authorization fiscal year 1996 by the radically conservative Republicans that prohibited U.S. military facilities overseas from performing certain medical procedures for servicewomen or a female military dependent. Even if these U.S. citizens would pay for the procedure out of their own pocket, military doctors were prevented from assisting these women in receiving the same medical care and attention that they would be entitled to by law if they were in the United States.

This amendment will only permit the use of private funds by the U.S. citizen in exercising her rights to determine her own health choices. All costs to the Federal Government for use of the facilities will be compensated. No medical provider will be forced to perform abortions. This amendment restores previous DOD policy. This amendment protects military servicewomen and military dependents from foreign back alleys by allowing safe, legal, and comprehensive health services to be provided by U.S. medical personnel in U.S. facilities.

This is a bipartisan amendment to protect U.S. citizens overseas. I urge my colleagues to support the DeLauro amendment.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am constantly appalled by the discrimination that women veterans experience. This issue is just another example of how women are treated differently than men. There is never a discussion of cost for health care for men, but only for women. When it's women we're talking about we get all kinds of attention and charts, and so forth.

The military is not the appropriate place for this Congress to play moral policeman. Let's leave these women alone. Let's, instead, focus the debate on military readiness—and the best way to prepare the military to protect and defend our Nation.

Let's put fairness back in the system. Let's treat men and women the same. I urge my colleagues to support the DeLauro amendment.

This bill contains a provision to continue the practice of restricting a woman's access to a safe abortion while she is stationed at an overseas military facility. I believe that this is wrong.

In 1993, President Clinton signed an Executive order declaring that a woman who was stationed overseas could obtain an abortion if she paid for it privately. With the recently enacted fiscal year 1996 Defense bill, this Congress overturned the President's Executive order. This bill continues the same wrongheaded rule. Congresswoman DELAURO will offer an amendment to overturn this provision, so that the law reflects the President's Executive order.

The military is not the appropriate place for this Congress to play moral policeman. Let's leave these women alone. Let's, instead, focus the debate on military readiness—and the best way to prepare the military to protect and defend our Nation.

The potential danger in requiring a long wait for a woman to return to the United States to receive medical care may adversely affect our readiness. If a woman wants to use private funds to pay for an abortion, it is our responsibility to ensure that she can get a safe one at a military facility.

The bottom line is very clear: Prohibiting a woman from obtaining an abortion if she is stationed overseas will not improve military readiness.

I support women having the ability to exercise their constitutional right to have an abortion while serving in the military overseas. Especially if she is willing to use her own private money. It is the right thing to do. It was the Clinton administration policy. It was the Reagan administration policy. It made sense then. It makes sense now. I urge my colleagues to support the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the DeLauro amendment.

It is my hope that today with the support of my colleagues we will continue to show our support for the Reagan-Bush policy, reinstated last year, prohibiting the performance of abortions at overseas U.S. military medical facilities, except when the life of the mother is in danger. I strongly oppose spending my fellow citizens tax dollars on abortions in the United States and cannot see sending their money to military medical facilities across the world that perform abortions.

Ms. DELAURO claims no Federal money is involved because the abortion procedure is paid for by the woman. She must realize, however, that the military hospitals that perform abortions are federally funded and procedures at these facilities are subsidized by the U.S. Government with our tax dollars. I strongly oppose the DeLauro amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Over the past few years military doctors stationed at these overseas facilities have been forced to perform abortions no matter what their personal beliefs may be. No one should be coerced into doing something as unethical and immoral as taking the life of an unborn child, especially a military doctor whose purpose and duty is to preserve life. I do not believe U.S. taxpayers should be coerced into subsidizing abortions both in this country or in its military medical facilities overseas. I urge my colleagues to support the Dornan amendment, and oppose the DeLauro substitute.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 225, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

AYES—192

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

NOES—225

Allard	Bonilla	Coble
Archer	Borski	Coburn
Armey	Browder	Collins (GA)
Bachus	Brownback	Combest
Baker (CA)	Bryant (TN)	Cooley
Baker (LA)	Bunn	Costello
Ballenger	Bunning	Cox
Barcia	Burr	Crane
Barr	Burton	Crapo
Barrett (NE)	Buyer	Cremeans
Bartlett	Callahan	Cubin
Barton	Calvert	Cunningham
Bateman	Camp	Danner
Bereuter	Canady	Davis
Bevill	Chabot	Deal
Bilbray	Chambliss	DeLay
Bilirakis	Chenoweth	Diaz-Balart
Bliley	Christensen	Dickey
Blute	Chrysler	Doolittle
Boehner	Clinger	Dornan

Doyle	Kingston	Rahall
Dreier	Kleczka	Regula
Duncan	Klink	Roberts
Ehlers	Knollenberg	Roemer
Emerson	LaFalce	Rogers
English	LaHood	Rohrabacher
Ensign	Largent	Ros-Lehtinen
Everett	Latham	Roth
Ewing	LaTourette	Royce
Fields (TX)	Lazio	Salmon
Flanagan	Lewis (CA)	Sanford
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Saxton
Fox	Lightfoot	Scarborough
Frisa	Linder	Schaefer
Funderburk	Lipinski	Seastrand
Gallegly	Livingston	Sensenbrenner
Ganske	LoBiondo	Shadegg
Gekas	Lucas	Shuster
Gillmor	Manton	Skeen
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Skelton
Goodling	Mascara	Smith (MI)
Goss	McCollum	Smith (NJ)
Graham	McCrery	Smith (TX)
Greene (UT)	McDade	Smith (WA)
Gunderson	McHugh	Solomon
Gutknecht	McIntosh	Souder
Hall (OH)	McKeon	Spence
Hall (TX)	McNulty	Stearns
Hamilton	Metcalf	Stenholm
Hancock	Mica	Stockman
Hansen	Moakley	Stump
Hastert	Montgomery	Stupak
Hastings (WA)	Moorhead	Talent
Hayworth	Murtha	Tate
Hefley	Myers	Tauzin
Heineman	Myrick	Taylor (MS)
Herger	Neal	Taylor (NC)
Hilleary	Nethercutt	Tejeda
Hobson	Neumann	Thornberry
Hoekstra	Ney	Tiahrt
Hoke	Norwood	Upton
Hostettler	Nussle	Volkmer
Hunter	Ortiz	Vucanovich
Hutchinson	Orton	Walker
Hyde	Oxley	Walsh
Inglis	Packard	Wamp
Istook	Parker	Watts (OK)
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)	Weldon (FL)
Jones	Petri	Weldon (PA)
Kanjorski	Pombo	Weller
Kaptur	Portman	Whitfield
Kasich	Poshard	Wicker
Kildee	Quillen	Wolf
Kim	Quinn	Young (AK)
King	Radanovich	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

de la Garza	Mollohan	Shaw
Hayes	Oberstar	Thornton
Holden	Paxon	Towns
Laughlin	Pryce	Zimmer
Lincoln	Riggs	
Molinari	Serrano	

☐ 1943

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Ms. Pryce for, with Mr. Riggs against.

Mr. Serrano for, with Mr. Paxon against.

Mr. ENSIGN and Mr. ORTIZ changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

☐ 1945

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 104–570.

Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] wish to offer amendment No. 4?

If not, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of the report.

Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] wish to offer amendment No. 5?

If not, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of the report.

AMENDMENT NO. A–6 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. SHAYS. 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. SHAYS:

At the end of title X (page 359, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. . DEFENSE BURDENSHARING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Although the Cold War has ended, the United States continues to spend billions of dollars to promote regional security and to make preparations for regional contingencies.

(2) United States defense expenditures primarily promote United States national security interests; however, they also significantly contribute to the defense of our allies.

(3) In 1993, the gross domestic product of the United States equaled $6,300,000,000,000, while the gross domestic product of other NATO member countries totaled $7,200,000,000,000.

(4) Over the course of 1993, the United States spent 4.7 percent of its gross domestic product on defense, while other NATO members collectively spent 2.5 percent of their gross domestic product on defense.

(5) In addition to military spending, foreign assistance plays a vital role in the establishment and maintenance of stability in other nations and in implementing the United States national security strategy.

(6) This assistance has often prevented the outbreak of conflicts which otherwise would have required costly military interventions by the United States and our allies.

(7) From 1990–1993, the United States spent $59,000,000,000 in foreign assistance, a sum which represents an amount greater than any other nation in the world.

(8) In 1995, the United States spent over $10,000,000,000 to promote European security, while European NATO nations only contributed $2,000,000,000 toward this effort.

(9) With a smaller gross domestic product and a larger defense budget than its European NATO allies, the Untied States shoulders an unfair share of the burden of the common defense.

(10) Because of this unfair burden, the Congress previously voted to require United States allies to bear a greater share of the costs incurred for keeping United States military forces permanently assigned in their countries.

(11) As a result of this action, for example, Japan now pays over 75 percent of the nonpersonnel costs incurred by United States military forces permanently assigned there, while our European allies pay for less than 25 percent of these same costs. Japan signed a new Special Measures Agreement this year which will increase Japan's contribution toward the cost of stationing United States troops in Japan by approximately $30,000,000 a year over the next five years.

(12) These increased contributions help to rectify the imbalance in the burden shouldered by the United States for the common defense.

(13) The relative share of the burden of the common defense still falls too heavily on the United States, and our allies should dedicated more of their own resources to defending themselves.

(b) EFFORTS TO INCREASE ALLIED BURDENSHARING.—The President shall seek to have each nation that has cooperative military relations with the United States (including security agreements, basing arrangements, or mutual participation in multinational military organizations or operations) take one or more of the following actions:

(1) For any nation in which United States military personnel are assigned to permanent duty ashore, increase its financial contributions to the payment of the nonpersonal costs incurred by the United States Government for stationing United States military personnel in that nation, with a goal of achieving the following percentages of such costs:

(A) By September 30, 1997, 37.5 percent.

(B) By September 30, 1998, 50 percent.

(C) By September 30, 1999, 62.5 percent.

(D) By September 30, 2000, 75 percent.

An increase in financial contributions by any nation under this paragraph may include the elimination of taxes, fees, or other charges levied on United States military personnel, equipment, or facilities stationed in that nation.

(2) Increase its annual budgetary outlays for national defense as a percentage of its gross domestic product by 10 percent or at least to a level commensurate to that of the United States by September 30, 1997.

(3) Increase its annual budgetary outlays for foreign assistance (to promote democratization, economic stabilization, transparency arrangements, defense economic conversion, respect for the rule of law, and internationally recognized human rights) by 10 percent or at least to a level commensurate to that of the United States by September 30, 1997.

(4) Increase the amount of military assets (including personnel, equipment logistics, support and other resources) that it contributes, or would be prepared to contribute, to multinational military activities worldwide, including United Nations or regional peace operations.

(c) AUTHORITIES TO ENCOURAGE ACTIONS BY UNITED STATES ALLIES.—In seeking the actions described in subsection (b) with respect to any nation, or in response to a failure by any nation to undertake one or more of such actions, the President may take any of the following measures:

(1) Reduce the end strength level of members of the Armed Forces assigned to permanent duty ashore in that nation.

(2) Impose on that nation taxes, fees, or other charges similar to those that such nation imposes on United States forces stationed in that nation.

(3) Reduce (through rescission, impoundment, or other appropriate procedures as authorized by law) the amount the United States contributes to the NATO Civil Budget, Military Budget, or Security Investment Program.

(4) Suspend, modify, or terminate any bilateral security agreement the United States has with that nation.

(5) Reduce (through rescission, impoundment or other appropriate procedures as authorized by law) any United States bilateral assistance appropriated for that nation.

(6) Take any other action the President determines to be appropriate as authorized by law.

(d) REPORT ON PROGRESS IN INCREASING ALLIED BURDENSHARING.—Not later than March 1, 1997, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) steps taken by other nations to complete the actions described in subsection (b);

(2) all measures taken by the President, including those authorized in subsection (c), to achieve the actions described in subsection (b); and

(3) the budgetary savings to the United States that are expected to accrue as a result of the steps described under paragraph (1).

(e) REPORT ON NATIONAL SECURITY BASES FOR FORWARD DEPLOYMENT AND

BURDENSHARING RELATIONSHIPS.—(1) In order to ensure the best allocation of budgetary resources, the President shall undertake a review of the status of elements of the United States Armed Forces that are permanently stationed outside the United States. The review shall include an assessment of the following:

(A) The alliance requirements that are to be found in agreements between the United States and other countries.

(B) The national security interests that support permanently stationing elements of the United States Armed Forces outside the United States.

(C) The stationing costs associated with the forward deployment of elements of the United States Armed Forces.

(D) The alternatives available to forward deployment (such as material prepositioning, enhanced airlift and sealift, or joint training operations—to meet such alliance requirements or national security interests, with such alternatives identified and described in detail.

(E) The costs and force structure configurations associated with such alternatives to forward deployment.

(F) The financial contributions that allies of the United States make to common defense efforts (to promote democratization, economic stabilization, transparency arrangements, defense economic conversion, respect for the rule of law, and internationally recognized human rights).

(G) The contributions that allies of the United States make to meeting the stationing costs associated with the forward deployment of elements of the United States Armed Forces.

(H) The annual expenditures of the United States and its allies on national defense, and the relative percentages of each nation's gross domestic product constituted by those expenditures.

(2) The President shall submit to Congress a report on the review under paragraph (1). The report shall be submitted not later than March 1, 1997, in classified and unclassified form.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and a Member opposed will each control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield half my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to briefly describe this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of a number of colleagues on both sides of the aisle. This is an amendment designed to encourage the administration to ask our allies in Europe to pay more of the nonsalaried costs of our troops in Europe. Presently we have 116,000 troops in Europe. The nonpersonnel cost is $8.3 billion. Our allies contribute about $2 billion in in-kind and cash, but their cash contribution is $46 million. In contrast, we have 45,000 troops in Japan. The total nonpersonnel cost is $5.8 billion. The contribution of the Japanese is $4.6 billion.

In Europe our allies contribute $2 billion to an $8 billion cost. In Japan our allies contribute $4.6 billion out of a $5.8 billion cost. In cash contributions to the United States from Japan, we receive $3.8 billion. Our European allies contribute $46 million in cash contribution.

An amendment similar to this passed the House last year, 273–156. The year before it passed 268–144. It has clear support in the House but has not passed the Senate and has not been in a conference report.

This is an attempt to take the considerations of our colleagues in the Senate and have an amendment we think that they also can support. It would not reduce the number of troops in Europe but would enable the President to allow for four different types of assistance on the part of the Europeans, that they contribute more, and more to the indirect costs of our troops in Europe, that if they cannot do that, increase their own defense spending or their own foreign aid assistance or their own military contributions to other countries but bear a bigger burden of sharing the cost of defending the free world, and it gives the President four basic options. One is to reduce the level of troops but not require a reduction in the number of troops.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will control 15 minutes.

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

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment offered by my colleagues. I commend them for their efforts to address many of the concerns that have been voiced over previous formulations on this issue, and for coming forward for what is clearly a better provision than those offered in the past.

But, however well intentioned, these provisions still suffer from the basic problems of previous amendments. This amendment is still based on a fundamental misunderstanding of America's alliances and their purpose, which is to advance our own security interests. Also, the amendment reflects a skewed perspective on the relative value between humanitarian, peacekeeping, and foreign assistance contributions and military coalition efforts. Finally, it still resorts to the use of legislated statistical formulas as the principal measure of the worth and value of our security alliances.

Mr. Chairman, I find it ironic that many of my colleagues who have the highest hopes for peace in this turbulent, post-cold-war world would work to weaken some of the key instruments that have brought us this peace and are the best hope for preserving it in the future.

Alliances are, by their very nature, fragile. Napoleon said that he always preferred to fight against coalitions, observing that the often contradictory policies of his enemies worked to devalue whatever combined military forces they could mount against him. Yet, despite the inherent weaknesses of alliances, the United States was able to maintain a durable global coalition for five long decades of cold war. If we are to maintain the health of these instruments of peace and American security in these uncertain times, we must not try to fashion our alliances into things they were not designed to be.

Let me elaborate on these three objections I have just raised. First, the purpose of our alliances must be to further American national security interests and those of our partners. While the rhetoric in this debate may lead one to believe that we have a presence in Europe solely to benefit our NATO Allies, the fact remains that we maintain a sizable forward deployed force in Europe principally to serve legitimate and important American security interests.

Second, this amendment places too much value on the activities that are secondary to principal security concerns, like peacekeeping and humanitarian operations. Under the formula advanced in the amendment, a staunch ally such as Great Britain, whose troops regularly fight alongside American troops, might be exposed to burdensharing penalties while other nations, content to participate in U.N. operations, might be exempt.

This leads me to the third objection. A true measure of an ally's worth is difficult to quantify, especially when measured simply in dollars. Consider the case of the Saudis, who have run considerable domestic political risk to allow American troops to be stationed and operate on their soil. If the Saudis cut back on their substantial financial contribution to this effort, would we truly want to withdraw from that region? We simply cannot take an accountant's approach to security strategy and expect to continue to emphasize American leadership around the world.

Mr. Chairman, let me again commend the sponsors of this amendment for their continuing efforts on this issue, but despite these efforts I must still urge a ''no'' vote.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to be able to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the democratic leader and a man who had a lot to do with drafting this amendment.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I urge a large bipartisan vote for this amendment. We have had burdensharing amendments in the past and I am afraid they have not gotten the result that all of us want. The progress that we have made in this

area has been not enough in my view. This is a new amendment that we have worked on in a bipartisan way. It broadens the traditional approach that we have taken to burdensharing. We are asking our allies not merely to pay more but to do more, to play an active role in their own defense and in their region's affairs.

This bill is intended to increase burdensharing in four critical areas: financial support, defense spending, participation in multinational military operations, and foreign aid. We believe it gives the President the leverage he needs to achieve that goal, and it gives the Congress the information it needs to take action unilaterally if our allies do not rise to the challenge.

I believe this amendment is a much better approach than the one that we have used in the past. We will not simply reduce over presence overseas if our allies do not do more, because in some cases that hurts us more than it hurts them. Instead, we will provide the incentives to make it in our allies' clear interests to play a greater role, as they should. If that fails, we can take serious unilateral action. And, believe me, we should do that if we do not get the result that we have been asking for.

The new world order demands a new world partnership. And at a time of smaller governments here at home, it makes sense to share our burdens all around the world.

I urge every Member, Democrat and Republican, to vote for this amendment to make clear that America can lead the world without always paying all of the bill, and to ensure that just as all nations share the blessings of peace and security, we should all bear the burdens as well.

I urge every Member to vote for this amendment to send a signal to our administration that we want them to take this most seriously and, more importantly, that our allies should take it seriously as well.

I commend the gentleman from Connecticut and others on the Republican side with my friend from Massachusetts, who has led on this effort for taking this effort on and improving this amendment in such important ways.

□ 2000

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Certainly, every responsible American wants and expects our allies to shoulder their fair share of the burden of defense. Unfortunately, however, this amendment helps perpetuate an underlying misconception regarding the rationale for the forward-basing of U.S. military forces.

As the legislation itself acknowledges, U.S. defense expenditures primarily promote U.S. national security interests. The promotion of these interests are also the primary reason for the stationing of U.S. forces overseas. The fact that their presence also benefits our key allies is a secondary but important benefit to us. To risk a conflict in any of the regions where our personnel are now stationed—even those countries far from our borders—would mean jeopardizing U.S. lives and commerce, and contribute to global instability.

This amendment's citation of Japan's burdensharing figure of 75 percent of nonpersonnel costs as a role model for other allies to emulate is very misleading. Following World War II, the United States compelled the Japanese to adopt the Peace Constitution, whereby they abandoned all but the most limited and parochial security responsibilities. For 50 years, we have been the guarantor of Japanese security. Our European partners, on the other hand, are full allies with a commitment to fight side-by-side to defend our common vital interests.

What is the difference? The difference, Mr. Chairman, could be clearly seen when the United States sent two carrier battle groups to the Taiwan Strait and because of their Peace Constitution our Japanese friends stood back and watched. On the other hand, our NATO Allies are on the ground in Bosnia, forming the bulk of IFOR, and they were there before us as a part of UNPROFOR. This is a significant difference, one that this Member hopes his colleagues would recognize.

There are also numerous extenuating circumstances at play in determining the appropriate allied burdensharing responsibility. This includes the expense that has been shouldered by many of our European allies on other allied priorities, including peacekeeping—responsibilities not yet significantly assumed by the Japanese. In addition, disparities in construction and housing costs also factor into the burdensharing disparities between Japan and European allies.

Finally, the amendment grants far-reaching discretionary authority to the President, who would be free to impose such measures as troop reductions and suspension of bilateral agreements in response to an individual country's failure to meet specified arbitrary goals. Mr. Chairman, such actions are unlikely to be in our national interest, and could in the long run result in considerable expenditure of U.S. lives and treasure.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject the Shays-Frank amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, as in the past, I rise in support of the Shays amendment. First of all, foreign nations should pay more. They should do more. And yes, national security for the United States and economic benefit helps from those allies. But it also helps our allies. You are telling me that we cannot ask them to do more and share more of the burden? I disagree. Yes, we can.

One thing I do disagree with, though: I absolutely do not want a new world order. I do not want the United Nations to be at the head of our troops. I want a strong military, but not a one world order. But that does not mean that foreign nations cannot pay their fair share.

I look at the case of Japan. We give billions of dollars to Japan, the trade deficit we have, and then they spend $3 billion a year subsidizing their shipbuilding and ship repair industry. And we have our ships in their ports doing the same thing. And they have nearly forced our workers and our ship builders out of work here in this country.

They can pay more. Other nations can pay more. I fully support the Shays amendment and ask for its passage.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of my friend and colleague from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS]. I do so because I feel it would jeopardize the ability of the United States to defend its own national security interests. U.S. troops are not for sale. If it is in our interests to have troops located somewhere in the world, they should be located there. If it is not in our interests, they should not be, no matter how much money another country is willing to pay us. It just should not be that way.

The United States must defend its own interests, whether maintaining peace in a hostile part of the world or here at home. It should not rely on payments from a foreign nation.

Another point that was brought up earlier underscores why this amendment, though well-intentioned, misses the point. Troops located in Germany do not only defend Germany. They do not only defend Europe. Troops in Europe were used most recently in Operation Desert Storm. And what does this amendment say when our troops are going to be sent around the world? Our troops are every bit in danger, but they are every bit fighting for our national interests. We should not hold them hostage. We should not hold our own policy hostage to a policy that says one country has to pay, even though our troops are there to help nations around the world, help democracy around the world, and help our own U.S. interests. This amendment is well-intentioned, but it is misguided. I would hope all Members would vote against it and support the very rational policy articulated by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE], one of the cosponsors and a long supporter of this.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, for 3 years I have joined my distinguished

colleague from Massachusetts in sponsoring this amendment to require greater burdensharing of our allies. Now that the cold war is over, we can no longer afford to bear the full cost of our allies' defense. As we struggle to balance the budget at home, it is only fair that our allies pick up the cost of their defense.

Here in the United States, we spend 4.7 percent of our GNP on the military. NATO countries in Europe spend just 2.7 percent and Japan spends 1 percent. It simply is not fair.

We have a choice: We can invest in our jobs, safety on our streets, our education, or we can pick up the billions of dollars for our allies' defense while they invest in their own citizens' health care and education.

I would say the choice is simple. Our amendment is about fairness and common sense, and that is why it is endorsed by Citizens Against Government Waste, National Taxpayers Union, and the Concord Coalition. Our amendment will save over $11 billion. By bringing this money home, we begin to give our own constituents a break. My constituents and all Americans deserve nothing less.

Vote yes on our burdensharing amendment. Vote yes on the Frank-Shays amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I join the chairman of the full committee in opposing this amendment, but I must say if the House gave an award to the most improved amendment writing, the authors of this amendment would certainly win that award. It is a vast improvement over the burden sharing amendments of prior sessions.

But it still has the same fundamental flaw. It proceeds from the notion that our forces stationed and deployed abroad are there in defense of Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, Belgians or someone else. They are there in the interests of the national security of the United States. They are not mercenaries.

The amendment is totally simplistic in seeking to say, in effect, we will unilaterally define what fair share burdens will be. You will pay it or otherwise sanctions will be imposed. How are we going to determine that Portugal should be paying the same share as a France or Germany?

The amendment simply does not have a practical underpinning to support it, and should be resisted.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this important amendment. Like most of my colleagues, I am committed to ensuring that the United States military is the finest fighting force in the world. We certainly owe this to our brave men and women who serve their country in uniform. However, I am also very concerned about the fiscal crisis facing America. With a $5 trillion public debt, we must look to reduce unnecessary Federal spending everywhere we can.

During the cold war, the forward presence of U.S. troops on the European continent was necessary to neutralize the impending Soviet threat. But the time has come for our European allies to contribute to the cost of freedom. In the Pacific arena, Japan already assumes 79 percent and Korea 63 percent of the non-personnel costs for United States troops deployed in these countries. Yet, astonishingly, our European friends contribute less than 25 percent of the non-personnel costs. That this occurs in 1996 is simply wrong.

Our European allies must step up to the plate. This broad amendment will offer our friends several options to meet their share of U.S. support. According to CBO, our proposal would save the American taxpayers in excess of $7 billion over the next 4 years.

Let us do the right thing and pass this important amendment today.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Spence en bloc amendment to the 1997 National Defense Authorization Act, and I also want to voice my strong support for this entire bill. I am pleased with the priorities that we have established for funding, that ensures our soldiers have access to the best information possible through the best technology available.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing more important in terms of what the Federal Government should be doing than defending this country from foreign invasion. And within that concept, there is nothing more important than sending our men and women to combat with the best, most sophisticated technology that we can afford them. I do not mean just by dollars, I mean by a national commitment.

One such commitment is the field emissions display unit that the chairman included in his en bloc amendment that was brought in by this Member. This unit would allow for a fraction of the cost to be spent for this display unit to be installed in the M–1 tanks, and the new display unit would be far more effective.

Mr. Chairman, again, I want to say that there is nothing more important that this body can do than to provide for the proper defense.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], who actually will speak on this amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I urge everybody to support this amendment. I have been the room-clearer at more international conferences, because I have been talking about this for 20 years. It is amazing how your allies clear out. And I have been on this floor over and over arguing for different amendments, and have had many of you stand there and tell me if my amendment passed, it would the end of everything, that it would be over.

Guess what? We are down to about 100,000 in Europe, and it is going well. We pushed the Japanese and we pushed the Japanese, and they are doing a great job. Now what this amendment is saying is we ought to have the Europeans do the same thing.

Let me tell you about doom and gloom. The new doom and gloom is the threat of the debt. We are not allowed any cutting amendments on the floor but this one. This is the only chance, and this says that we are recognizing the fact our military allies are also trading competitors. And by our paying for all their defense, we put ourselves at a terrible global disadvantage.

☐ 2015

Vote for this amendment, it is about time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON]

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I care deeply about the deficit and maintaining a strong national defense. Next year we will be spending more just on the interest servicing the $5.5 trillion national debt than all of the Defense Department budget and foreign aid put together; and, consequently, we need to look under every rock and stone for savings.

Last year a similar amendment passed this body 273 to 176. Our amendment this year provides flexibility to offset the cost of our troops overseas by our European NATO Allies. If we can ask Americans to tighten their belts on a whole host of issues, is there any reason why we cannot ask our European allies to do the same?

This amendment can save the taxpayers $11 billion. That is certainly worth a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on our side?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman there are 2 minutes remaining on his side.

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

This is a very clear-cut issue. Members have said American troops are not there to defend other countries, they

are there to defend us, but the fact is that they are doing both. No one thinks that we have no role in defending other countries. The question is not whether we should pay. We will. Even under this amendment the American taxpayers pay the great bulk of this. What we are talking about is whether or not these other nations should get a free ride. We will spend most of the money.

People have said, gee, if we do not put out all the extra money, we will lose out on all our allies. How come we have to constantly bribe them to let us defend them? The way people argue, you would think America was the baby that was so ugly one had to put a lamb chop around its neck so the dog would play with it.

Apparently, the notion is that we would be so bereft of helping people, that if we did not bribe people by picking up their defense budgets they would not do it.

People say it worked in Japan but not here. The very same people are trying to kill this amendment today voted against us when we imposed it on Japan. They used the same arguments.

We are performing a task in the common defense. It is not just for us, it is for them. What is not common is the burden. We are picking up all the tab and they are getting all the benefit for free. What we need to do is to share the burden, and that is what this calls for.

We are going to run into, as Members of this House, an increasing crunch if we get to a zero deficit. There will be a terrible crunch on other discretionary spending. This is a chance to say to the beneficiaries of American fighting people on American tax dollars that they can make a reasonable small contribution. We ought to do it.

And for people who say we can never accept money under those circumstances, then we owe a lot of people a lot of money for the gulf war. We took money to fight the gulf war in the common interest. We got money from our allies because we were bearing that burden, and it worked very well.

The only thing we accomplish by voting ''no'' is to have the American taxpayer continue to pick up the tab for the rest of the world.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I want to thank first my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], who has been working on this issue for so many years, and colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are trying to provide a workable solution to a very real problem.

The last I heard, our country had a financial crisis. The last I heard, Members on this side of the aisle believe we need to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget. We are cutting domestic spending, we are cutting foreign aid, we are freezing defense spending, and we are slowing the growth of entitlements. We are asking every part of our Government to recognize that we have to get our financial house in order.

We need to ask our allies in Europe to do what our allies in Korea and Japan are doing. Our allies in Japan are paying $3.8 billion in direct payments to help us defray the cost of our troops in Japan, $3.8 billion. Our allies in Europe are paying $46 million. We are asking our colleagues to do their part in this effort.

This amendment in the past was opposed by the State Department and the Defense Department. Because of the work of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and others, it has received their support, and certainly not their opposition.

I encourage my colleagues to recognize this amendment passed last year and it was a stronger amendment then, 273 to 156; the year before 268 to 144. This amendment has had the support of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the past. It is an amendment that will help us get our financial house in order, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, as one of the sponsors and drafters of the amendment, I obviously rise in support of it. I tried to listen very carefully during the course of the debate to those persons who rose in opposition to this amendment. I would like to respond to a few of their remarks as I noted their comments.

One of my colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia, indicated that this was the most improved amendment. The gentleman is correct. Last year the Department of defense opposed the burden-sharing amendment. This year the Department of Defense generally supports the amendment, and I quote verbatim:

> After detailed review, analysis and consideration of the provisions of the amendment, the Department believes it provides a solid basis upon which to proceed in future discussions and negotiations with our allies around the world to attain greater respensibility sharing in defense and security issues of national concern.

Second, with respect to the improved amendment, this has, over the years, been a controversial amendment. I have had conversations with the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Massachusetts saying that we ought to update the burden-sharing amendment so that it speaks to the realities of the post-cold war world and not the cold war. They were receptive to those ideas. So we are here with an amendment that corresponds to a post-cold war environment as we march toward the 21st century.

Several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in opposition to the amendment say there is a misperception about why American troops are forward deployed. It is not either/or. Wake up. They are forward deployed because of shared security reasons. That means the other countries' concerns and our concerns. Therefore, we have a right to enter into a process that says our burden-sharing ought to reach some accommodation that speaks to equity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for those Members who oppose it, read the amendment. The amendment in part says:

> In efforts to increase allied burden-sharing, the President shall seek to have each nation that has cooperative military relationships with the United States, including security agreements, basing arrangements, or mutual participation in multinational military organizations or operations, to take one or more of the following actions.

Action No. 1, to attempt to reach as a goal a percentage of the investment. Second, to increase their military outlays in order to provide an opportunity for increased sharing of the cost. A third could be that they increase their annual budgetary outlays for foreign assistance to promote democratization, economic stabilization, transparency arrangements, defense economic conversion, respect for the rule of law, and internationally organized human rights. So that is a third.

The fourth, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], raised and I want to respond to that. Increase the amount of military assets, including personnel, equipment, logistic support, and other resources that it contributes or would be prepared to contribute to multinational military activities worldwide, including United Nations or regional peace operations.

The gentleman spoke to IFOR and UNPROFOR. That is exactly, Mr. Chairman, what this fourth provision provides the President an option to deal with. It is not one option, it is several options. And if people stop long enough to read the legislation and not react to last year's amendment, then they will understand that the arguments are not well founded.

Finally, one of my colleagues said that the amendment is well intended but misguided. I would suggest that what is misguided are the arguments in opposition to the amendment. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on a bipartisan basis to overwhelmingly adopt the proposition before the body.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 353, noes 62, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

AYES—353

Abercrombie	Allard	Archer
Ackerman	Andrews	Armey

Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Burr
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—62

Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bateman
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Combest
DeLay
Dicks
Doolittle
Edwards
Funderburk
Gekas
Geren
Gilman
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hyde
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
King
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Latham
Laughlin
Livingston
McCrery
McHugh
Mica
Murtha
Packard
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Rogers
Salmon
Saxton
Scarborough
Shadegg
Skelton
Spence
Stump
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Torkildsen
Vucanovich
Walker
White
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—18

Boehner
Buyer
Clinger
de la Garza
Dornan
Fields (TX)
Hayes
Holden
Johnston
Kleczka
Lincoln
Molinari
Mollohan
Paxon
Pryce
Serrano
Yates
Zimmer

□ 2046

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Serrano for, with Mr. Paxon against.

Messrs. JONES, LAUGHLIN, BARR of Georgia, FUNDERBURK, and EDWARDS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. SMITH of Texas, WILLIAMS, and LAZIO of New York and Mrs. FOWLER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SOLOMON. If I understand it correctly, Mr. Chairman, this group of en bloc amendments will either go by a voice vote or the vote will be rolled until tomorrow. Therefore, we do not expect any other votes tonight.

It that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Chair's understanding at this point.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. SPENCE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 430, I offer en bloc amendments consisting of amendments, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, amendment No. 12, as modified, amendments 15, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, amendment No. 26, as modified, and amendments 27, 29, 30 and 33 printed in part B of House Report 104–570.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc and report the modifications.

The Clerk designated the amendments en bloc and proceeded to read the modifications.

Amendments en bloc, as modified, consisting of amendments 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, as modified, 15, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 as modified, 27, 29, 30 and 33, offered by Mr. SPENCE:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. MCINNIS OF COLORADO (AMDT. B–1 OF HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

In section 107 (page 20, beginning on line 9)———

(1) insert ''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—'' before ''There is hereby authorized''; and

(2) add the following at the end:

(b) AMOUNT FOR ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY AND APPROACHES PROJECT.—Of the amount specified in subsection (a), $21,000,000 shall be available for the Alternative Technology and Approaches Project.

———

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA OR MRS. CHENOWETH OF IDAHO (AMDT. B–2 OF HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of title II, (page 70, after line 15), add the following new section:

SEC. 248. FUNDING INCREASE FOR FIELD EMISSION FLAT PANEL TECHNOLOGY.

(a) INCREASE.—The amount authorized in section 201(1) for the Combat Vehicle Improvement Program for M1 Tank Upgrade (program element 23735A DD30) is here by increased by $10,000,000 to assist in funding the development of field emission flat panel technology.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount authorized in section 101 is hereby decreased by $10,000,000.

———

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF PENNSYLVANIA OR MR. SPRATT OF SOUTH CAROLINA (AMDT. B–3 OF HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

In section 203, add at the end of subsection (c) (page 36, after line 6) the following new paragraph:

(3) Funds made available pursuant to subsection (b) may be used for dual-use program only if the contract, cooperative agreement, or other transaction by which the program is carried out is entered into through the use of competitive procedures.

Add at the end of section 203 (page 37, after line 11) the following new subsection:

(g) REPEAL.—Section 2371(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking out ''; and'' at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(3) by striking out paragraph (3).

———

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM OF CALIFORNIA (AMDT B–5 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of subtitle B of title II (page 50, after line 6), insert the following new section:

SEC. 223. HIGH ALTITUDE ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM.

Any funds authorized to be appropriated under this title to develop concepts for an improved Tier III Minus (High Altitude Endurance Unmanned Aerial Reconnaissance System) that would increase the unit flyaway cost above the established contracted for amount must be awarded through competitive acquisition procedures.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF MISSISSIPPI (AMDT B–6 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of subtitle B of title II (page 50, after line 6), insert the following new section:

SEC. 223. CERTIFICATION OF CAPABILITY OF UNITED STATES TO PREVENT ILLEGAL IMPORTATION OF NUCLEAR, BIOLOGICAL, OR CHEMICAL WEAPONS.

Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a certification in writing stating specifically whether or not the United States has the capability (as of the date of the certification) to prevent the illegal importation of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons into the United States and its possessions.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. HANSEN OF UTAH (AMDT B–8 OF HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of title II (page 70, after line 15), insert the following new section:

SEC. 248. NATURAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT AND TRAINING DELIVERY SYSTEM.

Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for program element 65804D, funding shall be available for a proposed natural resources assessment and training delivery system to enhance the ability of the Department of Defense to mitigate the environmental impact of its operational training of forces and testing of weapons systems on military installations where problems are most acute.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS OF CALIFORNIA (AMDT B–9 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of subtitle C of title III (page 84, after line 25), insert the following new section:

SEC. 328. AGREEMENTS FOR SERVICES OF OTHER AGENCIES IN SUPPORT OF ENVIRONMENTAL DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may enter into a cooperative agreement with an agency of a State or local government to obtain assistance in demonstrating, validating, and certifying environmental technologies.

(b) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.—The types of assistance that may be obtained under subsection (a) include the following:

(1) Data collection and analysis.

(2) Technical assistance in conducting a demonstration of an environmental technology, including the implementation of quality assurance and quality control programs.

(c) SERVICE CHARGES.—The cooperative agreement may provide for the payment by the Secretary of service charges to the agency if the charges are reasonable, non-discriminatory, and do not exceed the actual or estimated cost to the agency of providing the service.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON OF CALIFORNIA (AMDT B–10 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of subtitle A of title V (page 129, after line 7), insert the following new section:

SEC. 508. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN MANAGEMENT CONSTRAINTS ON MAJOR RANGE AND TEST FACILITY BASE STRUCTURE.

Section 129 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting after ''industrial-type activities'' the following: '', the Major Range and Test Facility Base,''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) apply to the Major Range and Test Facility Base (MRTFB) at the installation level. With respect to the MRTFB structure, the term ''funds made available'' includes both direct appropriated funds and funds provided by MRTFB customers.''.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. MONTGOMERY OF MISSISSIPPI (AMDT B–11 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of subtitle B of title V (page 136, after line 8), insert the following new section:

SEC. 517. ELIGIBILITY FOR ENROLLMENT IN READY RESERVE MOBILIZATION INCOME INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 12524 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) MEMBERS OF INDIVIDUAL READY RESERVE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, and pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary, a member of the Individual Ready Reserve who becomes a member of the Selected Reserve shall not be denied eligibility to purchase insurance under this chapter upon becoming a member of the Selected Reserve unless the member previously declined to enroll in the program of insurance under this chapter while a member of the Selected Reserve.''.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR OF MINNESOTA (AMDT B–12 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII (page 274, after line 15), insert the following new section:

SEC. 702. PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE SCREENING FOR COLON AND PROSTATE CANCER.

(a) MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS.—(1) Subsection (a) of section 1074d of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''Female''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) Male members and former members of the uniformed services entitled to medical care under section 1074 or 1074a of this title shall also be entitled to preventive health care screening for colon or prostate cancer at such intervals and using such screening methods as the administering Secretaries consider appropriate.''.

(2)(A) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1074d. Primary and preventive health care services

(B) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''1074d. Primary and preventive health care services.''.

(b) DEPENDENTS.—(1) Section 1077(a) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(14) Preventive health care screening for colon or prostate cancer at the intervals and using the screening methods prescribed under section 1074d(a)(2) of this title.''.

Section 2079(a)(2) of such title is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''the schedule and method of colon and prostate cancer screenings,'' after ''pap smears and mammograms,''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''or colon and prostate cancer screenings'' after ''pap smears and mammograms''.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. FARR OF CALIFORNIA (AMDT B–15 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of title VIII (page 316, after line 14), insert the following new section:

SEC. . DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR PURCHASE OF FIRE, SECURITY, POLICE, PUBLIC WORKS, AND UTILITY SERVICES FROM LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.

(a) EXTENSION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—Section 816 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 2820) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) DURATION OF PROJECT.—The authority to purchase services under the demonstration project shall expire on September 30, 1998.''.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out '', 1996'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''of each of the years 1997 and 1998''.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR OF MINNESOTA (AMDT B–18 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of title X (page 359, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1041. AUTHORITY TO TRANSPORT HEALTH PROFESSIONALS SEEKING TO PROVIDE HEALTH-RELATED HUMANITARIAN RELIEF SERVICES.

Section 402 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense may transport to any country, without charge, health professionals who are traveling in order to furnish health-care related services as part of a humanitarian relief activity. Such transportation may be provided only on an invitational space-required noninterference basis.

''(2) Any expenses incurred as a direct result of providing such transportation shall be paid out of funds specifically appropriated to the Department of Defense for Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid (OHDACA) programs of the Department.''.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. SCARBOROUGH OF FLORIDA (AMDT. B–21 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of title X (page 359, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1041. TREATMENT OF EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES OF COAST GUARD UNDER FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.

(a) DEFINITION OF EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLE.—Section 644(g) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2403(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Such term includes excess property of the Coast Guard.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 517 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2321k) is amended by striking out subsection (k).

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. PICKETT OF VIRGINIA (AMDT. B–22 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of title X (page 359, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. . FORFEITURE OF RETIRED PAY OF MEMBERS WHO ARE ABSENT FROM THE UNITED STATES TO AVOID PROSECUTION.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF FORFEITURE PROCEDURES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall develop uniform procedures under which the Secretary of a military department may cause to be forfeited the retired pay of a member or former member of

the uniformed services who willfully remains outside the United States to avoid criminal prosecution or civil liability. The types of offenses for which the procedures shall be used shall include the offenses specified in section 8312 of title 5, United States Code, and such other criminal offenses and civil proceedings as the Secretary of Defense considers to be appropriate.

(b) REPORT OF CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report describing the procedures developed under subsection (a). The report shall include recommendations regarding changes to existing law, including section 8313 of title 5, United States Code, that the Secretary determines are necessary to fully implement the procedures.

(c) RETIRED PAY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''retired pay'' means retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, payable under a statute to a member or former member of a uniformed service.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. BROWDER OF ALABAMA (AMDT. B–23 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of title X (page 359, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1041. CHEMICAL STOCKPILE EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report assessing the implementation and success of the establishment of site-specific Integrated Product and Process Teams as a management tool for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program.

(b) CONTINGENT MANDATED REFORMS.—If at the end of the 120-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act the Secretary of the Army and the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency have been unsuccessful in implementing a site-specific Integrated Product and Process Team with each of the affected States, the Secretary of the Army shall—

(1) assume full control and responsibility for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program (eliminating the role of the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency as joint manager of the program);

(2) establish programmatic agreement with each of the affected States regarding program requirements, implementation schedules, training and exercise requirements, and funding (to include direct grants for program support);

(3) clearly define the goals of the program; and

(4) establish fiscal constraints for the program.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MS. MCKINNEY OF GEORGIA (AMDT. B–24 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of title X (page 359, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1041. QUARTERLY REPORTS REGARDING COPRODUCTION AGREEMENTS.

(a) QUARTERLY REPORTS ON COPRODUCTION AGREEMENTS.—Section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out ''and'' at the end of paragraph (10);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting in lieu thereof ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following new paragraph:

''(12) a report on all concluded government-to-government agreements regarding foreign coproduction of defense articles of United States origin and all other concluded agreements involving coproduction or licensed production outside of the United States of defense articles of United States origin (including coproduction memoranda of understanding or agreement) that have not been previously reported under this subsection, which shall include—

''(A) the identity of the foreign countries, international organizations, or foreign firms involved;

''(B) a description and the estimated value of the articles authorized to be produced, and an estimate of the quantity of the articles authorized to be produced;

''(C) a description of any restrictions on third party transfers of the foreign-manufactured articles; and

''(D) if any such agreement does not provide for United States access to and verification of quantities of articles produced overseas and their disposition in the foreign country, a description of alternative measures and controls incorporated in the coproduction or licensing program to ensure compliance with restrictions in the agreement on production quantities and third party transfers.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (12) of section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, as added by subsection (a)(3), does not apply with respect to an agreement described in such paragraph entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON OF NEW YORK (AMDT. B–25 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of title X (page 359, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1041. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH VETERANS' PREFERENCE REQUIREMENTS TO BE TREATED AS A PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An employee of the Department of Defense who has authority to take, direct others to take, recommend, or approve any personnel action, shall not, with respect to such authority, take or fail to take any personnel action with respect to an employee or applicant for employment if the taking of or failure to take such action would violate any law, rule, or regulation implementing, or directly concerning, veterans' preference.

(b) EFFECT OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—A failure to comply with subsection (a) shall be treated as a prohibited personnel practice.

(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall, not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit a written report to each House of Congress with respect to—

(1) the implementation of this section; and

(2) the administration of veterans' preference requirements by the Department of Defense generally.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this section, the terms ''personnel action'' and ''prohibited personnel practice'' shall have the respective meanings given them by section 2302 of title 5, United States Code.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY OF MASSACHUSETTS (AMENDMENT B–26 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of title X (page 359, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1041. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND PRESIDENTIAL REPORT REGARDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROLIFERATION AND POLICIES OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) intelligence investigations by the United States have revealed transfers from the People's Republic of China to Pakistan of sophisticated equipment important to the development of nuclear weapons;

(2) the People's Republic of China acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''NPT'') as a nuclear-weapon state on March 9, 1992;

(3) Article I of the NPT stipulates that a nuclear-weapon state party to the treaty shall not in any way encourage, assist, or induce any non-nuclear-weapon state to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons;

(4) the NPT establishes a non-nuclear-weapon state as one which has not manufactured and exploded a nuclear weapon by January 1, 1967;

(5) Pakistan had not manufactured and exploded a nuclear weapon by January 1, 1967;

(6) Article III of the NPT requires each party to the treaty not to provide to any non-nuclear-weapon state equipment or material designed or prepared for the processing, use, or production of special fissionable material, unless the material is subject to the safeguards stipulated in the treaty;

(7) Pakistan has not acceded to the NPT, and nuclear-related equipment and material provided to Pakistan is not subject to international safeguards;

(8) under the NPT, assisting a non-nuclear-weapon state to acquire unsafeguarded nuclear material important to the manufacture of nuclear weapons is a violation of Articles I and III of the NPT;

(9) this transfer constitutes the latest example in a consistent pattern of nuclear weapon-related exports by the People's Republic of China to non-nuclear-weapon states in violation of international treaties and agreements and United States laws relating to the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons;

(10) failure to enforce the applicable sanctions available under United States law in this case compromises vital security interests and undermines the credibility of United States and international efforts to discourage commerce in nuclear-related equipment, technology, and materials;

(11) recent claims by senior Chinese officials that the Government of the People's Republic of China was unaware of any transfers of ring magnets by a goverment-owned entity, if true, call into question the reliability and effectiveness of Chinese export controls; and

(12) recent exports of sophisticated nuclear-related technologies reduce the credibility of previous assurances by the People's Republic of China concerning its nonproliferation policies since the ratification of the NPT.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that in responding to the transfer from the People's Republic of China to Pakistan of equipment important to the development of a nuclear weapons program—

(1) the President should not have decided that there was not a sufficient basis to warrant a determination that sanctionable activity occurred under section 2(b)(4) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended by section 825 of the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994; and

(2) the President should have imposed the strongest possible sanctions available under United States law on all Chinese official and commercial entities associated directly or indirectly with the research, development, sale, transportation, or financing of any nuclear or military industrial product or service made available for export since March 9, 1992.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on the response of the United States to the transfer from the People's Republic of

China to Pakistan of equipment important to the development of a nuclear weapons program. The President shall include in the report the following:

(1) The specific justification of the Secretary of State for determining that there was not sufficient basis for imposing sanctions under section 2(b)(4) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended by section 825 of the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994, by reason of such transfer from the People's Republic of China to Pakistan.

(2) What commitment the United States Government is seeking from the People's Republic of China to ensure that the People's Republic of China establishes a fully effective export control system that will prevent transfers (such as the Pakistan sale) from taking place in the future.

(3) Whether, in light of the recent assurances provided by the People's Republic of China, the President intends to make the certification and submit the report required by section 902(a)(6)(B) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note), and make the certification and submit the report required by Public Law 99–183, relating to the approval and implementation of the agreement for nuclear cooperation between the United States and the People's Republic of China, and, if not, why not.

(4) Whether the Secretary of State considers the recent assurances and clarifications provided by the People's Republic of China to have provided sufficient information to allow the United States to determine that the People's Republic of China is not in violation of paragraph (2) of section 129 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as required by Public Law 99–183.

(5) If the President is unable or unwilling to make the certifications and reports referred to in paragraph (3), a description of what the President considers to be the significance of the clarifications and assurances provided by the People's Republic of China in the course of the recent discussions regarding the transfer by the People's Republic of China of nuclear-weapon-related equipment to Pakistan.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA (AMENDMENT B–27 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of title X (page 359, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1041. TRANSFER OF U.S.S. DRUM TO CITY OF VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA.

(a) TRANSFER.—The Secretary of the Navy shall transfer the U.S.S. Drum (SSN–677) to the city of Vallejo, California, in accordance with this section and upon satisfactory completion of a ship donation application. Before making such transfer, the Secretary of the Navy shall remove from the vessel the reactor compartment and other classified and sensitive military equipment.

(b) FUNDING.—As provided in section 7306(c) of title 10, United States Code, the transfer of the vessel authorized by this section shall be made at no cost to the United States (beyond the cost which the United States would otherwise incur for dismantling and recycling of the vessel).

(c) APPLICABLE LAW.—The transfer under this section shall be subject to subsection (b) of section 7306 of title 10, United States Code, but the provisions of subsection (d) of such section shall not be applicable to such transfer.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. CHAMBLISS OF GEORGIA (AMENDMENT B–29 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of title X (page 359, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1041. EVALUATION OF DIGITAL VIDEO NETWORK EQUIPMENT USED IN OLYMPIC GAMES.

(a) EVALUATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall evaluate the digital video network equipment used in the 1996 Olympic Games to determine whether such equipment would be appropriate for use as a test bed for the military application of commercial off-the-shelf advanced technology linking multiple continents, multiple satellites, and multiple theaters of operations by compressed digital audio and visual broadcasting technology.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 1996, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation conducted under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. SPENCE OF SOUTH CAROLINA (AMENDMENT B–30 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of title X (page 359, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. . MISSION OF THE WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY.

The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the activities of the White House Communications Agency (or any successor agency) in providing support services for the President from funds appropriated for the Department of Defense for any fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 1997) are limited to the provision of telecommunications support to the President and Vice President and related elements (as defined in regulations of that agency and specified by the President with respect to particular individuals within those related elements).

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. PORTER OF ILLINOIS (AMENDMENT B–33 IN HOUSE REPORT 104–570)

At the end of part I of subtitle C of title XXVIII (page 462, after line 25), insert the following new section:

SEC. 2824. REAFFIRMATION OF LAND CONVEYANCES, FORT SHERIDAN, ILLINOIS.

As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall complete the land conveyances involving Fort Sheridan, Illinois, required or authorized under section 125 of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104–32; 109 Stat. 290).

Mr. SPENCE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the modifications be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SPENCE and the National Security Committee for accepting my amendment dealing with veterans' preference as part of this en bloc amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is unclear whether managers, not necessarily within the Department of Defense but throughout this Government, are fully aware of the proper hiring procedures when it comes to giving veterans a priority.

My amendment seeks to remedy enforcement problems when it comes to veterans' preference that might be rooted within the Federal bureaucracy.

It does that by holding those managers and supervisors in a position to hire and fire directly responsible for failing to implement veterans preference procedures.

In other words, failure to do so is defined as a prohibited personnel practice, and will be punishable by DOD procedures reserved for those found guilty of engaging in such prohibited practices.

Mr. Chairman, I will be offering the same amendment to all bills reauthorizing each department of Government as we proceed through this session of Congress.

This amendment has the endorsement of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars and I urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment and America's veterans.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD at this point the comments of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague Congressman GERRY SOLOMON in offering a bipartisan which we hope will put China and other would-be proliferators on notice that the United States will punish nations that trample our arms control laws and violate international treaties designed to curb the spread of nuclear weapons.

China is a pathological proliferator, plain and simple. Over the years, Beijing's rulers have compiled a mile-long radioactive rapsheet of weapons offenses that make China the Al Capone of atomic commerce.

Despite rock solid evidence that China broke United States law by selling nuclear-related equipment to Pakistan and cruise missiles to Iran, the State Department has decided to let Beijing off the hook. No sanctions will be imposed in response to China's latest violations.

The amendment which Congressman SOLOMON and I are offering today expresses the sense of the Congress that sanctions should have been imposed on China for its most recent illegal sales.

Our amendment also contains a tough reporting requirement. Within 60 days after the enactment of the authorization bill, the amendment requires the President to report to Congress on what commitment our Government is seeking from China to ensure that China establishes an effective border enforcement system to prevent future transfers such as the Pakistan sale from taking place.

The reporting requirement also directs the President to explain the significance of China's assurances made last week that it won't misbehave again.

This bipartisan amendment has the support of Members on both sides of the aisle, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY], my distinguished colleague.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the National

Security Committee for their cooperation in accepting my co-production reporting amendment.

The committee bill devotes significant additional resources to modernization, because in the words of the committee, ''the U.S. military's technical superiority depends on a steady investment in modernization of new and upgraded weapons systems and equipment.''

The taxpayers' investment in modernization and new military technologies should be carefully guarded just as we seek to protect patented products and intellectual property from pirating overseas.

Mr. Chairman, Congress and the public must be fully informed about our arms production technologies being exported abroad. My co-production reporting amendment would do just that with a simple reporting requirement on all co-production agreements between the United States and foreign countries.

Again I thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking member.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to speak on two amendments that are in the en bloc. First is the McInnis amendment on chem demil. I rise in strong support of the McInnis amendment to add $5 million to the chemical demilitarization technology approaches on that project.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. stockpile consists of 30,000 tons of chemical weapons. Four percent of its total is stored in my district, the Newport Army ammunition plant in Indiana. To destroy this stockpile the Army has undertaken a 12-year plan to incinerate this material at an estimated cost of $12.5 billion. I expect this figure to rise dramatically as the program proceeds.

Alternative technologies to safe incineration could offer us—alternative technologies to incineration could offer a safe, effective, and more cost efficient method of destroying certain agents and material in the stockpile, such as bulk nerve gas stored at Newport. Currently the Army and the National Research Council are evaluating five alternative technologies to incineration. A decision to proceed with this pilot program will be made later this year. This additional $5 million will help accelerate this process.

Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague for offering this amendment and urge a ''yes'' vote on his amendment which will be offered en bloc.

The other for which I rise in strong support is on the Solomon amendment with regard to veterans preference. I serve as chairman on the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs with regards to the veterans preference issue. I am very concerned right now and I lay most of my concerns at the feet of a professional bureaucracy within the Federal Government which seems dedicated to routing out veterans through an avoidance of proper hiring and downsizing procedures. Veterans preference must remain the first criteria in hiring, promotion, and retention. To me, veterans preference is blind as to race, gender, age, and religion, and I believe that America understands the sacrifices of veterans and that we must maintain veterans preference in regard to our hiring of veterans in the country.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] a member of the committee.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on this amendment, particularly the part dealing with the chemical stockpile emergency preparedness program. We have got chemical weapons stored all around this country. They need to be destroyed. We need to get some focus to this program. We need to ask ourselves, first, do we really want to get rid of these weapons and why; second, how do we want to get rid of them; and, thirds, what are we willing to pay to get rid of them?

Those questions have not been adequately addressed by this country, and this amendment would cause us to stop and focus on this issue.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member would like to take a brief moment to raise a point associated with a portion of the en bloc amendment, the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FARR]. The gentleman's amendment addresses legitimate concerns related to problems experienced at a military facility in his district; specifically, unnecessary regulatory requirements that impede the implementation of more cost-effective alternatives to providing municipal services at the facility.

These problems are not unique to California. A military facility in this Member's district, the Lincoln Municipal Airport, has experienced cost-ineffective practices related to fire services. Although a commonsense solution exists to solve the problems involving the international guard unit, this Member has been told that their cost-saving initiative has been stalled at the national level of the National Guard. Clearly this is an issue that merits examination.

This Member would ask the chairman of the National Security Committee, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], to work with him to address these concerns in a constructive manner.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would be pleased to work with the gentleman on this issue.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that assurance.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR], a member of the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee for yielding this time to me. I rise in support of the en bloc amendment. Contained in it is language that would require the President of the United States within 15 days to certify to Congress whether or not this Nation possesses the ability to detect the smuggling or importation of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons into our country.

Mr. Chairman, there are 4 million cargo containers a year that come into this country, 40-foot container equivalents. There are also between 20 and 30 nations that possess either nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons. While the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], in particular have done a great job of making the Nation aware of our Nation's vulnerability to the two nations that possess ballistic missiles that can strike our Nation, there are at least 5 rogue nations—including Iran, Iraq, Libya, Cuba and North Korea—that possess chemical weapons, biological weapons and, some fear, nuclear weapons, that could smuggle them into our country. The purpose of this amendment is to make the commander in chief, the Department of Defense, and this administration aware of that threat to our Nation, and hopefully in next year's defense bill that is presented to the Congress, they will take some steps to address that threat to the people of this country.

□ 2100

In my opinion, it is a bigger threat to this country than the threat of ballistic attack.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EVERETT].

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage our distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], in a brief colloquy regarding the Army's Hellfire II missile. It is my understanding that the Army's fiscal year 1997 budget request contains $108 million for 1,800 Hellfire II missiles. This is the first year of a plan for 7,569 missiles over a 5-year period, is that correct?

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

Mr. EVERETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, the very distinguished gentleman from Alabama is correct in his understanding. The Subcommittee on Military Procurement recommended, as did the full committee, approval of the request for Hellfire II procurement.

Mr. EVERETT. I also understand that the Army proposed fiscal year 1997 as a stand-alone year, followed by a 4-

year multiyear procurement of the balance of the 5,769 Hellfire II missiles. Does the chairman support the Army's acquisition plan for Hellfire II and will he give full consideration of a proposed 4-year multiyear procurement Hellfire II next year?

Mr. HUNTER. I acknowledge that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs has recommended that the modernization of the semiactive laser Hellfire inventory be continued, and I support the Army's proposed procurement to achieve that goal. The gentleman from Alabama has my assurance that the subcommittee will give full consideration to any proposed multiyear plan submitted with the fiscal year 1998 budget.

Mr. EVERETT. I thank the distinguished chairman for his comments and his support.

Mr. HUNTER. We thank the gentleman for his hard work on this program.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement, during the committee's markup of this defense authorization bill we discussed the urgent requirements facing the Navy's FA–18C/D aircraft to prove their self-detection capability. Following the shootdown of the F–16 over Bosnia last June, Secretary Perry directed the installation of the limited numbers of the ALQ–165 jammer on Navy and Marine Corps F/A–18–C/D's operating in the Bosnia theater. It is my understanding that without this jammer, the Navy and Marine Corps' F/A–18–C/D aircraft have no electronic self-detection against pulse doppler or continuous wave radar threats which characterize the most widely deployed air-to-air and surface-to-air threats to tactical aircraft.

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the committee is concerned that the limited number of ALQ–165 systems in the Navy's inventory could prevent the Navy from providing adequate self-protection for its F–18–C/D aircraft in future contingencies.

For this reason, the committee added $50 million to the budget request for common ECM equipment in the aircraft procurement Navy account to be used to purchase ALQ–165 jammers. Is that correct?

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is correct, and we are grateful to the gentleman for his leadership in this area.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for the clarification.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] for a colloquy.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman of the Committee on National Security in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the fiscal year 1997 defense authorization bill includes a provision which would permit the Secretary of Defense to waive certain requirements for full-scale live fire testing of the V–22 tiltrotor and F–22 fighter aircraft.

I know the gentleman agrees that the live-fire test program plays a critical role in assuring the operational suitability of new equipment for use by our Armed Forces.

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

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICA. The Defense Department is making great uses of advances in modeling and simulation technologies of our military services, defense agencies, industry, and academia. These advances are being used for a wide range of activities, including development of new materiel, testing and evaluation, manufacturing, training, and operational planning.

I believe the application of these technologies to the Department's live-fire test program would permit more thorough and realistic evaluation of new equipment for our Armed Forces and would reduce testing costs and time. Their transfer to the private sector would also increase the fidelity of testing in the automotive, aircraft, and other industrial sectors.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from South Carolina if he would assist me in working with the Department of Defense to extend the advanced modeling and simulation technology to the live-fire test program, and if possible, would he address this potential issue with the other body as we complete the defense authorization bill?

Mr. SPENCE. I thank the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Chairman, for his observations, and agree that the Department's advances in development, modeling, and simulation technology may hold significant promise for more cost-effective and comprehensive tests and evaluation of new materiel for our Armed Forces, including live-fire testing. I would be pleased to work with the gentleman from Florida and the Department of Defense in this area.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his assistance.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his outstanding leadership in moving forward the National Defense Authorization Act. This bill is very important because it supports troops and their families by ensuring quality medical care for military families and enhances military readiness by increasing key underfunded readiness accounts. It funds key modernization programs identified by the service chiefs and, Mr. Chairman, it also builds a smarter Pentagon for innovation reform.

Finally, I think what is very important for our colleagues and our constituents, it ensures veterans preference protection. I believe that this legislation is very much one that should be embraced by both sides of the aisle, and I look forward to its passage.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding and rise in strong support of the Spence en bloc amendment and the bill.

Let me begin, Mr. Chairman, by once again thanking Chairman SPENCE for his hard work on the significant procurement reforms our committees have achieved in the past 2 years. I would also like to offer my support for the report language he has included in H.R. 3230 on the acquisition process. The report recognizes that the work of Congress in enacting new reforms is winding down and that the burden for continuing has now shifted to the executive branch. In addition, the report clarifies the intent of Congress with respect to the Government's audit rights for commercial pricing data. Although we believe that Congress has spoken clearly on Truth in Negotiations Act audit rights, the report's language should eliminate any remaining doubts as to congressional intent.

Turning to the gentleman's en bloc amendment, I commend him for including as part of that amendment much-needed reforms to the White House Communications Agency.

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight initiated a review of the management and operations of the White House Communications Agency nearly 3 years ago. Our inquiry began after discussions with White House staff indicated that WHCA maintained a very broad, but ill-defined role in the Executive Mansion. WHCA's own staff admitted to being uncomfortable with the breadth of services they were sometimes asked to provide and with the Agency's lack of clear mission control. Those concerns led me to ask first the GAO, and then the Department of Defense inspector general to review WHCA's mission, role and activities.

Last month, the DOD IG issued its final WHCA report showing an agency rife with mismanagement, lacking in oversight, and suffering mission creep. The IG found that although a military unit within DOD, WHCA has functioned outside the Department's operational control and with little or no Defense Department oversight. The IG concluded that WHCA's budgets have gone largely unreviewed; its annual performance plan has failed to meet DOD standards; its acquisition planning has been inadequate and resulted in wasteful purchases; and that the agency has ignored Federal procurement law, purchasing goods and services without contracts or legal authority. The IG further reported that inadequate financial controls have resulted in excess and sometimes duplicate payment of unverified bills. Finally, the IG concluded that WHCA is providing the White House with services and equipment outside the scope of its mission of telecommunications support to the President.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense concurred with the IG's findings. He promised corrective action in the areas of budgeting, management, acquisition and oversight. The administration disagreed, however, with the IG's recommendation that unauthorized services be stopped. This sole remaining area of disagreement is the subject of the Spence amendment.

The Spence WHCA amendment simply reaffirms the Agency's traditional role by limiting its use of DOD appropriations to providing telecommunications support to the President, the Vice President, and others specified by the President. Adoption of the amendment will refocus WHCA's mission and prohibit the improper funding of nontelecommunications activities through Defense dollars. Those activities will be returned to the White House for executive funding, management, and control.

While Chairman SPENCE, Subcommittee Chairman ZELIFF, and I had hoped to pursue this correction informally, we have been stymied by the administration's refusal to address the problem. The White House has even prohibited its witnesses from appearing at the oversight hearing which Mr. ZELIFF will chair on Thursday. Because the administration has rejected the inspector general's recommendation and refused to discuss informal correction, we have no choice but to proceed with the amendment.

I appreciate the gentleman's sponsorship of this small, but important reform, commend him on his work, and urge the amendment's adoption.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

The amendments en bloc, as modified, were agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHABOT) having assumed the chair, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 3230) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3230.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET TO FILE REPORT ON AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Budget may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997, and that it be in order on Wednesday, May 15, 1996, to consider that concurrent resolution under the following terms:

One, the Speaker may declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution;

Two, the first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with;

Three, all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution shall be waived;

Four, general debate shall be confined to the congressional budget and shall not exceed 3 hours, including 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget;

Five, after general debate, the Committee shall rise without motion;

And six, no further consideration of the concurrent resolution shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

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

There was no objection.

NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO OFFER HOUSE RESOLUTION 303 RAISING A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 4(C) of rule XI, I announce my intention to call up House Resolution 303 as a question of privilege. The resolution was reported on December 13, 1995.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MEEHAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE AVIATION SAFETY PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I regret the crash of ValuJet flight 592 was the catalyst for renewed attention on airline safety. However, I hope that a productive dialog on the future safety of the aviation industry will result from this tragedy.

For me, a similar tragedy brought home the need for greater air safety measures. July 4th weekend, 1994, a USAir flight that originated in my hometown, of Columbia, SC, crashed just outside of Charlotte, NC. Several of my constituents were among the victims. That single event heightened my awareness of aviation safety concerns and prompted me to begin a search for solutions.

That search led me to the first step of what I believe is the long journey to restoring public confidence in air travel—the enactment of the Aviation Safety Protection Act of 1996 (H.R. 3187). I introduced this legislation on March 28 to provide whistle-blower protection for airline employees who supply information to the Federal Government relating to air safety.

The intent of this legislation is to encourage airline employees to become actively involved in the safety of airline passengers and to feel free to come forward if they believe that safety is being jeopardized due to negligence or oversight. The same job protections afforded to most of the work force should be extended to the airline industry, especially since lives are at stake.

Under the legislation, an employee who believes he or she has been fired or otherwise retaliated against for reporting air safety violations may file a complaint with the U.S. Secretary of Labor. If the employee's claim is found to be valid he or she would be entitled to reinstatement and compensatory damages.

On the other hand, if the Secretary of Labor determines that the complaint has been filed frivolously, the offending employee will be required to pay up to $5,000 of the employer's legal fees.

This is an issue of safety and fairness. The Aviation Safety Protection Act of 1996 will provide security for airline employees who may be afraid to report safety violations for fear of losing their jobs and the income they need to support their families.

In addition, the Federal Aviation Administration has recently recognized the need to require the same safety standards for commuter airlines as for major carriers. Commuter planes carry an estimated 60 million passengers annually. With the tremendous growth of

commuter flights in recent years, we must do everything we can to ensure the safety of those passengers.

Due to the growing competitiveness among airlines, the number of aircraft of all sizes that have entered the market is growing exponentially. At the same time, the limited FAA budget is already strapped. The Aviation Safety Protection Act would enable airline employees to aid the FAA in ensuring air travel remains safe without fear of reprisal.

The checkered safety record of ValuJet Airlines is just now coming to light. One can only wonder if this tragedy could have been prevented if an employee had come forward earlier to report safety concerns.

In light of this American tragedy, I urge Congress to expedite approval of the Aviation Safety Protection Act, so that we can begin to rebuild the public's confidence in our aviation industry.

□ 2115

ELIMINATING THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE IS NOT THE WAY TO GO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHABOT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the bill that has been under consideration on the floor of the House for the past few hours has been dealing with the defense of our Nation, and no one in this Chamber would think of unilaterally disarming our country militarily. So why is it, then, that the Republican leadership now proposes to eliminate in the budget debates coming up during the next 2 days the Department of Commerce and so unilaterally disarm us economically? Because this Department of Commerce under, first, Secretary Ron Brown and now his successor, this Department of Commerce has been turned into an efficient juggernaut advancing U.S. interests here and abroad economically.

Mr. Speaker, if I were a business leader in this country, a small- or mid-size business leader particularly, but also a CEO of a large corporation, I would be very, very concerned about this move to take the one agency in the Federal Government that has become very effective at promoting U.S. commerce and jobs and exports and dismantling it and eliminating some of its functions and shipping some of the functions off to other agencies and departments where there is not a smooth fit.

For instance, what would be eliminated or phased out? The advanced technology program. Well, certainly we do not need technology in our economy, do we? The manufacturing extension partnerships is like the old agricultural extension program for rural areas. This is manufacturing extension, and it can be for rural areas but urban areas as well, particularly benefiting small-and mid-size businesses.

They would eliminate the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration. Tourism is becoming one of the fastest growing industries in our country. The National Telecommunications and Information Administration. They would take the Economic Development Administration, which has been crucial in my State of West Virginia as well as every State in this country, they would take it and move it to the Small Business Administration, believing it would take only 25 employees to administer its many millions of dollars worth of grants.

The irony to this of course is the SBA, the Small Business Administration, and the EDA are not a compatible fit. The Small Business Administration deals with small business, and individual small businesses. The EDA, the Economic Development Administration, deals with the infrastructure that is necessary to help businesses grow. But it is not the same function at all.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, the business community should be greatly concerned. It should be greatly concerned at the idea that the International Trade Administration could be greatly phased down. For instance, it is estimated that half the State offices would have to be eliminated. It would reduce the support for the U.S. business community. It would terminate domestic services in one-half the States. It would lessen the ability to protect U.S. industries against unfair practices, such as dumping.

There are many, many areas of the Department of Commerce which would be, of course, either phased out or phased down or eliminated under this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to look at the achievements that the United States Department of Commerce, this department that is now sought to be eliminated over the next couple of days in the Republican leadership budget, I think it is very important to look at some of the accomplishments. Ron Brown was a heck of a leader for the United States and for the Department of Commerce. He created the first-ever national export strategy which brought $80 billion worth of business deals, that is right, deals, contracts signed, jobs created, on the bottom line. That is what the Department of Commerce has been doing these last 3 years.

He championed the role of civilian technology by entering into $1.5 billion of public-private partnerships, roughly a 50–50 split, 220 of these, to advance technology, increase the number of manufacturing extension centers in this country from 7 to 60. They benefit small- and mid-size businesses. U.S. merchandise exports went up 26 percent in 3 years, from 1993 to 1995.

He hosted the first-ever White House conference on travel and tourism. This is what you want a Department of Commerce to be doing. This is what you want a Government agency to be doing, to be working in public-private partnerships, to be bringing home the bacon, to be creating jobs, working with the private sector. That is what our Department of Commerce has been doing.

So, what is the solution? What is the answer? Well, the bean counters on the other side now say eliminate the Department of Commerce, eliminate the Economic Development Administration, which, with its $2.5 million of assistance to the Swearingen project in Martinsburg, WV, helped leverage $130 million of investment so that the first jet manufacturing center in this country in many, many years is under construction right now and will create 800 jobs, good-paying jobs, when it is created.

That is what the Department of Commerce can do and is doing across this country. Their answer? Eliminate it, phase it out, break it up, ship it off. We do not like coordinated approaches. We do not like efficiency. We do not like somebody going out and actually bringing home the business. That is what this is about.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the motivations; there are no bad motivations. It may be a philosophical difference. Maybe they do not like success. Maybe it is just that they think that Government should not be involved in this type of activity. Eliminating the Department of Commerce is not the way to go.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CIA DIRECTOR WILLIAM COLBY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to remind my colleagues and remind the American people of a great American, a spy who has come in from the cold, William Colby. Mr. Colby was memorialized today in a service that I had the honor of attending at the National Cathedral and sitting there among so many hundreds of family members, friends, world leaders, former colleagues of his and probably many average American citizens who had read about him in the newspaper, believed in what he had done, recognized him for the greatness that he embodied and simply came in and attended the memorial service.

As I sat there, I was reminded of the time that I have spent, that I have known Mr. Colby, first as a junior officer for several years during my tenure at the CIA. I had the honor of serving under him during the years that he served as DCI or Director of Central Intelligence. At the time I knew him probably simply by reputation as the boss, the man that headed the agency. I knew him by reputation for the long years of service that he had put in serving his country at the CIA and,

prior to that, in the OSS and in the military during the war. But it was really in the years after I left my service at the CIA, entered the private practice of law in Georgia, served as the U.S. Attorney in Georgia, and now as a Member of Congress that I have really come to know the William Colby that was such a tribute to his country, to his family and to his friends.

Mr. Colby's passing, of course, is the signal of the passing of an era in some ways. The tremendous years, decades of service to his country, the selfless service that he embodied, the service that forsook the lucrative call of private practice for many years, that drew him away from his family for many years, that kept him apart indeed in many ways from his fellow citizens for many years because of the very nature of his work, the secrecy of it, are the sorts of things that we see far too infrequently in public life nowadays.

Mr. Speaker, something else about Mr. Colby that I know from personal experience that is, if not unique, certainly something that we again do not see too often. That is the fact that, despite the man's tremendous intellect, despite the tremendous responsibilities that he continued to carry with him, even after leaving Government service, despite the fact that he could be jetting around the world anywhere at a moment's notice and meeting with world leaders, meeting with business leaders, large and small, he would always, and I emphasize always, find the time to take a call from a friend, to chat for a few minutes, to answer a question, to promise to get back to that old friend, that former junior colleague of his with an answer that might help with providing some information to an American citizen contemplating traveling abroad and who wanted to learn something about the inside scoop on a foreign nation.

In listening to the tributes today at the National Cathedral to my old friend, Bill Colby, I really was struck by the depth of public service embodied in this man. It is something that I cherish very much, and I commend to my colleagues here in this House and to the American people to learn about this man, to study him, to take heart in the selfless public service, the nonpartisan public service. In all the years that I knew Bill Colby, and he supported me politically, he supported me in many ways, I never asked him whether he was a Republican or a Democrat, and I do not know. It is not something that he demanded as a litmus test of anybody, and probably most people never demanded it of him.

Mr. Speaker, he responded to me as he responded to American citizens, many of whom he never knew, because he was that kind of man. He was a man that would constantly reach out, give of himself whether it was simply answering a question or whether it was parachuting behind enemies lines in World War II or serving this country very valiantly for many years in Vietnam. Mr. Colby truly was the professional's professional. He was the patriot's patriot for this country. He has indeed now come in from the cold, for he is now in the bosom of our Lord. I commend him to the American people.

GOLDEN EAGLE AND CORPORATE VULTURE AWARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last month as a cochair of the Jobs and Fair Trade Caucus, I proudly presented our group's first monthly Golden Eagle Award to Malden Mills in Methuen, MA.

If you will recall, the Gold Eagle Award recognizes fine U.S. companies that exemplify the best that is in us as a nation, companies which treat their workers with dignity while making decent profits, companies which contribute to strengthening their communities, companies which charge a reasonable price for their products and remain and prosper in these United States. When all of these practices are undertaken by one company, that company deserves our praise as a Golden Eagle U.S. company.

On the other hand, the Corporate Vulture designation, like the scavenger it represents, is given to a company in need of vast improvement, a company which exploits our marketplace yet downsizes its work force in America and outsources most of its production to foreign countries using sweatshop labor abroad. These firms then import their transhipped products back to the United States while keeping their prices high here at home and maintaining all of the benefits of being called an American company.

□ 2130

Corporate vultures deserve the consumers' disdain. Now, let me acknowledge this month's Golden Eagle company. The March 18 issue of Business Week detailed the unprecedented stock ownership of the company we all know as United Airlines, our Nation's leading airline company. Tonight, the Jobs and Fair Trade Caucus awards the employee owners of United Airlines our Golden Eagle Award and this new U.S. flag flown over the Capitol for your leadership, your rising productivity, and the example you set for all other companies in these United States.

United Airlines and its employee owners fit our description of a golden Eagle company in every respect. In the 18 months since United employees bought 55 percent of their company for $5 billion, United Airlines has confounded all the skeptics by their success. The Nation's No. 1 airline is outperforming most of its rivals, gaining markets share from the other top two airlines. The company is posting fatter operating margins and higher stock gains, with the stock price more than doubling since the purchase of the company.

The American workers of United and its chief executive officer Gerry Greenwald have made the company the success it is. By taking a huge risk in accepting pay cuts of 15 percent or more in the short term, United employees have shown that hard work over the long haul pays dividends. Operating revenue per worker jumped by 10 percent last year. Employee complaints, down by over half, have turned into new ideas about how to better work together with management. And unlike many large corporatios these days, which relentlessly downsize their work force, United is a job creator, hiring 7,000 new people since the buyout.

In marked contrast to our Golden Eagle Award, this month's Corporate Vulture designation goes to Hershey Foods, a company no longer so sweet to America. Hershey Foods, America's largest producer of chocolate, continues to outsource its production to countries like Mexico and cut its U.S. work force. Last fall, Hershey Foods announced layoffs of approximately 500 workers and then announced the company was moving the production line of its giant kiss from Hershey, PA, to its plant in Guadalajara, Mexico, which employs approximately 260 workers. The U.S. workers laid off were earning $15.40 an hour, and as one old-timer stated, as a part of that enjoyed health insurance, dental, eye, along with a pension plan.

Hershey's Mexican workers are paid 50 cents an hour with almost no benefits. The chief executive officer of Hershey Foods, Chairman Kenneth Wolfe, says he understands the pain he has caused the workers and their families in Hershey, PA. I frankly find that hard to believe. Chairman Wolfe earned an annual compensation of $1.2 million in 1994, not counting his stock options. Moreover, Hershey Foods is earning increased profits. The latest annual report shows that Hershey Foods enjoyed a net profit of $184 million, while total sales have increased to $3.6 billion. A company and a chief executive officer earning millions of dollars every year have no idea what it means to lose your job and worry about your family's future.

Economists will claim that Hershey's move to Mexico is good for American consumers. After all, when you are only paying your Mexican workers a few cents an hour and earning millions of dollars, your product will be cheaper, right? Take a look at the shelf. Hershey prices on chocolate have gone up in bars. So this evening, this month, Hershey Foods definitely fits the bill as this month's Corporate Vulture, May 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will

appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MCDERMOTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

COMMENTS ON REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to once again talk about the proposed Republican cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that are included in the budget, which we are most likely going to be voting on this Thursday in the House of Representatives.

I had the opportunity on Monday of this week, just this past Monday in fact, to speak before the Edison Senior Center. Edison is the largest municipality in my district in New Jersey, and there must have been 100 senior citizens at the Edison Senior Center when I was there.

I talked to them about what the Republican leadership was proposing to do with Medicare and Medicaid once again, and how similar the proposals in this budget we will be voting on are to the cuts and fundamental changes in Medicare and Medicaid that the Republican leadership proposed last year, and which the President and which the Democrats in the House of Representatives fought so hard to keep from becoming law.

We were successful. We were successful in stopping those changes to Medicare and Medicaid last year, and many of the seniors at the Edison Senior Center, I indicated to them I felt very strongly that they and the seniors throughout the country were a big part in our effort to try to stop those changes in Medicare, because many of them wrote to their Congressmen or Congresswomen and wrote to their Senators and said they did not like the changes that the Republicans were proposing.

So I asked them to once again start a writing campaign, and talk to other seniors that they know and their family members to say we do not want these radical changes being proposed by the Republicans.

Now, as we know, this current budget plan, this current Republican plan would cut Medicare by $168 billion over the next 6 or 7 years, and cut Medicaid by $72 billion. Most of the Medicare cuts this time would be in hospital care. That is particularly important to the State of New Jersey, because many of the hospitals in New Jersey, particularly in urban areas, but also in suburban and rural areas, are having a very difficult time making ends meet. Many of them are more than 50 percent, sometimes 60 percent dependent on Medicare and Medicaid, to keep their operations going. A significant cut in either of those programs really could cause many of those hospitals to close, particularly in the urban areas.

The whole reason we started the Medicare program that was started under President Johnson back in 1963 is because many seniors did not have health insurance, and found it difficult because of lack of funds or because of their condition, their physical condition, to buy health insurance. I think a lot of times we forget what it was like prior to Medicare coming into existence, how many senior citizens did not have health insurance, how many basically were so poor and had to pay money out of their pocket if they wanted health care, so they just basically delayed it, did not go to the hospital or the doctor.

We do not want to go back to that era, the era when seniors were impoverished in order to provide health care for themselves, or when so many of them did not have any health insurance coverage.

One of the things that I told the seniors in my district on Monday is that we are not just talking about money here. I think the money aspect is important, because essentially these large cuts in Medicare and Medicaid are being used to finance tax breaks for mostly wealthy Americans. So the money is an important part of this.

But there are also some fundamental changes in the Medicare program and the Medicaid program that are being proposed here by the Republican leadership that go way beyond the monetary aspect. Essentially what it amounts to is choice, the fact that senior citizens are going to have less choices of doctors and less choices of hospitals. Because what is happening is the way that Republicans have structured these changes in Medicare and Medicaid, they are pushing more and more seniors into HMO's or managed care, where often times they do not have the choice of doctors. They cannot go to the doctor, the specialist they traditionally go to, or sometimes cannot even go to the hospital that they traditionally go to that may be nearby.

I guess one of the things that really bothers me about the Republican rhetoric on the Medicare issue is they keep stressing what they are doing with Medicare is providing more choices. That somehow choice is sort of the linchpin, if you will, of their recommendation. And I would maintain that just the opposite is true, that the way the reimbursement rate is set up is so that seniors, basically a higher reimbursement rate goes to managed and HMO's, and less to traditional fee for service, where you have your choice of doctors or hospitals. That means seniors are going to have less choices as more and more are pushed into managed care.

I am being joined here tonight by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] and I wanted to yield some time to her. But I did want to mention, because there was one thing before I do yield, that there was an article in the New York Times this Sunday, that although it did not mention what was happening here in the House with regard to Medicare and Medicaid per se, I think is relevant, and I mention it because they specifically mention our two States, New Jersey and Connecticut.

The article is entitled ''The high cost of plugging the gaps in Medicare.'' Basically what the article says is that Medigap insurance, which is the insurance that seniors buy in order to cover the health care programs or the health care costs that are not covered by Medicare, and about 50 percent of the seniors in this country have Medigap because they want additional coverage, that the cost of Medigap insurance is skyrocketing.

They mentioned the AARP, which has a policy sold by Prudential, that will go up an average of 26 percent more this year. They specifically mention that in New York, the average premium of the five largest Medigap insurers soared 11 percent in a year, a rate equalled or topped in Connecticut or New Jersey. In both our States, we are talking about increases in Medigap insurance that are at least 11 percent in 1 year.

I think that this is directly related to what is happening in Washington with Medicare, because as you make cuts in Medicare, and, of course, the Republicans are talking about much deeper cuts than the President or anything that the Democrats have put forward, as you make these huge cuts in Medicare, and also in Medicaid, what is going to happen is that you are going to find less services that are covered or quality of services that are covered, more out-of-pocket expenses for senior citizens, and I think that that is going to be reflected more and more in higher Medigap premiums.

The other thing it will result in is that more and more people again will be pushed into managed care or HMO's, where they do not have a lot of choices because they will opt for that, rather than have to pay for the large premium increases in the Medigap program.

I would like to yield at this time to Ms. DELAURO, who has been an outspoken advocate of protecting the Medicare program, and I believe has had a lot of impact over the last year when

we were fighting these terrible Republican leadership proposals to try to significantly change the Medicare program.

Ms. DELAURO. I would like to say thank you to my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], who continues to demonstrate tireless, and I mean tireless, leadership on the health care issue, and obviously as it affects America's seniors. I think we ought to be having this debate and discussion, and I am sure we will continue it.

But May is Older Americans Month. I think it is a very fitting time for us to be talking about how what we do here in a budget can truly impact the lives in a very profound way of America's seniors. We saw that from last year's budget. There was an enormous outcry across this country as to what was happing to seniors.

I am a little perplexed that given the outcry that we saw and the public's feelings, if you recall, the public said to the President, veto the budget. Sixty percent of the public said veto the budget that was proposed last year, because of the severe cuts in Medicare and in Medicaid, education and the environment as well, but Medicare and Medicaid, and what that meant for the lives of seniors.

You are absolutely right about the article that was in the New York Times. MediGap was supposed to help to supplement Medicare. And what we are beginning to look at is the beginning, if you will. I mean, there are gaps in Medicare, therefore Medigap is to assist people. What we are looking at, instead of trying to figure out a way in which to make the Medicare system stronger, because people know that no system is perfect. And what we need to do is to make changes, to make it a better program, which we have said all along. Let us fix what is wrong with it, and let us build on it, in the sense that it has truly been a lifesaver for seniors in this country, who not too many years ago, less than half of our seniors had any kind of health care or protection at all. Today 99 percent of seniors have health care coverage, and the difference has been Medicare.

Instead of taking a look at that system, where you can build on the opportunity for long-term care, for home health care, for prescription drug assistance, which we all know is truly one of the areas that affects everyone, but it affects seniors particularly, because many times what seniors do is they do not get the prescription filled. They get it half filled, or they fill it and then they go without eating for a couple of days. But in any of those circumstances, it clearly is not good for their health.

So that we are now going to embark on a new budget proposal that will in fact erode this health care system that we have for seniors today, and I think we both agree and all of us who are engaged in this debate agree that the United States has the best quality health care in the world.

☐ 2145

That is not at issue. The question is its affordability and a variety of other questions. If we continue to erode the Medicare System, as is being proposed by the Republican majority in this House, we will then create a second-rate health care system for our seniors. That is not what we ought to be about.

I think there are a couple of interesting things. Over this past weekend the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, attacked the Democrats on Medicare, and he told the Republican Convention that the battle over how much money should be spent on Medicare is the most important question facing voters in 1996.

I think that that is probably right, because Medicare is not just a program. Medicare is not just a program. Medicare symbolizes a decent and a dignified retirement to people who have spent a lifetime playing by the rules, working hard, doing all that they can for their family, paying into a system, wanting to make sure that at the end of their lives, in the remaining years of their lives, if they need health care coverage, that they will have it, and that they are not going to get crippled financially by a particular illness. No one decides to get sick. It happens.

I think that the Speaker's partisan attack is unfortunate. We disagree about Medicare but I do think, as I said, that the question of funding Medicare is a critical one. Again, this is part of our value system. Medicare is a priority, and how we define our priorities is how our values are defined and what kind of a Nation we want to try to be.

That is why this issue is so critical and so important, and why we have to continue to focus our time and attention on it.

If we go back to what the Speaker is talking about, it was not too many months ago where he said, and the quote is clear, that the Medicare system should wither on the vine. The majority leader in the Senate bragged about how pleased he was and how proud he was of a vote that he cast in 1965, voting against the Medicare system because it is a system that does not work.

This is recent evidence of people who are in leadership positions in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, who would like to convey to the public that what they want to try to do is to slow the growth of Medicare, when in essence they do not truly believe in a Medicare system and its value and what it means in terms of a decent and secure and safe environment for seniors in this country. That is what the issue is about. That is what the debate is about.

We can deal with numbers, but numbers are not at issue. With this second budget proposal that has been made, to quote Yogi Berra, it is deja vu all over again. We are going back essentially to where we were in last year's debate, and that is what the public needs to know about. We are talking about $168 billion in Medicare cuts. We are talking about roughly, once again, in terms of the debate that we had over the last year and a half almost, it is $168 billion in Medicare cuts, it is now $176 billion in a tax break for the wealthiest Americans.

It is the very same debate, and that is why we have to continue to focus our time and attention on the issue. The question is, will we put hard-working families first or are we going to put special interests first? That is what the debate ultimately comes down to.

Let me say to my colleague, and I know he feels the same way, if we were assured that the money that was being cut was going to go into the solvency, as they talk about, of the Medicare trust fund, we could make an argument for this. But that is not the case. That is not the case at all.

The danger is that we are going to see funds for hospitals cut. In some rural parts of our country we will see that hospitals will close. Once again, deductibles will go up, premiums will go up, the choice of doctor is at risk again. So it is, in fact, the same debate all over again.

We have to be tireless, in my view, as my colleague from New Jersey has said, in continuing to make the case and raising once again the profile of this issue. I compliment my colleague in visiting a senior center over the weekend and getting people to come out once again, to do the writing, to do the calling, to be engaged in signing the questionnaires, et cetera. I will be doing the same thing myself to let the people that I represent know that the battle is on once again.

We have to be indefatigable. We have to be tireless, and the American public needs to speak up all over again on this issue.

Mr. PALLONE. I agree, and I appreciate the remarks the gentlewoman has made, if I could just follow up on two points that she made.

One is when I was at the senior center in Edison on Monday, one of the very first things the gentlewoman discussed was prescription drugs and the cost of prescription drugs, and how some seniors simply cannot afford to buy them or they will not get a refill if they need it. It is amazing to me, because when we talk to seniors when we are in our districts, these issues in many ways are very plain to them.

Many of the seniors in the audience in Edison said to me, ''Well, Congressman PALLONE, I don't understand. What Medicare should do,'' and this is almost a direct quote from one of the individuals, ''what Medicare should do is to be expanded to include preventive care.'' He talked about prescription drugs, because he said, ''A lot of times I go to the doctor and he prescribes a drug to me, and Medicare is covering the cost of the doctor visit but it is not covering the drug. So I get the prescription but I go home and I never fill it.''

What good is that? The point is that if Medicare were expanded to cover certain kinds of preventive care, like prescription drugs or like home health care visits, we would actually save a lot of money. We should be thinking of creative ways to expand Medicare, deal with prevention, and then save money in the long run.

That is what I was kind of hoping we were going to be doing when we started to talk about Medicare in the beginning of this Congress. But, obviously, I was very naive, and I think I was naive because I did not understand what the gentlewoman brought up, the basic idea, which is that this Republican leadership, both in the Senate and here in the House, really does not like the Medicare program. They have an ideological problem with the Medicare program, and that is why we are getting these quotes from Speaker GINGRICH saying that we will deal with it piece by piece and it will wither on the vine, or from the Republican presidential candidate saying that he is proud of the fact that when he was in the House of Representatives he did not vote for Medicare. They are not really interested in creative ways of trying to save money and expanding the money to help seniors. They just basically want it to go away.

The other thing the gentlewoman mentioned and I thought was so important, she talked about the dangers of Medicare becoming a second rate health care system, and I think we have talked about that a little tonight. But there is also sort of a corollary to that, the notion of a divided system, sort of a class battle, if you will, between the wealthier seniors and the middle class or poorer seniors.

I see that happening, for example, with Medigap. We mentioned that about half the seniors have Medigap and half do not. That means that a lot of seniors, even those who are on Medicare now, increasingly are not able to get certain kinds of health care services because they cannot pay out-of-pocket, because they do not have Medigap. So already we have a two-tiered system.

Now, in this Republican budget, one of the things we did not mention tonight, but I think we should, is that they have brought up again the Medical Savings Accounts, the so-called MSA's, which I call the tax break for the healthy and wealthy. Basically what they are suggesting, and the gentlewoman knows is the case, is that seniors opt into a situation where they get catastrophic coverage. If something really terrible happens to them and they have to go to the hospital for a long stay, they are covered, but they are not covered for anything else.

The money that the Federal Government puts up for Medicare, like a voucher, is put into some sort of savings account, and if they have to go to a doctor or they have something that only takes a relatively small degree of care, then they have to pay all that out-of-pocket.

But if an individual has a very high deductible, or are essentially only covered for catastrophic care, the only people that will be able to afford that are the healthy and wealthy, so to speak, because they will say, ''Well, that is fine, I will opt for that.''

So what do we do? Once these medical savings accounts become part of the Medicare system, we will have a two-tiered system, in essence. The cost for those who do not have the MSA's will probably go up, because they will be the ones that have less money and are more of a burden on the system. So the cost of the system will go up.

I know the gentlewoman has been very concerned about that issue, so if the gentlewoman wants to talk about that I would yield to her.

Ms. DELAURO. It is incredible, and this is a corollary, if you will, because we have the budget proposal now that once again makes this tremendous hit on the Medicare system, juxtaposed with the tax break for the wealthiest Americans; and then we have had an opportunity in this body over the last several months, in a bipartisan way, to look at health care reform or some first steps in terms of health care reform through the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill, and the Roukema bill on the House side that deals with two important issues, the prohibition on preexisting condition and the ability for people to change jobs and still maintain health insurance; things that people would very, very much like.

There again, rather than taking good pieces of legislation and trying to get them passed, and the President said he would sign the bill, and the authors of the bill said let us move forward, again very bipartisan, they add this concept that the gentleman has talked about, the medical savings account, which creams the healthy off the top, leaves the most frail, the most ill in the traditional health insurance policies, thereby taking the opportunity to bring some relief to people on health care, helping to try to then even lower the cost of health care, and what happens? More people uninsured, we drive the premiums up, and we completely reverse the intent of what we are trying to do by this concept of these savings accounts that healthy people will take advantage of. But the more sick an individual is, the more frail an individual is, they will wind up in the traditional systems.

Those premiums will go up. Less people will be able to afford them. More people will be uninsured. It is quite remarkable.

Then we take that and look at a budget, another one coming in where we have fought this battle and now we have to refight it, or it is just a continuation, quite honestly. It is just a continuation where we are going to see once again the medical savings accounts introduced and Medicare on the chopping block again.

Again, we need to mention over and over again, people need to understand, Medicaid, a $72 billion cut. Less than what it was, no question. Nevertheless, this is a system that helps to ensure the health of seniors in nursing homes. We are going to find people who are in nursing homes now, whose families will have to make a decision to take them in or do something else in order to provide health care for them.

I wanted to make one point, because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will talk about how they want to slow the rate of growth. A noble cause; one that I support, and I know my colleague from New Jersey supports. However, what they do not talk about is how many more people are going into the system every year. No accounting for that and what the increased costs are; no accounting for inflation at all. It is as if the system is dead in the water, stagnant, does not move, is not dynamic, is not fluid, and it is just where it will be today.

☐ 2200

We know that is not the case. It is not the case on anything that we deal with. It is changing. It is changing. But they try to say that they are lowering the rate of growth.

We need to lower that rate of growth. I just need to make the point on this that we made in the past. Where are you and where are my Republican colleagues on lowering the rate of growth in private insurance, as we were talking about Medigap policies? Those premiums are going up. Where are we lowering the rate of growth in the cost of prescription drugs? Where are we lowering the rate of growth in other parts of the health system? Why is it that we only want to attack seniors in this process? That is, I think, a question that our colleagues have got to answer.

Mr. PALLONE. If I could reclaim my time, I just want to follow up on what you said about Medicaid, particularly this issue of the rate of growth and not taking into consideration what is actually happening out there in the real world.

What they are proposing for Medicaid, which, as you mentioned, the majority of the people think Medicaid is just for poor people, the reality is the majority of Medicaid funds are used for senior citizens in nursing homes.

One of the things that I mentioned in the past, going back to last year, was that we are going to have a crisis. There was an article in the New York Times back in November that says, ''Critics say Republican budget will create shortage of nursing home beds for elderly. The reason for that is exactly what you said, which is that the number of people who are over 85, the over 85 population is growing dramatically and will be over the next 10 or 20 years.''

So the numbers that the Republicans are using for Medicaid, and they are going to block grant them to the States, do not take into account how many more seniors are going to be out there that are going to need nursing

home care. It completely ignores it. So we know there is going to be a shortage of beds in nursing homes.

The same thing with regard to children. Medicaid historically over the last 5 or 10 years has been able to absorb the number of children who are no longer covered by private health insurance. In other words, ever since the late 1980's, with all the downsizing and we had large unemployment then and we continue to have an unemployment problem, a lot of parents, when they lost their health insurance, their children were not covered. Because the Congress, under the Democratic leadership, had actually expanded the opportunities where Federal money went to the States, particularly to cover children, and States were encouraged to match those funds on a one-to-one basis, most of the children who were taken off health insurance, because their parents lost it when they lost their jobs or changed jobs, were actually covered by Medicaid. Because as those numbers of children without health insurance grew, Medicaid took up the slack and expanded.

This is a survey that was done by the Journal of the American Medical Association, published again in November's Washington Post, at a time when we were having the big budget battle here. They point out again that that is going to be completely reversed.

If you block grant this money to the States and give them leeway and you cut the rate of growth, so to speak, as the Republicans put it, a lots of States will just cut back on the number of children that are covered. And we will see a lot of children that are simply not covered by Medicaid or by any kind of health insurance whatsoever.

I know that we want to yield the rest of our time to one of our other colleagues. I appreciate the fact that you came, that Ms. DELAURO is on the floor here joining me on this. I know that she and I share the concern about what would happen with Medicare and Medicaid if this Republican budget goes through. Even though it is coming up Thursday and is going to be voted on, we will continue to fight this battle to the end.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank my colleague from New Jersey.

LIBERTY, JUSTICE, AND AN INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to particularly thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] for his great kindness in yielding me some of his time this evening. I had wanted this time to speak on liberty, justice, and an independent judiciary.

I come forward because I believe it is my obligation to do so, not as a lawyer, although I happen to be a lawyer, not as a law professor, although I am still a law professor because I continue to teach a seminar at Georgetown Law Center, but as a Member of Congress.

I am moved to come forward this evening because of recent attacks on the judiciary. Those attacks cannot be answered by the judiciary and they have come from this branch. I come forward this evening to make a plea to my colleagues that the cynicism toward Government which has infected the executive branch and the legislative branch, as Americans regard us, stops at the courthouse door.

Recently, from the legislative branch and the executive branch, there have been troubling signals that we may be willing to pull the judiciary into the polarized politics of the 104th Congress and the Presidential campaign. I agree with the dean of the Fordham University Law School, John Furick, who has said, and may I quote him,

> We are at a juncture where we all need to step back, including our President, Congress, governor and mayor, and here he means the governor and mayor of New York, and consider what is at stake when we make our judiciary part of the politics of the present day.

I want to cite two cases that have drawn us into this controversy. They are decisions where I profoundly disagree with what results the courts have reached. One involves Judge Harold Baer. This is the case where the judge initially found that there was an unlawful search and seizure. He threw out the evidence because he found that the police had searched the car when they saw bags being loaded into the car and men running away. And most of us wondered what in the world the judge could be talking about when he said it was reasonable for black men to run away from the cops in this upper Manhattan neighborhood. Thank you very much. As a Member who represents many African Americans, I can tell you that we do not expect people to run away from cops upon seeing them.

New evidence came forward, and the judge reversed himself. Before that happened, Mr. DOLE allowed as how the judge should be impeached because of his initial decision while it was still pending, mind you, and the President stopped short of that but himself criticized the judge very profoundly while the matter was still pending.

This already has had an effect upon the court. The lawyer for the defense himself, and I want to quote his statement, said to the judge in court, asking him to recuse himself, again, I am quoting,

> Never before have the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, 140 Members of Congress and a Presidential candidate sat in on a case and said that a Federal judge should be impeached or resign.

The defense lawyer then called upon Judge Baer to recuse himself entirely from the case saying, and I am quoting,

> It would appear you may have been influenced by outside forces.

Thus, when the judge heard new evidence, heard evidence that corroborated the initial evidence of the policemen involved, the defense lawyer said, there is still the appearance of impropriety and you should recuse yourself. I am not sure that the judge can ever get that stain off of himself, although it is clear that there was enough evidence before, frankly, and certainly afterward.

There is a second case from New York where I also disagree with the judge. That was one in which Governor Pataki, himself a lawyer, I believe also Mayor Giuliani called for the removal of a criminal court judge. His name was Lauren Duckman. Judge Duckman had lowered the bail of a suspect allowing the suspect to get out of prison and the suspect proceeded to kill his former girlfriend and it was harassment of his former girlfriend that got him in jail in the first place.

I do not think I need to tell anybody who knows me in this body where I stand on that case. The governor said that if the State commission did not remove this judge within 60 days, then he would ask the State Senate to begin removal proceedings.

Judges are often attacked and as public officials should be open to caustic attack, but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I have seldom, if ever, seen these kinds of attacks come from the top of the Government.

I am here this evening to say, stop it. Stop it. This is an attack upon our system of Government. It is difficult for judges to respond.

To his credit, from the top of the judiciary, the Chief Judge, the Chief Justice, Mr. Rehnquist, has in his own way responded, in a speech at the American University Law School. He responded in very lawyer-like fashion, referring to precedent, particularly the impeachment in 1805 of Justice Samuel Chase because of the way he handled three cases. The Senate, however, refused to convict and convictions must take place in the Senate.

Mr. Rehnquist noted the precedent and its viability for more than 200 years, for almost 200 years, and indicated he thought that precedent should stand. He also cited the infamous case of President Franklin Roosevelt who attempted but failed to pack the Supreme Court with extra justices when he thought, frankly, that the Republic was going to fall because the New Deal programs designed to save us from a catastrophic depression were put in jeopardy by the response of the judiciary. Even given the seriousness of those cases and the seriousness of the Baer case and the Duckman case which I have just alluded to, there is no case so serious that it is worth the attacks we have recently seen. I believe Mr. DOLE has pulled back. I believe President Clinton has pulled back. I am here to say, let us all pull back.

Judges must be subject to the same kind of criticism that other public servants are, except that restraint is

necessary because, unlike the executive and unlike the legislature, the courts must be entirely independent, free from outside influence. And that depends upon the way we, especially we in public office, behave.

Justice Breyer was in Russia in 1992 and sat in on a meeting between President Yeltsin and 500 Russian judges. And the justices reports that Mr. Yeltsin said to the 500 Russian justices, there are going to be changes made in the judiciary in Russia. For one thing, the prosecutor is not always going to win.

The prosecutor always wins; indeed, the parliament always wins in totalitarian regimes. I do not speak as Justice Rehnquist did as a judge. I have no desire to be a judge. I speak as a legislator. Understanding that the Judiciary is dependent upon the self-imposed restraint that this body and the Executive has almost always exercised for more than 200 years, the system demands restraint by us. Otherwise the judiciary itself is undermined, but, much more importantly, our Democratic form of government is undermined.

□ 2215

That is exactly what Alexander Hamilton said in a terse, but piercing, statement, and I quote Hamilton:

> There is no liberty, he said, if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive power.

Are we going to go back to Henry VII, when it is said he ruled his law with his judges?

We can have very little to do with judges except insofar as the President and the Senate participate in their appointment.

One commentator recently has written that the recent controversy about these cases, and I am quoting, should have dispelled any lingering doubt that the Judiciary and the nominating process for judges are destined to be entangled in partisan politics this election year possibly in a way not seen before, end quote.

Oh no, let us not pierce the separation of powers during the 104th Congress. We have polarized the country and this body enough. We push the envelope way too far when we draw judges and courts into our partisan disputes.

It is fair game to criticize decisions, it is fair game to criticize judges. It takes judgment to know when to stop. It takes discipline in this body and in the Executive to know when to stop.

This is a part of our history that is most revered. It begins before our forbears came to these shores. It took hundreds of years in England for the parliament to wrest its own superiority from the king. That was the beginning of English democracy. But the judges were still subservient to the parliament, so the parliament got greater democracy by pulling power from the monarch, but had no intention whatsoever of creating an independent judiciary initially. It took those who framed our Constitution to truly develop the notion of an independent, totally untainted, totally nonpartisan judiciary.

The Founders therefore took the British legacy, which included parliamentary supremacy, several steps further. The British had no written constitution. The Framers insisted upon a written constitution. But in order for the Constitution to matter, to guard the new Nation and its processes and its citizens, somebody had to be in charge of interpreting it. That was the role of an independent judiciary, and in order to make sure that liberty was guarded, nobody could tamper with the judges whose job it was to interpret the Constitution and the rights that flow from it.

So, as one commentator has said, if, meaning if the judges, were not entirely independent, and I am quoting, the Constitution's promise of a government of limited powers could be broken with utter impunity. The Founders thus rendered Federal jusges independent of the political departments not only with respect to their tenure and salary, but, more importantly, in their source of judicial authority.

It is this additional step, inconceivable in England, that made the American Constitution truly revolutionary. Without the judges there untouched and untouchable, the whole thing known as American democracy, the whole thing known as our former government, collapses in your laps. What has kept if from collapsing thus far? Amazingly, self-restraint. Self-restraint in this body and in the other body, self-restraint of the Executive; that is all that has done it. That is what separates us from the juntas and the banana republics and the totalitarian regimes.

Separation of powers is not a cliche, but it is a very ambiguous concept. What in the world does separation of powers truly mean? When you consider the supremacy of the legislature in our form of government, what separation of powers means is certainly not absolute. We, or the Senate, confirms judges. The President appoints judges, so clearly they do not spring from somebody's forehead. They are, in fact, touched by us initially. At the other end they can be removed only by impeachment, and we cannot reduce their compensation.

One writer has said that there is a twilight zone in between. You can appoint them, you can confirm them, and you can remove them for high crimes and misdemeanors, which is why Mr. DOLE'S comment was totally out of order, because whatever these judges had done did not amount to high crime, it amounted to a wrong decision.

If you can bring them in, and you can put them out with lots of safeguards attached to both ends, what can you do in between, the so-called twilight zone? A lot, and not very much. Public servants, whether they serve on the bench in the executive or in the Congress, are subject to public criticism and public scrutiny. But we are all different. We are different from the Executive, we are different from the judiciary. But the Executive and the legislature are much more alike than the judiciary is like either of us.

This is not a civic lesson, my colleagues. This is a warning from one of your Members. It is up to us to raise this point. It is up to us to signal that we do not mean to cross over the line to pierce the wall of separation of powers. That is not our intent, I do not believe it is the intent of any Member of this body, I do not believe it is the indent of the President of the United States, but I do believe that in the heat of argument it is very easy to do. Step back, step back.

The courts have been utterly principled on the separation of powers. The courts have defended our separate power. The courts have consistently, using the speech and debate clause, prevented any interference with out deliberations and have given the most liberal interpretation to the speech and debate clause, coining even the principle of legislative independence.

Each branch is coequal, but we are very different, and those differences must be respected or the 104th Congress will go down not only as the most calamitous, boisterous, raucous Congress, but as a Congress that lost respect for our form of government and helped to bring shame upon it. That is not the intent of any Member of this body.

I go very far and thought I should leave you with some examples of just how far I go when it comes to allowing, indeed encouraging, criticism of the judiciary. On March 18, 1986, Senator CHARLES GRASSLEY, a Republican of Iowa, mailed a questionnaire to article 3 judges, and it makes some of them very uncomfortable; does not make me uncomfortable. Lots of controversy about it. He asked them about their workloads, he asked them to fill out a questionnaire. These are sitting judges, they are article 3 judges. Everybody got it except the Supreme Court Justices. They were supposed to talk about their workloads, the use of law clerks and their outside teaching activities, their travel to conferences. I found most of it pretty mundane. What had not happened before is a sitting Member sending a questionnaire to judges.

Look, we get the money, we appropriate money. I do not know we cannot know something about the way in which courts operate. Some of the questions might have made some people uncomfortable; for example including does your court have a procedure for certifying opinions for publication? Or a motion of a party? Some have suggested that court policies regarding the publication of opinion and withdrawal of published opinions foster a number of problems, including an unfairness to litigants, a loss of judicial accountability and uncertainty about Presidential

status and actual judicial economy. What is your view of these suggestions? Are you involved in extracurricular activities such as teaching, lecturing, writing law review articles and making public opinions? If so, how much time do you spend on these activities, including preparation and travel?

Some people would say, hey, it is an independent judiciary. You are in the Congress. When you ask them questions, people may think you are trying to intimidate them. I do not think so. I think that if we are appropriating article 3 courts every year that we have a right to know something about their activities.

I leave a very large space for criticism and inquiry.

Mr. DOLE and Mr. Clinton have had an exchange. Mr. DOLE has criticized the ABA. I profoundly disagree with that. Just because you do not like the fact that some liberal judges have escaped, have gotten through, the scrutiny of the ABA because all this was a dupe, frankly, is to tell us about competence. I do not know why you want to throw the ABA out because it does not stop judges at the courthouse door if they happen not to meet your ideological tests. Nevertheless, Mr. DOLE has made an issue of the ABA. He has also made an issue of President Clinton's nominees. He has said that, and he used their caustic language, that it was a bunch of liberal judges and that they disregard the law, and he said some pretty excoriating things.

□ 2230

''A startling number of Mr. Clinton's lower court appointees have demonstrated an outright hostility to law enforcement.''

Fair criticism. I do not agree with it, but fair criticism. In return, Mr. Clinton has said that 67 of his appointees have received the highest rating of the ABA, compared to 52 percent of George Bush's nominees, 53 percent of Ronald Reagan's, and 57 percent of Jimmy Carter's; so he says, ''Look, this is all about qualifications. So far my judges are the highest qualified. That is all you can look at.'' Moreover, he said Mr. DOLE voted for 182 out of 185 of his nominees.

Mr. DOLE responds, ''Hey, I voted for them because of your prerogative. You cannot pin those judges on me.'' They can go back and forth like this during the entire presidential campaign and not offend me at all, not offend the separation of powers, not offend an independent judiciary. But when you call for impeachment of a judge, you send a chill through every judge in the United States. When you say you had better start impeachment proceedings, you who are an independent commission, or we the Governor, or we the legislature are going to do it, you send a chill. Neither of those chills is deserved. Both of those chills the entire system of government that is the United States.

Mr. Speaker, judges are controversial for a very important reason. That is because, as de Tocqueville said, ''Hardly any question arises in the United States that is not resolved sooner or later in a judicial question.'' If that was true in the 19th century, imagine how much more true it is today. Yes, this is a high stakes game. Yes, judges in our system of government have much more power than judges generally have. But yes, we can tolerate it. We know where to stop. We love this system, and the last thing any Member wants to do is to destroy it.

The principle of separation of powers, of an independent judiciary, of limited government, and of constitutional government are more important than Judge Baer's decision in the New York City case, are more important than Judge Duckman's decision in the case of the woman who was murdered. Yes, judges are human and they will make mistakes, and some of them will be profound, and some others of them will be outrageous. But we will not throw away 200 years of a magnificent constitutional system because two judges make a mistake. We will not do this. This Member comes to the floor to announce that she believes she is speaking for Members of the House and Senate and the President of the United States when she says we will not do this.

We will carry on the 1996 campaign with a lot more vigor and raunchiness than I would like, but it is going to happen. It is going to be a nasty, ugly campaign. So be it. That can happen between the two branches, and in a Presidential campaign. I do not like it. There is nothing illegal about it. There is nothing about it that risks our system of government. If we must punch each other out, as we have all during the 104th Congress, so be it. I ask my colleagues only one thing: As we go at one another, just leave the judges and the courts out of it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. If I could, Mr. Speaker, I will sum up a statement on the arms transfer to Pakistan and the United States response to Chinese nuclear transports. This is with regard to events taking place over the weekend.

I wanted to express my strong concern about these two recent developments that will affect the proliferation of nuclear and conventional arms in the South Asia region. First, after months of negotiations, it was announced last Friday that the United States will not punish the People's Republic of China for its sale to Pakistan of 5,000 ring magnets, devices used for the production of weapons-grade enriched uranium, in direct violation of provisions of the nonproliferation Act.

The official rationale for taking no action against the Chinese was that Beijing had committed itself not to make any such transfers in the future and that the Chinese would help us to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and consult with us on export control policies.

Secretary of State Christopher indicated that the United States had no hard evidence to counter China's denials of any knowledge of the transfers to Pakistan, even though there is strong evidence that the particular Chinese companies that sold the ring magnets have in fact been identified.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong concern about two recent developments that will affect the proliferation of nuclear and conventional arms in the South Asia region.

First, after months of negotiations, it was announced last Friday that the United States will not punish the People's Republic of China for its sale to Pakistan of 5,000 ring magnets, devices used for the production of weapons-grade enriched uranium—in direct violation of provisions of the Non-Proliferation Act. The official rationale for taking no action against the Chinese was that Beijing had committed itself not to make any such transfers in the future, and that the Chinese would help us to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and consult with us on export control policies. Secretary of State Christopher indicated that the United States had no hard evidence to counter China's denials of any knowledge of the transfers to Pakistan—even though there is strong evidence that the particular Chinese companies that sold the ring magnets have, in fact, been identified.

Interestingly, in last Saturday's New York Times, accompanying the article about the decision not to sanction China for the nuclear equipment transfers, was an article entitled ''Tread Carefully With China, Business Leaders Urge U.S.'' Leaders of the Business Council, meeting with government officials in Williamsburg, VA, urged that differences with China over not only nuclear proliferation, but also a wide range of human rights concerns and piracy of American music, movies, and software, should not get in the way of our economic relationship with China.

Now, in today's Washington Post we read that there may have been even less to the Chinese pledge of cooperation than initially met the eye. In the official Chinese statement, there was no specific reference to future sales of ring magnets, nor was there any specific pledge that sales of similar, nuclear-related gear to would-be nuclear proliferators would not recur. In a clever bit of diplomatic slight of hand, our diplomats essentially said that they thought the Chinese meant to make these promises, and as long as the Chinese didn't publicly contradict our statement, it would look like we had a deal. I fear that we got nothing more than another empty promise from the Chinese leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this administration has sought to expand American trade and investment in the emerging markets of the world, and there is much that is positive about this strategy. But, when it comes to China, I believe we had to draw a line—particularly with regard to this reckless Chinese policy of assisting the nuclear weapons development program of Pakistan, a country that has repeatedly shown itself to be unstable, a country that has trained and financed terrorist movements, a country that has openly shown itself to be hostile to United States and Western interests.

Sadly, it appears that the Clinton administration is pursuing the same policy as the Bush administration pursued with regard to China,

arguing that increased business links would help modify Chinese behavior. This policy has essentially forced us to sweep one outrage after another under the rug, with the nuclear proliferation issue being only the latest in a series of outrages.

Mr. Speaker, in another issue that could have lasting effects on security in the strategically important South Asia region, I regret to point out that the administration is also going forward with the shipment of $368 million worth of sophisticated conventional arms to Pakistan. Plans call for shipping the weapons to Pakistan after the completion of the elections in India—the logic being, apparently, to avoid making the arms transfer an issue in the elections, despite the fact that it has been widely known for weeks that the shipment would happen. This ill-advised proposal that will only contribute to instability and weapons proliferation in the region.

A provision in the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations authorizes the transfer of $368 million in sophisticated conventional weaponry, including three Navy P–3C antisubmarine aircraft, 28 Harpoon missiles, 360 AIM–9L missiles, and other Army and Air Force equipment. This provision, known as the Brown amendment, after its Senate sponsor, passed the Senate last year. Although the provision was never debated in the House, it carried in conference. I drafted a letter to the conferees, which was signed by 40 other Members from both sides of the aisle urging that this provision not be included in the bill. But, owing in large part to the support of the administration and the influence of the pro-Pakistan lobby, the provision was included in the bill and became law.

As far back as last summer, many of us in Congress—Democrats and Republicans, Members of both bodies—argued that providing these weapons to Pakistan was a bad idea, given Pakistani behavior. About a year ago, it was reported that Pakistan received Chinese M–11 missiles, in direct violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime. These missiles, in direct violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime. These missiles are capable of carrying nuclear warheads, and can strike cities within a 275-mile radius. It was also reported last year that Pakistan developed its nuclear weapons from a blueprint provided by the PRC, and Pakistan then gave this blueprint to Iran. Pakistan remains an unstable nation, where the military does not seem to be under strong civilian control, a country which supports the embargo of Israel and does not recognize the State of Israel.

Yet here we are, Mr. Speaker, forgiving the outrageous behavior of both Pakistan and China.

It is important to recognize that Pakistan has not agreed to do anything in exchange for the release of the arms—the shipment of which was seized pursuant to the Pressler amendment. Named for its Senate sponsor, the Pressler amendment, mandates an annual Presidential certification that Pakistan does not possess a nuclear explosive device. If such a certification cannot be made, under the law, all United States military assistance to Pakistan must be ended—including weapons already paid for but not delivered. In 1993, President Clinton did offer to return all or some of the weapons in the pipeline if Pakistan would agree to cap its nuclear program. Pakistan rejected this offer. In fact, by receiving the ring magnets from China, Pakistan was continuing to act—in defiance of the United States—to further its nuclear ambitions.

Finally, the administration came up with a compromise: while 28 F–16 fighter jets would not be delivered to Pakistan—they already have 40 F–16's—the $368 million worth of military equipment would be delivered with no strings attached.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, Pakistan gets its weapons—our weapons—and we receive nothing in return.

Mr. Speaker, the delivery of these weapons to Pakistan will be seen by India as a slap in the face. India, the world's second most populous country, is in the process of completing the largest exercise in democracy in world history. India's elections, despite a few isolated incidents of violence, were conducted very smoothly. While the implications of the election results are somewhat unclear, what is clear is that this election represents the free expression of hundreds of millions of citizens in a vast, diverse, and free nation. Contrast these democratic elections with the dictatorship in China. Contrast the ability of hundreds of millions of people to express their views without fear of reprisals with the ongoing atmosphere of political violence that continues to tear Pakistan apart.

In addition to sharing our democratic values, India has also been pursuing a historic free-market economic reform. In fact, the United States has in the past few years become India's largest trading partner.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the administration to end this tilt toward Pakistan and China. We must work to promote not only free markets, which are an extremely important consideration, but also democracy. Based on these criteria, we should be working for improved relations with India.

IMPORTANT ISSUES WHICH DEFINE THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS IN THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHABOT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to address my colleagues in this obviously empty Chamber, even at this late hour, because I am going to be discussing some issues that I think are of paramount importance and which define the differences between the Republican and Democratic Parties in the 104th Congress.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I happened to hear the first half hour of the last hour, which involved comments by my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], regarding our budget proposal, which will be coming to the House floor here in the next couple of days. This is the budget proposal for the coming Federal fiscal year which will begin on October 1 of this year.

As is very typical, he made very disparaging remarks about our plans to save Medicare from bankruptcy and our plans to reform Medicaid into a block grant program for the States. These tactics are not isolated to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] alone. They run rampant through the national Democratic Party today, as the Democratic Party has seized on this particular issue to frighten and scare Americans in the hopes that they can, by employing these kinds of tactics, regain control of the House and Senate in the November elections.

Mr. Speaker, what we get, instead of constructive debate on the House floor, are what I would prefer to call drive-by special orders. In fact, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is still present. He is standing toward the rear of the Chamber, grinning. I would invite him to return to this very podium where he made his comments and engage in actual debate, rather than stand up and demagogue on these issues.

The first thing, Mr. Speaker, the American people need to know is that the Republican and Democratic Party, if you use President Clinton's budget proposal as their blueprint for reforming Medicare, are roughly $30 billion apart. In the context of a 6-year balanced budget plan, that is a very small difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties.

But again, we would never know that to listen to my Democratic colleagues, who insist on demagoguing this issue, and who, frankly, never mention that President Clinton, the leader of their party, has put forward a plan to reform Medicare by reducing the growth in Medicare expenditures.

Another way of putting that is that both the Republicans and Democrats want, at least, again, if you use President Clinton's proposal and not the comments of the far left wing of his party in the House and Senate, if you use his proposal, we both want to increase Medicare spending but at a slower rate, at a sustainable rate, in order to save the program from bankruptcy.

Before he might have to depart, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, even though there are only a few of us present now, I am going to pose a pop quiz to the House. The question is who made the following statement:

> Today, Medicaid and Medicare are going up at three times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at two times the rate of inflation. That is not, I repeat, not a Medicare or Medicaid cut. And we have kept private sector increases so they won't go up as much. So only in Washington do people believe that no one can get by on twice the rate of inflation. So when you hear all this business about cuts, let me caution you, that is not what is going on.

Now, who made those comments: President Clinton or NEWT GINGRICH, the Speaker of the House? If you guessed President Clinton, you were

right. He made those comments on October 5, 1993. On May 16, 1995, more recently, he said, ''I believe we have to slow the growth of Medicare.''

Mr. Speaker, compare the comments of President Clinton to what you hear tonight on the House floor from people like the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE]. Then think for a moment on this particular quote. This is a quote by the former Democrat Governor of Colorado, Gov. Richard Lamb, in Newsweek May 13, so just the other day: ''I am awed by his,'' referring to President Clinton, ''I am awed by his understanding of this insolvency of Medicare, which just makes his demagoguing worse. He knows what is happening, yet he is poisoning the well. Medicare is not as bad off as the Republicans said, it's must worse.''

So that is what we hear nightly out here during special orders, is Democrats demagoguing this issue and poisoning the well, and ruining any chance of a bipartisan proposal, a bipartisan solution to save Medicare from bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], as well. I do want to continue in the vein of a pop quiz, since it is getting near the end of the school year, and since there are a lot of kids there, students who are picking up the brunt of this huge, massive debt.

Let me give you a number. As of today, by the way, our debt is $5,092,815,215,000. To help senior citizens, to help the middle class, to help the young folks, we have to get our head out of the sand and say, OK, it is time to act like we do have a debt out there after all, and let us be responsible and work together in a bipartisan fashion and quit all this election year sniping, which apparently is so addictive and tempting these days.

The pop quiz. I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], your final exam: Which number is larger, $179 billion, or $304 billion. Which one is larger?

Mr. RIGGS. I think I can answer that one, even though I do not pretend to be any kind of mathematics expert, but obviously the $300 billion figure is much larger.

Mr. KINGSTON. You are doing well so far. Question No. 2: If the House raised Medicare from $179 billion to $304 billion, would they be increasing Medicare, decreasing Medicare, or leaving it level?

Mr. RIGGS. They obviously would be increasing.

Mr. KINGSTON. Increasing. So why do you suppose there are Members of the House who say increasing Medicare from $179 to $304 billion is a cut? Can you explain that? That is the discussion question.

Mr. RIGGS. It is. In fact, let me just add, to personalize it a little bit more for our colleagues and for any Americans, our fellow Americans who might be listening to us, our plan to save Medicare from bankruptcy, while increasing Medicare spending and increasing Medicare health care choices, increasing Medicare spending per senior citizen from $4,800 per citizen per year in 1996 to $7,300 per senior citizen in 6 years. Obviously when you go from $4,800 today to $7,300 over the next 6 years, you are increasing Medicare spending per senior citizen. No matter which way you slice it, that happens to be an increase.

Let me stop and see if the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] would like to join me at this point in time.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE.]

Mr. PALLONE. I certainly would like to debate these issues, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I do not think the issue really is whether we are talking about a cut in the increase or an overall cut after inflation. To me the problem here is——

Mr. KINGSTON. A cut is not the issue at all. As a matter of fact, we just said, beyond a doubt, that if you, if I could point out——

Mr. RIGGS. I yield the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. KINGSTON. If we want to have a discussion, let us get on the concrete foundation that the figure $179 is smaller than the number $304, and remove from the discussion that Medicare is cut. Could we agree that $304 is bigger than $179?

□ 2245

Mr. PALLONE. I would like the gentleman to yield me some time if I could talk about this. If not, there is no point, if I am not going to be given a couple of minutes or so to respond.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to give the gentleman a chance to respond, but I appreciate the statement of my colleague from Georgia and again we hope that you can perhaps tell us what your proposal is to save Medicare from bankruptcy.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question. If I could have a couple of minutes to respond.

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PALLONE. I thank the gentleman. First of all, I would point out that the level of cuts that the Republicans are talking about in this budget are not necessary for Medicare solvency. Basically what the Republicans are proposing are cuts that are $44 billion more for Medicare than what President Clinton has proposed in his budget.

Let us keep in mind that the President proposed a budget earlier this year, and now the Republican budget that is coming up this Thursday for a vote is basically a counterproposal to that. The President acknowledges, as every Democratic Congress has in the past, that it is necessary to deal with the Medicare program and make sure that the trust continues to be solvent. That is why he has proposed a certain level of cuts in Medicare. But those are strictly to keep the trust fund solvent.

Mr. Speaker, the level of cuts that the Republicans are proposing, which is significantly more than the President, these are the things that I have a problem with, and I believe that those are being used primarily to pay for tax breaks. More important than that, and I stressed earlier this evening, is that the very nature of the Medicare program changes with this Republican proposal. Basically what you are doing is cutting down and eliminating choices. You are pushing a lot more seniors, in fact I think eventually all seniors, into managed care or HMO's where oftentimes they are not going to have a choice of doctors or even hospitals. You are allowing for a different reimbursement system, basically providing a higher level of reimbursement for HMO's or managed care than the traditional fee-for-service system where you can choose your own doctor, and then you allow balanced billing. In other words, doctors can charge more for people who stay in the traditional Medicare so there will be a larger out-of-pocket expense for those who continue to stay in the traditional fee-for-service program where they have their choice of doctors.

In addition to that, you have introduced this notion of medical savings accounts, which basically establishes a catastrophic health insurance policy which only the healthiest and the wealthiest senior citizens are going to be able to afford.

So three major points in the existing Medicare Program have existed essentially for the last 30 years. One is unlimited choice of doctors and hospitals. Second is a limit, I think it is 15 percent, on the amount that can be charged as a co-payment by the physician beyond Medicare, plus the guarantee that if you are in Medicare, you are going to have a certain level of health services that are provided for. All three of those things are negatively impacted by the Republican proposal.

What I am saying is that those are not necessary in order to guarantee the solvency of the program, if you simply implement the level of cuts that the President has proposed, and then you will keep the Medicare Program solvent.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a choice Thursday. It is going to be the Republican budget. There is going to be the President's budget, and there may be a lot of other alternatives. What I am saying is the President's budget is far superior and solves the problem of solvency. So, the Republicans in raising this issue of solvency are using it as an excuse to cover all the other changes that they are suggesting to make in the Medicare Program.

Mr. RIGGS. Let me reclaim my time and give the gentleman a chance to catch his breath.

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all point out that our plan very clearly says right on its face that no older American who is currently receiving Medicare health care benefits will be forced out of the traditional fee-for-service program. It does provide other options

for health care, and the gentleman from New Jersey mentioned a couple, managed care, and medical savings accounts. We think those are both progressive ideas, designed to build more flexibility into the program, ultimately give more choice to Medicare recipients and frankly to empower them to be more involved with decisions having to do with their own personal health care.

Let me point out that, second, a fact that the gentleman kind of skipped over. Let me back up for just a moment.

Let me also stipulate that our plan requires that any savings from reducing the rate of growth in Medicare expenditures must stay in the Medicare Program. As a consequence, the Congressional Budget Office says that our program will extend the life or the solvency of the hospital insurance trust fund to the year 2008, which is 3 years more than the President's proposal.

So, yes, we are bolder because we are trying to think not just of the needs of today's seniors but the needs of the next generation of Medicare recipients as well. But I want to come back to one point because I really want to understand this in terms of the gentleman's position.

Do I understand correctly that your position is that the roughly $120 billion I believe that is in Medicare savings that the President proposed is OK? That is to say, you are comfortable with that? You can support that level of savings? You will vote on this floor if you have the opportunity for that level of savings? But you object to our figure which is roughly now, and I know we are talking ballpark figures here, but our figure is roughly $30 billion more in savings, which you characterize as cuts.

Mr. PALLONE. If the gentleman will yield further, let me say this. I am not in charge of the rules process but I believe that there will be an opportunity on Thursday to vote on the President's budget as an alternative and, yes, I will vote for that assuming that that is in order and that we have that opportunity. I am also concerned about the level of cuts in the President's budget but obviously I think it is far preferable to what the Republican leadership has proposed and I will support it. The concern I have is that the level of cuts, and obviously even more aggravated in terms of what the Republican leadership has proposed, is going to have a very negative impact on hospitals. In other words, if you look at the level of cuts in the Republican budget, most of the money that is proposed to be cut comes out of Part A which is of course primarily paying or reimbursement for hospital care. We know, because that same level is basically what was proposed in 1995, that many hospitals will not be able to absorb that level of cut primarily because they are 50, 60 in some cases better than 60 percent dependent on Medicare. So I do think that there is a danger and that we are kidding ourselves here if we think that we can continue to make these level of cuts that you propose. I know it is a little better than 1995 overall but it is not really better in terms of Part A and what that means for the Nation's hospitals.

I would venture to say that the President's proposal is significantly less in terms of the level of cuts to hospitals and that is far preferable because it will mean that many of these hospitals, and I think in particular of my home State, will be able to survive with that level of cuts, whereas they may not be able to, or most likely will not be able to under what the Republican leadership has proposed.

But even beyond that again it is the changes in the Medicare Program that you are proposing that bother me the most. I think it is going to significantly change the nature of the Medicare Program and not provide the guarantee that seniors have had for the last 30 years in terms of the unlimited choice of doctors and being protected against additional costs that would be charged by physicians.

Mr. RIGGS. Let me reclaim my time and state to the gentleman again so he is absolutely clear on this point, we have made, I think emphatically clear to the American people from day one that anyone presently in the Medicare Program under the traditional fee-for-service arrangement could stay in that program. That is explicitly built into the legislation.

I also want to make the point, then I am going to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, and I hope the gentleman will stay because I will yield him more time, but I also want to point out that the Democrat plan does not contain the same incentives for rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse, not the same aggressive incentives that ours have, including a financial incentive to those Medicare recipients who do report waste, fraud, and abuse in the system, and I think we all know that there is rampant waste, fraud, and abuse, almost endemic to the system.

Second, it does not provide the same flexibility in choices that we have offered Medicare recipients in our plan. I am a Californian, I admit California is on the cutting edge of the Nation in terms of introducing the idea of managed care on an outpatient basis for all age groups, not just older Americans, and I am absolutely convinced that managed care is a viable health care alternative for those Medicare recipients who are either already enrolled in managed care programs that are quite satisfactory in terms of their needs, in their opinion, meeting their needs, and, second, in terms of giving Americans again more say, more of a role, in making their own health care decisions.

We are not forcing anyone out of the program. We are trying to bring a 1950's style program into the 1990's. Again I say to the gentleman, he insists on continuing to use the term cuts to describe our program. But as that gap between the Republican proposal and the Clinton proposal narrow, at what point do you cease to describe our program as a cut? That was the question posed to the President at the press conference last week, and he sort of hemmed and hawed. He ultimately, as many times he does when he is pinned down, he ultimately blamed the media for introducing the use of the term cuts into the debate, and nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that that term has been used out on this floor of the other body repeatedly. I believe it has been identified by the Democratic Party strategists as the key wedge issue to be used as a political football, if you will, to try to regain control of the House and the Senate.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, there is no question that this is the liberal Washington keep the status quo propaganda machine using the word cut. And the gentleman from New Jersey, who I respect, I think maybe it is a reflection of the New Jersey school system when he refers to going from $304 billion from $179 billion as a cut, where all the rest of the States across the country would call that an increase.

Moving on, though, with his concern about hospitals, I am concerned about hospitals but only after I am concerned about patients and senior citizens. I think that the patients, you have to put the patients first. I am sorry about the hospital system in New Jersey, but again I am more concerned about the patients.

My mother, as I believe your parents are, as well, is on Medicare. It is a 1964 Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan. I like the idea of mom having choices because I trust her and I trust other people's parents and their children's ability to choose what health care plan fits them best. Right now it is Medicare or Medicare, period. Under the proposal they would have a physicians service network as an option. They would have a managed care plan as an option. They would have traditional Medicare as an option. They would have medical savings accounts as an option.

Mr. Speaker, all these are actuarially worked into the formula that increases the benefit from around $5,000 to $7,200. The numbers vary slightly, but the fact is that it does give more choices while cracking down on fraud and abuse.

My dad lives in a condominium complex in Athens, GA, where there are a number of other seniors. My dad has macular degeneration, is legally blind, he has diabetes. But all the seniors in his complex work together and go over each other's bills, medical, food needs, and so forth. He says just about without exception when they go to the hospital for a head cold, they get billed for x rays or something just totally ridiculous. I do not think it is all fraud, but it is just a general sloppiness that Medicare is paying for it, so do not worry about it. We have got to crack down on that abuse because it is right out of our seniors' pockets.

One other thing that the gentleman from New Jersey mentioned was this tax cut thing, and maybe we could just at this point agree that we disagree on Medicare. We want to save and protect it one way, and the President wants to keep patching it up another way until the next election. I think that it is important—and one of our great challenges, where he saves the program until 2008, we need to save it ad infinitum but at least get beyond the election cycle.

I note with interest that one of the things about the Clinton budget is that 74 percent of the reductions, the deficit reductions in the overall budget come the last 2 years, which is 2 years after he is out of office if he was to be reelected. So here we have got the pain, as usual, coming later, whereas the Republican budget overall reduces spending and savings, consolidates the size of Government over a 6-year period of time. It is more fair and more equitable that way.

Mr. Speaker, the thing, though, our profamily budget also calls for a tax credit of $500 per child for families under $110,000. I have always thought of New Jersey as having higher incomes than Georgia; $110,000, you can live well. But the fact is that is a combined income, and that still in many cases is very middle class.

I would like to ask our friend from New Jersey when we talk about tax cuts for the wealthy, which I have heard him and many of his colleagues expound on over and over again, who are the wealthy that we are talking about in this budget that would benefit and maybe even why it is so bad to do anything for the wealthy. I would like to just throw that question out to the gentleman.

□ 2300

Mr. RIGGS. Let me pose that question to him, and then maybe the gentleman from New Jersey will also tell us where he stands on the repeal of the Clinton Democratic gas tax increase, which will be coming to this House floor early next week. I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Well, you are probably asking the wrong person, because I did not vote for the original gas tax increase, and I would have no problem and would certainly vote for the repeal.

I only mentioned the tax breaks because of my concern over the fact that the Medicare cuts as well as the Medicaid cuts I believe will be used to finance them. I know that one of the things that the gentleman said before, which I am very concerned about, he said we were going to have a guarantee that you could stay in the traditional fee-for-service plan and that whatever cuts were implemented by the Republican leadership would stay in the Medicare Program.

I would say that those promises are not real. First of all, because in 1995, when we discussed the issue, we tried to put an amendment in the budget that would say that all the money that was saved in Medicare and Medicaid would only be used for those programs. That amendment was actually defeated on the floor of this House. I voted for it. So I think it is a false promise.

Second, when you talk about the guarantee that you will be able to stay in the fee-for-service or traditional Medicare Program, again, the guarantee does not mean anything if you build into your proposed changes in Medicare a different reimbursement rate for managed care and HMO's versus the traditional fee-for-service program where you can choose your own doctor.

That is the problem here. You are building in incentives that basically make people or force people to go into HMO's, because the reimbursement rate because of the caps will be higher for HMO's and managed care and lower for the traditional fee-for-service system. Under the traditional fee-for-service system you are going to allow balanced billing. You are saying the doctors can charge more than the 15 percent now allowed under current law. Basically what is going to happen here, even though there may be something written in the legislation that says you can stay in the traditional Medicare system, the reimbursement rate, and money drives everything, is going to push people into managed care and into HMO's.

I am not saying managed care and HMO's are always bad. There are some that are very good. The bottom line is a lot of seniors are used to having their own choice of doctors, and depending on the area, they may not be able to get into an HMO or managed care system where their doctor is covered by that system. So this notion of choice, that somehow the Republican leadership plan is going to guarantee choice or provide lots of other choices, I think is a false promise, and particularly when you talk about the MSA's.

I believe you brought up the issue of the medical savings accounts. That is nothing more than catastrophic health care coverage. What I think is going to happen is once again the healthy and wealthy people will choose that because they can afford to put the money aside and not worry about whether they are going to have to pay out of pocket for the health care and just have this catastrophic coverage.

The people remaining in the Medicare system are going to be the sicker and probably the poorer people. That is going to drive up the cost for the Government for those that remain in the system. I am fearful what you are doing here is creating a sort of two-tiered system, pushing certain seniors into managed care, having a lot of them opt out for this catastrophic coverage that they may not necessarily know what they are getting into.

When you say you are still going to be able to have your traditional Medicare, the bottom line is you really are not, because you are creating incentives that will make it more difficult for that to happen.

I also wanted to address the issue of fraud. This was a big issue for the Democrats in the last Congress. Again, I was in the Committee on Commerce, I am a member of the Committee on Commerce, and we specifically tried to change the language that was in the Republican bill that made it easier for those who were committing fraud or were basically abusing the Medicare system to get away with it.

The standard of proof that was put into place in that budget last year, and I suspect it is the same this year unless you show me differently, was actually watered down, so it would be more difficult to prosecute those who were violating Medicare and abusing the system.

I am 100 percent for trying to crack down on fraud and abuse. I think you can save a significant amount of money if you do that. Do not weaken the standard of proof and make it more difficult for the Justice Department and others to go after those committing the fraud and abuse. Otherwise you will have a worse system in terms of prosecuting those people.

Lastly, I do not want to get into semantics. I have said over and over, I think the gentleman from Georgia was here when I said it in 1995, we are talking about a cut in the growth of the program. I keep using the term ''cut.'' Maybe you do not like the term ''cut'' in growth, but I will say one thing, I use it for both the President and for the Republican proposal. The bottom line is that if you do not have enough money in Medicare to continue to service to the growing number of people who are going to be in the system, because we know there are going to be more seniors, the baby-boomer generation is getting older and there are going to be more and more seniors in the system, if you do not have enough money to cover that growth, in reality what you are doing is cutting the amount of money to be available to these people and the need is going to be there and there is not going to be the money to take care of the growing number of seniors.

I do not see this as a political issue. I know that has been raised many times on the floor. I am someone who has cared about seniors for a long time. I have worked for protective services for the elderly in various capacities. There is a lot of politics in this House of Representatives. The bottom line is we have to look at the substance of what is going on here. We are talking about the substantive changes of what would happen, what changes would exist in the Medicare Program, if this Republican proposal goes through.

That is why I think we need to continue to fight against it. Even if it passes on Thursday, which I suspect it will, I will be continuing to speak out against it as I have tonight.

I appreciate the time that you gentlemen have given me this evening.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman does not want to talk about taxes?

Mr. PALLONE. I will be glad to talk about taxes.

Mr. RIGGS. I am going to reclaim my time. We will talk about taxes in a moment. The point I want to make is that House Republicans and Senate Republicans have acted responsibly in this session of Congress. We sent the President a viable piece of legislation known as the Medicare Preservation Act and he vetoed that legislation. What is coming to the House floor, I believe the gentleman said Wednesday or Thursday, later this week, is a budget resolution for the Federal fiscal year 1997. It assumes a certain amount of savings in the Medicare Program, but it is not a comprehensive plan to preserve and protect Medicare from bankruptcy, such as the legislation the President vetoed.

I also want to make a point, and that is the gentleman repeatedly refers to HMO's. But I am perplexed, because there are literally thousands of older Americans today who are already in Medicare health maintenance organizations. I hear from many of them, I am sure the gentleman must have heard from some of them, that there is a high level of satisfaction for the most part with the services that they are receiving through those HMO's. After all, no one has forced them into those HMO's. They still have the option of relying on the traditional fee-for-service arrangement, yet they have voluntarily opted to enroll in Medicare health maintenance organizations.

So I believe that that is evidence that HMO's or managed care can be introduced alongside the traditional fee-for-service arrangement, with again the ironclad guarantee that we built into the legislation, which is that no older American currently receiving Medicare benefits would be forced out of the traditional fee-for-service program.

I also want to point out to the gentleman that I hope he is committed, and he makes some constructive suggestions, it sounds like he would like to, if we could agree on the ultimate level of savings to be achieved, to help us fine tune this legislation. But I want to point out that if we do not act, we will be remiss in our leadership responsibilities as elected officials, at least in my view, especially since we now know, every Member of this body, every Member of the other body, knows that Medicare will be bankrupt no later than the year 2001, just 5 years from now, and that is a year sooner than the Medicare trustees warned Congress a year ago last month, April 1995. As both gentlemen know, several of those Medicare trustees are members of the President's Cabinet.

Now, those estimates of Medicare going bankrupt sooner than we had projected come from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. So let us assume that because of the partisan wrangling, because of those who are more interested in preserving Medicare as an issue for the fall election campaign than in actually preserving Medicare for the next generation, let us assume nothing happens and we continue down that road with Medicare going bankrupt. And I should point out at this juncture that this is not FRANK RIGGS, Republican, speaking now. Of course, these warnings are coming from not just the Congressional Budget Office, as I just mentioned, but from the mainstream media.

For Pete's sake, the Washington Post, not exactly a conservative publication, editorialized on April 29, just a short time ago, ''By the end of the fiscal year 2001, the trust fund will have a deficit of $2.9 billion because of rising costs. In other words, the fund will be bankrupt a year earlier than projected last year by Medicare program actuaries.''

They go on to say, ''According to the Congressional Budget Office figures, the trust fund will be in the red by $331.6 billion by the end of fiscal year 2005.''

You heard me right, a $331 billion deficit, $100 billion worse than the cumulative deficit forecast a year ago by the CBO, the $150 billion worse than the cumulative deficit projected by the Medicare actuaries last year.

The last comment I wanted to quote, ''The new numbers appear to lend support to Republican charges that the Medicare hospital tust fund is deteriorating faster than had been realized and that steps must be taken quickly to arrest the decline.''

So, if the gentleman happens to share those sentiments, I think he has an obligation to contribute constructively to the debate, rather than to come down here and do, as I suggested earlier, sort of join with the President in, to use the terms of former Colorado Democrat Governor Richard Lamb, poisoning the well. Because make no mistake about it, colleagues and the American people, the alternative, if we allow this program to go bankrupt, is a substantial increase in payroll taxes on the backs of every working American. The Medicare trustees and actuaries estimated roughly a 40-percent payroll tax would be necessary to replenish the hospital insurance trust fund if we did nothing, or we would be looking at the possibility of rationing health care benefits. In fact, by law, of Medicare goes bankrupt, no benefits can be paid, and therefore no services rendered or received.

So I really want to urge the gentleman and his Democratic colleagues to start contributing constructively. If you have suggestions for how to save Medicare from bankruptcy, on how to modify or fine tune the Medicare Preservation Act which President Clinton vetoed, then, by all means, please put them on the table and stop poisoning the well.

Mr. PALLONE. If the gentleman will yield further, I have said over and over again that the President's budget which came out earlier this year guarantees the life of the Medicare trust fund in my opinion for as long as the Republican proposal. What I am saying is the additional Republican cuts, this additional $44 billion more in Medicare cuts, is not necessary for Medicare solvency.

There is over $120 billion remaining in the trust fund. Although it did not perform as well as projected in 1995, the difference between the actual and projected performance was within the typical margin of error.

The fund comes out with a report every year. In 1993 the President made certain corrections and signed into law a bill extending the life of the trust fund for 3 years. Now, he had an additional proposal to extend the life of the fund. We are not talking about his agreement about the fact that Medicare has a problem that needs to be tinkered with. I am saying these Republican proposals go much further than that and are not necessary and are proposals to change radically the nature of the Medicare Program. If we adopted the President's position and budget, we would solve the solvency problem, just like the Republican budget does as well.

I wanted to say one more thing in closing. I know the gentleman mentioned there are some seniors in HMO's. But they are still a relatively small percentage. My point only is we should not be pushing seniors into HMO's establishing a different reimbursement rate and providing a financial incentive to go into HMO's.

In my home State of New Jersey, there happen to be very few seniors in HMO's. Some of them are good. I think there are a lot of problems with HMO's in terms of disclosure, advertising, in terms of seniors and people in general not knowing what they are getting into.

I would say one thing. You are right when you talk about the budget we are going to be voting on this Thursday basically being a skeleton. I know once that is adopted, and I am not going to support the Republican budget, that over the next few months we are going to be hammering out the details as to how this is going to be implemented until we get to reconciliation in the fall.

The point I am making tonight is let us not in trying to hammer out that budget end the details, because the devil is in the details. Do not do the types of things that the Republicans proposed last year in terms of changing the Medicare Program, because I think that, going beyond the financial aspects and the level of cuts, that would be the most damaging thing that could be done to Medicare as we know it.

But, again, I want to thank the gentlemen for giving me some of their time tonight to participate in this debate.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask the gentleman this: Having been turned down getting time from you guys last Thursday when you controlled the time,

would you, in the sense of fairness, make it a practice and tell your Democrat colleagues that Republicans do yield time and it would be very, very appreciative if Democrats would yield us time? Could you maybe take the lead on that, because I see there is some reluctance on your side.

Mr. PALLONE. Let me say this: I think there are times when having a debate like this back and forth is valuable, and there are other times when it is available to just have one side represented for 1 hour and the other side for another hour. Why do we not see how it goes.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is valuable if you believe in what you are saying. If you are saying stuff, as a couple of your colleagues were the other night about NEWT GINGRICH's statement regarding HCFA, and trying to imply that was a Medicare statement, which the people who were using that knew that to be a total lie on the House floor incidentally, I would say I would not want to yield the floor either if I was lying. But if I was truthing, I would yield the floor.

I hope you will yield the floor and encourage your colleagues to yield the floor, not because of Republicans and Democrats, and one might look better than the other, but because we have problems in America. We all have parents and children and folks back home dependent on us.

□ 2315

I read a statistic the other day that something like only 10,000 people in the history of the United States have served in Congress, and indeed there are only 435 of us right now. Folks curse Congress and kick Congress and laugh at politicians, rightly so, and yet they still depend on us to do this job, which is to work together and put the needs of American people and Government first, and not Republican or Democrat problems. I think it is always important to back up a step and remember what our job mission is and who our boss is.

Mr. RIGGS. I appreciate the gentleman making that point. In fact, I was going to make a similar point, just reminding the gentleman from New Jersey that I think the exchange, and I think it has been a very civil and polite conversation that we have had tonight, is much more constructive for both our colleagues and for the American people.

I do not want to violate House rules. We have to be respectful of those rules, but I think we should acknowledge at any given time we have a vast viewing audience watching the proceedings on this House floor. I think we have duty to inform and instruct them, and in the process I think we can still make clear the distinct differences between the two political parties in the House of Representatives.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments and participation tonight. I get the last word because I control the time, and I will just conclude this section of our special order, before we turn our attention to the budget, by quoting from the nonpartisan American Academy of Actuaries form December 21 of last year.

They said—now, bear in mind these are nonpartisan actuaries, people who do this kind of financial forecasting for a living—they said that the President's budget does not protect Medicare from bankruptcy, and went on to say:

> It is similar to the quick fixes enacted in the past that have allowed the Medicare program to fall into its current financial state. This proposal also includes accounting tricks. In the long run these tricks undermine the economic discipline of the trust fund.

So I hope our colleagues will realize that we are interested in preserving Medicare. We are interested in addressing, forthrightly and immediately, the problem of the Medicare trust fund going bankrupt, as projected by the Medicare trustees and by the American Academy of Actuaries.

For the 37 million Americans, older Americans and disabled Americans who rely on Medicare, exploiting Medicare as a campaign issue is, in my mind, well, it is a very cynical thing to do. We ought to get about our business in the 44-some-odd legislative days remaining in this session of Congress, the 104th meeting of Congress in our Nation's history, with a plan to protect Medicare from bankruptcy.

Again, I thank the gentleman for joining me tonight. I challenge him and all my Democratic colleagues to join us in doing the right thing.

Now, speaking of cynicism, I want to take a moment more because I think it is a logical segue of sorts. We have been talking about some of the facts behind the so-called mediscare campaign that has been waged by the National Democratic Party against our plans to preserve Medicare from bankruptcy, and that is part of what I believe will be viewed ultimately as a legacy of cynicism left behind by President Clinton when he leaves office.

For the past 4 years the American people have witnessed President Clinton say one thing, then turn around and do something completely different, beginning of course with his promise to cut middle class taxes, which he made the centerpiece of his economic plan in the 1992 campaign called ''Putting People First.''

At first these promises might have been attributed to inexperience, a new President getting started in office. They were certainly fodder for a lot of jokes around Washington. But over time the President's utter failure to be true to his word on anything has worn very thin.

Just last week the President held a news conference and said, with a straight face, ''The main point is that we are not yet in an election, at least we shouldn't be.'' Yet as he spoke his political party, the National Democratic Party, the Democratic National Committee I guess is actually what it is called, they were airing an advertisement that reeks of electioneering at its worse.

In fact the Democratic National Committee attack ad against Senator DOLE is a phony attack, not supported by the facts whatsoever.

In fact, one media commentator, Brooks Jackson of CNN, went so far as to call these television advertising spots false advertising. He described the Democratic strategy as one, ''not to let the facts get in the way of pro-Clinton political spin.'' That was on CNN's Inside Politics show on April 4.

So the President is continuing with mediscare, with these Democratic National Committee ads, a very cynical approach to this year's election which overlooks one fact: The American people are a lot smarter than he or his party give them credit for, and they will not be fooled by deceptive advertising that distorts his opponents' records.

Now, let us do a quick reality check. I know the Democrats supposedly have their truth squad, or whatever it is called, instant response, but here is what the Democratic National Committee ad currently airing around the country says. The announcer said:

> The facts? The President proposes a balanced budget protecting Medicare, education, the environment. But Dole is voting no. Well, here is the reality behind that claim. President Clinton has never proposed a detailed budget plan. He never proposed a plan until he was forced to do so by the new Republican majority in Congress.

Senator DOLE of course voted ''yes'' for the first balanced budget plan in 26 years, the first balanced budget proposal put forward by a Congress in 26 years, and as we all know, the President vetoed that legislation.

As I just mentioned a moment ago, and as my good friend the gentleman from Georgia mentioned, the President's so-called balanced budget plan is backloaded. Most of the spending cuts, which occur in one-third of the Federal budget, which is discretionary spending, occur in years 5 and 6, after the President would be out of office, assuming that we wins reelection. And of course, as the American Academy of Actuaries has told us, the President's plan does not protect Medicare from bankruptcy. Again, they describe it as accounting tricks and quick fixes such as those that have been enacted in the past.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KINGSTON. I would also like to join in this. The President's budget calls for 14 new Federal Government programs. What a way to end the era of big Government. He also has a tax increase in his budget that is only there until the year 2000. Again, conveniently, if the President were reelected, right when he gets out the tax cut, which he has $129 billion in tax cuts, I guess for the wealthy also, our colleague from the other side of the aisle

did not define wealthy a minute ago, but the President calls for tax cuts, and then only temporarily. Once he gets out of office, the taxes go back up.

And I would tell the gentleman that 15,800 new Federal employees are added to the rolls under the President and 451 to the Department of Labor. For the Secretary of Labor alone, 83 new positions. That is not ending the era of big government.

There is a spending increase on 75 different programs, including a 248 percent increase for the EPA, 277 percent of the community development group, 66 percent for bilingual education, which, to me, that is a State issue not a Federal issue, but a 66 percent increase on it.

This is a budget, as the gentleman and I have both pointed out, where all the savings are on the back end. It is a phony election year budget, and it is right on the wake where the President actually, on May 8, called for a 90-day freeze on politics. Right when he was doing an $11 million fund raiser, incidentally.

Mr. RIGGS. I appreciate the gentleman's points. They are so well made and taken. He mentioned the President's proposed tax cut. In these nationwide television ads run by the Democratic National Committee, the ad goes on to say the President cuts taxes for 40 million Americans, DOLE votes ''no.''

Well, any observer of Washington these last 17 months knows that President Clinton never proposed cutting taxes until Republicans won control of Congress. To the contrary, in 1993, President Clinton, who, as a candidate, promised a middle class tax cut, raised taxes $258 billion, the largest tax increase in history, which impacted every American household or some 260 million Americans.

As we know now, that tax increase, the 1993 Clinton Democratic tax increase, and I say Clinton Democratic because not a single Republican in the House or the other body voted in support of that Clinton tax and budget plan, but that Clinton Democratic tax increase included the 4.3-cent-per-gallon gas tax that we will repeal on this House floor next week, in time to give American motorists a little tax relief before Memorial Day.

It also included the increase on Social Security benefits. And if we were really interested in demagogueing, we would probably be coming down to this well every day and night reminding our fellow Americans that the President and congressional Democrats increased taxes by $258 billion, including a gas tax increase, including a Social Security tax increase.

In fact, now the President admits that he raised them, referring to the taxes, too much. That is what he said in Houston on October 17 of last year to a gathering of prominent donors. And as the gentleman from Georgia pointed out just a moment ago, his new budget increases taxes by more than $60 billion, according to the Senate Committee on the Budget.

We all know Senator DOLE voted yes on tax cuts for working families and for economic growth, and that, ultimately, the President vetoed those tax cuts.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield. Here we have a President who in 1992 did run on a middle-class tax cut. In fact, one of his ads said, ''Hi, I am Bill Clinton, I believe you deserve a change, that is why I have a plan to get the economy moving again, starting with a middle-class tax cut.'' And that ad ran from New Jersey to Iowa.

Then, of course, when the middle-class tax cut package that DOLE supported and worked to get out of the Senate, when it got to the White House Oval Office it was vetoed.

Medicare. The President says let us save Medicare. Well, on a bipartisan basis we worked very hard to try to save, protect, and preserve Medicare. BOB DOLE worked for it. When it got to Bill Clinton's desk, it was vetoed.

On welfare reform the President promised to end welfare as we know it. Now, he may have promised to extend welfare as we know it. We were not sure. As we look back, that is exactly what has happened. But let us say he did say end welfare as we know it. We had a bipartisan welfare bill that just passed the Senate 87 to 12.

I mean the Senate has been his biggest ally. Frankly, Republicans and Democrats alike in many respects. President Clinton has worked with the liberals over there to twist the system and throw a monkey wrench in the process and so forth, but Senator DOLE worked very hard to get this major reform out, and got it out and it was vetoed again, even in bipartisan fashion.

Product liability reform, something that American businesses need to keep their competitive edge internationally up. So important these days with NAFTA and GATT and so forth. Passed the Senate in a bipartisan fashion. Senator DOLE worked for it, President Clinton vetoed it.

And the balanced budget. Passed the House, bipartisan fashion. Passed the Senate. Senator DOLE worked very hard to get it out of the Senate. Got to the White House and it was vetoed. Dead on arrival.

□ 2330

So a major difference, between BOB DOLE tax relief, BOB DOLE saving Medicare, BOB DOLE reforming welfare, BOB DOLE balancing the budget, Bill Clinton vetoing tax relief, Bill Clinton vetoing Medicare reform, Bill Clinton vetoing welfare reform, Bill Clinton vetoing a balanced budget. You have a very clear choice.

It is interesting that people say to us, why are you not getting the word out? I tell you one thing, a clue came out the other day: 92 percent of the press admitted to voting for Bill Clinton in 1992.

Mr. RIGGS. That is the Washington-based press corps.

Mr. KINGSTON. I could not report objectively on, let us say, my son or daughter if they were in elected office. I went to a school play this weekend. My daughter had a small role in it. I loved it. I tell you what, that was the most important role in the play. But all the other parents probably thought their child's role was just as important.

That is the relationship that you have with the press and the liberal Washington status quo community. It is not an arms's length objective relationship. The press has totally lost credibility because they are so cozy with the liberal Democrats, and they are doing everything they can to keep Bill Clinton in office because they do not want to change the status quo.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, of course that press bias, which was so clearly pronounced in that survey released the other day, has been reinforced by these Democrat National Committee ads and by the big labor union bosses who have also been spending millions and millions of dollars in the mediscare campaign.

The gentleman from Georgia mentioned welfare reform. That is the other claim made in the Democrat National Committee television ads. The ad concludes by saying, President Clinton demands work for welfare, while protecting kids; DOLE says no to the Clinton plans.

Well, President Clinton, Mr. Speaker, has never submitted a serious welfare proposal to the Congress. The one he submitted, in 1994, exempted half of American adults on welfare from work, the work requirements for able-bodied welfare recipients, in exchange for their welfare benefits. And the President himself later agreed with well known national columnist Ben Wattenberg that his welfare proposal had been ''soft and weak.'' That was the quote that Ben Wattenberg attributed to President Clinton.

President Clinton, as the gentleman from Georgia points out, vetoed bipartisan welfare reform not once but twice and now he is threatening to veto a plan endorsed by all 50 of the Nation's Governors. Unanimity, that is truly remarkable for this town. You have all 50 of the Nation's Governors, big State, little State, Republican and Democrat alike, all endorsing welfare reforms. And now the President is saying that he is going to veto that plan.

Senator DOLE said yes to genuine welfare reform. As the gentleman from Georgia points out, President Clinton, who as candidate Clinton in 1992 promised to end welfare as we know it, President Clinton said no. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his comments.

Mr. KINGSTON. If you think about it, how many people do you know in your district in California have been able to provide for their family based on a 20-hour work week. I would be

willing to bet zero. I asked this question of an audience in Georgia recently: How many of you pay for your kids, your house with 20 hours work a week? Nobody.

Yet the President vetoed welfare reform because we required in the bill 20 hours worth of work each week for able-bodied recipients, 20 hours. That is all. But it was too much for the President. No tough love here. Veto, giveaway, giveaway, giveaway. That is all he seems to want to protect is the status quo giveaway system. We think he should have some tough love out there. Give a helping hand to those who need it. Give a little push, a living push to those who need that. But it is not fair to America's middle class to be shouldering the burden for those who could be working and contributing.

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I know that the time for our special order is concluded.

I would end by noting that as President, BOB DOLE will sign a balanced budget which will allow Americans to earn more and keep more of what they earn so that they can do more for themselves, for their families, for their communities and for their churches. That is, again, one of the distinct differences between the two political parties.

I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for his participation in this special order. I want to thank the speaker and our wonderful House staff.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MOLINARI (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today and for the balance of the week, on account of maternity leave.

Mr. HOLDEN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and tomorrow, May 15, on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. PRYCE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MEEHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLYBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOBSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOODLING, for 5 minutes each day, on May 15 and 16.

Mr. MCKEON, for 5 minutes each day, on May 15 and 16.

Mr. BARR of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. PRYCE) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. COYNE.

Mr. FROST.

Mr. GORDON in 10 instances.

Mr. LIPINSKI in two instances.

Mr. UNDERWOOD in two instances.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. GUTIERREZ.

Mr. ANDREWS in two instances.

Mr. WARD.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. STARK in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOBSON) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia in two instances.

Mr. DORNAN.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. ALLARD.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PORTMAN.

Mr. DICKEY.

Mr. BARTON of Texas.

Mr. LATHAM.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KINGSTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. MCINNIS.

Mr. COSTELLO.

Mrs. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

Mrs. MCCARTHY.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 811. An act to authorize research into the desalinization and reclamation of water and authorize a program for States, cities, or qualifying agencies desiring to own and operate a water desalinization or reclamation facility to develop such facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Science and Transportation and Infrastructure.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On May 13, 1996:

H.R. 2137. An act to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to require the release of relevant information to protect the public from sexually violent offenders.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, May 15, 1996, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2961. A letter from the Administrator, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Small Business Innovation Research Grants Program; Administrative Provisions (RIN: 0524–AA08) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2962. A letter from the Administrator and Executive Vice President, Farm Service Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rules—(1) Final Rule: 1995—Crop Sugarcane and Sugar Beets Price Support Loan Rates (RIN: 0560–AE44) and (2) Final Rule: Dairy Indemnity Payment Program (RIN: 0560–AE57) received May 10, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2963. A communication from the President of the United States; transmitting an amendment to the fiscal year 1997 appropriations request for the Department of Energy, with respect to spent nuclear fuel activities in North Korea, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107(H. Doc. No. 104–212); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2964. A communications from the President of the United States; transmitting his request to make available appropriations totaling $100 million in budget authority for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, and to designate the amount made available as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 104–213); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2965. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Coast Guard Board for Correction of Military Records: Procedural Regulation (RIN: 2105–AC31) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

2966. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Low-Income Public Housing—Performance Funding System [Docket No. FR–3760–F–01] (RIN: 2577–AB50) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2967. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Environmental Review Procedures for Recipients and Responsible Entities Assuming HUD Responsibilities [Docket No. FR–3514–F–04] (RIN: 2501–AB67) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2968. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—HUD Acquisition Regulation; Field Reorganization, Streamlining, and Simplification [Docket No. FR–3887–F–02] (RIN: 2535–AA23) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2969. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Title I Property Improvement and Manufactured Home Loan Insurance Programs Interim Rule [Docket No. FR–3718–I–01] (RIN: 2502–AG32) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a))1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2970. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Public/Private Partnerships for the Mixed–Finance Development of Public Housing Units [Docket No. FR–3919–I–01] (RIN: 2577–AB54) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2971. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Office of Thrift Supervision's 1995 Annual Report to Congress on the Preservation of Minority Savings Institutions, pursuant to Public Law 101–73, section 301 (103 Stat. 279); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2972. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations—The State Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program—Order of Selection, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

2973. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Disclosure to Participants (RIN: 1212–AA77) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

2974. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on the Youth Conservation Corps Program in the Department for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1705; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

2975. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Notice of Deletion of Washington County Landfill Superfund Site from the National Priorities List [NPL] (FLR–5505–2) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2976. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; PA; Approval of Source-Specific VOC and NO_x RACT and Synthetic Minor Permit Conditions, and 1990 Baseyear Emissions for One Source (FRL–5467–6) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2977. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; Ohio (FLR–5500–5) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2978. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Interim Approval of Operating Permit Program; New Jersey (FLR–5505–7) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2979. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon (FLR–5504–8) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2980. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Allyl Isoothicyanate as a Component of Food Grade Oil of Mustard; Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance (FLR–5366–4) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2981. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Alaska (FLR–5465–2) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2982. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Cornell, WI) [MM Docket No. 95–164] received May 14, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2983. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Coolidge and Gilbert, AZ) [MM Docket No. 95–109] received May 14, 1996, pursaunt to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2984. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Citizens Utilities Company Permanent Cost Allocation Manual for the Separation of Regulated and Nonregulated Costs (AAD 94–6) May 14, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2985. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of Cable Act Reform Provisions of the telecommunications Act of 1996 [CS Docket No. 95–85] received May 14, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2986. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Warning Statements For Products Containing or Manufactured with Chlorofluorocarbons and other Ozone-Depleting Substances (Docket No. 93N–0442) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2987. A letter from the Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Freedom of Employees in the Nuclear Industry to Raise Safety Concerns Without Fear of Retaliation; Policy Statement—received May 10, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2988. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Termination or Transfer of Licensed Activities: Recordkeeping Requirements (RIN: 3150–AF17) received May 14, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2989. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Greece for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–18), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2990. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office [TECRO] for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–34), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2991. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Bahrain for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–41), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2992. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office [TECRO] for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–40), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2993. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Morocco for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–44), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2994. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Denmark for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–38), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2995. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Greece for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–20), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2996. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–43), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2997. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Singapore for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–42), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2998. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled ''Compliance Review of the District of Columbia Insurance Administration for Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47–117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2999. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to the Procurement List—received May 14, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3000. A letter from the Executive Director, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, transmitting the Authority's report entitled ''Final Report on the Mayor's District of Columbia FY 1997 Budget and Multiyear Plan,'' adopted by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority on May 8, 1996, pursuant to Public Law 104–8, section 202(d) (109 Stat. 113); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3001. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1995, through March 31, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3002. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; Acquisition of Leasehold Interests in Real Property (RIN: 3090–AF92) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3003. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Travel Regulations; Privately Owned Vehicle Mileage Reimbursement (RIN: 3090–AF88) received May 10, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3004. A letter from the Program Management Officer, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Amendment 5 [Docket No. 951208293–6065–02; I.D. 110995B] (RIN: 0648–AF01) received May 10, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3005. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Fisheries Conservation and Management, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska; Pacific cod in the Central Regulatory Area [Docket No. 960129018–6018–01; I.D. 050396B] received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3006. A letter from the Program Management Officer, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Ocean Salmon Fisheries Off the Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California; 1996 Management Measures and Technical Amendment [Docket No. 960429120–6120–01; I.D. 042496C] (RIN: 0648–AI35) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3007. A letter from the Executive Director, American Chemical Society, transmitting the Society's annual report for the calendar year 1995 and the comprehensive report to the Board of Directors of the American Chemical Society on the examination of their books and records for the year ending December 31, 1995, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(2) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3008. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Special Food or Meals (RIN: 1120–AA37) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3009. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Intensive Confinement Center Program (RIN: 1120–AA11) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3010. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's study on tanker navigation safety standards: Tanker Inspection Standards, pursuant to Public Law 101–380, section 4111(c) (104 Stat. 516); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3011. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–300, –400, and –500 Series Airplanes (Docket No. 95–NM–117) (RIN: 2120–AA64) (1996–0059) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3012. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 47B, 47B–3, 47D, 47D–1, 47G, 47G–2, 47G–2A, 47G–2A–1, 47G–3, 47G–3B, 47G–3B–1, 47G–3B–2, 47G–3B–2A, etc. (Docket No. 96–SW–01) (RIN: 2120–AA64) (1996–0060) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3013. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Jetstream Model 4101 Airplanes (Docket No. 95–NM–95) (RIN: 2120–AA64) (1996–0062) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3014. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–80 Series Airplanes and Model MD–88 Airplanes (Docket No. 95–NM–127) (RIN: 2120–AA64) (1996–0049) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3015. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Helicopter Systems Model 369, 369A, 369D, 369E, 369FF, 369H, 369HM, 369HS, and 500N Helicopters (Docket No. 96–SW–02) (RIN: 2120–AA64) (1996–0061) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3016. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Territory and Airspace of Afghanistan (RIN: 2120–AG10) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3017. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class D and E2 Airspace and Establishment of Class E4 Airspace (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0021) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3018. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; Visalia, CA (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0020) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3019. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airspace Actions; Establishment of Class E Airspace; San Andreas, CA (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0019) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3020. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Transportation for Individuals With Disabilities (Misc. Amendments) (RIN: 2105–AC13) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3021. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations Fireworks, Upper New York Bay, NY and NJ (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3022. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: U.S.S. *JOHN F. KENNEDY*, Fleet Week 1996, Port of NY and NJ (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3023. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: fleet Week 1996 Parade of Ships, Port of New York and New Jersey (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3024. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Greenwood Lake Powerboat Race, Greenwood Lake, NJ (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 13, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3025. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Part 80 of the Commission's Rules Regarding the Inspection of Great Lakes Agreement Ships [CI Docket No. 95–54] received May 10, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3026. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, United States Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Removal of Customs Regulations Relating to the Steel Voluntary Restraint Arrangement Program (RIN: 1515–AB04) received May 14, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2297. A bill to codify without substantive change laws related to transportation and to improve the United States Code; with an amendment (Rept. 104–573). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STUMP: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3376. A bill to authorize major medical facility projects and major medical facility leases for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 1997, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104–574). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KASICH: Committee on the Budget. House Concurrent Resolution 178. Resolution establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 (Rept. 104–575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 3448. A bill to provide tax relief for small businesses, to protect jobs, to create opportunities, to increase the take home pay of workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKEEN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

H.R. 3449. A bill to provide emergency livestock feed assistance in 1996 to livestock producers whose operations are located in areas that were approved for such assistance in 1994 and 1995 as a result of drought and in which drought conditions continue in 1996; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLINGER (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FOX, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. MASCARA):

H.R. 3450. A bill to provide for modification of the State agreement under title II of the Social Security Act with the State of Pennsylvania with respect to certain students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 3451. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from certain reporting requirements certain amounts paid to election officials and election workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. HORN, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. BURR, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BASS, Ms. GREENE of Utah, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COX, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. POMBO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. TALENT, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. TATE, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. MCDADE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. FOX, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. KIM, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HERGER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina):

H.R. 3452. A bill to make certain laws applicable to the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Judiciary, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA (for herself, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. BLUTE):

H.R. 3453. A bill to provide for the more effective enforcement of child support orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, the Judiciary, National Security, Transportation and Infrastructure, International Relations, Economic and Educational Opportunities, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 3454. A bill to provide enhanced penalties for discharging or possessing a firearm during a crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, and for discharging or using a firearm to cause serious bodily injury during such a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. FOGLIETTA):

H.R. 3455. A bill to prohibit persons convicted of a crime involving domestic violence from owning or possessing firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZIMMER (for himself, Mr. BONILLA, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia):

H.R. 3456. A bill to provide for the nationwide tracking of convicted sexual predators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN:

H. Res. 433. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit a Member, officer, or employee of the House from distributing campaign contributions in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 434. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that children are America's greatest assets; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 218: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 351: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 357: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 359: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 635: Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 713: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 777: Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. FRISA.

H.R. 778: Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FRISA, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 779: Mr. TORKILDSEN and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 780: Mr. TORKILDSEN and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1073: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. HEFNER.

H.R. 1074: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. HEFNER.

H.R. 1154: Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 1210: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1325: Mr. FARR, Mr. CANADY, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1618: Mr. STOCKMAN and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 1776: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 1998: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 2167: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2200: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 2244: Mr. GREENWOOD and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 2286: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 2320: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. PORTMAN.

H.R. 2508: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. FAZIO of California.

H.R. 2536: Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. KLUG, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 2545: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2634: Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 2651: Mr. VOLKMER and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2697: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HORN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. OLVER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2764: Mr. CONDIT and Mr. ENSIGN.

H.R. 2779: Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 2798: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 2900: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 2925: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. FROST, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 2951: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2994: Mr. TEJEDA, and Mr. JOHNSTON OF FLORIDA.

H.R. 3084: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 3106: Mr. EVANS and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 3111: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3130: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3135: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3142: Mr. BACHUS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee.

H.R. 3161: Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 3180: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. HORN.

H.R. 3199: Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. THOMAS.

H.R. 3226: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. POSHARD, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 3246: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 3252: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 3266: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BLUTE, and Ms. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 3267: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 3270: Mr. FROST and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 3303: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 3310: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 3332: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FAZIO of California, Ms. FURSE, Mr. TORRES, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 3348: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 3372: Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 3392: Mr. YATES, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 3396: Mr. COBURN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 3401: Mr. FILNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MCHALE, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 3421: Mr. TORRES, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. SEASTRAND, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.J. Res. 100: Mr. MCCOLLUM and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. HEINEMAN.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. ROYCE.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *104th* CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 14, 1996 *No. 67*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by Rev. Bill Hall of Geronimo, OK. We are very pleased to have Reverend Hall with us.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, Rev. Bill Hall, offered the following prayer:

Let us join together in prayer this morning.

Our Father, at the beginning of this session, we want to join together to offer thanks for this great Nation and for the privilege of being a citizen of the United States of America.

We do approach Thy throne of grace today and ask for divine guidance. Let us become aware of Thy divine presence in this place at this hour.

At this time we ask that You will give each of these elected servants the wisdom and the courage that they will need to perform their duties today.

We also join together to pray for peace and security for our citizens. We pray Thy blessings to be bestowed upon our homes, on our schools and, indeed, throughout our Nation today. Let us be reminded that righteousness exalteth a nation but sin is a reproach to people. This morning together we make our petition and offer our thanks in the precious name of our Lord and Savior. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Democratic leader this morning to recognize our guest Chaplain; it has a special meaning to him and to all of us.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

REV. BILL HALL

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me thank the distinguished majority whip, my friend from Mississippi, for giving me the opportunity to recognize a person very important to my family and to me. Rev. Bill Hall is my father-in-law, and it is an honor to have him offer the prayer that opens up the Senate this morning.

By having him here, we share with the rest of the world what my wife and I have known for a long time. He is a man of dedication, and a man of spiritual strength. For many decades he has had the good fortune to share his strength and his spirituality with parishes throughout Oklahoma and Kansas. We have watched in great awe and admiration his remarkable work with people in towns small and large, in families broken and healed, and in parishes of all sizes.

As we begin this special day, it is a unique honor for me and a very important occasion to recognize his contribution to the many, many people who have benefited from his wisdom and from his leadership as pastor of his churches. I commend his message to the Senate and to the country as we begin this day.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Again, Mr. President, I join our distinguished colleague and friend from South Dakota in welcoming to our body the Reverend Billy Hall. We thank him for his beautiful prayer for our people and our country today. We know how proud he is of his son-in-law, TOM DASCHLE, and we are very proud of TOM and Linda.

We are deeply honored to have Reverend Hall here today.

We thank him very much.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this morning there will be a period for morning business until the hour of 10:30 a.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2937, the White House Travel Office legislation. The Senate will stand in recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. today to accommodate the respective party luncheons. Senators are reminded that a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the pending Dole amendment No. 3961 to H.R. 2937 will occur at 2:15 p.m. today unless a unanimous-consent agreement with respect to further consideration of H.R. 2937, the gas tax repeal, and other related issues can be reached. Therefore, other votes are possible today in relation to those items just mentioned or any other items cleared for action.

The majority leader had indicated yesterday that there is a likelihood of votes throughout the day today, Wednesday, and Thursday, with the budget resolution being taken up, I believe, probably on Wednesday morning, and we can expect votes probably at night on each of these 3 days.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for a period of time not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] is recognized to speak up to 10 minutes.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAMS pertaining to the submission of Senate Resolution 254 are located in today's RECORD under ''Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.'')

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] is recognized to speak for up to 10 minutes.

THE GASOLINE TAX REPEAL

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the effort to roll back the 4.3-cent-per-gallon gasoline tax that was part of the 1993 deficit reduction package. I seriously question the wisdom of repealing the 4.3-cent-per-gallon gasoline tax at this time.

I think it is important to remember how we got this 4.3-cent-per-gallon gasoline tax. We got this as a result of the 1993 deficit reduction package. It was a time when there was an understanding that there was great urgency to reduce the budget deficit in this country. At that time, when President Clinton came into office, the budget deficit for the previous year had been $290 billion. Since that time, after we passed the 1993 budget plan, the deficit has been reduced to $145 billion this year. In other words, the deficit was cut in half. It was cut in half because some of us voted for a package to cut spending and, yes, to raise taxes, primarily on the wealthiest among us, in order to get our fiscal house in order.

Now we have a proposal before us to reduce the gasoline tax by 4.3 cents. Most people think it is a political move. Most people think it is politically popular. But sometimes what is politically popular, at least for the moment, does not stand much scrutiny. I believe that is the case with this proposal. I just had 40 members of the rural electric cooperatives from my State in my office, and I asked them, ''What should we do? How would you vote if you were here representing North Dakota?'' By 38 to 2 they said, ''Keep the gasoline tax and if there is a proposal to offset the revenue lost by repealing the gas tax, take those funds and reduce the deficit. That should be the priority in this country.''

I think those folks from North Dakota have it exactly right. The top priority ought to be to continue to reduce the deficit. Yes, it is true we have cut it in half since 1993, but the job is not done, and we ought to complete that job. We ought to get it done.

Some are saying that this 4-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax is the reason gas prices have gone up. That defies common sense and it defies logic. Clearly, a 4-cent gasoline tax put into effect in 1993 has nothing to do with rising gas prices experienced in the spring of 1996. In fact, when that tax went into effect in October 1993, gas prices went down. They did not go up, they went down.

The recent rise in gas prices has been caused by a number of factors totally unrelated to gasoline taxes: an unusually cold and longer than average winter that drove up demand for home heating fuel; refinery breakdowns across the country; more low-mileage sport utility vehicles that are on the road that increase the demand for fuel; the speed limit has been increased, again increasing the demand for fuel; and oil companies are holding lower than average inventories, moving to just-in-time inventory management in order to save money. But even with all of that occurring, driving up the price of gasoline in the spring, the price of gasoline is now showing signs of coming down.

In my home State of North Dakota, the price for a gallon of regular unleaded gasoline in Fargo, ND, the biggest city in my State, is now about $1.25, down about 4 cents in the past 2 weeks.

It is not just in North Dakota that we have seen gas prices come down. As this news story from the Los Angeles Times indicates—the story ran last week—a major headline: ''Gas Prices Show Signs of Decline as Production Surges.''

Los Angeles, CA, we all know, has been the hardest hit by increases in gasoline prices.

> Average cost at the pump falls half a cent, and state officials predict more reductions. . . . After lagging, refineries again operating at close to normal output.

Mr. President, that is what has happened. Gas prices are starting to come down because of market forces.

Additionally, the price of gasoline in the United States is very low in comparison to other industrialized countries.

Saturday's Washington Post included a column comparing gas prices in other countries. I thought it was an excellent graphic that compared what folks are paying in other countries versus what we are paying. It is $4.66 a gallon in the Netherlands; $4.49 a gallon in France; $4.39 in Italy; $3.68 in Britain; $1.30 in the United States.

We have the lowest gas prices of any industrialized country in the world. Now we are talking about taking off 4 cents instead of applying it to deficit reduction, deficit reduction that over 7 years amounts to $30 billion?

I really do not understand why we dig the hole deeper before we start filling it in. The people that I represent believe the highest priority is to eliminate these deficits so we can start to see this economy grow.

Mr. President, there is also a question of whether this repeal would ever benefit consumers. The whole theory has been if you take off the 4-cent gasoline tax, that is going to benefit consumers.

The Washington Post last week had a headline that says: ''Experts Say Gas Tax Cut Wouldn't Reach the Pumps. Oil Industry Called Unlikely To Pass on Savings to Consumers.''

Mr. President, these are not my views. These are not views of other Members of the Congress or other Members of the U.S. Senate. These are the views of oil industry experts.

I go to one energy expert, Mr. Verleger, who is quoted in the story as saying:

> The Republican-sponsored solution to the current fuels problem . . . is nothing more and nothing less than a refiners' benefit bill.

He makes the point these reductions in the gas tax will not be passed on to consumers, but the real beneficiaries will be the folks that refine the gasoline. Those are the folks that will get the benefit of any repeal of the 4-cent gas tax.

The president of the conservative Cato Institute, a former member of President Reagan's Council of Economic Advisors, said:

> I don't think there is anything the Republicans can credibly do to guarantee that the tax reduction gets passed through to the consumer.

Mr. President, I think he is right. We have not only had the testimony of those energy experts, but we have heard from the oil industry itself. The CEO of ARCO, Mike Bowlin, said last week:

> There are other market forces that clearly will overwhelm that relatively small decrease in the price of gasoline. . . . People's expectations will be that the minute the tax is removed, they want to see gas prices go down 4.3 cents, and that won't happen.

Mr. President, what could be more clear? I think these three experts have said it about as clearly as it can be stated. There is no way that this reduction in the gas price can be assured to be passed on to consumers. But what we can be assured of—what we can be assured of—is this is going to blow a $30 billion hole in the plans to reduce the budget deficit in this country.

I believe deficit reduction is more important than taking off the 4-cent-per-gallon gasoline tax that we have no assurance will be passed through to consumers anyway. I understand the majority leader has provided offsets to pay for the gas tax repeal, at least for the next several months.

Mr. President, I would like to offer an amendment that would take his offsets and, instead of repealing the gas tax, apply it to reducing the budget deficit that is still $145 billion this year. That is what we ought to do if we are, instead of playing politics, serious about managing the fiscal affairs of this country.

If we are really serious about helping families, I think we ought to look at the benefit of reducing the deficit in comparison to the benefit of repealing this 4-cent gasoline tax.

This chart shows the benefit to a typical family of balancing the budget versus what a typical family would gain from repealing the 4-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax, and that is assuming every penny got passed on to consumers. We already know, from what I have already presented, that that gas tax repeal is unlikely to get passed on to consumers. But let us just look at what

happens, what the benefits are of balancing the budget to the average family versus what the gas tax repeal would do.

Balancing the budget, balancing the unified budget, would reduce the home mortgage for a typical family in the United States by $917 a year. That is because interest rates would be reduced; a car loan savings would be $97 a year; student loan savings $56 a year; in comparison to what the gas tax would mean to a family, $42 a year.

Mr. President, it seems to me very clear that the priority ought to be in further reduction of the deficit rather than in a repeal of the gas tax, which is unlikely to ever be passed through to consumers. The benefit to consumers, the benefit to families, lies in further deficit reduction.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

AMERICA ON MY MIND

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today with America on my mind to applaud our favorite Republican Senators and Republican Congressmen who have worked so diligently in trying to present a budget that stays in balance and would balance the budget in 6 years and still would not raise taxes.

It is interesting that my colleague from North Dakota would also put in there that he likes the balanced budget. We would like to see him vote for one. Take-home pay, if the budget is balanced, will increase, predictability in the marketplace, predictability of jobs. That is what worries people today: ''Will I have my job in a year?''

Government has to be more responsible when it comes to spending. I look here at this cartoon. ''What are you looking at?'' He says, ''Our paychecks!'' He takes a magnifying glass to see it.

The Republican budget will balance by the year 2002 and does it by living within its means without raising taxes. This budget provides real welfare reform, real welfare reform that the President and the administration has called for but has vetoed. It provides tax relief for job expansion, predictability in the workplace, and, more importantly, it gets us on the road of saving and preserving Medicare for future generations, of which our colleagues, some of them, have stuck their heads in the sand.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURNS. It looks out for the long term, not just the short term.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BURNS. I would like to make my statement, and then I have a committee meeting to go to, if the Senator does not mind.

Balancing the budget, without raising taxes, and deals also with Federal spending. You know, spending money, especially other people's money, is sort of like alcoholism. A fellow asked, ''Does he have a drinking problem?'' And he says, ''No, he has a stopping problem.'' That is what we have in this Government. But if we deal with the spending problem, here is what has to happen. Families have to balance their budget. Government does not have an income problem. It has a spending problem. Mr. President, 38.2 percent of the family's income right now goes for taxes. So there is no doubt about it, a balanced budget will put more money in the pockets of Americans, not just a selected few, all Americans—single-income taxpayer, double-income taxpayer, newlyweds, farmers, ranchers, high tech, low tech. Everybody wins with a balanced budget.

The best way to increase our take-home pay, not only earn more but save more, to keep more in your pocket at the end of the month—it is better than any other program—is to go with a balanced budget. I applaud my colleagues who have worked so hard on this budget, presenting it to this Congress later on this week. I stand in support of that budget. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent we extend morning business so I may be permitted to make a 10-minute presentation that is accounted for in the previous order of the Senate.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask if the Senator would be so kind to extend that for another 5 minutes so I may have 5 minutes when he concludes his 10-minute presentation.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me further amend the unanimous consent, if I might. My colleague, Senator CONRAD, had wanted to respond. Let me ask if we might add 2 minutes to respond because the previous speaker spoke of Senator CONRAD and refused to yield to him. I make a unanimous-consent request that Senator CONRAD be accorded 2 minutes. I continue to seek my 10 minutes, and I am happy to accommodate the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A BALANCED BUDGET PLAN

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana, in his presentation, said that he would like the Senator from North Dakota to vote for a balanced budget plan. I do not know where the Senator from Montana has been. Not only have I voted for a balanced budget plan, I have presented three in the U.S. Senate in the last year.

I presented the fair share balanced budget plan last year; got 39 votes. It was the most ambitious deficit reduction plan that has been presented by anybody in either House—got 39 votes in the U.S. Senate.

No. 2, I cosponsored with Senator SIMON last year the commonsense balanced budget plan. We got 19 votes in the U.S. Senate for that plan. That plan was the second most ambitious deficit reduction plan that anybody has presented in the U.S. Congress.

Third, I have been involved in the centrist coalition, which will have a substitute to the Republican plan that we will offer this week, which is a 7-year balanced budget plan that 22 of us have put together—11 Democrats and 11 Republicans. Not only have I voted for balanced budget plans, I have helped author them, or in some cases authored them in their entirety. I just want to set the record straight.

I thank my colleague from North Dakota for this opportunity to respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator from North Dakota.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I watched yesterday. We had, I think, six of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle come to the floor. We have seen six or seven of them virtually every day come to the floor of the Senate and describe to us what is wrong with the President's agenda and what is right about their agenda.

Yesterday, specifically, the discussion was about the proposed reduction in the gasoline tax of 4.3 cents a gallon. The point was repeatedly made that the gasoline tax was increased in 1993 in order to accommodate more Federal spending. That, of course, is not the case. The gas tax increase of 4.3 cents a gallon was a result of it being included in a very large package of spending cuts and, yes, some tax increases, in order to reduce the Federal budget deficit. It is worth noting that since that time, the Federal budget deficit has been reduced by 50 percent on a unified budget basis.

Last week, on Thursday, we faced the spectacle at that point of having a proposal brought to the floor of the Senate to reduce the gasoline taxes by 4.3 cents a gallon and to pay for it with kind of a Byzantine scheme of telecommunications spectrum sales beginning in 1998, and some other things that the Office of Management and Budget said would increase the Federal deficit by $1.7 billion next year. In other words, a proposal was brought to the floor of the Senate that said, ''Let's reduce the gasoline taxes by 4.3 cents a gallon.''

The experts say there is no guarantee that the consumers will see the benefit of that, or that it will be passed through for a reduced pump price to the consumers. However, we would then see a $1.7 billion increase in Federal deficit in the next year as a result of it.

In the very next breath, we are told that there is something wrong with

others in the Chamber who do not support a balanced budget. I do not know who those others are, but somehow those who bring a proposal to the floor to increase the Federal budget deficit, even as they repeal the 4.3-cent gasoline tax, are accusing others of not supporting a balanced budget. It is an interesting paradox in political dialogue.

I thought it would be useful today, just for a couple of minutes, to talk about some of these proposals more generally. Those who bring the proposed cut in the gas tax to the floor of the Senate, I suspect, think it is very popular, and it may be popular for someone to bring a bill to the floor to say, ''Let's repeal all taxes. Let's have no one any longer be a taxpayer. Let's get rid of all taxpayers.'' But, of course, we provide for the common defense. That costs some money. We build roads in this country. We provide for schools. We hire police and firefighters. We do all the things necessary to govern.

Then we have people come and say, ''Today is tax freedom day; it is the day beyond which no one ever has to support government again,'' suggesting, somehow, that the taxes that have been paid earlier in the year to invest in Social Security, Medicare, a police department, a fire department, or a Defense Department or the Centers for Disease Control, somehow none of that mattered, and all of that was squandered and wasted.

I guess I do not understand some of the logic. But the same people will bring to the floor apparently next week a proposal for a $40 to $60 billion national defense plan, a new iteration of star wars. These same people who propose a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that, by the way, would raid the Social Security trust fund, now say, ''Let's embark on a new program called national missile defense.'' They say, ''On the little issues, we insist that the Pentagon does not know what it ought to spend. We demand that the generals and admirals spend $12 billion more than they ask for. We insist they buy planes they do not ask for, they buy trucks they do not need, they buy submarines they do not want. We insist they buy all of that because generals and admirals do not know how much they want to spend. We in Congress know better,'' and then insist they spend $12 billion more than the Pentagon has asked for.

On top of that, we insist on a new, expensive, gold-plated star wars program now named ''national missile defense.'' Oh, it is not star wars, they say. Oh, yes, it is. The bill suggests that we build space-based lasers. Of course it is star wars. Will it cost a lot of money? You bet your life it will cost a lot of money—$40 to $60 billion. The tragedy is this: There is relatively little likelihood of a rogue nation getting hold of an ICBM missile in order to put a nuclear tip on the top of it and threaten the United States. There is so little likelihood of that. There is so great a likelihood of some terrorist nation, some rogue nation, some band of independent terrorists getting a nuclear device and putting it in the trunk of a rusty Yugo and parking it on a New York City dock, or a glass vial that big with the deadliest biological agents known to mankind to threaten a major metropolitan area, or, yes, even a rental truck with a fertilizer bomb.

We understand about terrorism and about the threat to this country. The threat is not a rogue nation having a sophisticated intercontinental ballistic missile. It is the threat of terrorists with deadly biological agents and suitcase bombs, including suitcase nuclear devices that will threaten this country. Yet, we are told a national missile defense star wars program is what this country needs.

My colleague this morning said the issue is paychecks, the issue is paychecks and jobs. I agree with that. There is no social program in this country that has the value of a good job that pays well. That is one of the reasons I would like to do a number of things. I would like to straighten out our trade mess in this country. Our trade deficit is unforgivable. We ought not have a $30 billion trade deficit with China and then have them, when they need to buy airplanes, tell us, ''You either make them in China or we will not buy them from you.'' We ought not have a recurring $60 billion annual trade deficit, a $30 billion combined trade deficit with Mexico and Canada. Jobs leave America.

The second point is we ought to have the courage in this Chamber to shut off the tax incentive that exists in our tax laws telling firms, ''Move your jobs overseas and we will give you a tax break.'' I am still waiting for one person to stand up and say, ''I support that provision,'' but we cannot get it repealed.

We have a tax incentive to move jobs overseas. Finally, another step of paycheck and jobs issues is the minimum wage. Yes, we care about the minimum wage. The fact is, a whole lot of folks in this country work for minimum wage and have now been, for 5 years, at the bottom rung of the economic ladder without a 1-cent increase.

The last time the minimum wage was increased, on April 1, 1991, the stock market was at 2881. It is now almost double that. The minimum wage has not moved a cent. But CEO's at the top of the economic ladder got a 23-percent increase in their compensation last year—an average of $11,000-a-day compensation for the CEO's at the top of the ladder. But it is $8,800 a year, full-time minimum wage, for the folks at the bottom. They have not had an adjustment for 5 years.

I say to some, if you do not believe in the minimum wage, bring a bill to the floor to try to repeal it. If you believe there ought to be a minimum wage, then you ought to believe in an adjustment at some point. The question is how much and when. Let us discuss that.

If I might, in the last minute, read again a letter I received last week from a young woman who has four children, has had a tough life. She has had setbacks almost every minute, every time they turn around, it seems. Their trailer house burns and they lose everything, or there are operations or medical problems with the four children. She, in a four-page letter, says:

> How can we make it like this. I wish somebody in an official capacity could be the one to tell my boys they can't play baseball this summer because I can't afford the $25 fee for each of them, let alone the money for bats and gloves they would need. We don't spend our money on alcohol or drugs. We don't go out on the town. Our lives revolve around trying to make ends meet. Our dream of owning a home is long gone. We are better off, I know, than a lot of others who have to live on the street, but how far are we from that? One check maybe?
>
> We are in that forgotten group of people called the working poor, the people that fall through the cracks of Government. We want to have something to show for working hard every day instead of slipping further in the hole. We are suffocating, and the future looks dim for us. I beg you shamelessly, for the sake of my children, to please help us find a glimmer of hope to help us dig our way out of this hopelessly grim situation.

This is from a woman and her husband who work at the minimum wage, are unskilled, and have suffered setback after setback and cannot find a way at the bottom to pull themselves up. They, for 5 years, have had their wages frozen because there has not been a one-penny adjustment in the minimum wage. During that time, the stock market has doubled. CEO's are doing great. They got a 23-percent increase last year alone.

The folks at the bottom deserve some kind of adjustment. They are the voiceless that we ought to give a voice to. They are the hopeless that we ought to offer hope to, as we work in the U.S. Senate, and say we care about you and we are going to try to do something to offer some help to those on the bottom rung of the economic ladder. I hope we can do that together in a bipartisan way in this Chamber in the coming weeks.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri to speak for up to 5 minutes.

CUTS IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BOND. Thank you, Mr. President. I rise today to make the basic and simple point that numbers do not lie. I am chairman of the Veterans' Affairs/HUD Appropriations Subcommittee. I have been very much concerned about making sure that the people who serve this country in the military get the kind of care that has been promised by the Veterans' Administration.

The VA deals, primarily, with those who have suffered war-related injuries, and who are medically indigent now. Yes, there are efficiencies that can be

made and there are certain steps being taken within the VA to operate more soundly. But I was shocked when I saw the President's proposal for Veterans' Administration spending for the next 6 years.

The President now says he wants to balance the budget. But how does he do it? Well, Mr. President, he takes it out of the vitally important medical care and health care services for the veterans. I joined with Chairman PETE DOMENICI to beat back efforts by our Democratic colleagues in the subcommittee to substitute the President's budget, which he claims gets us to balance. I thought it was so serious that I wanted to speak on the floor. I spoke this weekend back home in Missouri, talking about the tremendous decline that the Clinton budget proposes for Veterans' Administration spending over the next 6 years, which is almost 23 percent.

Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration cannot live with that kind of cut. That is the kind of cut that the President proposes the VA will have to follow to get to a balanced budget for the entire Government in the year 2002. At least the President agrees that we need to get to a balanced budget. But does he really mean this budget?

Well, Mr. President, it was very interesting to me to read in the newspaper on Saturday morning—in the St. Louis newspaper—a report by political correspondent, Jo Mannies, who called the White House after I presented this information and she says: ''A White House aide replied that Bond was misrepresenting the facts.''

Misrepresenting the facts? Mr. President, here are the facts. Under the Clinton budget, the Veterans' Administration have a budget authority that goes from $17.3 billion in 1997, to $15.9 billion in 1998, to $14.5 billion, to $13.0 billion, to $13.29 billion, to $13.8 billion. That comes out to be a $12.979 billion cut in Veterans' Administration funding in that 6-year period.

Can the VA live with that? No. Secretary Jesse Brown said, when I asked him before the Appropriations Committee, ''Are you planning to live within this budget?'' He said, ''I am not planning to live with it. I am not planning to live with your budget to green line''—which at that time was a flat line—''nor am I planning to live with the President's line.'' Secretary Brown went on to say, ''I think his budget means something to me because he has given his word that he is going to negotiate with the veterans' community.''

Really? Does the President not mean what he said when he presented the balanced budget that shows these cuts? The interesting part of the story, the White House aide Jo Mannies referred to was Lawrence Haas of the White House Office of Management and Budget. He said the Republicans were misrepresenting their plans and the President when it comes to spending for veterans.

President Clinton's 1997 budget plan contains an outline for reaching a balanced budget by 2002. ''The outline cites across-the-board spending cuts of equal percentages for most discretionary programs, including the VA,'' he said. ''The outline is not a hard and fast proposal for any of the programs,'' he said, ''because the President and the Congress review discretionary programs each year.'' He said that he expected changes for many of the specific programs. He said, ''If past practices continue, the VA would be treated well and wouldn't experience much, if any, of a cut.''

Mr. President, we have the President presenting a budget showing that he gets to balance by making a 23-percent cut in the Veterans Administration. Oh, incidentally, it is not an across-the-board cut because the President, at the same time, proposes a 28-percent increase in the spending on AmeriCorps, our national service.

Mr. President, we are left with the amazing proposition that the White House official spokesperson said that it is the official policy of the Clinton administration that you should not believe the official policy of the Clinton administration. The Clinton administration sent up a budget that shows a 23-percent cut, a $12.9 billion cut over 6 years.

Mr. President, that is how they get there—a budget that I think has misplaced priorities. It does not make the cuts needed in Medicaid and in welfare spending, so they have to slash things like Veterans' Administration. Either they mean this and they are going to get to a balanced budget and the veterans are going to be unhappy, but they have an Office of Management and Budget saying they do not mean it. They have told the Secretary of Veterans Affairs they do not mean it.

So, Mr. President, we are left with this real question: Which numbers are lying—the numbers they presented in the budget, or the numbers they are telling the Veterans' Administration they are going to get?

I intend to work with my colleagues to make sure that the Veterans' Administration is adequately funded.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO DR. W. JAMES RIVERS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is no secret that a career dedicated to the service of others is a calling that garners minimal financial reward and often little recognition. Individuals will labor their whole lives working to make the world a slightly better place, only to receive few, if any, accolades or commendations. Today, I want to take this opportunity to recognize one person who has dedicated his life to God and his fellow man, Dr. W. James Rivers, and whose commitment to both has made South Carolina a better place to live.

Dr. Rivers' calling to the ministry did not come until he was in his thirties, but he knew early on that he wanted to dedicate his life to serving others. Upon his graduation from the University of South Carolina, he earned a commission in the United States Air Force and found himself on the Korean Peninsula, where the United States and the United Nations were waging a war against the expansionist Communists of North Korea and China. The fighting in this conflict was brutal and it was not long before the young officer was in the thick of it, and during his time in Korea, he flew 50 combat missions against our enemies. When a cease-fire agreement was finally reached, and the shooting finally stopped, James Rivers decided to remain in the Air Force and climbed to the rank of captain; however, in 1958, he heard the Lord's call, resigned his commission, and began the process of becoming a minister.

After returning to school, Dr. Rivers began his second career of service, this time to God, which began with a 4-year stint ministering at Dutch Fork Baptist Church. In 1967, Dr. Rivers moved from Columbia, SC, to my hometown of Aiken, where he became the pastor of Millbrook Baptist Church. For the past 29 years, he has ministered to the needs of his flock with great compassion, and has proven to be an effective leader for his church, performing more than 1,400 baptisms, and more than 1,000 marriages. Additionally, under his direction, Millbrook Baptist Church has more than trebled in size, added both a Christian Activities Center and educational building, and has established three mission churches in other States. It takes a man of great spirit, ability, and energy to accomplish such impressive tasks.

Mr. President, Dr. W. James Rivers will be retiring from his career as a minister on May 19, and in recognition of his many years of selfless service, the mayor of Aiken has set aside that Sunday as Jim Rivers Day. I am pleased to join my fellow Aikenites and South Carolinians in recognizing and thanking Dr. W. James Rivers for all his contributions to our State. We are grateful for all his hard work and proud to claim him as a leader of our community.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL OFFICE LEGISLATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 2937, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2937) for the reimbursement of attorney fees and costs incurred by former employees of the White House Travel Office with respect to the termination of their employment in that office on May 19, 1993.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Dole amendment No. 3952, in the nature of a substitute.

Dole amendment No. 3953 (to amendment No. 3952), to provide for an effective date for the settlement of certain claims against the United States.

Dole amendment No. 3954 (to amendment No. 3953), to provide for an effective date for the settlement of certain claims against the United States.

Dole motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report back forthwith.

Dole amendment No. 3955 (to the instructions to the motion to refer), to provide for an effective date for the settlement of certain claims against the United States.

Dole amendment No. 3961 (to amendment No. 3955), to provide for the repeal of the 4.3-cent increase in fuel tax rates enacted by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I want to talk today about repealing the gasoline tax, and I want to talk about it from two angles:

No. 1, the gasoline tax we adopted in 1993, where the money went to general revenue, was an unfair and discriminatory tax that should be repealed.

No. 2, I want to talk briefly about gasoline prices, something that all of Washington talks about but no one actually does anything about. By passing the pending amendment, by repealing the 4.3-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline, we can bring the price of gasoline down by about $1 a tank whenever you fill up your car, your truck, or your van.

Historically, Government has understood that gasoline taxes are inherently discriminatory since the level of gasoline usage varies greatly depending on where you live. The average resident of a State like Texas spends almost twice as much money on gasoline as the average resident of a State like New York. People who live in rural areas, by the very nature of their living in rural areas, travel great distances and use a lot of gasoline and diesel in their cars and trucks. As a result, government has concluded that taxing gasoline as a source of general revenue is inherently discriminatory. It discriminates against people who live in rural areas as compared to urban areas, it discriminates against people who have to travel great distances to work, and it discriminates against people who live in the Western part of the country where you have more open spaces and people generally drive more.

To try to deal with the inherently unfair nature of a gasoline tax as a source of general revenue, what we have normally done is to dedicate the gasoline tax to pay for roads and bridges. Since the 1950's, it has in essence become a user fee: the people who use the roads the most pay the most gasoline taxes, and they are the largest beneficiaries.

Before we adopted the Clinton gas tax, we had never, since we started the highway trust fund, imposed a permanent gasoline tax that was not dedicated to highway building. The Clinton gas tax is unique in that it is a permanent tax on gasoline where the money goes not to road building, so that the people who are paying the taxes are the principal beneficiaries, but instead goes to the general revenue. In fact, if you look at the Clinton budget since 1993, you will see that the money basically goes to social programs and social welfare. In 1993, through the Clinton gasoline tax, we imposed a new general tax on gasoline—paid for by people who have to drive their cars and their trucks great distances to earn a living—in order to pay for benefits going to people who by and large do not work.

We, therefore, created through this gasoline tax an incredible redistribution of income and wealth—the Clinton gasoline tax imposed a new burden on people who drive to work for a living in order to subsidize people who by and large do not go to work.

We have an opportunity in the pending amendment to solve this problem by repealing this gasoline tax thereby eliminating this burden on people that have to drive their cars and trucks great distances to earn a living. In my State, it is not uncommon for someone to live 40 miles from where they work and, as a result, a gasoline tax imposes a very heavy burden on them.

We have an opportunity to eliminate that inequity by repealing the 4.3-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline, a permanent gas tax that, for the first time ever, went into general revenues to fund social programs instead of paying for highway construction.

Now, everybody is talking about rising gasoline prices—the President has asked for an investigation by the Justice Department and we are holding hearings all over Capitol Hill. Yet, we all know one thing for certain: if we really want to lower the price of gasoline this week, there is only one thing that we can do—repeal the Clinton gasoline tax.

If we repeal the gasoline tax today in the Senate, if the House passed it tomorrow, and if the President signed it on Thursday, on Friday morning every filling station in America would lower their posted price by 4.3 cents a gallon and everybody in America who fills up their car, their truck, or their van with gasoline would save about $1 a tank. This is something that we can do, it is something that we have the power to do, but the question is: Do we have the will to do it?

I would like to remind my colleagues, and I would like to remind anybody who is listening, that I offered the amendment to repeal the Clinton gasoline tax 19 days ago. My effort to offer that amendment was stopped by the Democratic leadership in the Senate who decided not to allow this amendment to come up for a vote.

The President now says he would sign the bill repealing his gasoline tax and our Democratic colleagues in the Senate say that they too are for it. My guess is, if we had a vote today, 80 Members of the Senate would vote to repeal this gasoline tax. Yet, for 19 days we have denied lower gas prices to the American people. We have denied the equity that would come from repealing this gasoline tax which, for the first time since the creation of the highway trust fund, taxes people who drive their cars and trucks to work in order to subsidize welfare for people who do not work. For 19 days, despite the fact that almost everybody agrees this is something we should do, we have not done it.

Unless some kind of an agreement is worked out, at 2:15 p.m. today we are going to vote on breaking the Democratic filibuster of the gasoline tax repeal amendment.

If you want to repeal the gasoline tax, then you should vote to end debate and let us have a vote on actually repealing the gasoline tax.

I hope the American people will make note of how individual Senators vote, and will remember that people who want to repeal the gasoline tax are going to vote to end the debate. After 19 days of stalling, after 19 days of perpetuating an inequitable tax, after 19 days of artificially holding up gasoline prices, I hope our Democratic colleagues in the Senate are ready to let this Senate do its will.

I believe the Senate is ready to repeal the gasoline tax and I am confident that we will vote to repeal it if the Democrats will just let us. After 19 days of the Democrats stalling, I am ready to vote, and I am sure the American people are also ready for us to vote.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President. Some of the things that Senators are saying about the gas tax are being perceived as grandstanding positions in my state of California. The people of California know, because the experts in the industry have told them, that they may never see the effect of the tax repeal. As Senator CONRAD has stated, the experts believe the benefit will go to the refiners. What could happen is that we would lose $30 billion from deficit reduction.

It seems to me most people understand this. I think it is really important to find out the causes of this runup in prices. I have written to Hazel O'Leary and asked her to undertake an investigation. The President acted to sell some of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in an effort to add to the supply. There was an article in the Los

Angeles Times that traced the increase in prices, and it concluded that prices kept rising regardless of inventories.

So I think the American people are a lot smarter than some would believe in this Senate. I think they understand that repealing this 4-cent tax has could result in huge deficit increases. I think they understand that the gas price runup has many causes. Repealing the 4-cent tax does not guarantee that the people will see any benefit.

What is interesting to me is the way my Republican friends want to pay for this repeal. It seems it has seen various proposals come forward. The first one was the majority leader on the other side, DICK ARMEY, who suggested we cut education to pay for this gas tax repeal. Thank goodness that proposal was shot down. It seems to me unbelievable to cut back in education when we know that the future of our Nation depends upon how well our children are educated and that the best jobs go to the best educated. So that Republican idea seems to be buried.

Then we were going to sell broadcast spectrum, but then they found out that any income generated by the auction would not be seen for many years.

And now there is a proposal to place a charge on banks and savings institutions, to better prepare them in case there is another crisis in savings and loans and bank failures.

So I think every plan that I have seen is quite wanting. There are a lot of tax loopholes out there I would like to see closed. Let us look at some of those.

So I think as we get to this vote on the gas tax it is going to be interesting to hear the debate. What is the most important thing for the country, a repeal of a 4-cent tax that may never see its way to the consumers pockets?

I would love to be able to guarantee that it would go to the consumers' pockets. It would be an interesting proposal to try to work on something like that. But let us hear the debate.

It is a very important issue, I think in many ways symbolic of whether our actions match our rhetoric around here. So I am looking forward to the debate.

Mr. President, I also heard that the Senator from Missouri was attacking the President on funding for veterans, and I find that very, very interesting since the President vetoed the appropriations bill that included veterans' funding because of unwise policy riders inserted by the Congress. Also, the President felt this Congress was not being fair to veterans because it cut hospital programs promised by previous administrations. I have a case in point in my own State where we are supposed to build a veterans hospital at Travis Air Force Base and this Republican Congress deleted those funds. The President has it in his budget.

I would be happy to join with the Senator from Missouri to make sure our veterans are taken care of. I would love to start with the hospital at Travis, which the veterans need to have and the President has supported.

So I find it interesting that colleagues from the other side come down and blast the President for not supporting this country and not presenting a budget that meets this country's needs when, in fact, if you look at the President's budget versus the budget of the Republicans that just got through the Budget Committee on which I serve, what you see very clearly is that the Republicans go after Medicare; they go after Medicaid; they go after the earned income tax credit, resulting in a tax increase on the working middle income and poor; and that the Democrats, behind this President, are willing to make investments, investments in education, investments in the environment, investments in medical research and in advanced technology research. That is what the future is about. So I look forward to all these debates and I hope we will have them soon.

At this time I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the bill before us has amendments which have been debated involving a great number of very important issues including issues relative to the gas tax repeal, minimum wage, and the so-called TEAM bill. The fact that those are much more public issues and have been the subject of much greater public debate has caused many to overlook the substance of the underlying bill to reimburse the attorney fees of former Travel Office employees.

There have been some comments made on the floor that the underlying bill, H.R. 2937, is an important bill because it is fair, right, and remedial. Some have said it is noncontroversial. Then the debate moves on to the more publicly debated issues—the gas tax, the minimum wage, and the TEAM Act, which have had greater public notice. Then little is said further about the Travel Office bill.

I have questions about the implications of what we would be doing if we passed this Travel Office bill. As best as I can determine, if we pass this bill, it would be the first time in our history that we will have passed legislation to pay the attorney fees of someone who has been indicted. In order to be indicted, a grand jury has to determine that there is probable cause that the person committed the alleged crime. It is a system that we use thousands of times a year across this country. In order to be indicted, a prosecutor must present evidence to a grand jury to show that there is probable cause that a crime has been committed and that the person at issue is the one who committed the crime. That is what has happened in the case, or what did happen in the case of Billy Dale. The grand jury determined that there was probable cause that he committed a crime against the United States and that he should stand trial.

Once a person is indicted, the prosecutor must meet a higher standard of proof—proof beyond a reasonable doubt the indicted individual committed the crime. That is the way the system works. Then it goes to a trial. A judge is usually presented with a motion for a directed verdict, or might be presented with a motion for a directed verdict, arguing that there is insufficient evidence before the court to permit a reasonable juror to find that person is guilty of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. It is my understanding that there was a motion for a directed verdict in Billy Dale's case and that the judge denied the motion for a directed verdict.

With this legislation, what we are then doing is taking the unprecedented step of saying that in this case we believe that the prosecutor who presented a case to a grand jury and the judge who denied a motion for a directed verdict was so wrong that the taxpayers should pay Billy Dale's attorney fees. If we do that in this case, there is no reason why we will not be asked to do that in hundreds of other cases.

What is the precedent that we are setting for evaluating whether or not we should be paying attorney fees in cases where persons are indicted and whose cases go to a jury? In other words, where there is a motion for a directed verdict which is denied and who are then acquitted.

We have not had 1 hour of hearings in the Senate on this bill. There is no Senate committee report on this bill. The committee report that is before us is a House committee report which does not even discuss the nature of the indictment, the facts surrounding the indictment, nor the basis for it. It just ignores some very critical facts.

There are about 5,000 Federal criminal defendants each year who are either acquitted or have their cases dismissed after indictment. Do we want to open ourselves to the possibility of reviewing each and every one of those cases to decide whether or not the grand jury and the U.S. attorney acted properly, and whether a judge was correct in denying the motion for a directed verdict? Are we going to set up a special subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to consider attorney fees for indicted but acquitted individuals? Will we have some criteria to guide us in the future?

I do not want to get into a litany of the recent acquittals that would make many of us blush in equating them with unfair prosecution. But the fact that somebody is acquitted does not mean that a prosecution was unfair.

Some may argue, ''Well, here the acquittal came in a matter of a few

hours, and that confirms the unfairness of the situation.'' Is that the standard—quick acquittals? Are we then going to subject the Treasury of the United States to claims for attorney fees?

For the past 15 years or so, I, along with Senator COHEN, have been sponsoring reauthorizations of the independent counsel law. That law has a provision in it for payment of attorney fees for persons who are investigated. But it has a very clear and explicit condition—in fact, a couple of them.

First, the attorney fees would be paid only if they would have been incurred but for the use of the independent counsel.

Second, they will not be paid to any person who has been indicted. It is explicit in the independent counsel law. Attorney fees are not available to persons who have been indicted by the independent counsel.

When we added that provision in 1982, there was no question by any witness at our hearing or any advocate for the statute about paying attorney fees for indicted individuals, and yet in this bill, this underlying bill, we are crossing a very significant line. We are talking about using taxpayer dollars to do it. To the best of our information, it is the first time it will be done, and it is being done without a Senate hearing or a Senate committee report laying forth criteria as to what will be the future standards.

Some people say, well, this bill is just for a half-million dollars. We closed down an agency of the Government last year that had a total budget of $1.2 million. That was the Administrative Conference of the United States. We said we could not afford the $1.2 million for that agency. So we cannot treat this expenditure as if it does not matter. It does.

And also problematical is the fact that there is no requirement that the taxpayer pay only reasonable attorney fees. For instance, if the citizen Billy Dale here paid $500 an hour for his attorney, should we be reimbursing him at that rate? I cannot support that. But the bill is silent in terms of reasonableness of attorney fees. We have limits on attorney fees in all the other statutes that I know about. In the independent counsel law we require that the court determine that the fees paid to eligible persons be reasonable and market rate.

And by the way, as I mentioned before, the independent counsel law does not permit an attorney fee to be paid to someone who has been indicted. But where the attorney fee is permitted there is a requirement that the attorney fee be reasonable and market rate. That requirement is not present here. In the Equal Access to Justice Act we limit the amount paid to an attorney to $150 an hour, and that act applies where a court determines that a government's civil case against a small business had no substantial justification. There is no requirement like that in this bill. I think that is a disservice to the American taxpayers as well.

In addition, there is no ceiling in this bill on the overall total. If Mr. Dale's attorneys are going to say that they worked 100 hours, we are going to presumably sock the taxpayers for 100 hours even though there has been no judgment as to whether or not the 100 hours was an appropriate length of time, and maybe it only should have been 50 hours.

In an earlier bill that was introduced, Senator HATCH did have a ceiling on the amount the taxpayers would have to pay. But the bill before us does not do that. There is no ceiling. It is unlimited. So let us look again at what the underlying bill does. First, it authorizes the use of taxpayer dollars to reimburse the legal expenses of an individual indicted for the commission of a Federal crime.

Congress has never, to the best of my knowledge, authorized that type of payment. Second, the bill authorizes the payment of all legal expenses incurred without any requirement that the expenses were necessary, appropriate or reasonable in amount. The bill does not place a ceiling on the amount of money that may be paid. It creates an open-ended entitlement.

So even though the amount may seem small, we are opening a wide door here to the Federal Treasury and we should take more care before we are doing so.

At this point, I would make a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. LEVIN. I ask the Chair whether or not the bill before us is a private bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a private bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Senate is at a regrettable impasse. For several weeks now, Democrats have been trying to bring an increase in the minimum wage to a vote on the Senate floor. We were repeatedly blocked by parliamentary maneuvers. The majority insisted on lumping a number of unrelated matters together and resisted the right of the minority to offer any amendments to any of matters involved. This is a very unfortunate circumstance. We should deal with each of these matters, the minimum wage increase, the TEAM Act, the proposed repeal of the gasoline tax, and the matter related to the White House Travel Office separately, debate them, amend them according to the will of the Senate, and then pass or defeat each. Instead, in an effort to score political points in a contest with the President, the majority has used parliamentary rules to produce distorted results. First, four different bills were bundled together in one, and if the effort to shut off debate had succeeded, with no ability to amend except very narrowly. For example, it might have proven impossible to offer an amendment to the gas tax repeal provision to try to assure that the benefit goes to the consumer and not to the oil companies. It might also have proven impossible to amend the provision to attempt to assure that the repeal is adequately paid for and does not increase the federal deficit. Now, we face yet another amendment without the ability to amend it and yet another effort to cut off debate.

The minimum wage issue is straightforward. It's about whether or not we are truly committed to helping working people earn a living wage. Recently, we have begun to hear more concern expressed about jobs and wages for the working family in America. Some have newly discovered the problems that working families face today: The declining purchasing power of their wages, increasing health care costs, and the high cost of child care are among those most important. But, for some of us, and for the American people, these are not new issues.

The last time we gave minimum wage workers a raise was 5 years ago April 1. The current minimum wage is $4.25. In the last 5 years, because of inflation, the buying power of that wage has fallen 50 cents and is now 29 percent lower than it was in 1979—17 years ago.

With this amendment, the hourly minimum wage would rise to $4.70 this year, and to $5.15 next year. Close to 12 million American workers would take a step forward toward a more equitable living wage.

Remarkably, there are some in this Congress who not only oppose an increase to a fair level: Some would eliminate the minimum wage completely. But, I thing that they comprise a tiny extreme minority. The last increase had overwhelming bipartisan support. On November 8, 1989, the Senate passed the increase by a vote of 89 to 8. Supporting that increase were the current GOP and Democratic leaders. In the House, this bill passed by a vote of 382 to 37. Voting ''yes'' were the current Speaker of the House and the Democratic leader. And, the bill was signed into law by President George Bush.

Discounting inflation, a Rand study shows that the median income of families fell more then $2,700 over 4 years to about $27,000 in 1993. But people at the lower rungs of the economic ladder have it the worst.

Rand's researchers found that between 1989 and 1993, the top fifth of the economic spectrum earned nearly 10 times what those in the bottom fifth earned. The gap between the top and the bottom is very wide—and getting wider.

These figures illustrate that although our economy is growing and unemployment is relatively low, working families are confronting difficult and uncertain times. This amendment would provide a modest boost in earnings for many of these households.

A higher minimum wage could help reverse the growing wage inequality

that has occurred since the 1970's especially among women.

While some claim a moderate increase in the minimum wage will cost jobs, leading economists find little evidence of loss of employment. Instead, they find that a ripple effect could expand the impact beyond the immediate minimum wage work force. Some workers in low-wage jobs who currently earn more than the minimum wage may see an increase in their earnings as minimum wages rise.

As the richest nation on Earth, our minimum wage should be a living wage. But it isn't close. When a father or mother works full-time, 40 hours a week, year-round, they should be able to lift their family out of poverty.

The current minimum wage is actually about $2 an hour less than what a family of four needs to live above the poverty line. At $4.25 an hour, you earn $680 a month, gross. That is $8,160 per year.

Adults who support their families would be the prime beneficiaries of our proposal to raise the minimum wage. Nearly two-thirds of minimum wage earners are adults and more than one-third are the sole breadwinners. Nearly 60 percent of the full-time minimum wage earners are women. Often these are women bringing home the family's only paycheck.

In 32 States over 10 percent of the work force would benefit directly from an increase in the minimum wage. In Michigan, 324,000 workers, almost 12 percent of the work force are making the minimum wage. Some 435,000 workers earn less than $5.15 per hour.

Mr. President, the bottom line is work should pay, and the current minimum wage is not enough to live on. The minimum wage is a floor beneath which no one should fall. But we should make sure that standing on the floor, a person can reach the table. A full-time minimum wage job should provide a minimum standard of living in addition to giving workers the dignity that comes with a paycheck. Hard-working Americans deserve a fair deal.

Mr. President, it is ironic that many who are the strongest line-item veto proponents and who, last year, indeed were proposing a version of line-item veto which would have caused bills to be carved up into hundreds of separate bills for the President's signature or veto, now are trying to do the reverse. They are taking clearly unrelated matters and lumping them together while blocking important relevant amendments. We need to get on with the business of the Nation. We should address the gas tax proposal, the minimum wage increase, and the other matters before the Senate in separate bills, allow Senators to propose their amendments, debate the issues, vote, and send legislation to the President for his signature or veto. The only reason this is being wrapped up in one big package and hamstrung it with parliamentary entanglements, is Presidential politics. I predict it will not benefit those who concocted the strategy. Our Nation deserves better.

Mr. President, I did want to spend a few minutes this morning pointing out some of the difficulties that I think will be created if we pass this underlying bill without criteria being established, without a Senate committee report, without a requirement that fees be reasonable, without a limit on the amount of the authorization here, the obligation of the Federal Treasury. There are some precedents that are being set here if we pass this bill as is, which should not be set without further deliberation by the Senate because of the implications to the Treasury of thousands of people who have been indicted who are either then acquitted or whose cases are dismissed who might also be able to make claims under the precedent that could arguably be set by this bill.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2202

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate H.R. 2202, the illegal immigration reform bill, so that the Senate's actions of yesterday, requesting the conference and appointing conferees, can be executed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move the Senate now recess under the previous order until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

The motion was agreed to, and, at 12:15 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:16 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. JEFFORDS).

WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL OFFICE LEGISLATION

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the clerk will report the cloture motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Dole amendment, No. 3961:

Bob Dole, Trent Lott, Craig Thomas, Larry E. Craig, R.F. Bennett, Mark Hatfield, Ben N. Campbell, Spencer Abraham, Nancy Landon Kassebaum, Don Nickles, Chuck Grassley, Conrad Burns, John Ashcroft, Jim Inhofe, P. Gramm, W.V. Roth, Jr.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The mandatory quorum call has been waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 3961 shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 112 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Abraham	Faircloth	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McCain
Baucus	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Brown	Grassley	Pressler
Burns	Gregg	Roth
Campbell	Hatch	Santorum
Chafee	Hatfield	Shelby
Coats	Helms	Simpson
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Cohen	Inhofe	Snowe
Coverdell	Jeffords	Specter
Craig	Kassebaum	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner

NAYS—43

Akaka	Ford	Mikulski
Bingaman	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Graham	Moynihan
Bradley	Harkin	Murray
Breaux	Heflin	Nunn
Bryan	Hollings	Pryor
Bumpers	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Johnston	Robb
Conrad	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Simon
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Exon	Leahy	Wyden
Feingold	Levin	
Feinstein	Lieberman	

NOT VOTING—3

Biden	Kerrey	Pell

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the ayes are 54, the nays are 43. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now

be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1756 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI pertaining to the introduction of S. 1755 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Iowa.

REDUCING THE GASOLINE TAX

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, even though we are in morning business, I want to address the issue that was on the floor prior to the vote that we just had. That vote on cloture was our attempt, on the majority side, to stop a filibuster and to get to a vote on reducing the gasoline tax by 4.3 cents.

Once again we have run up against the minority's unwillingness to allow us to have a vote on President Clinton's gas tax. We know it would pass overwhelmingly. The President has already said he would sign it. It seems to me it is something we ought to do.

We had 54 votes—I think that is 53 Republicans and one Democrat vote—to stop debate so we could get to a vote on final passage. We would have more than 51 votes to pass it. So it would pass, but we needed six more votes from the Democratic side to make cloture happen. We did not get them. So we are at a standstill here on this piece of legislation. It is needlessly being held up, and those holding it up are needlessly causing the taxpayers of this country, those people who drive cars, to pay more tax while the price of gasoline continues at a very high level. Consequently, I hope we can bring the repeal of President Clinton's gas tax to a vote. I particularly would like to repeal it because the repeal is something that can be passed very quickly. We know that this is true because it is something that the President said he would sign.

We Republicans strongly feel that President Clinton's gas tax should be repealed because we, en bloc, voted against President Clinton's tax bill of 1993. We knew it was the biggest tax hike in the history of the country, and we felt it would do harm to the economy. We are finding out that it is doing harm to the economy. Even though we have had a recovery, we could have created 3 million more jobs in this recovery, compared to other recoveries, had President Clinton not increased taxes. These are jobs that are not being created because of the damper on the economy that the biggest tax increase in the history of the country has given us, of which the 4-cent gas tax increase was a major part.

I thank the majority leader for calling this bill up that repeals the Clinton gas tax, and for his bringing it to the immediate attention of the Senate.

If I can begin by way of conclusion, I believe the Senate should join the House Committee on Ways and Means in passing a swift repeal of the Clinton gas tax increase of 1993. In 1993 the Committee on Ways and Means, then controlled by Democrats, estimated what this bill would cost the drivers of the various States. They figured what they think it would cost my Iowans, based on the assumption that Iowans drive 12,396 miles per year. I think that this estimate is probably a number that is smaller than what Iowans truly drive. I do not think these estimates by the economists for the Ways and Means Committee include the fact that farmers and many other people in rural America have to drive long distances, not only for their business, but also to get their kids to school and back home every day and all the other things associated with a family. I think the 12,396 miles that was estimated by the Committee on Ways and Means in 1993 is probably too small.

Nonetheless, the Committee went on to say that if you take that 12,396 miles that Iowans would drive on average per automobile, and multiply that times the Clinton gasoline tax increase of 4.3 cents, it is going to cost Iowans an extra $26.66 per year to drive a car. That is assuming a one-driver family. Most families are two-driver families and then would expend twice that amount of money at $53.32.

I think families with children have better use for their $53.32 fuel tax expense than funding the President's big spending habits that were part of his 1993 budget and tax increase. For example, $53.32 for the average family would buy any of the following items in a typical Iowa farm town: 24 gallons of milk at $2.15 a gallon, 67 pounds of apples at 79 cents a pound, 71 cans of tomato soup at 75 cents a can, 14 boxes of breakfast cereal at $3.69 a box, 44 dozen eggs at $1.19 a dozen, 53 loaves of bread at 99 cents a loaf, 60 pounds of hot dogs at 89 cents a pound, and 106 boxes of macaroni and cheese at 50 cents a box.

Alternately, if a family wants to have summer activity for children, $53.32 will buy either three unlimited summer children's passes at the swimming pool or two activity fees for the youth little league baseball program.

These are real opportunity costs affecting real families in my State because we have this gas tax increase that has been a damper on the economy and families. Because Iowa families have been paying the Clinton fuel tax for all of 1993 and all of 1994, you must readily see that President Clinton has denied these families some of these necessities. He has done so, not only once, but he has done it twice.

Now, in 1996, Iowa families desperately need Congress to repeal the President's 1993 fuel tax increase. The American Farm Bureau Federation, which speaks for a lot of people in rural America, agrees with the need for the repeal of the tax. The American Farm Bureau notes that President Clinton's gas tax increase is the first time in which fuel taxes have ever been used for anything other than transportation funding.

The highway trust funds are important to farmers because Iowa farmers need someone to improve rural bridges and roads, not only for getting a family back and forth to town, but also to get their inputs into their farming operations as well as the grain and other products that they produce to market. We find in our State that many of our roads and bridges used by farmers do not currently meet safety engineering standards.

If we need to have a gas tax, then I say let it be spent on roads and highways and bridges to move people. It is a user fee. It ought to be used for that purpose.

This 4.3-cent gas tax increase in 1993 went into the general fund. As Senator ASHCROFT, of Missouri, said better than any of us can say, it is a Clinton gas tax increase paid for by people going to work. It goes into a fund that is going to go to programs for those people that do not go to work.

If we are going to tax working people 4 more cents for gas, it ought to go into the road fund so that it is going for the people that are using the roads. So if we take this 4 cents out, and President Clinton still feels that this money ought to be spent on some of these programs with the general fund as their source of revenue, then the President should agree to cut spending elsewhere in the budget rather than taking money that ought to go to build better roads, safer roads, and safer bridges. But his act of 1993 does not build any roads or bridges with his fuel tax.

So the President had an opportunity to cut spending when we passed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. I like to remind people that because some are cynical about Congress' ability to pass legislation to balance the budget that the Republican Congress succeeded in doing it.

Mr. President, if I am running out of time, I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am sorry that I went over time, but I will make this last point.

The President in December vetoed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. This

1,800-page bill that we sent to the President was the product of about 8 months of work by the Senate and the House. It was the product of 13 different committees. Every committee had to change the programs that are under its jurisdiction to fit into the effort. That effort was the policy to balance the budget. Our bill did that.

So, once in awhile, I like to reconsider our now vetoed Balanced Budget Act of 1995, because I have been working with other people in the Congress for a long time and we said that we could balance the budget. But, quite frankly, until last year we never delivered on that promise.

We tend to overpromise in Congress which can be wrong. We should be careful not to overpromise. We should perform in office commensurate with the rhetoric of our campaign.

We had promised to balance the budget over so many years in the 1970's and 1980's and early 1990's—the last time we had a balanced budget was in 1969—but we did not succeed, and yet we had promised it. That is why some people are so cynical about some of us in public office.

I suppose if you would have asked me 12 months ago, would we ever have gotten to a balanced budget, I would have been cynical myself about our ability to succeed. I would have said, ''Well, no. It's a good goal, but we'll never get it done.'' I never said that at the time, but that is what I thought. Yet, I am on the committees that have to deliver on it. We were able to produce a budget that the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office declared balanced. And the President vetoed it.

We are going to be able to start, maybe tomorrow morning, to put together another balanced budget act. This will be the balanced budget act of 1996. We will still have a lot of tough decisions to make, but at least now we have the President on record as saying that he was for a balanced budget. He said he was for a balanced budget, only he would do it in 10 years even though our's did it in 7 years. The new one to be taken up soon will do it in 6 years. It will ultimately balance because we said 12 months ago we were going to balance it. At least now we have the President saying he is for a balanced budget. I hope he really is. After June of last year, he said he was for a balanced budget. We passed it, and he still vetoed it.

So the process starts over again. I am not cynical about whether or not we can balance the budget now because we proved to the public we could do it. Most importantly, we had to prove it to ourselves that we could do it, and we did.

So I think that the President has an opportunity now to hopefully reject this business that you can tax people with a gas tax for money that ought to go into the road fund to build safer highways. Currently, President Clinton's gas tax is going to fund a bunch of programs with gasoline user fees that have nothing to do with the people that are using the highways. Here is a way that he could help repeal that. He said he would do it. I hope he sends a message to the minority party up here on the Hill that he will do it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

THE DEFICIT

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I have listened very carefully to the Senator from Iowa's speech, as I have listened virtually to every member of the Republican Party of the Senate who has consistently lamented the deficit-reduction package of 1993. I did not enjoy voting to raise taxes in 1993 any more than I enjoyed cutting spending in 1993. But to set the record straight, that deficit-reduction package was intended to reduce the deficit compared to what it would otherwise be, by $500 billion over a period of 5 years.

It was a very dramatic time in the Senate. Fifty Democrats voted aye. Every single Republican voted no. And Vice President GORE, who was seated in the chair that day, voted aye and broke the tie. And so the $500 billion deficit-reduction package became law. At least two Senators on this side of the aisle lost their reelection campaigns because they voted aye, a very courageous and responsible vote.

The Office of Management and Budget estimates that rather than produce $500 billion in savings, but because interest rates came down as a result of that package and because economic activity went up, the 1993 Clinton budget bill will actually reduce the deficit by $800 billion over the same 5-year period, 1993 to 1998.

So I ask my Republican colleagues who find that deficit-reduction bill passed by 50 very courageous Democrats in 1993, I ask them to tell all Americans as we start to work on the budget tomorrow, where you would get that $800 billion if we had not acted so responsibly?

The budget we will debate tomorrow, which I have absolutely no intention of voting for, again, has substantial cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, and—listen to this—a $60 billion cut in education over the next 6 years.

Who gets the money? Why, the Republican budget provides for an $11.3 billion increase next year alone in defense spending. Now, Mr. President, for the edification of anybody who cares, out of a roughly $1.7 trillion budget, less than one-third of that is for what we call domestic discretionary spending—education; the environment; medical research; medical care and a whole host of other things.

Mr. President, $515 billion is provided for discretionary spending, but defense gets the bulk of that, including a nice, handsome $11-plus billion increase, and everything else that makes us a great country worth defending goes down. The environment, including funding for EPA's enforcement, takes a whopping hit. In 1970, 65 percent of the lakes and streams in this country were neither swimmable nor fishable. In 1995, 65 percent of the lakes and streams in this Nation are swimmable and are fishable because EPA, through their enforcement acts, made people quit dumping their sewage into the rivers and streams and made the soap manufacturers come up with cleaner soaps without chemicals in them.

How does the Republican budget respond to that kind of progress? Why, they cut EPA's enforcement because they argue the business community just cannot take it. I am the first to admit that some regulations are crazy and do not make sense. But nobody, Republican or Democrat alike, in their heart of hearts wants to turn the clock back on cleaning up the lakes and streams of this Nation, or polluting the air we breathe, which is much, much cleaner now, principally because we made the automobile industry put catalytic converters in their cars.

So when the Republicans talk about that big tax hike in 1993, what is their answer? Maybe in their heart of hearts they are feeling a little badly about having voted against cutting the deficit by an honest-to-God $800 billion—not over 7 years; over a 5-year period. What is their answer to it? Cut the gasoline tax 4.3 cents. I thought my good colleague from Louisiana, Senator BREAUX, had a great line. That is like spitting in the ocean and trying to make it rise.

The gas tax did not cause the gasoline price increase and it is not going to contribute to reducing it. It will go into the pockets of the oil companies. Everybody says that by October, gas prices will be back where they started from and we will be sitting here with $3 billion added to the deficit.

What is it with the Republicans? They will not vote for deficit reduction, they keep on increasing defense spending, they keep wanting to repeal the gas tax. And their budget has an enormous billion tax cut. I am not voting for any tax cuts until we get the deficit under control.

You know what is really paradoxical about the proposed tax cut that gives families a credit for each child? Listen to this: Six to nine million people in this country work for anywhere from $4.25 an hour to $6 and $7 an hour, 6 to 9 million of them. We give them a little check at the end of the year called the earned income tax credit because we believe that is preferable to their quitting work and going on welfare. So we say we will give you up to $2,800 at the end of the year if you will just stay on the job. That is a lot cheaper than $9,000 a year on welfare. It is a good investment for us.

What does the Republican budget do? It cuts investment tax credit by approximately $20 billion. What does this mean to the 6 to 9 million people who are working for essentially minimum

wages, up to $7 an hour? Effectively, they get a tax increase because the earned income tax credit has been cut.

Do you know what else is really ironic about it? Those people do not pay taxes. They do not make enough to pay taxes. So you know what? They do not get a child tax credit. They are getting a tax increase by cutting the earned-income tax credit, and they get nothing to offset it because it is only if you pay taxes that you can offset the tax cut for each child.

What kind of lunacy is this? What do the American people expect from us? They expect a little decency and they expect fairness.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUMPERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, first, I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas, thank you for coming to the floor today and talking to us and to whoever is watching here. As the Senator has a way of doing, he finds the truth. He finds the truth in all of this. The truth that he pointed out—and then I will ask a question—when you get through with this Republican budget, what you realize is that it hurts the people of this country. It hurts the hardest working people of this country. We will bring that out in the next few days.

The question I want to ask the Senator is this: We know when the Government shut down and we had that crisis, it was because the President of the United States stood up and said to this Republican Congress, ''I'm not going to back down. I'm going to stand up for Medicare and the elderly who rely on it. I'm going to stand up for Medicaid and the poorest children who rely on it, and the poorest seniors in nursing homes who rely on it.'' He was going to stand up, and he did, for the environment and for education.

I say to my friend, has he looked at this Republican budget that they have just unveiled with great fanfare, and that budget which the President vetoed, and does he see similarities between the two?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUMPERS. Let me say to the Senator from California, this question reminds me of something Franklin Roosevelt said. My father taught us when we died we were going to Franklin Roosevelt's. He was the only one who ever did anything for us.

This budget is a manifestation of almost total disdain for people trying to reach for the first rung on the ladder. It is protectionism at its worst of those who have much. Franklin Roosevelt once said, and I know the Senator is familiar with the quote, ''The groans of the full pocketbooks of the wealthy are louder than the churning of the empty stomachs of hungry people.'' That is not so true now as it was during the Depression, but the principle in this budget is the same.

You think about cutting education $60 billion. You think of how many children will not be educated as a result of that. I have said time and time again if it had not been for the GI bill waiting for me when I got out of the service, I would not be standing here right now.

And that applies to millions and millions of people. There was a very poignant story in the Post this morning about a woman who said, ''I wouldn't be in this position if it hadn't been for student loans and student grants.'' So what are we doing? We are cutting education $60 billion. Everybody wants clear air and clean water. So what are we doing? Cutting the environment. Nobody wants to see a child go without health care. So we are cutting Medicaid. I could go on and on. But I find this budget almost identical to the budget we debated last year——

Mrs. BOXER. That is right.

Mr. BUMPERS. The one followed by a reconciliation which the President had the good sense and the courage to veto. Had he not vetoed it, we would be on our way to third-world status right now. That is how bad I felt it was.

Mr. President, I know my time has about expired. Every time I think of the fact that two of my very best friends and best Senators in the U.S. Senate lost their seats because they cast a very courageous vote here in 1993, it makes me sad.

So, Mr. President, there are going to be a limited number of amendments. I have a number that I wish I could offer on the budget, but I know time constraints will not permit that. However, I will offer a few. One amendment would keep the U.S. Government from selling assets to balance the budget. Think about selling the power marketing systems. Think about selling the Elk Hills Petroleum Reserve. Sell everything. What do you do for an encore when everything is gone?

A woman once said her husband came home from the law office and said, ''I had a great day today.'' She said, ''What happened?'' He said, ''I sold my desk.'' That is what we are doing in this budget. I am not going to vote for it. I am going to vigorously speak against it, and there will be 53 Republicans that will vote for it. We are starting down the same road we just left.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

GAS TAX REPEAL

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, a few moments ago, the other side of the aisle effectively blocked the efforts to repeal President Clinton's August 1993 increase on gasoline, diesel fuel, and jet fuel. Now, just to put this in perspective, when the President was running for the office he now holds, he said, in unequivocal terms, that a gas tax was the wrong thing to do, he said it was egregious for low income, and he said it was harmful to the elderly, all of which is true. It is as regressive a tax as one can find because the lowest income families in America pay the highest share of their disposable incomes. It ranges as high as 8 percent of their disposable income that has to be invested in the purchase of gasoline.

So those that have the least resources are those for which this tax causes the most difficulty, which, as I am sure, is why the President said it was the wrong thing to do. Nevertheless, on arrival at the White House, an increase in gasoline taxes was put in his tax increase on America, which, as we all know, was the largest tax increase in American history. These policies have had the effect of costing America's average families, all of them put together, about $2,000 to $3,000 in lost income.

Some people around here do not seem to think that is a lot of money. But for the average family in Georgia, let me try to put it in perspective. An average family in Georgia makes $45,000 a year. Both parents have to work to get that. In fact, in many cases today, the kids have to work, too, to make ends meet. By the time this average family in Georgia pays their Federal taxes, FICA, Social Security, Medicare, State and local taxes—their share of the regulatory apparatus in our country, which is at an all-time high—they have 48 percent of their gross income left to do everything that we have asked them to do. That is unbelievable.

If Thomas Jefferson were here today, or any of the other Founders, they would absolutely be stunned that we have grown up the Government so large that it takes over half the resources from labor, leaves them with less than half of what they earned to do what they have to do, to promote their own dreams, to educate, to house, to feed, to clothe, to transport, to provide for the health of their families and their communities. No wonder there is so much anxiety in the workplace today, so much anxiousness among our people. We have literally pushed the American family to the wall.

So, suddenly, there is a phenomenon that makes everybody focus on the price of gasoline. The prices have been skyrocketing because there is a refinery shortage, because there was a bad winter, because the price of the crude product costs much more today. And so some Members came to the floor and said let us at least, in the face of this, get rid of that burden. Let us repeal that gas tax. Let us remember what the President said when he ran for President. And then even the President said, ''Yes, I agree. I would sign a repeal of the gas tax.''

But when we tried to do it in these last 5 or 6 days, with us saying it should be done, with the President finally agreeing, remembering his remarks during the campaign that it was

a wrong tax, a regressive tax, a tax hard on low income, a tax that is hard on senior citizens—so we had the majority and the President both agreeing. But the other side will not let it come to a vote. They will not even allow this modest reduction of economic pressure on the American family.

In the face of vast public support, a modest attempt to put a few more dollars in the checking accounts of these American families, for which—to step back a moment, Mr. President, last week we acknowledged, just for taxes—forget the regulatory reform—an American family, a Georgia family in my case, works today from January 1 to May 7 for the Government, and May 8 is the first day they get to keep their paycheck. For Heaven's sake, a family in America has to work from January 1 to May 7, and on May 8 gets to keep their first paycheck.

I might add that, under this administration, the date you get to keep your check is the latest in the year that it has ever been. These policies have added 3 more days that a family has to work for the Government before they can keep their own earnings.

We just heard remarks from the Senator from Arkansas bemoaning attempts to try to lower that impact. The last balanced budget that the Congress sent to the President would have put $2,000 to $3,000 in the checking account of that average Georgia family I was talking about. That is the equivalent of a 10- to 20-percent pay raise. Now, if you are currently having over half of your resources taken, just think what an important event it would be to be able to keep another $2,000 to $3,000 in the checking account of that average family. A phenomenal impact.

As I said, it is almost not comprehensible. I would never have believed while growing up that I would be in the U.S. Senate at a time when a family has to work from January 1 to May 7 before they get to keep their first paycheck.

If we ask Americans what would be a fair tax level, no matter their circumstances, they will tell us 25 percent. That would be working from January 1 to March 1, and then on March 2 you get to keep your paycheck. But no. No. Now it is May 8 before you get to keep your paycheck.

We came forward and said, ''Look, the President has vetoed all this tax relief. But let us at least at a minimum take this gas tax burden off the backs of the working families.'' I might point out that it would mean somewhere around $100 to $200 that would be left in the checking account. Several people on the other side have suggested that is too little money to be concerned about. Well, if it is such a small amount, why are we in such an argument about returning it to the families that earned it? Let us go ahead and give it back to them. If it does not matter to them, why does it matter to us?

I remember several years ago in my State when we raised the fee on the license tag $10 to $15, and it almost created a revolution, from my mother to every neighborhood. ''Why am I paying this additional $5?'' We got rid of that in a hurry, and we ought to get rid of this gas tax. We ought to leave that money in the checking account for those who earned it.

In my State alone, the gas tax removed $238 million annually from the economy. That is an enormous sum of money. Removing that money from the State, taking it out of the families that earned it and the businesses that earned it and shipping it up here to the Treasury so some Washington wonder wonk can decide where to spend it makes no sense under the current conditions that we face.

But even this modest attempt to lower taxes even the slightest amount has found stiff opposition from the other side, and they have consistently refused to allow this measure—which now their own President says he is willing to sign—they will not let it get passed; deadlocked; cannot end the debate; another filibuster, which I might point out is a 60-to-50 effort to stop a filibuster, more than any other session in contemporary history.

Whenever we get into these tax questions, Mr. President, I always get back to this average family. I asked for a snapshot of that family about 3 months ago. It has been absolutely fascinating. I do not think many people in America, even those paying this burden, understand that half of what they earn is being taken right out of their checking account and shipped up here so that another set of priorities can be imposed.

That is an inordinate burden, and there is no institution in America that has had a more profound effect on the American family and its behavior than their own Government—more than Hollywood, more than all these cultural issues that we talk about all the time. There is no institution other than our own Government that has had such a profound effect. I mean, what else can sweep through your home and take half the resources you earn?

When I was a youngster, I was told that the largest single investment that I would ever make was my home. Wrong. The largest single investment I make and all my fellow citizens make is the Government. We have long since surpassed the investment in the home with the Government. The Government now takes more than your mortgage, clothing, and transportation combined—the Government.

Back in 1950 when the quintessential family was Ozzie and Harriet, Ozzie was sending 2 cents to Washington out of his paycheck. If he were here today, he would be sending a quarter; 2 cents to a quarter in 50 years. Do you know that Harriet would not be at home either? She would be in the workplace. She would have to be in the workplace so that they could maintain what they are charged to do for their family and deal with the tax burden.

Several months ago I took a chart from 1950 to 1996 and tracked the tax burden, which has grown and grown from 2 cents to 25 cents federally. I tracked a number of families in which both parents had to be in the workplace, and you will not be surprised, Mr. President, they track each other identically right on the line. As the tax burden went up, another set of families had to have both parents in the workplace.

I know there are many other features of our new world—the desire for professional accomplishment, the lifting of the glass ceiling. There are many factors that are in the workplace. But I argue that the most significant reason is tax pressure. In fact, there was a recent study that asked the other spouse, ''Are you pleased to be in the workplace?'' You will not be surprised, Mr. President, a third of them do not want to be there at all, a third of them want to be there as volunteers, and another third of them would work just part time. But the economic pressures that time and this new era have put on those families has literally pressured a total realignment of who is in the workplace.

Families today are in the workplace, husband, wife, and children, just to keep their standard of living in place. The tax burden, Mr. President, has had a more profound effect on the workplace than any other single event in the last 25 years.

Mr. President, I am going to conclude my remarks. But let me just say I am absolutely stunned that even a slight attempt, a modest effort, to go in the correct direction of relieving the tax pressure on the American working family is opposed by the other side of the aisle—attacks in the road, and the barricades across the road to relieving America's families of the enormous tax burden they bear today. They work from January 1 to May 7, and finally on May 8, get to keep 1 day's paycheck. We try to push that clock back just the slightest degree and are railed against by the other side of the aisle. It is perplexing, Mr. President, and I am sure it is to America's families across our land as well.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE GAS TAX, THE BUDGET, AND OBSTRUCTIONISM

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to talk a little bit about several things.

I am not the one who is, of course, engaging in the obstruction of the gas tax repeal that we have been going through now for nearly a week. I would like to comment just a bit on the budget. Even though we are not into the budget debate, there are comments that have been made this afternoon that I think require some little comment. Finally, just a little comment on where we have been this year in terms of obstructionism and holding us back.

It is kind of frustrating, maybe more so for those of us who are new here, and I think very frustrating for the people in the country, to see the Senate not able to move forward on issues that certainly cause disagreement. Nevertheless, we do have a system for that, and that is called voting. If the issue gets more votes than it does not get, then it passes. It if does not, it does not. That is the concept of most of us on how to run things. So it is a little frustrating finding yourself in the position of not moving when there are things to be done, when there are things that are important to families in this country.

One of the other things I think is particularly frustrating is we have here, and very proudly so, a government of the people and by the people, where people make the final decisions on how they stand, how they believe on issues. But, to do that, it is necessary to have the facts. Increasingly in our society, I think, and it troubles me a bit—we have more ability now to communicate than we have ever had. We have the opportunity now, regardless of what happens here or what happens around the world, to know about it instantly through this communications system. Yet, at the same time, despite that system, we find ourselves with more noninformation all the time. It is not the province of any one particular party, it is not the province of any one person, but we find ourselves, I think, with more and more information that is spun to make a point and that is not, frankly, accurate. I think that is too bad. It is really difficult to make decisions with respect to policies and issues if the information we have is distorted. I think we see that increasingly happen to us.

Talking about the budget, a little bit ago there was discussion on the floor about the budget that will be brought out and talked about tomorrow. Among other things it was said EPA takes a whopping cut. The fact of the matter is discretionary spending at the EPA would remain at the level provided in the recently signed appropriations bill. It is not a cut. It stays as it is.

The allegation was also made that education would be cut. Education will increase from $47.8 to $52 billion. That is not a cut. Last year we got into this business about Medicare and talking about the cuts. There were no cuts. What it was was reducing the level of growth so we could maintain that program. If you like Medicare, if you like health care for the elderly, then you have to do something. We thought then that you had to do something by about 2005 or whatever. Now it has been refined to where you have to make some changes by 2001 or the system will go broke. That is no one's projection except the trustees, three of whom are appointed by the President.

The resolution, as a matter of fact, would increase the spending for beneficiaries from $4,800 in 1995 to $7,000. That is not a cut. Yet we hear, and the media continues to utilize that word, ''cut.''

So it is very difficult, it seems to me, to really deal with this. There is a legitimate difference of view. I understand that. Much of the conversation that goes on here, even though we talk about details, is basically a philosophical difference. A little bit ago one of our associates on the other side of the aisle was talking about the benefits of tax increases because they helped reduce the deficit. Of course they do. But the philosophical question is, do you want to reduce the deficit by controlling spending and reducing the level of spending, the rate of spending which would balance the budget, or do you want to continue to spend at the same level and raise taxes to offset it? That is a philosophical difference. That is basically what we talk about here.

It is a defining choice. I suspect everyone, even though it does not happen, says: Yes, let us balance the budget. We have talked about a constitutional amendment here, talked about it this year—everybody, when they initially stood, said, ''I am going to balance the budget. We do not need a constitutional amendment. We can do it.''

Yes, we can. We have not done it for 25 years, however. So it does seem to me a constitutional amendment is something reasonable. But further than that, and at least as important, is what is the philosophy of doing it? Do you want to continue to grow at the rate we have in the past, which is like 8 percent a year faster than the growth in the economy? Or do we want to reduce that level, that rate of growth, and balance the budget that way? I happen to favor that idea.

I think voters said, in 1994, the Federal Government is too big, it is too costly, we need to do something to contain it. I think we should do that. So that is the great debate. To have that debate, you have to have some facts there. You have to talk about the same numbers. Then we argue about the philosophical difference, because there is one.

The idea, somehow, the statement that ''I am not going to vote for any tax cuts'' does not seem to me to be the kind of thing that I support. I think we ought to have tax cuts. I think we ought to be able to leave more money in the pockets of American families. About 40 percent, on average, of our income goes to some level of taxation. I do not think anybody ever intended for that to be the case.

Of course, there are functions of Government that we all support. There are functions of Government that we need to fund and finance, but I do not think anyone had the notion that we would be doing it at the level of 40 percent of our income.

So I hope as we go through this budget—and it is more apparent in budgets than anything else—that we can say: Here are the basic sets of facts. We ought to start there. Then if you disagree, fine. Disagreement is what it is all about.

Let me talk a minute about the gas tax filibuster. We have been trying to do that for a while. What are we talking about? First of all, the bill that is on the floor has to do with Travelgate reimbursement, reimbursing those employees who were unjustly taken to court, who had worked at the White House, to pay their legal fees. That is the basic issue.

The amendments to that included a gas tax reduction of 4.3 cents. It has to do with the minimum wage, a controversial issue, but a valid issue, useful. It has to do with the TEAM concept of allowing employers and employees to be able to come together to use some of the new techniques that have been developed in management, to allow employers to call upon employees to find better ways to do things. We have seen this happen around the world. I come from Cody, WY. The guy who started that kind of management in Japan came from Cody, WY, of all places. And it works. But we do not allow that to happen unless there is a change.

The minimum wage is a legitimate issue. Interestingly enough, it came up here in the Senate about a month ago and had not been talked about for 3 years. But when the AFL–CIO was here and promised $35 million for the election, suddenly it became an issue. It is a legitimate issue. We ought to talk about it.

The gas tax, however, the 4.3 cents—the average gas tax paid in this country is about 38 cents. About half is Federal, about half State. I come from Wyoming where people drive a good deal more. Someone mentioned their family, when using their car, would save about $20. Ours is about $70, because we do drive a great deal more. So it is a little unfair regionally. I have a parochial concern about that.

I think one of the interesting things, though, is that this 4.3 cents, out of the 18 cents, is the only portion of the gas tax that does not go to the maintenance and building of highways. It goes into the general fund. I think it would be a mistake to begin to tax this commodity generally for nonhighway uses. That is what we have done. So we have an opportunity now to change that.

One of the reasons it comes up, of course, is because of the extraordinary recent prices in gasoline over the last month or less. Is this the answer to that? No, of course not. But this needs to be repealed under any circumstances. It provides an opportunity

to talk about it, some way to say, ''Well, the 4.3 cents will never get to the consumer.''

I do not believe that. First of all, it has such a high level of visibility that it surely will have to go there. Second, there is great competition, as you know. If I have a gas station on one corner and you have one on the other, and I lower mine, you are going to lower yours, too. That is going to happen. Competition has a great deal to do with that.

We had a hearing this week and took a look at the costs of gasoline, and it is roughly a third—about a third for crude oil, about a third in the refining and marketing, and about a third in taxes. Not many commodities are taxed that high. So we ought to do that.

I am very disappointed that instead of voting on it, instead of following the advice of the President, who over the years has indicated that he was opposed to a gas tax, who indicated during his campaign that that was not a good tax because it taxed the poor at a much higher level of a percentage of their income than the rich—it is true—now supports it, brought it to us. So we need to change that. Why do we not? Because our friends on that side of the aisle will not let it come up.

Filibuster. This is not the classic filibuster where people stand up and talk all night and bring their sleeping bag and cook dinner out in the back. This is the kind where it is simply obstructionism that will not let it come to the floor, and it continues.

So we need to change that, Mr. President. We need to move forward. Let these issues stand for all as they will.

Finally, I think there has been some frustration, at least on my part, this year in that this is not the first time or the only time it has happened. My friend from Georgia just indicated that some 60 times this has happened this year, more than any other time in recent history. We have set about to make some changes this year.

I think those of us who just came last year in the last election are maybe more aware of the need for change, feel more of a mandate to make a change. I think, to a large extent, we have succeeded in causing that change to happen. We have not come to closure on as many things as I wish we would have and could have, but I can tell you that we have changed the debate here.

Now we are talking about how do you balance the budget, arguing about which aspects of the budget we can change to balance it. For 25 years we did not talk about balancing the budget at all. Now we are. Now we are talking about ways to make Government more efficient and more effective and, indeed, to move some of the functions of Government back closer to people, the States and the counties. That is a new idea. Not since the Great Society with Lyndon Johnson have we talked about making it smaller rather than larger. So there have been a lot of things that this same sort of obstructionism has caused not to happen.

Tort reform. A lot of people believe that we ought to do something in our legal system, do something about litigation so that we do not have this constant pressure. We cannot do that because there is obstruction from the White House.

Regulatory reform. Almost everybody understands and recognizes that we are overregulated. Sure, we need regulations, but they need to be the kind that are efficient and effective and not so costly. We did not get regulatory reform because it was obstructed.

The balanced budget amendment to the Constitution failed by one vote in the Senate. As I mentioned, people argue, ''Well, we don't need to do that.'' The evidence is we do. We do it in my State. We do it in most of our States. We do it in about 43 States, I think. There is a constitutional amendment that you cannot spend more than you take in. That makes sense. It is morally and fiscally responsible. We ought to do that.

Welfare reform. Almost everybody believes that we need to help people who need help, but we need to help them back into the work force, and we need to make some changes so that can happen. We need to move that much more to the States. Certainly the delivery system in Wyoming for welfare needs to be different than it is in Pennsylvania. We have 100,000 miles and 475,000 people, half of what is in Fairfax County across the river. Our system has to be different. We need to let the States devise that delivery system.

Health care reform is stalled right now. It is not an extensive health care reform, but it has to do with portability; it has to do with accessibility to insurance. It is hung up now. We cannot move forward.

I have been involved, as have many of us, with Superfund reform. Everybody knows Superfund reform has to come about. One of the main contributors to cleaning up Superfund sites are insurance dollars, and 85 percent of those dollars go to legal fees, not to cleaning up Superfund sites. That needs to be changed. We need to reduce spending. Talk about balancing the budget—spending has continued to grow.

So, Mr. President, those are some of the effects, it seems to me, of sort of obstructing moving forward. This one is more pronounced than most. We cannot move on the gas tax. But it has been going on all year. That apparently is the strategy to move into this election, to make sure we do not do anything. I think that is too bad.

So, Mr. President, I hope that we can do something about it. I hope we can make a move. I think the 4.3-cent gas tax needs to be repealed and needs to be returned. I hope, as we move into the debate on the budget, that we can at least talk about facts, put the numbers out there as they really are, and then argue about whether you like it or not. I hope that we can move forward on a great many of the issues that I believe people would like to see considered and would like to see passed.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION POLICY ON DRUG SMUGGLERS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, after reading a May 13 report in the Los Angeles Times, I wrote to Attorney General Reno expressing my shock at reports that Clinton administration officials are letting drug smugglers go free as a matter of official policy.

Although I have not yet heard back from Attorney General Reno, this is a disturbing matter that requires action now. Drug use among our children is on the rise and is contributing to the rise in juvenile crime.

Therefore, tomorrow I plan to offer a sense-of-the-Senate resolution calling on Attorney General Reno to investigate this matter and report back to Congress in 30 days, and calling on the Attorney General to ensure that any policy that allows drug smugglers to go free is stopped and that all such persons be vigorously prosecuted.

Mr. President, the Clinton administration has been indifferent, at best, to the war on drugs right from the beginning when President Clinton largely dismantled the drug czar's office. I hope my colleagues will join me in sending a strong message that, for the sake of our children today and tomorrow, we believe we must aggressively put these drug smugglers—who are nothing more than merchants of death—where they belong, behind bars.

I will point out a few statistics. These are not Senator DOLE's facts. These are facts given to us by people who are experts in the area. The number of young people between 12 and 17 using marijuana has increased from 1.6 million in 1992 to 2.9 million in 1994. That has probably increased a lot more since the end of 1994. And the category of ''recent marijuana use'' has increased a staggering 200 percent among 14- to 15-year-olds. About one in three high school students uses marijuana, and 12- to 17-year-olds who use marijuana are 85 percent more likely to graduate to cocaine than those who abstain from marijuana. Juveniles who reach age 21 without ever having used drugs almost never try them later in life. If you make the first 21 years

without using drugs, then you are probably not going to be addicted.

The latest results from the Drug Abuse Warning Network shows that marijuana-related episodes jumped 39 percent and are running at 155 percent above the 1990 level. Another frightening figure is that between February 1993 and February 1995, the retail price of a gram of cocaine fell from $172 to $137 and a gram of heroin also fell from $2,032 to $1,278, which means it is going to be more accessible and readily available because it costs less. The number of defendants prosecuted for violations of the Federal drug laws has dropped from 25,033 in 1992 to 22,926 in 1995.

So it seems to me that we have a very serious problem on our hands. It is not a partisan issue. It is not politics at all, as far as I know. So I hope my colleagues will have an opportunity here.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and the letter I sent Attorney General Reno be printed in the RECORD, which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENSE-OF-THE-SENATE RESOLUTION ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S PRACTICE REGARDING THE PROSECUTION OF DRUG SMUGGLERS

Whereas, drugs use is devastating to the nation, particularly among juveniles, and has led juveniles to become involved in interstate gangs and to participate in violent crime;

Whereas, drug use has experienced a dramatic resurgence among our youth;

Whereas, the number of youths aged 12-17 using marijuana has increased from 1.6 million in 1992 to 2.9 million in 1994, and the category of ''recent marijuana use'' increased a staggering 200% among 14- to 15-year-olds over the same period;

Whereas, since 1992, there has been a 52% jump in the number of high school seniors using drugs on a monthly basis, even as worrisome declines are noted in peer disapproval of drug use;

Whereas, 1 in 3 high school students use marijuana;

Whereas, 12- to 17-year-olds who use marijuana are 85% more likely to graduate to cocaine than those who abstain from marijuana;

Whereas, juveniles who reach 21 without ever having used drugs almost never try them later in life;

Whereas, the latest results from the Drug Abuse Warning Network show that marijuana-related episodes jumped 39% and are running at 155% above the 1990 level, and that methamphetamine cases have risen 256% over the 1991 level;

Whereas, between February 1993 and February 1995 the retail price of a gram of cocaine fell from $172 to $137, and that of a gram of heroin also fell from $2,032 to $1,278;

Whereas, it has been reported that the Department of Justice, through the United States Attorney for the Southern District of California, has adopted a policy of allowing certain foreign drug smugglers to avoid prosecution altogether by being released to Mexico;

Whereas, it has been reported that in the past year approximately 2,300 suspected narcotics traffickers were taken into custody for bringing illegal drugs across the border, but approximately one in four were returned to their country of origin without being prosecuted;

Whereas, it has been reported that the U.S. Customs Service is operating under guidelines limiting any prosecution in marijuana cases to involving 125 pounds of marijuana or more;

Whereas, it has been reported that suspects possessing as much as 32 pounds of methamphetamine and 37,000 Quaalude tablets, were not prosecuted but were, instead, allowed to return to their countries of origin after their drugs and vehicles were confiscated;

Whereas, it has been reported that after a seizure of 158 pounds of cocaine, one defendant was cited and released because there was no room at the federal jail and charges against her were dropped;

Whereas, it has been reported that some smugglers have been caught two or more times—even in the same week—yet still were not prosecuted;

Whereas, the number of defendants prosecuted for violations of the federal drug laws has dropped from 25,033 in 1992 to 22,926 in 1995;

Whereas, the efforts of law enforcement officers deployed against drug smugglers are severely undermined by insufficiently vigorous prosecution policies of federal prosecutors;

Whereas, this Congress has increased the funding of the Federal Bureau of Prisons by 11.7% over the 1995 appropriations level;

Whereas, this Congress has increased the funding of the Immigration and Naturalization Service by 23.5% over the 1995 appropriations level: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the Sense of the Senate that the Attorney General promptly should investigate this matter and report, within 30 days, to the Chair of the Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary;

That the Attorney General should change the policy of the United States Attorney for the Southern District of California in order to ensure that cases involving the smuggling of drugs into the United States are vigorously prosecuted; and

That the Attorney General should direct all United States Attorneys vigorously to prosecute persons involved in the importation of illegal drugs into the United States.

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER,
Washington, DC, May 13, 1996.

Hon. JANET RENO,
U.S. Department of Justice, 10th Street and Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL RENO: I am writing to request your response to a disturbing Los Angeles Times story (''Drug Runners Arrested at Border Often Go Free,'' May 13, 1996) that suggests that U.S. Attorney Alan Bersin has adopted an official policy allowing some drug smugglers to return to Mexico without prosecution.

According to the Times article, officials at the U.S. Attorney's office ''confirm that under a program quietly adopted two years ago, an increasing number of suspected traffickers have been sent back to Mexico without arrest or prosecution in either federal or state court'' and ''more than 1,000 smuggling suspects have been processed in this way since 1994.'' More specifically, the Times article reports that:

Two suspects with 32 pounds of methamphetamine, and another with 37,000 Quaalude tablets, were simply ''excluded'' from the United States after their drugs and vehicles were confiscated.

After a seizure of 158 pounds of cocaine, one defendant was cited and released because there was no room at the federal jail and the charges against her were dropped.

U.S. Customs Service records show that some drug smugglers have been apprehended two or more times—even in the same week—and have not been jailed or prosecuted.

No prosecutorial action has been taken against a number of drug smugglers captured with more than 125 pounds of marijuana.

According to one Drug Enforcement Administration agent cited in the article, ''there is virtually no risk [to smugglers] as long as they keep quantities down. First of all, the chances of getting caught are slim, and the chances of prosecution are almost zero if you get caught with a small quantity and if you're a Mexican national.''

Attorney General Reno, my questions to you are simple ones: Is the Los Angeles Times story accurate? And if so, do the policies of the U.S. Attorney's office in Los Angeles represent the policies of the Justice Department and the Clinton Administration?

With teenage drug use on the rise here in the United States and with the ascendancy of Mexico as a major U.S. supplier of cocaine, marijuana, and methamphetamine, the American people would rightfully expect that we would be hard at work strengthening our fight against the Mexican drug trade, not weakening it, as the Los Angeles Times story suggests.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this important matter. I have attached a copy of the full Los Angeles Times article for your review.

Sincerely,

BOB DOLE,
Senate Majority Leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I think so often of that November evening long ago, in 1972, when the television networks reported that I had won the Senate race in North Carolina. It was 9:17 in the evening and I recall how stunned I was.

I had never really anticipated that I would be the first Republican in history to be elected to the U.S. Senate by the people of North Carolina. When I got over that, I made a commitment to myself that I would never fail to see a young person, or a group of young people, who wanted to see me.

I have kept that commitment and it has proved enormously meaningful to me because I have been inspired by the estimated 60,000 young people with whom I have visited during the 23 years I have been in the Senate.

A large percentage of them are greatly concerned about the total Federal debt which back in February exceeded $5 trillion for the first time in history. Congress created this monstrous debt which coming generations will have to pay.

Mr. President, the young people who visit with me almost always are inclined to discuss the fact that under the U.S. Constitution, no President can spend a dime of Federal money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by both the House and Senate of the United States.

That is why I began making these daily reports to the Senate on February 25, 1992. I decided that it was important that a daily record be made of the precise size of the Federal debt

which, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, May 13, 1996, stood at $5,094,150,618,714.59. On a per capita basis, the existing Federal debt amounts to $19,234.76 for every man, woman, and child in America on a per capita basis.

The increase in the national debt in the 24 hours since my report yesterday—which identified the total Federal debt as of close of business on Friday, May 10, 1996—shows an increase of more than $1 billion—$1,335,403,008.84, to be exact. That 1-day increase alone is enough to match the total amount needed to pay the college tuition for each of the 198,015 students for 4 years.

TRIBUTE TO CHUCK LOWE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, America is a nation that has a fascination with pop culture, especially the movies and television, and individuals often form their opinions about issues based on what they see on screens in their living room or in a theater. Unfortunately, this practice often leads to misimpressions about the facts of life. Take for example organized crime. So often in movies and television shows, those who are involved in organized crime are depicted as sharp dressed and honorable men who simply choose to make their money and live their lives outside the law. One cannot help but have a romanticized and idealized notion of what it is like to be a wiseguy.

To those of us who understand and study such issues, we know that nothing could be further from the truth. The real faces of organized crime are the heartless killers and goons who put a stranglehold on trucking, rackets, and unions, they are not manicured, honorable men; they are the outlaw bikers who peddle methamphetamines and dabble in white slavery, they are not fun loving rebels who just want to ride motorcycles; they are the gangs from our cities' ghettos who wholesale crack and terrorize neighborhoods with their indiscriminate violence, they are not misunderstood youths; and, they are the ''new mafias'' from places such as Russia, Mexico, and Vietnam, men and women who prefer intimidation and criminal enterprise to hard work, unlike their honest immigrant peers who are fighting to realize the American dream. Organized crime is about as an ideal lifestyle as having a terminal disease, and it is just as deadly and destructive. Simply put, in a nation of laws, there is no room to tolerate organizations whose sole reason for existence is to commit crime and victimize hard working and honest Americans.

In the last 30 years, the Federal Government has begun to take the fight against organized crime right to the enemy's doorstep. Through statutes such as RICO, the allocation of resources dedicated to combating organized crime, and intensified cooperation between law enforcement agencies, we are making real progress in subduing our Nation's criminal classes. Today, I want to take a moment to salute an individual who has devoted his life to this fight, Mr. Charles D. ''Chuck'' Lowe, who serves as the Director of the Regional Organized Crime Information Center.

Chuck Lowe began his career in law enforcement back in the late 1950's as a member of the U.S. Coast Guard's New York City Port Security Unit. In that position, he worked closely with the New York Police Department, the Customs Service, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Certainly it must have been his time fighting crime in the city that never sleeps where he found the career he loved and he learned the importance and effectiveness of cooperation between enforcement agencies. In the years following Chuck's enlistment in the Coast Guard, he served ably and capably with the Washington, DC, Metropolitan Police Department as a plainclothes detective, and then with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. During his 22-year career with BATF, Chuck was involved in a multitude of interesting and dangerous cases, he helped to protect the President, and he held a number of key leadership positions within that agency. His efforts as a Federal agent earned him numerous citations and recognitions, including awards for superior performance, case preparation, and training.

In 1988, Chuck left the BATF to join the Regional Organized Crime Information Center [ROCIC], an organization committed to collecting, evaluating, analyzing, and disseminating information concerning whitecollar career criminals, narcotics violators, gangs, and other violent offenders. As he had done in his previous assignments, Chuck immediately threw himself into his work, and it was a surprise to no one when he became the Director of ROCIC in 1991, only 3 short years after joining the organization.

Under his supervision, ROCIC has grown tremendously, more than tripling the number of agencies it serves, and it has greatly expanded the services it provides to its 1,157 members. His efforts to modernize ROCIC have improved morale at that agency, made it more efficient, and has given law enforcement officers a potent tool with which to coordinate their efforts against organized crime.

Mr. President, it is with regret that I report that Chuck Lowe has decided to hang up his badge and gun and retire from his distinguished career as a law enforcement leader. In his more than 30-year career as a cop, Chuck has contributed much to keeping our streets safe. We are proud of the work he has done and we wish him well in the years to come.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to very briefly follow up on a rather lengthy statement I made on May 3 regarding the present intellectual property rights dispute with the People's Republic of China. Since then, I have read a number of reports in the Chinese media regarding their view of the present situation which I feel bear examination and call for some response.

First, I am struck by the fact that the Chinese Government's position on its level of compliance with the IPR agreement appears to be somewhat schizophrenic. On the one hand, I have seen statements from both the Foreign Ministry and Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation stating, for example, that ''the Chinese side has fully and conscientiously carried out its duties as stipulated in [the] Sino-U.S. IPR Agreement.'' On the other hand, I have also read statements from the same spokesmen for the same ministries tacitly acknowledging that China has not adhered to the letter of the agreement but falling back on the excuse that ''demanding that a developing country such as China do a perfect job [in regards to enforcing the terms of the Agreement] within a short few years is not practical as well as unfair.''

Well Mr. President, which is it? I, and most other observers I believe, would credit the latter as being closer to the truth. Starting from that premise, I would remind the Chinese that we are not asking that they do a perfect job of rooting out IPR piracy. We are simply asking that they adhere to an agreement that they signed; we are simply asking that they live up to their voluntarily assumed responsibilities. If, as the Chinese assert, it is unfair for us to assume that they can try to stem IPR piracy in only a few years, then why on Earth did they sign the agreement to do so in the first place? How can it be unfair to hold the Chinese to their own word?

It is sort of like two ranchers who sign a contract, one agreeing to buy 10 head of cattle from another. The buyer takes the 10 head, but gives the seller only one-third of the agreed-on payment. When the seller complains, the buyer says that it's unfair to blame him for not living up to the agreement in full because he doesn't have enough money to pay for all 10 head. Well, the buyer knew going into the deal that he couldn't live up to his side of the agreement, but went ahead in spite of that and signed it anyway. So who is the guilty party, Mr. President, certainly not the aggrieved seller.

Second, the Chinese have repeatedly stated that they are opposed to our imposition of sanctions because economic and trade disputes ''should be settled through consultations in the spirit of mutual respect, equality, and mutual benefit.'' Well Mr. President, we have tried consultations, only to have the Chinese side continually promise adherence but fail to carry through. As the Chinese are so fond of saying, ''deeds speak louder than words''; and their deeds clearly show that they are not living up to the agreement. We

have tried mutual respect, but there is no mutual respect when one side systematically fails to live up to an agreement. We have tried mutual benefit, but there is no mutual benefit when IPR piracy in the People's Republic of China costs United States' companies in excess of $2 billion in lost revenue per year.

Third, as I noted in my last statement, I have noticed a tendency on the part of some Chinese officials when faced with statements regarding the lack of Chinese adherence to the agreement to attempt to deflect the criticism by taking the offensive and claiming that the United States has not held up its side of the agreement. Unfortunately, Mr. President, when pressed for specific examples of that alleged noncompliance, my Chinese friends have grown somewhat vague and noncommittal.

Mr. President, as the two sides continue 11-hour talks on this impasse, I hope that the Chinese side will remember that it is the United States, and not them, that is the aggrieved party.

THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF DOLLARS FOR SCHOLARS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on May 16 in Boston and Fall River in Massachusetts, volunteers and supporters from throughout the Nation will gather to commemorate the 35th anniversary of the Dollars for Scholars program. It is fitting that this celebration take place in Massachusetts. Our State is the home of the Nation's first Dollars for Scholars chapter, which was founded in Fall River by Dr. Irving Fradkin, a local optometrist. Thirty-five years ago this month, the Dollars for Scholars parent organization was formally incorporated in Boston. From its roots in Massachusetts, Dollars for Scholars has grown to 760 chapters in 40 States. Last year, chapters across the country raised a total of $15.8 million and helped over 15,000 students achieve greater educational opportunity.

Massachusetts has some of the most successful Dollars for Scholars chapters in the country. Its 68 chapters last year alone awarded more than $1.5 million in college scholarships to over 2,500 students. In Boston, Holyoke, Worcester, Middleboro, Gloucester, and other communities, local citizens are reaching out to young men and women with a powerful message about the importance of education. Since its founding in Fall River, Dollars for Scholars chapters in Massachusetts have had a significant impact in our State—distributing a total of $17.5 million in scholarships to more than 37,000 students.

The 35th anniversary events being held in Boston and Fall River this week are part of the Year of the Scholar activities across the country. The Year of the Scholar salutes the 30,000 volunteers who have helped colleges and communities across the country work cooperatively to confront the rising costs of higher education. It celebrates the success of student scholars who have been able to go college with the help of the Dollars for Scholars Program. Dollars for Scholars deserves great credit for its extraordinary work in helping students fulfill their dream of a college education.

Education is the key to the work force of the future and the Nation's role in the global economy. Access to quality education for all citizens is a national priority. All children deserve an opportunity to learn and fulfill their potential. We must continue to improve our schools and make college education more accessible and affordable, in order to build a stronger economy and maintain a strong democracy.

I commend the citizens of Massachusetts for their long-standing commitment to education for all, and I am honored to take this opportunity to congratulate the Dollars for Scholars volunteers for their impressive work on this auspicious anniversary.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, what is the state of the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

PREVENTING A VOTE ON REPEAL OF THE GAS TAX

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, in connection with the debate, which I suspect will soon be superseded by debate on a budget agreement, a few points are still very, very much in order.

No. 1, there is a concerted effort here on the floor of the Senate to prevent a vote on a reduction in the gas tax, a reduction triggered by the rapid runup in the price of a commodity of vital importance to every American. But I think often overlooked in this debate is the fact that this is not just any run-of-the-mill gas or motor vehicle fuel tax.

This tax, imposed about 3 years ago at the time of President Clinton's first budget, represented an unprecedented change in the use of motor vehicle fuel tax. Always previously here in the Congress—and for all practical purposes almost always in our States—motor vehicle fuel taxes were used for transportation purposes, generally for the construction and maintenance of highways, but more frequently in the recent past for mass transit systems, whether bus related or on fixed rails.

As such, motor vehicle fuel taxes were usually less objected to by the vast majority of people than was the case with many others taxes because they could see what they were getting for their money, because one paid in proportion to one's use of those very transportation facilities.

President Clinton, however, flouted that convention in 1993 and determined that this gas tax was to be used for various social purposes. As the junior Senator from Missouri so eloquently put it a couple of days ago, the net result was that people who must use their automobiles to get back and forth to work were paying a tax to pay welfare to people who were not working at all and, in some cases, had no intention of doing so.

So, Mr. President, the concentration on the removal of this tax is not only based on the proposition that the American people are too heavily taxed as it is but on the fact that this one is peculiarly unfair and peculiarly unprecedented. Nevertheless, the vote was taken a couple of hours ago on this floor. Once again there was an eloquent statement on the part of the President's party that they would not allow this repeal to come to a vote.

The second element of that filibuster is directed at the TEAM Act, an act absolutely essential to validate the new sense of cooperation which is gaining wider and wider acceptance in labor-management relations across the United States and, indeed, is necessary if we are to meet the competitive pressures of the present economic world. Close to 90 percent of American workers in the private sector are not unionized and have chosen not to be. Yet, they are prohibited from entering into voluntary relationships with their employers to discuss matters of common interest, of morale, of productivity, of the very future of their jobs by a recent ruling of the Supreme Court enforced by the National Labor Relations Board.

A TEAM Act to encourage that cooperation will be of great importance in enhancing American competitiveness and in making many American workplaces happier and more interesting places for the vast majority of Americans to spend their working hours.

Because of their distaste for each of these proposals, the President's party, ironically enough, they are filibustering an increase in the minimum wage, a proposition made out to be of urgent and vital importance, more important than anything else before this body. Their actions speak louder than their words in this connection. They are not willing to let the majority of this body make a judgment on a gas tax repeal and on the TEAM Act while at the same time increasing the minimum wage if those issues are joined together, though, of course, it was originally their idea to join the minimum wage to an immigration bill to which it had no relationship whatsoever.

Finally, of course, Mr. President, underlying all of this bill is a modest, House-passed piece of legislation to provide overdue and just relief to those wrongfully fired from the White House Travel Office 2 years ago and, in one case, prosecuted for actions determined not to have been remotely criminal by a jury.

So three significant matters are now being filibustered by the President's

party in order to protect the President from the embarrassing situation that, in order to get three pieces of legislation which he has said he would sign, he would also have to take one vehemently opposed by the chiefs of organized labor but supported by the overwhelming majority of American men and women who are a part of these labor-management teams at the present time.

Mr. President, my advice to the majority leader is to continue on his course of action, that it is appropriate to say that we should look at a larger world and the relationships on these pieces of legislation, that we should not say to the President we will not ask you to do anything embarrassing, we will simply send legislation to you that you have already fully endorsed both publicly and privately and anything that might be a bit controversial we will allow it to be killed by filibusters in the U.S. Senate. No, Mr. President, their pairing is an appropriate pairing.

I hope we will continue until we and, not at all incidentally, the American people succeed in getting the relief to which they are overwhelmingly entitled.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY RELATIVE TO NUCLEAR, BIOLOGICAL, AND CHEMICAL WEAPONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 143

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I transmit herewith a report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order No. 12938 of November 14, 1994, in response to the threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons (''weapons of mass destruction'') and of the means of delivering such weapons.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1996*.

REPORT OF REVISED DEFERRAL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 144

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 1, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on the Budget, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral of budgetary resources, totaling $1.4 billion. The deferral affects the International Security Assistance program.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1996*.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill, previously received from the House of Representatives for the concurrence of the Senate, was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2974. An act to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to provide enhanced penalties for crimes against elderly and child victims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–2588. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule (received on May 6, 1996) relative to Florida Grapefruit, Oranges, Tangelos, and Tangerines; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2589. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule (received on May 9, 1996) relative to marketing orders; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2590. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule (received on May 9, 1996) relative to milk in the New York-New Jersey and Middle Atlantic Marketing Area; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2591. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule (received on May 9, 1996) relative to melons grown in South Texas; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2592. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of two final rules (received on May 9, 1996) relative to the Sheep Promotion, Research, and Information Program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2593. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule (received on May 6, 1996) relative to sweet onions grown in Walla Walla Valley of Southeast Washington and Northeast Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2594. A communication from the Administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule (RIN0051–AA24) received on May 9, 1996; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2595. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, case number 96–01; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–2596. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Legislative Liaison (Programs and Legislative Division), Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a cost comparison study relative to Military Family Housing Maintenance Andersen Air Force Base (AFB), Guam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2597. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Legislative Liaison (Programs and Legislative Division), Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a cost comparison study relative to refuse collection at Andersen Air Force Base (AFB), Guam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2598. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Legislative Liaison (Programs and Legislative Division), Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a cost comparison study relative to the transportation function at Kirtland Air Force Base (AFB), New Mexico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2599. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Legislative Liaison (Programs and Legislative Division), Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a cost comparison study relative to Logistics function at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (AFB), Ohio; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2600. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Legislative Liaison (Programs and Legislative Division), Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a cost comparison study relative to the Base Supply function at Edwards Air Force Base (AFB), California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2601. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Legislative Liaison (Programs and Legislative Division), Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a cost comparison study

relative to the supply function at Kirtland Air Force Base (AFB), New Mexico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of May 13, 1996, the following report was submitted on May 13, 1996, during the adjournment of the Senate:

By Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 57: An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 (Rept. No. 104–271).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAFEE, from the Committee on Environmental and Public Works:

*Hubert T. Bell, Jr. of Alabama, to be Inspector General, Nuclear Regulatory Agency.

(The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that he be confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services:

The following-named officer for reappointment to the grade of lieutenant general in the U.S. Army while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, United States Code, section 601(a):

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Daniel W. Christman, 000–00–0000, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Navy of the United States to the grade indicated under title 10, United States Code, section 624:

UNRESTRICTED LINE

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) James F. Amerault, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) Lyle G. Bien, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) Richard A. Buchanan, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) William V. Cross II, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) Walter F. Doran, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) James O. Ellis, Jr., 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) William J. Fallon, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) Thomas B. Fargo, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) Dennis V. McGinn, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) Joseph S. Mobley, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) Edward Moore, Jr., 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) Daniel J. Murphy, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) Rodney P. Rempt, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) Norbert R. Ryan, Jr., 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) Raymond C. Smith, Jr., 000–00–0000.

RESTRICTED LINE

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) George P. Nanos, Jr., 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) Craig E. Steidle, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) James L. Taylor, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. (lh) Patricia A. Tracey, 000–00–0000, U.S. Navy.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably 3 nomination lists in the Air Force and Marine Corps which were printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of April 19 and May 9, 1996, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar, that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The nominations ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk were printed in the RECORDS of April 19 and May 9, 1996, at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

In the Air Force there are 6 appointments to the grade of second lieutenant (list begins with Ryan C. Berry). (Reference No. 1036.)

In the Marine Corps there are 163 appointments to the grade of second lieutenant (list begins with Craig R. Abele). (Reference No. 1083.)

In the Marine Corps there are 255 appointments to the grade of second lieutenant (list begins with Carlton W. Adams). (Reference No. 1084.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself and Mr. SANTORUM):

S. 1754. A bill to designate the United States Courthouse at 235 North Washington Avenue in Scranton, Pennsylvania, as the ''William J. Nealon United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 1755. A bill to amend the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to provide that assistance shall be available under the noninsured crop assistance program for native pasture for livestock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. KERRY):

S. 1756. A bill to provide additional pension security for spouses and former spouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1757. A bill to amend the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights act to extend the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolution was read on May 13, 1996:

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. Con. Res. 57. An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated on May 14, 1996:

By Mr. GRAMS:

S. Res. 254. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the reopening of Pennsylvania Avenue; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself and Mr. SANTORUM):

S. 1754. A bill to designate the United States Courthouse at 235 North Washington Avenue in Scranton, PA, as the ''William J. Nealon United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE WILLIAM J. NEALON U.S. COURTHOUSE DESIGNATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today to name the new U.S. courthouse being constructed in Scranton, PA, for one of Pennsylvania's most distinguished Federal judges, Judge William Nealon.

Judge Nealon was born and raised in Scranton and attended its public schools. After service in the Marine Corps during the Second War, Judge Nealon graduated from Villanova University and then received a law degree from Catholic University here in Washington. Returning to Scranton to practice law, he became a widely respected trial lawyer. When a vacancy opened up on the Lackawanna County Court of Common Pleas, Judge Nealon was appointed by President Kennedy to serve as U.S. district judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania. At the time of his appointment, Judge Nealon was the youngest Federal judge in the Nation.

Judge Nealon has served the people of the middle district of Pennsylvania for almost 34 years since then, including over 12 years chief judge of the court. He has been widely respected among the bar of the middle district for his intelligence, dedication, and judicial demeanor. Throughout his long career, he has been considered by many to be the model of a trial judge.

Judge Nealon has been active in many efforts to improve the administration of justice across the Nation. He served as the representative of the third circuit to the Committee on the Administration of the Criminal Law of the Judicial Conference of the United States for 6 years. For 4 years he served as a member of the Third Circuit Judicial Council, and for 3 years, from 1987 to 1990, he was elected by the other district judges in the third circuit to serve as a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the policymaking body that oversees the Federal courts.

To this record of distinction in his professional career, Judge Nealon can add a record a community involvement matched by few others. It can truly be said that Scranton is a better place because of Judge Nealon. He is a former chairman of the board of Mercy Hospital in Scranton, of the Scranton Catholic Youth Center, and of the University of Scranton. He has also served as a member of the board of Lackawanna Junior College, St. Michael's School for Boys, the Everhart Museum, and the Scranton-Lackawanna Health and Welfare Authority. He has received the Distinguished Service Award from the Boy Scouts of America and was the 1995 recipient of the Champion of Youth Award of the Boys & Girls Clubs of Scranton, in addition to numerous awards from legal and academic institutions.

One would think that this lengthy record of accomplishment would be enough for any one person, but Judge Nealon has also raised an outstanding family. He and his wife Jean have 10 children and 26 grandchildren.

Earlier this year, I sponsored Senate passage of a bill introduced in the House by Representative KANJORSKI to name the U.S. Courthouse in Wilkes-Barre after Judge Max Rosenn of the third circuit, Wilkes-Barre's leading jurist. I can think of no one more deserving than Judge Nealon of the honor of having the new U.S. Courthouse in Scranton named after him.

I am pleased to introduce this legislation. I hope my colleagues will support it and that the Senate will adopt it this year.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1754

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Courthouse at 235 North Washington Avenue in Scranton, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the ''William J. Nealon United States Courthouse''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''William J. Nealon United States Courthouse''.

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 1755. A bill to amend the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act providing that insurance shall be available under the Noninsured Crop Assistance Program for native pasture for livestock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE FEDERAL AGRICULTURE IMPROVEMENT AND REFORM ACT OF 1996 AMENDMENT ACT OF 1996

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, fellow Senators, we are having a drought in the State of New Mexico that is about as serious a situation as we have had. We have read about the forest fires. Obviously, the forest is dry, but, also, the grazing land is dry. The ranchers are unable to graze cattle. That is a very important part of our life in New Mexico.

Today, I am introducing a bill. Yesterday, I introduced one with Senator BINGAMAN. He was the prime sponsor. Today he joins me in this one, which would take some of the assistance that is given for other crops in the event of a disaster and make that apply to the forage that goes for cattle. We think maybe it was intended, but it is not clear.

So this would provide emergency relief to some of the cattle people in our State and in the arid parts of America where we are having a disaster with drought. It makes some of this available to them. Because of the forage they use for the cattle, it would make that subject to the same kind of emergency assistance as other crops when those crops are in a drought situation.

Mr. President, yesterday, Senator BINGAMAN and I introduced a bill that would provide short-term assistance for our cattle producers in New Mexico and across the United States.

Cattle producers are suffering economically due to historically low cattle prices, and high feed costs.

In New Mexico, these conditions are made even worse by extensive drought conditions, which have had an impact on some areas of the State for 3 years.

The Bingaman-Domenici bill would provide $18 million in feed assistance, by extending the authority of the for the Emergency Livestock Feed Program through the end of this calendar year.

This assistance is extremely urgent for livestock producers in drought-affected areas.

In some parts of States like New Mexico, producers typically harvest and store feed reserves for the coming winter during the summer months, while their livestock graze on high country summer pastures.

Many of these summer ranges are located on Federal land, and in order to prevent overuse during the drought, many of these areas will not be available for grazing this year.

In order to maintain enough livestock to remain in business, many producers will be forced to graze areas that would normally be set aside for hay and winter feed production, leaving them little or no forage to get them through the coming winter.

The temporary extension of this program through December will allow the Secretary to provide these individuals with assistance in obtaining these needed feed resources.

Mr. President, today, I am introducing a bill that will provide a more permanent solution.

This bill would clarify in law, as is currently the case in USDA regulations, that native pasture for grazing livestock would qualify under the Noninsured Crop Assistance Program [NAP].

Specifically, the bill would amend the law to read:

The term ''eligible crop'' shall include floricultural, ornamental nursery and Christmas tree crops, turfgrass sod, seed crops, aquaculture (including ornamental fish), native pasture for livestock, and industrial crops.

NAP was created under the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1994 and amended in the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1966 [FAIR].

The NAP is a disaster program for noninsured crops. Following a major crop loss, it provides benefits similar to those for insurable crops, but only at the catastrophic level.

This is by no means a windfall for livestock producers; on the contrary, catastrophic coverage provides a minimal benefit in a disaster, or emergency cases of the most dire need.

This bill has not been scored by the Congressional Budget Office [CBO], however, if CBO scores a cost with the bill I will provide an offset to ensure that it remains budget neutral.

I understand that the current regulations provide NAP catastrophic coverage for improved and native pasture.

I am concerned, however, that without the clarification provided by this legislation, the inclusion of native pasture may be at risk as the administration promulgates its new regulations under the FAIR Act.

Mr. President, I believe that failing to provide assistance to our ranchers today will cost us tomorrow. Many communities in New Mexico depend on the cattle industry.

In fact, livestock products accounted for $1.1 billion of cash receipts for all agricultural commodities in New Mexico in 1994.

The support we give our livestock industry during this period of drought, low prices, and high feed costs will save numerous small, family-owned business in these devastated areas.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this clarification to existing law.

By Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KERRY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 1756. A bill to provide additional pension security for spouses and former spouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE WOMEN'S PENSION EQUITY ACT OF 1996

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, pension policy decisions will determine, in no small part, the kind of life Americans will live in their older years. The amount invested in retirement savings has an important impact on our national savings rate, our economy generally, and the kind of life every American lives today. Now, more than ever, therefore, all Americans

need to consider the role that pensions play in determining the quality of life for retirees, and the implications of pension policy decisions for our society as a whole.

Pension issues are convoluted yet critically important. I am reminded of a poem written by the late Karl Llewellyn, a professor at my alma mater, the University of Chicago, in connection with an introduction to the study of the law.

Entitled ''The Bramble Bush,'' the poem said: ''I jumped into the bramble bush and scratched my eyes out; I jumped out of the bramble bush and scratched my eyes in again.'' As a student, I had no idea what he was talking about. Later in life, I understood that he meant the bramble bush as an analogy to the law. One had to master the complexities and details of it—by jumping in—in order to reach understanding of the whole—upon jumping out.

And so it is, I think, with pension reform. The subject has been called esoteric, abstruse, mysterious, even eye glazing, but in the final analysis it is really about whether our society will arrange a system of security for people who have gone past their earning and working years, or whether our society will make retirement a determinant of a widening income gap between the rich and the poor. It is about fairness and gender equity and economic power. It goes to the heart of our challenge to treat the end of life as the golden years rather than the disposable years. It is about the permanence of the American dream.

The importance of retirement savings and investment to our Nation's economy, as well as to individuals, cannot be overstated. We should encourage private saving, and our pension laws should reflect that policy goal. It is equally important that these laws be reality based, and that reform should address the elimination of historical and institutional inequities and unfairness. Fairness is fundamental. Women, however, have traditionally been the overlooked and silent unintended beneficiaries of policy decisions which reinforce institutional sexism.

Our pension system was not designed for working women, either those in the work force or in the home. Countless statistics show that women are far more likely to spend the final years of their lives in poverty. Women make up 60 percent of seniors over 65 years old, but 75 percent of the elderly poor. An elderly woman is twice as likely as a man to live below the poverty line. These women are more likely than not to live alone. The demographics of mortality differences between men and women were never adequately addressed in the development of policy for retirement security. That a woman is more likely to be widowed, or divorced in retirement was similarly not taken into account. Pension policy making has traditionally been predicated on a fictionalized model of women's role in the society and the economy.

Over a lifetime, women earn about two-thirds of a man's income. Since pensions are based on a formula which combine the number of years of work and salary earned, women suffer a gender gap that carries over into retirement. As a result, women are far more likely to receive inadequate pension support. Moreover, because women are more often called upon to interrupt jobs in order to raise children or care for sick relatives, pension security is a more illusive objective for us.

A 25-year-old man—on average—will spend 70 percent of his adult life in the work force, while a woman will spend less than 45 percent of her adult life in the work force. What this can mean is that a woman with a 40-year career who takes 7 years out of the work force may get half of the pension benefits she might have enjoyed with continuous employment. Our real support for the care-giving role of women in our society is more accurately reflected in this fact than in all of the platitudes given ''family values.''

For women who never enter the work force, the jeopardy of divorce or widowhood can mean the difference between security and penury. It is estimated that nearly 80 percent of women who are poor as widows were not poor before their husbands died.

These are costs not just borne by the individual affected directly, but by our society as a whole, as the widening income gap occasioned and influenced by pension inequities shows up as increased demand for transfer payments and public support.

Retirement security has been likened to a three-legged stool. Social Security, private pensions, and personal savings constitute the basis of an income stream for the later years of life.

Social Security, contrary to popular opinion, is not now nor has it ever been adequate to support a comfortable retirement. The average Social Security benefit earned by a woman who worked outside the home today provides about $538 a month, less than the minimum wage. Social Security provides about 40 percent of a workers' income while working. Our system assumes the other legs of the stool will help make up the difference.

However, only one third of private sector retirees receive a private pension. Of those, there are essentially two variants: the defined benefit plan and the defined contribution plan. The former is structured around the guaranteed payout or benefit upon retirement. The latter is structured around the treatment of payments into the plan during the working years. It is probably a commentary on the change in the climate of policy making that the traditional benefit plan is being overtaken as the approach of choice by the newer products associated with contribution plans.

As to personal savings, we have in this country the lowest private savings rate in the industrialized world, a source of great hand wringing among economists and policy makers. Given that the baby boom is about to become the elder explosion—with a baby boomer turning 50 every 7 seconds this year—efforts to promote personal frugality are among the policy challenges of the pension debate.

And yet, pensions represent a major part of the wealth of our Nation. There are 700,000 private pension plans in this country worth $3.4 trillion dollars (one trillion equals $1 per second for 32,000 years). The Federal Government provides about $75 billion annually in tax incentives to encourage pension savings, a tax expenditure which has never really been coordinated with the direct investment in Social Security. Pension contributions now total roughly $42 billion annually, making them the single largest source of private investment capital.

A playing field this vast has got to be fair to the whole community, and so the need for equity for women has never been greater.

The Congress has taken steps to correct the inequities facing women. In particular, the Retirement Equity Act of 1984 made several important changes, requiring that workers receive the consent of their spouses with regard to retirement benefits after death. It also required that private pension plans honor State court orders to divide pension benefits in divorce proceedings. This legislation made pensions accessible to millions of workers, widows, and divorced homemakers, but only if they understand the law or the legal forms. These, and other reforms, have made a difference. However, the issues continue to confound us, and further change is essential.

Pension maintenance, particularly in the context of divorce and widowhood, remains a challenge. In 10 years the IRS has not come up with clear guidance for the circumstances under which one can sign away pension rights. It is time to provide for informed decisionmaking, and for the equitable division of such rights in case of divorce. Similarly, the rules pertaining to pension distribution among Government employees—both military and civil service—should not penalize the divorced or widowed spouse.

I am here today to introduce legislation which will begin to address the problems women face as they try to hold on to their pension for their retirement. The Women's Pension Equity Act of 1996:

It creates a simple model of the form that a woman must sign in order to waive her benefits if she survives her husband.

And by the way, I point out that the language of the bill is gender neutral, so in that regard it would refer to men as well.

It creates a model of the form that couples must use if they wish to divide a pension upon divorce that includes contingencies for pre- and post-retirement survivors benefits.

It allows a widow or divorced widow to collect their husband's civil service pension if he dies after leaving his civil service job and before collecting his pension benefits.

It allows a court that awards a woman part of her husband's civil service pension upon divorce, to extend that award to any lump sum payment made if the husband dies before collecting benefits.

It extends the military pension benefits awarded to a spouse upon divorce in cases where the husband rolled that pension over into a civil service pension.

It allows a spouse to continue receiving Tier II railroad retirement benefits awarded upon divorce, upon the death of her husband.

I should like to take a moment to further describe what these provisions do and give some examples of the problems this legislation solves.

Sometimes a woman buries her husband only to discover that she has nothing. Her husband did not understand—and neither did she—that if they signed the survivor benefits waiver, she would get nothing if he died.

As one woman wrote:

My husband . . . died 12/11/91. [He] and I were together for 40 years . . . At . . . retirement he opt[ed] to get the maximum. I know that he didn't realize what he had did because he kept telling everyone that his wife would be independent if he predeceased me. . . .

Till the day before he passed he must have know something was happening to him. He told me ''you have nothing to worry about.'' I was shocked when his job told, ''I would get nothing''.

That was an actual quote, and you can see that the Syntax and the grammar were a little fractionated in the letter.

This woman is not educated. She and her husband counted on his pension to carry them through retirement. When they signed some pension forms from the company, the forms did not state clearly enough that she would lose her pension if he died.

This happens, unfortunately, all too frequently it is a very sad situation to face.

Women also unknowingly give up their future right to a share of their husbands' pension benefits when they divorce and do not sign a complete Qualified Domestic Relations Order, QDRO. Pensions are often the most valuable asset a couple owns—earned together during their years of marriage.

Judy Horstman of Joliet, IL, was divorced in October 1989, after 23 years of marriage. She was awarded half of her husbands pension from his 18 years of service with General Motors. Her husband continued to work in the plant until he died in November 1990. When he died, she received no pension from General Motors. She was informed that she was no longer entitled to any of his benefits because her divorce decree only referred to joint and survivor's benefits, not pre-retirement benefits in case he died. Because he died before retirement and not after, and because her lawyer forgot to put one line in writing, she lost her rights to a pension.

Judy Horstman lost her right to retain part of her husbands pension because her lawyer did not know the right questions to ask. They missed something when they wrote the Qualified Domestic Relations Order and so now, 7 years later, Judy still has no pension benefits from her 24 years of marriage.

This bill simplifies the spousal consent form so that average women can read and understand it. It also simplifies the QDRO for women, lawyers, and businesses so everyone knows what to consider and include in a divorce decree.

And it also includes provisions to correct some of the most illogical parts of pension laws that are unduly harmful for women. Let me give you four examples of the problems the bill will fix.

First, when a couple is married for 30 years, and the husband is in the military, upon divorce the court can ensure that the wife receives 50 percent of the pension benefits.

If, however, the husband leaves the military after the divorce, enters the civil service, and rolls his military pension over into his Government pension, his wife loses any claim on her spouse's pension. This legislation ensures that this kind of injustice will not occur in the future.

Second, a husband working in the civil service leaves his job to work outside the Government. He does not begin collecting his pension yet, because he has not yet retired.

If he dies after leaving the civil service and before collecting pension benefits, his widow receives nothing. If he died while working in the civil service or after retirement, she would receive a survivor's pension from the Federal Government. This legislation ensures that this kind of injustice will not occur in the future.

Third, a husband dies before retirement and his civil service pension is rolled over into a lump sum payment to whomever he names as his beneficiary.

The courts cannot require that he name his ex-wife as a partial beneficiary even if the court awarded her a portion of his pension. This legislation ensures that this kind of injustice will not occur in the future.

Fourth, an ex-wife has been awarded a portion of her husbands tier II railroad retirement benefits. The tier II benefits are the equivalent of a private pension for the railroad retirees. The ex-husband dies and her Tier II benefits cease immediately.

In other words, at the moment he dies her private pension rights die with him.

This legislation ensures that this kind of injustice will not occur in the future.

These are just some examples of the kinds of unjust, ridiculous, confusing, and harmful pension laws this legislation addresses. These initiatives help bring about equity in the pension system for married women.

I am keenly aware that we must address broader issues as well. And we will address them. We should focus on making participation in private pension plans easier, and not the game of roulette which all too often leaves people surprised at their retirement. Women, particularly, should not be penalized for career interruptions by vesting rules which require long-term employment. Current vesting rules depend on 5 years of continuing employment. The average job tenure for women is around 4 years—again, going in and out of the work force because of family demands very often. Women should not be penalized for taking care of their families.

Portability, an issue which is even now being debated in the Congress in the context of health security, remains a hurdle for retirement security.

The President's recently unveiled Retirement Savings and Security Act addresses portability in regards to the popular 401(k) plans, and is a welcomed advance in this area. We need to continue to address the ability of workers to transfer earned pensions.

Women who have spent many years in the work force should be able to count on their own pension income during retirement. It is important that we both improve the situation for women after a divorce or the death of a spouse, and the situation for women entering the work force. It is important to recognize that these issues of financial security go hand in hand. I will continue to work with my colleagues to bring pension equity to all aspects of the nation's pension laws.

Retirement security is not an expense we cannot afford. It is an investment we cannot avoid. Our economy will benefit. Our society will benefit. Our people will benefit if we undertake the macro and micro challenges of this issue.

The Bramble Bush illustrates that we are all in this together, and, if with Grace, we live long enough to retire it ought not be a punishment of longevity. The haves and have nots share an equal stake in the outcome of pension reform. That advocacy, in my opinion, is patriotism in the most classic sense, seeking to preserve the American dream for future generations.

There is no reason that this legislation cannot be enacted right away. The benefits are obvious and the changes simple.

I urge every one of my colleagues to support the rapid adoption of the Pension Equity Act of 1996. This legislation is being cosponsored by Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE, Senator PATTY MURRAY, and Senator JOHN KERRY.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill and a summary of its provisions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1756

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Women's Pension Equity Act of 1996''.

SEC. 2. MODEL SPOUSAL CONSENT FORM AND QUALIFIED DOMESTIC RELATIONS ORDER.

(a) MODEL SPOUSAL CONSENT FORM.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.—Section 417(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) CONSENT FORM.—The Secretary shall develop a form not later than January 1, 1997, for the spousal consent required under paragraph (2) which—

''(A) is written in a manner calculated to be understood by the average person, and

''(B) discloses in plain form whether—

''(i) the waiver is irrevocable, and

''(ii) the waiver may be revoked by a qualified domestic relations order.''.

(2) AMENDMENT TO ERISA.—Section 205(c) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1055(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) The Secretary of the Treasury shall develop a form not later than January 1, 1997, for the spousal consent required under paragraph (2) which—

''(A) is written in a manner calculated to be understood by the average person, and

''(B) discloses in plain form whether—

''(i) the waiver is irrevocable, and

''(ii) the waiver may be revoked by a qualified domestic relations order.''.

(b) MODEL QUALIFIED DOMESTIC RELATIONS ORDER.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO ERISA.—Section 206(d)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1056(d)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(O) The Secretary shall develop a form not later than January 1, 1997, for a qualified domestic relations order—

''(i) which meets all the requirements of subparagraph (B)(i), and

''(ii) the provisions of which focus attention on the need to consider the treatment of any lump sum payment, qualified joint and survivor annuity, or qualified preretirement survivor annuity.''.

(2) AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.—Section 414(p) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(13) The Secretary of Labor shall develop a form not later than January 1, 1997, for a qualified domestic relations order which—

''(A) which meets all the requirements of paragraph (1)(A), and

''(B) the provisions of which focus attention on the need to consider the treatment of any lump sum payment, qualified joint and survivor annuity, or qualified preretirement survivor annuity.''.

(c) PUBLICITY.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor shall include publicity for the model forms required by the amendments made by this section in the pension outreach efforts undertaken by each Secretary.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF TIER II RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS TO SURVIVING FORMER SPOUSES PURSUANT TO DIVORCE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 231d) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the payment of any portion of an annuity computed under section 3(b) to a surviving former spouse in accordance with a court decree of divorce, annulment, or legal separation or the terms of any court-approved property settlement incident to any such court decree shall not be terminated upon the death of the individual who performed the service with respect to which such annuity is so computed unless such termination is otherwise required by the terms of such court decree.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. SURVIVOR ANNUITIES FOR WIDOWS, WIDOWERS, AND FORMER SPOUSES OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO DIE BEFORE ATTAINING AGE FOR DEFERRED ANNUITY UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM.

(a) BENEFITS FOR WIDOW OR WIDOWER.—Section 8341(f) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by—

(A) by inserting ''a former employee separated from the service with title to deferred annuity from the Fund dies before having established a valid claim for annuity and is survived by a spouse, or if'' before ''a Member''; and

(B) by inserting ''of such former employee or Member'' after ''the surviving spouse'';

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting ''former employee or'' before ''Member commencing''; and

(B) by inserting ''former employee or'' before ''Member dies''; and

(3) in the undesignated sentence following paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by inserting ''former employee or'' before ''Member''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B) by inserting ''former employee or'' before ''Member''.

(b) BENEFITS FOR FORMER SPOUSE.—Section 8341(h) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by adding after the first sentence ''Subject to paragraphs (2) through (5) of this subsection, a former spouse of a former employee who dies after having separated from the service with title to a deferred annuity under section 8338(a) but before having established a valid claim for annuity is entitled to a survivor annuity under this subsection, if and to the extent expressly provided for in an election under section 8339(j)(3) of this title, or in the terms of any decree of divorce or annulment or any court order or court-approved property settlement agreement incident to such decree.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii) by striking ''or annuitant,'' and inserting ''annuitant, or former employee''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(iii) by inserting ''former employee or'' before ''Member''.

(c) PROTECTION OF SURVIVOR BENEFIT RIGHTS.—Section 8339(j)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''The Office shall provide by regulation for the application of this subsection to the widow, widower, or surviving former spouse of a former employee who dies after having separated from the service with title to a deferred annuity under section 8338(a) but before having established a valid claim for annuity.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply only in the case of a former employee who dies on or after such date.

SEC. 5. COURT ORDERS RELATING TO FEDERAL RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR FORMER SPOUSES OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8345(j) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) Payment to a person under a court decree, court order, property settlement, or similar process referred to under paragraph (1) shall include payment to a former spouse of the employee, Member, or annuitant.''.

(2) LUMP-SUM BENEFITS.—Section 8342 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (c) by striking ''Lump-sum benefits'' and inserting ''Subject to subsection (j), lump-sum benefits''; and

(B) in subsection (j)(1) by striking ''the lump-sum credit under subsection (a) of this section'' and inserting ''any lump-sum credit or lump-sum benefit under this section''.

(b) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 8467 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) Payment to a person under a court decree, court order, property settlement, or similar process referred to under subsection (a) shall include payment to a former spouse of the employee, Member, or annuitant.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. PREVENTION OF CIRCUMVENTION OF COURT ORDER BY WAIVER OF RETIRED PAY TO ENHANCE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ANNUITY.

(a) CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM.—(1) Subsection (c) of section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) If an employee or Member waives retired pay that is subject to a court order for which there has been effective service on the Secretary concerned for purposes of section 1408 of title 10, the military service on which the retired pay is based may be credited as service for purposes of this subchapter only if, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, the employee or Member authorizes the Director to deduct and withhold from the annuity payable to the employee or Member under this subchapter, and to pay to the former spouse covered by the court order, the same amount that would have been deducted and withheld from the employee's or Member's retired pay and paid to that former spouse under such section 1408.''.

(2) Paragraph (1) of such subsection is amended by striking out ''Except as provided in paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (4)''.

(b) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—(1) Subsection (c) of section 8411 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) If an employee or Member waives retired pay that is subject to a court order for which there has been effective service on the Secretary concerned for purposes of section 1408 of title 10, the military service on which the retired pay is based may be credited as service for purposes of this chapter only if, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, the employee or Member authorizes the Director to deduct and withhold from the annuity payable to the employee or Member under this subchapter, and to pay to the former spouse covered by the court order, the same amount that would have been deducted and withheld from the employee's or Member's retired pay and paid to that former spouse under such section 1408.''.

(2) Paragraph (1) of such subsection is amended by striking out ''Except as provided in paragraph (2) or (3)'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (5)''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 1997.

WOMEN'S PENSION EQUITY ACT OF 1996

PRIVATE PENSIONS

Require the IRS to create a model form for spousal consent with respect to survivor annuities.

Background—In 1984, Congress passed the Retirement Equity Act (REA) which provided, among other things, that survivor annuities were to apply automatically and any opt-out could be obtained only with spousal consent.

Problem—The consent forms are not in plain language and do not contain sufficient explanation, i.e. that the decision is irrevocable even in the event of divorce. For the past 10 years, the IRS, at the urging of the GAO, has been preparing a model consent form for couples that choose to take a larger annuity during the husband's life and give up the survivor annuity—but that form has never been completed.

Require the Department of Labor to create a model QDRO form.

Background—The 1984 REA required pension plans to honor court orders dividing pensions upon divorce. But the law does not protect spouses automatically. The divorced woman, or her lawyer, must ask for a court order specifically including the pensions in the divorce settlement. Without a qualified domestic relations order (QDRO) spelling out how, to whom, and when the pension should be paid, plans don't have to pay the divorced spouse a dime.

Problem—(1) Many lawyers do not know to ask for a QDRO. (2) There are no model QDRO's for lawyers, or couples who divorce without a lawyer, and pension plans will not honor the orders unless they are complete. (3) Pre- and post-retirement survivor benefits are often forgotten.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Make widow or divorced widow benefits payable no matter when the ex-husband dies or starts collecting his benefits.

Background—If the husband dies after leaving the government (either before or after retirement age) and before starting to collect retirement benefits, no retirement or survivor benefits are payable to the spouse or former spouse.

Problem—The widow or divorced wife loses everything: the ex-wife's benefits never start because he didn't choose to or didn't live to start collecting his benefits, and the widow's benefits are canceled because he wasn't working in the federal government at the time of his death.

Authorize courts to order the ex-husband to name his former wife as the beneficiary of all or a portion of any refunded contributions.

Background—In the case of a husband dying before collecting benefits, his contributions to the CSRS are paid to the person named as the ''beneficiary.'' The employee may name anyone as the beneficiary.

Problem—A divorce court cannot order him to name his former spouse as the beneficiary to receive a refund of contributions upon his death, even if she was to receive a portion of his pension.

MILITARY RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Transfer the pension benefits awarded during divorce from a military to a civil service pension, if the spouse rolls the military pension into a civil service pension.

Background—The Uniformed Services Former Spouses' Protection Act of 1982 (USFSPA) provides that a court may treat only the member's ''disposable'' retired pay as marital property. The definition of disposable now includes, among other deductions, government salary or pension.

Problem—The allowed deductions can leave former wives with little if any pension. For example, if an ex-husband leaves the military and enters the civil service, he can roll over his military pension into his civil service pension and the ex-wife loses the military pension awarded to her during the divorce settlement.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Allow payment of a Tier 2 survivor annuity after divorce.

Background—The Tier 1 benefits under the Railroad Retirement Board take the place of social security. The Tier 2 benefits take the place of a private pension.

Problem—Unlike the nondivorced widow, the divorced widow loses any Tier 2 benefits she may have been receiving while her ex-husband was alive, leaving her with only a Tier 1 annuity.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN today in cosponsoring the Women's Pension Equity Act of 1996. This legislation addresses one of the most important issues facing women today—retirement security. Of course, both men and women share many of the same concerns about growing old and planning for the future. But, the fact is that women face a unique set of circumstances that put us at a disadvantage for living comfortably in our retirement.

We are all very aware of the anxiety being felt by our friends and neighbors as they see and hear about the wave of corporate downsizing taking place in many of America's largest industries. American workers no longer expect to hold down one or two jobs throughout their working careers. Rather, most Americans expect to hold five or six different jobs throughout their careers.

This job insecurity ripples through every aspect of our lives and impacts the way one determines how to afford a home, pay for a child's education, and set aside savings for retirement.

This anxiety is real and it is justified. Working families throughout Washington State are telling me they are worried about their futures and that of their children. My constituents recognize the skyrocketing costs of long-term health care, doubt whether they can ensure a successful and prosperous life for their children, and are losing faith in the Social Security system.

We all know that women often play the role of caregiver for sick parents or children. In this role, they are forced to leave their jobs and, in turn, jeopardize their own future security. As the daughter of two aging parents, I understand this anxiety and want to do all I can to ensure women are not penalized for doing the right thing—for taking care of their families.

In today's world, it takes two incomes to raise a family. This is not solely an issue of improving the security of retired women. This is about providing stability and peace of mind for working families and their children. It is about opportunities for the future and strengthening the resources that families can depend on tomorrow. This is about ensuring that both parents' hard work is rewarded.

The Women's Pension Equity Act corrects current pension laws, which often fail to account for the special pattern in a women's working life. Our employment patterns differ from our male counterparts in the work force. Women's tenures tend to be shorter—4.8 years compared with 6.6 years for men. Many women leave their jobs before they reach the required years of service to qualify for employer retirement plans; usually 5 to 7 years.

Also, under current law, if a woman's husband dies after leaving Government service but before starting to collect retirement benefits, no retirement or survivor benefits are payable to the spouse. This bill, among other things, will amend the Civil Service retirement system to make sure the spouse doesn't lose the benefits to which her family is entitled.

We can alleviate some of the anxiety Americans are experiencing. For instance, we can help Americans save for their future by expanding pension opportunities for the employees of small businesses. Only 24 percent of all employees in small businesses have pension plans, while 76 percent of employees in large businesses have pension plans. Or we could widen the scope of Individual Retirement Accounts. For instance, I am a cosponsor of S. 287, a bill that allows spouses who work at home to get a full IRA deduction.

Congress has the ability to improve the savings opportunities for millions of Americans, and Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN's bill will do so for millions of working and retired women. This legislation makes sense and successfully highlights the discrepancy that exists between male and female retirees and it lays out several ways to narrow the income divide that exists between them.

The facts are clear. Older women are twice as likely as older men to be poor. According to the Older Women's League, more than 70 percent of nearly 4 million persons over 65 living in poverty are women. Fewer than 25 percent of older women receive any pension income. And in 1993, the median pension benefit received by new female retirees was half that of men. Given all this, we must keep in mind that once they reach 65 women live on average 4 years longer than men.

This bill helps Americans save for the future, and it will make retirement life more secure for millions of women. It is an important first step to addressing the many obstacles which women face as they try to plan for their futures and those of their children. I commend Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN for her leadership on this issue, and I look forward to working with her on behalf of working families across our Nation.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the Women's Pension Equity Act of 1996, and to thank Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN and Senators MIKULSKI, MURRAY, BOXER, and FEINSTEIN for their leadership on this important issue.

Mr. President, women are five times as likely to live out their final years below the poverty line. Research also indicates that almost 80 percent of widows living in poverty were not poor because their husbands died—while the same is not generally true of men, according to the General Accounting Office.

I am proud to say that my wife, Teresa Heinz, contributed important work toward this bill. In April, she sponsored a conference in Boston entitled ''Women, Widows, and Pensions—The Unfinished Agenda.'' Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN was the keynote speaker and I believe many of the insights from the conference contributed to this bill.

But I also want to highlight a letter from a woman named Marian from Attleboro, MA. She wrote me recently that she just turned 81 years old and worked from 1934 to 1994. Because of family responsibilities, she had to take a total of 7 years off from work to raise her children. She said that since her various jobs paid less than what a man would make, she now receives a worker's benefit that is less than one-half the benefit that was earned by her husband when he was alive.

Mr. President, current pension laws do not take into account the circumstances of women in the work force. This bill takes an important step toward correcting pension inequities and helps to redress the overwhelming poverty suffered by older women.

The bill would require the IRS to create a model form for spousal consent for survivor annuities so that couples understand the consequences of taking a larger annuity during the husband's life and giving up the survivor annuity. The bill would also require the Department of Labor to create a model order so divorced spouses get the pensions they deserve.

Ultimately, we need fundamental reforms to address these pressing issues. Fewer women than men receive pensions and they receive less because they have fewer years in the work force: the average woman spends 11.5 years out of the work force largely due to greater time spent in nonpaying caregiving roles. Additionally, women earn less than men and are more likely to change jobs frequently and be affected by lack of pension portability and high vesting hurdles.

But, Mr. President, along with the President's recent pension initiative the Retirement Savings and Security Act, this bill will move toward a day when the laws governing our Nation's pension system are truly gender neutral and older women are not faced with living their final years in poverty.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1757. A bill to amend the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act to extend the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EXTENSION OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES ASSISTANCE AND BILL OF RIGHTS ACT

● Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today I am introducing a simple extension of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act. This act is the result of more than 25 years of national bipartisan collaboration to secure basic rights for our Nation's most vulnerable citizens.

Before the Developmental Disabilities Act was signed in 1970, Americans who happened to be born with developmental disabilities such as mental retardation and severe physical disabilities often lived and died in institutions where many were subjected to unspeakable conditions far worse than conditions found in any American prison.

As a nation, we had a lot to learn about how we could help people with developmental disabilities live more independent and more productive lives. We had a lot to learn about: How to help families find the strength to bring up their children with developmental disabilities in their family home; how to teach children with developmental disabilities in our schools; how to make room for these citizens to live and work in the heart of our communities; and how to ensure safe and humane living environments for those citizens with developmental disabilities who remain in residential facilities.

It has taken courage to face the fact that we had so much to learn. Because of the Developmental Disabilities Act, we have made tremendous progress across the Nation in all of these areas—education, living arrangements, and meaningful participation in community activities for many individuals with developmental disabilities. We are still learning.

When we reauthorize the Developmental Disabilities Act, we show that we support programs that help people with developmental disabilities continue to live independent and productive lives—and with as little bureaucracy and government intrusion as possible.

This goal was almost unthinkable two decades ago. New technology, new services, new professional practices, and new ways of thinking about Americans who have the most severe and lifelong disabilities have created opportunities beyond what we thought possible. Research has shown that the DD Act programs make significant contributions to this progress, and they do it with minimal Federal control.

The DD Act programs are flexible and responsive to the needs of consumers—people with developmental disabilities and their families—in each State. Federal funding is limited, so successful programs must leverage Federal funds by seeking State grants and training contracts, and grants from other sources. The programs have demonstrated that they can be cost-effective while attaining good results for the people who use them.

Since the DD Act was originally authorized, it has created a lean infrastructure of programs including, in each state, a university affiliated program to educate university students in developmental disabilities-related fields and to conduct research and training to meet the needs of State agencies; a Developmental Disabilities Council appointed by the Governor of each State to define and carry out State initiatives; and a protection and advocacy organization to provide legal assistance to persons with developmental disabilities, especially those who are living in institutions.

DD Act networks have been successful at creating new service models for people with developmental disabilities without creating new bureaucracies. With the 1994 amendments, made only 2 years ago, we can reauthorize it as it stands today and know that the continuous improvements we expect will be sought. As a nation, we are now able to create opportunities for many Americans with developmental disabilities to live and work in our communities, where services are decentralized and cost-effective. From this success, we have identified new challenges, and we still need to work to improve these community-based programs so they can meet any client's needs.

Clearly, our work is not finished. The simple and fundamental rights shared by every American citizen—to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—are not yet secure for those of us who have developmental disabilities. For this reason, it is essential that we extend the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act this year. We must not forget the rights of Americans with developmental disabilities this year, or ever again.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 615

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 615, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish outpatient medical services for any disability of a former prisoner of war.

S. 953

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 953, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of black revolutionary war patriots.

S. 984

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 984, a bill to protect the fundamental right of a parent to direct the upbringing of a child, and for other purposes.

S. 1150

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the names of the Senator from Kansas

(Mrs. KASSEBAUM) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1150, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Marshall Plan and George Catlett Marshall.

S. 1563

At the request of Mr. SIMPSON, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1563, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve eligibility for medical care and services under that title, and for other purposes.

S. 1669

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1669, a bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Jackson, Mississippi, as the ''G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.''

S. 1689

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1689, a bill to provide regulatory fairness for crude oil producers, and to prohibit fee increases under the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act without the approval of Congress.

SENATE RESOLUTION 254—RELATIVE TO PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

Mr. GRAMS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 254

Resolved,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) In 1791, President George Washington commissioned Pierre Charles L'Enfant to draft a blueprint for America's capital city; they envisioned Pennsylvania Avenue as a bold, ceremonial boulevard physically linking the U.S. Capitol building and the White House, and symbolically the Legislative and Executive branches of government.

(2) An integral element of the District of Columbia, Pennsylvania Avenue stood for 195 years as a vital, working, unbroken roadway, elevating it into a place of national importance as ''America's Main Street''.

(3) 1600 Pennsylvania, the White House, has become America's most recognized address and a primary destination of visitors to the Nation's Capital; ''the People's House'' is host to 5,000 tourist daily, and 15,000,000 annually.

(4) As home to the President, and given its prominent location on Pennsylvania Avenue and its proximity to the People, the White House has become a powerful symbol of freedom, openness, and an individual's access to their government.

(5) On May 20, 1995, citing possible security risks from vehicles transporting terrorist bombs, President Clinton ordered the Treasury Department and the Secret Service to close Pennsylvania Avenue to vehicular traffic for two blocks in front of the White House.

(6) By impeding access and imposing undue hardships upon tourists, residents of the District, commuters, and local business owners and their customers, the closure of Pennsylvania Avenue, undertaken without the counsel of the government of the District of Columbia, has replaced the former openness of the area surrounding the White House with barricades, additional security checkpoints, and an atmosphere of fear and distrust.

(7) In the year following the closure of Pennsylvania Avenue, the taxpayers have borne a tremendous burden for additional security measures along the Avenue near the White House.

(8) While the security of the President is of grave concern and is not to be taken lightly, the need to assure the President's safety must be balanced with the expectation of freedom inherent in a democracy; the present situation is tilted far too heavily toward security at freedom's expense.

SEC. 2 SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the President should order the immediate, permanent reopening to vehicular traffic of Pennsylvania in front of the White House, restoring the Avenue to its original state and returning it to the People.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, in just 6 days, the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House will mark its 1-year anniversary.

I rise today to speak for the 15 million tourists who visit the Nation's Capital each year, the local businessmen and women whose livelihoods depend upon open access, the government of the District of Columbia, the commuters who rely on our roads, and the people who call Washington, DC, home. On their behalf, I am submitting a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Pennsylvania Avenue be reopened to traffic and returned to its historic use. The May 20th closing is one anniversary we should not have to commemorate.

This resolution has the support of many with strong ties to the Washington community. I am grateful to have the endorsement of District of Columbia Mayor Marion Barry, and I am also proud that D.C. Council Chairman David Clarke and Councilmember Frank Smith support this effort. I ask unanimous consent that statements from Mayor Barry and Chairman Clarke and Councilmember Smith be included in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRAMS. In addition, my resolution has the strong support of more than a dozen of the area's residential, business, and historical organizations representing thousands of job providers and the District's half million residents. I ask unanimous consent to submit this list and supporting letters for printing in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I have come to the floor several times over the past year to voice my concerns about the closure of Pennsylvania Avenue.

I have talked about the damage it has done to Washington's business community, and the fear that it is scaring off new jobs and prompting potential retail and commercial tenants to stay away from the downtown area. I have talked about the damage it has done to Washington's business community, and the fear that it's scaring off new jobs and prompting potential retail and commercial tenants to stay away from the downtown area. I have discussed the hardships caused by the closing for anyone whose paycheck depends on access to the avenue, people like cab drivers and tour bus operators. I have outlined problem after problem the closing has created for the District itself, which had one of its major arteries unilaterally severed by the Federal Government without any consultation. I have discussed the inconvenience of our tourists, especially the elderly and disabled, many of whom are now being deprived of a close look at the White House. And I have talked about the tremendous cost for the taxpayers, a cost which has already reached into the millions of dollars.

I have raised each of those aspects of the closing because they are all relevant and pressing concerns. But that is not what I want to discuss today. There is another side to this issue that is easy to overlook amid all the other more obvious problems: the question of what the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue has done to the psyche of this city, and what we give up when we give in to fear.

The air was thick with fear in the weeks following April 19, 1995, when terrorists attacked the Federal building in Oklahoma City. How could something like this happen within our own borders, people wondered. And fear took hold. That was certainly the atmosphere in Washington—an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust that prompted the Treasury Department to close down two blocks of Pennsylvania Avenue a month after the tragic Oklahoma City bombing.

Now, obviously, protecting the President and those who work and visit the White House must be a primary concern, a matter never to be taken lightly. The occupant of the Oval Office deserves every reasonable measure of security we can provide. So if the Secret Service had information that the White House was a terrorist target and the President was in danger, then it was absolutely prudent at the time to close Pennsylvania Avenue.

But that was an entire year ago, and a decision that may have appeared prudent then strikes many as regrettable and short-sighted today. Rather than helping the Nation face down our fear, the Government's decision to close Pennsylvania Avenue—and keep it closed—has only perpetuated it.

This is the White House today. Not a pretty sight, is it? The stretch of Pennsylvania Avenue that stood for 195 years as ''America's Main Street'' is empty of any traffic—more a vacant lot than a working street.

Gone is the thrill for visitors of driving by the White House for the first time—the concrete barricades, traffic sawhorses, and ever-present patrol vehicles and armed officers have put an end to that.

Gone, too, is the sense of openness that inspired generations of visitors to feel close to the Presidency and their Government when they visited the Executive Mansion.

Today, there is an ominous atmosphere at the White House that you feel nowhere else in Washington. Visitors seem more to be tolerated than welcomed, and the fortress-like effect they discover there is unnerving.

I have no doubt that the place is secure—as secure as a bunker. But the price we have paid for all this security is immense because it has come at the expense of freedom.

Was it not Benjamin Franklin who warned against ''giving up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety''? And liberty is precisely what we have given up by closing off Pennsylvania Avenue.

While we may have obtained some temporary safety, we have surrendered to fear in order to get it, even though one of the first lessons we teach our young people in their American history classes is that freedom cannot coexist with fear.

Mr. President, a visit to the Nation's capital can have a profound impact on the schoolchildren who visit here every year. It is a place where history comes alive, and every monument, museum, and historic site they visit is a page right out of the textbooks.

The feeling they get by being immersed in history can not be duplicated in a classroom, and I know that a trip to Washington, DC has inspired many, many young people to seek careers in public service.

But how confused they must be when they visit the White House. Before travelling here, they have studied the Revolutionary War.

They have read the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. They have been taught that the foundation upon which this Nation was built was our absolute right to be free from oppression. It is that freedom, we tell them—a freedom we hold sacred, and treasure above all else—that makes this Nation so different from any other.

So what do you suppose goes through their minds when they at last visit the home of their President and find it barricaded behind all that concrete?

The preamble to the Constitution, with its talk of securing the blessings of liberty, must ring awfully hollow if this is what liberty really looks like.

What lesson are we teaching them about the freedom we claim to value so highly? What kind of message are we sending our children when they discover that the very center of the free world is not so very free after all?

I can tell you what they are thinking. I visit the White House two or three times a month, and I have heard their comments and seen the disappointment in their faces. They tell me it is shameful, it is disappointing, and it is wrong.

If there is a compelling reason to keep Pennsylvania Avenue permanently closed, I hope someone will step forward and make their case. I have been asking the question for nearly a year now, and have not yet heard a reasonable answer.

The monetary cost of shutting Pennsylvania Avenue down has been enormous Mr. President, but the emotional cost of keeping it closed forever would be devasting.

We may only be talking about two, short blocks, but those two blocks have represented freedom and access since nearly the birth of this Nation.

While we must never allow ourselves to become reckless about our security, it is equally true that we must never allow ourselves to become reckless about our freedom, either, especially when freedom is represented by such a visible symbol as the White House.

The way Pennsylvania Avenue looks today, well, that is just not the America, envisioned by our Founding Fathers. It is certainly not the America John Kennedy spoke of in his 1961 inaugural address:

> Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and success of liberty.

That resolve may have softened on Pennsylvania Avenue, but it is not too late to rekindle that spirit.

I believe that good sense will prevail and the avenue will reopen. And someday, Mr. President, when they are old enough to appreciate what it all means, I will take my grandchildren to the White House.

I will show them the home of the Presidents—great leaders like Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, who defined liberty for a young Nation and ensured that this would forever be a place where freedom could flourish.

And when they realized that the President lives in a house just like they do, along a street a lot like theirs, my grandchildren will smile.

Castles and kings require moats and crocodiles, but Presidents, well, they make their homes in houses, set on busy streets, in the hearts of busy cities. Open and accessible. And that is just the way Presidents ought to live.

My grandchildren may not understand just what liberty and freedom really mean, but they will feel its powerful presence and I hope they will be inspired.

There are a thousand good reasons to reopen Pennsylvania Avenue, Mr. President, but only one reason I can see for keeping it closed, and that is fear. We cannot allow fear to claim this victory.

We cannot allow the 1-year anniversary of the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue to pass without this Senate taking a stand on the side of freedom.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE SUPPORT THE SENATE RESOLUTION CALLING FOR THE REOPENING OF PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE IN FRONT OF THE WHITE HOUSE

District of Columbia Mayor Marion Barry.
D.C. Council Chairman David A. Clarke.
D.C. Councilmember Frank Smith.
AAA Potomac.
American Bus Association.
Apartment and Office Building Association of Metropolitan Washington, Inc.
Association of Oldest Inhabitants of D.C.
District of Columbia Building Industry Association.
District of Columbia Preservation League.
DuPont Circle Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2B.
Federation of Citizens Association.
Frontiers of Freedom.
Greater Washington Board of Trade.
International Downtown Association.
Arthur Cotton Moore Associates.
Washington Cab Association.
Washington D.C. Historical Society.
Washington D.C. Restaurant and Beverage Association.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, May 13, 1996.

Hon. ROD GRAMS,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRAMS: I want to thank you for your continued interest in the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue and the impact it has had on the District of Columbia. The effects on traffic patterns and drivers' convenience, business income, parking revenue, and most important, public access to the White House, have all been significant.

I hope that your legislation expressing the sense of the Senate that Pennsylvania Avenue be reopened in front of the White House can be approved. I would appreciate your conveying my support for such legislation to your colleagues.

Please contact me or my staff if you have any questions or requests that I can help with. Again, thank you for your understanding and appreciation of the consequences of the blockades.

Sincerely,

MARION BARRY, JR.,
Mayor.

STATEMENT OF D.C. COUNCIL CHAIRMAN DAVID A. CLARKE AND D.C. COUNCILMEMBER FRANK SMITH

We wholeheartedly support and applaud the effort by Senator ROD GRAMS and others to reopen Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House to vehicular traffic—and thereby restore this most public of public streets to its historic use.

District of Columbia residents, businesses and visitors have suffered for one year with the constant traffic gridlock, uncompensated economic costs, and loss of freedom from this vehicular barricade between the east and west ends of America's historic main street and our downtown. We call upon the federal government to pay for the entire cost of identifying and mitigating every adverse impact which has resulted from the federal government's vehicular restrictions in the economic and historic heart of the nation's capital.

In July 1995 the Council of the District of Columbia unanimously adopted a resolution expressing concerns about the restriction of vehicular access to streets around the White House, which now also applies to restrictions

placed upon other streets around certain Congressional and other federal buildings in Washington. Appended to this statement is the full text of the resolution which we co-authored.

THE GREATER WASHINGTON
BOARD OF TRADE,
Washington, DC, May 13, 1996.

Hon. ROD GRAMS,
U.S. Senate, Senate Dirksen Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRAMS: On behalf of the Greater Washington Board of Trade's membership, I applaud your efforts to reopen the 1600 block of Pennsylvania Avenue and offer whatever assistance this organization might provide. As a representative of over 1,000 businesses located in the greater Washington region, we have heard from many of our members about the impact that the street closing has had on their businesses. In short, the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue, paired with the closing of the parallel section of E Street between 15th and 17th Streets, has resonated throughout the District of Columbia's road system. The resulting gridlock is, at best, impeding the mobility of business people, residents and tourists.

Of even greater concern is the likelihood that this is just the beginning of an imposing security trend; already we have heard rumors that additional street closings will occur Street closings cannot be an appropriate solution to security concerns; rather, they are nothing more than a ''cure by amputation.'' Already, the Pennsylvania Avenue experiment has demonstrated the crippling effect such a policy has on traffic flow, and additional street closings would further exacerbate the difficulty of doing business in the District of Columbia.

In your April 29th letter to President Clinton, you cite the rich history of Pennsylvania Avenue as ''America's Main Street'' and its symbolism of freedom, openness and access to government. But equally important are the more direct economic impacts that the street closing has imposed on the operation of the District of Columbia. Traffic on surrounding streets has reportedly increased far beyond capacity, despite efforts by the local government and the Federal Highway Administration to create one way corridors traveling east and west to improve traffic flow. And while rush hour traffic has always been difficult, travel times across the downtown business district have more than doubled even during the mid-day hours.

Although many people consider Washington, DC to be only the home of the federal government, the City has a significant private sector community. A large number of those businesses are service oriented, requiring them to remain accessible to clients and customers. Thus, the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue is creating a hardship on the city's private sector, and in many cases, forcing them to reconsider whether they must relocate their operation outside of the District. In a city that is struggling to cope with dwindling revenues and the skyrocketing costs of human services, this is just one more factor contributing to the problems faced by the local government, the Congressionally appointed financial control board, and inevitably, the Congress in its role as steward of the Nation's Capital.

The business community recognizes that the safety of the President of the United States must be the top priority in decisions such as these. We believe, however that there may be more appropriate alternatives that would sufficiently mitigate potential security risks without shutting down the Nation's Capital piece by piece.

A decision to reopen Pennsylvania Avenue would go a long way to toward restoring mobility in the Nation's Capital. This is important to the people who live and work here every day, but it is also important to the millions of visitors who come from all 50 states. Should there be a decision to revisit the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue, the Greater Washington Board of Trade would be happy to work with Congress, the Executive Branch and the local government to identify more realistic options for improving security in the Nation's Capital. Thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH T. BOYLE,
Chair, KPMG Peat Marwick.
JOHN MILLIKEN,
Chair, Venable, Baetjer and Howard.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BUILDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 6, 1996.

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: I am writing to you in my capacity as president of the District of Columbia Building Industry Association. Our Association represents several thousand business people in the District of Columbia.

It has been almost one year since the executive order of the Secretary of the Treasury was issued restricting traffic on Pennsylvania Avenue, State Place and Executive Avenue. We understand that this was a very difficult directive for you to sign and that you had resisted several efforts by the Secret Service to restrict traffic in the vicinity of the White House in the past. While we in the Washington, D.C. business community were concerned about the process whereby this major traffic conduit was closed, the business community and citizens generally did not object to this action given the circumstances at that time.

In the past year, we have had time to experience the results of this action and feel it is time to reexamine this situation. Of course, your safety and the safety of the First Family and your staff are of paramount importance to all of us as citizens of the United States. However, the rerouting of traffic around the White House has resulted in serious traffic congestion on a daily basis, and exacerbated traffic problems during special events which are constant in Washington, DC, such as the Cherry Blossom Festival. Moreover, it has divided our city into an East and a West side causing both commerce and tourism to suffer negative economic consequences at the same time they are impacted by the City's debilitating fiscal crisis. These combined circumstances have had a disastrous effect on business and trade in DC.

While the emergency temporary restriction of traffic on these streets was warranted by the unique circumstances at that time, we do not feel this should be viewed and accepted as the long term solution to these security issues. Right now, there is a team of architects employed by the U.S. Government meeting to discuss alternatives for closing Pennsylvania Avenue prior to the official, legal closing of the street itself. We believe that alternative methods to provide long term improved security to the White House, such as structural reinforcements, improved fencing, electronic surveillance, limited traffic on adjacent streets to cars only, etc. should be reconsidered now. These alternatives may actually be more economical than the closing of these streets and certainly will be less costly in terms of diminished national prestige.

With the end of the Cold War five years ago, our country is more secure than at any time in this century. Since this time of relative peace is due in large part to American leadership, it is truly ironic that symbolically we are retreating by further limiting access to and around the White House. One could only imagine the outcry by Parisians if the French Government closed the Champs-Elysees in front of the Presidential Palace. Washingtonians have been very patient and understanding with the temporary closing of Pennsylvania Avenue, the most important street in the L'Enfant Plan. But now is the time to search for a better long term solution.

Just as we are sure you would reject suggestions that you limit your personal interaction with the American people such as your daily jogging, town meetings and other high-risk interactions with the public, we urge you to reconsider this highly visible statement to the American people and international tourists and reopen Pennsylvania Avenue.

So while we fully support the temporary measures taken by your administration to restrict traffic around the White House, we urge you to set up a task force to find alternate means of providing adequate security for the White House with the ultimate goal of reopening these streets by Inauguration Day 1997. Our Association is prepared to participate in this task force and provide whatever resources are necessary in order to accomplish this goal.

Sincerely yours.

THOMAS W. WILBUR,
President.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BUILDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 9, 1996.

Re Closure of a Section of Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Secretary of the Treasury's Order dated May 19, 1995.

Hon. ROBERT E. RUBIN,
Secretary, Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY RUBIN: I am writing to you in my capacity as Chairman of the Legislative and Governmental Affairs Committee of the District of Columbia Building Industry Association (''DCBIA'').

For your information, DCBIA is comprised of over 275 member organizations and over 1,000 individuals ranging from lenders, property owners, developers, property managers, construction companies, contractors, subcontractors, architects, engineers, lawyers, accountants, and others involved in the real estate industry. In other words, those who finance, own, develop, renovate, upgrade, improve and manage real property in the District, together with all of the providers of the additional services necessary to the real estate industry.

May 19, 1996 will mark the first anniversary of your directive to the Director of the United States Secret Service to close a portion of Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. and certain other streets. This emergency, temporary directive was intended to enhance the perimeter security of the White House. Under applicable federal law, your authority to prohibit vehicular traffic on public streets is temporary in nature, and is predicated on certain findings of fact which must be applicable at the time of the initial directive and at all times thereafter while the directive remains in effect.

DCBIA believes that now is an appropriate time to undertake a number of endeavors, including but not limited to, reexamining the factual determinations of one year ago, confirming that the Department of the Treasury is in compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration, the Department of

the Interior's Comprehensive Design Plan for the White House, the National Park Service, the National Capital Planning Commission, and all other applicable local and Federal requirements.

Now is also an appropriate time to reexamine the economic, physical and psychological impact of the street closures on the many thousands of American citizens that have had to bear the direct and immediate impact of your directive. Some of these people travel to the Nation's capital daily for their jobs and businesses, while others are visitors from places near and far. All of them have shared the serious and significant delays, detours and related problems of the street closures. The serious negative impact upon the local business community has become difficult if not impossible to accurately assess. The directive has simply divided our city to the detriment of all, and has fostered a ''bunker mentality'' among the citizens of the city, many of whom observe, on a daily basis, the barricades, uniformed Secret Service personnel and similar indicia of a city under siege directly in front of the Presidential residence.

DCBIA wishes to be absolutely clear on the issue of the safety of the President and the First Family. It is not a question of whether or not any of us doubt the supreme importance of protecting the President of the United States. We assert emphatically that the security of the President is and should be of profound importance to every American citizen, and every person who loves freedom and democracy. But at the same time, the directive issued in the name of safety and security is quite simply killing the city. When people cannot move freely and easily it impacts productivity and commerce. But the impact does not stop there. Eventually there are psychological and spiritual effects that are no less real or important. The District of Columbia cannot afford to make it more difficult than it already is to work, play and live here. The directive issued almost one year ago is doing just that.

DCBIA urges you and your staff, in conjunction with other public officials, to reopen the entire issue of the street closures for full and fair consideration. DCBIA seeks to be an active participant in this process and is committed to using its resources to help reopen Pennsylvania Avenue.

We look forward to your response and appreciate having this opportunity to raise this matter with you.

Sincerely,

NELSON F. MIGDAL,
Chairman, Legislative/Governmental Affairs Committee.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, May 14, 1996, in executive session, to certain military nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be allowed to meet during the Tuesday, May 14, 1996, session of the Senate for the purpose of conducting a hearing on reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Airport Improvement Program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full Committee on Environment and Public Works be granted permission to meet Tuesday, May 14, at 2:15 p.m., in S–216, the Capitol, to consider the nomination of Hubert T. Bell, Jr., nominated by the President to be Inspector General, Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee to meet on Tuesday, May 14, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 14, 1996, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on ''The False Statements Statute After *Hubbard v. United States*: assessing the need for revision.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for a subcommittee hearing on Confronting the Challenges Presented by an Aging Population, during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 14, 1996, at 9 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WHITEWATER DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND RELATED MATTERS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that The Special Committee to Investigate Whitewater Development and Related Matters be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 14, Wednesday, May 15, and Thursday, May 16, 1996 to conduct hearings pursuant to S. Res. 120.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 14, 1996, for purposes of conducting a subcommittee hearing which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this oversight hearing is to receive testimony on the management and costs of class action lawsuits at Department of Energy facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

IN RECOGNITION OF CFIDS AWARENESS DAY

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I'd like to take a few minutes of Senate business today to talk about chronic fatigue and immune dysfunction syndrome [CFIDS].

Mr. President, this past Sunday, May 12, marked the observance of International CFIDS Awareness Day. While the CFIDS Association of America coordinated a national awareness and educational campaign with respect to CFIDS, I'd like to make particular mention of the efforts of an organization in Pennsylvania, the Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Association of the Lehigh Valley.

The severity of chronic fatigue syndrome is largely unknown to the American public, and the observance on May 12th served as a very important and worthwhile opportunity to inform, educate, and increase the awareness of the illness. I commend the Lehigh Valley organization for their tireless efforts in combating CFIDS and for their participation and coordination of activities on May 12. In recognition of their efforts, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following proclamation, and I encourage the Senate's consideration and endorsement.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Association of the Lehigh Valley joins the CFIDS Association of America in observing May 12, 1996 as International Chronic Fatigue and Immune Dysfunction Syndrome Awareness Day; and

Whereas, chronic fatigue syndrome is a complex illness affecting many different body systems and is characterized by neurological, rheumatological and immunological problems; incapacitating fatigue; and numerous other long-term severely debilitating symptoms; and

Whereas, while there has been increased activity at the national, State and local levels, continued education and training of health professionals is imperative in garnering greater public awareness of this serious health problem and in supporting patients and their families; and

Whereas, although research has been strengthened by the efforts of the Centers for Disease Control, the National Institutes of Health, and other private research institutions, the CFS Association of the Lehigh Valley recognizes that much more must be done to encourage further research so that the mission we share with the CFIDS Association of America, ''to conquer CFIDS and related disorders'', can be achieved. Therefore, be it *Resolved*, that the United States Senate hereby commends the designation of May 12, 1996 as CFIDS Awareness Day and applauds the efforts of those battling the illness.

I appreciate the Senate's consideration of this issue, and thank my colleagues for their attention.●

ADVISORY BOARD ON WELFARE INDICATORS APPOINTED

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, just last week, on May 7, the House of Representatives appointed its four members of the Advisory Board on Welfare

Indicators, as provided by the Welfare Indicators Act of 1994, incorporated in the Social Security Act amendments of that year. The measure was introduced on the first day of the 103d Congress, January 31, 1993, the first legislative day that is, and signed just at the end of that Congress. In a floor statement at the time of introduction, I noted that the measure was directly modeled on the Employment Act of 1946. This was a statement of a large national goal, accompanied by provision for an annual assessment of progress toward that goal. Congress declared it to be the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. Words at first, but great consequences followed in our ability to measure and understand these purposes. I stated on the floor:

Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Welfare Dependency Act of 1993. The purpose of the bill, which is directly modeled on the Employment Act of 1946, is to declare it the policy and the responsibility of the Federal Government to strengthen families and promote their self-sufficiency. To this end, the bill directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study to determine which statistics, if collected and analyzed on a regular basis, would be most useful in tracking and predicting welfare dependency. Within 2 years, the Secretary would report the conclusions to Congress, and, a year later, would submit a first report on dependency. Thereafter, reports would be submitted annually. These reports would include annual numerical goals for recipients and expenditures within each public welfare program. For the interim, the bill establishes a goal of reducing dependency to 10 percent of families with children.

For the first time in American history the largest proportion of persons in poverty are to be found among children, not among adults or among the aged. This is new. When we first began to notice this trend in the 1960's, it seemed that we had discovered something uniquely American. Then we began to get the returns of the Luxembourg Income Survey. Children, it seems, are poorer than adults in all manner of places: Australia, Canada, Germany, England, as well as the United States. For too long we have been trying to measure a postindustrial phenomenon—dependency—with statistics designed to track industrial-era phenomena.

We used to know something about how to predict welfare dependency. In the early 1960's when I was Assistant Secretary in the Department of Labor for Policy, Planning, and Research, we found that there was an extraordinary correlation between male unemployment and new welfare cases from the period starting in 1946 up to about 1958–59. Then the correlation weakened, until finally in 1963 the lines crossed and the relationship became negative—the lower the unemployment rate, the higher the number of AFDC cases. Now, even during prosperous periods for our Nation, a shockingly high percentage of our children are dependent on public support.

We do have some data on the magnitude of this problem, if not its origins. Back in the 1960's the Office of Economic Opportunity had the good sense to put up money for a longitudinal study of families at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. The researchers computed the incidence of welfare dependency among children born in the late 1960's. The findings are dismaying. Almost one quarter—22.1 percent—of these children were dependent on AFDC for at least 1 year before reaching their 18th birthday. That's 72.3 percent of black and 15.7 percent of nonblack children.

But these findings on the extent of the problem tell us little about what causes it or how to address it. Certainly some part of this explosion in welfare dependency can be attributed to changes in family structure. Three decades ago there was nothing notably amiss with the traditional family. American divorce rates were high, but stabilizing. The traditional family of parents with children was the norm. As recently as 1970, 40 percent of the Nation's households were made up of a married couple with one or more children. The proportion dropped to 31 percent in the next decade. It is now around a quarter of all families. Simultaneously, the proportion of families headed by a single mother has exploded. In 1970, 11.5 percent of all families with children were headed by a single mother. In 1980, 19.4 percent. In 1990, 24.2 percent. Now a quarter of all live births are out of wedlock.

Our data collection needs to become more systematic and institutionalized. As we did earlier in this century for the problem of unemployment when we enacted the Employment Act of 1946, we need to define welfare dependency as a national problem and to begin to measure, analyze, and address it. Since 1946 unemployment has hardly disappeared but neither is it ignored, much less denied. I am introducing this bill on the first day of the new Congress because I believe that its passage would represent one of the most important moments in social welfare policy since Aid to Families with Dependent Children was enacted as part of the Social Security Act of 1935.

It might be noted here that in 1946 it was commonly assumed that with the war over, the Depression of the 1930's would resume. Western society had been stunned by that catastrophic and protracted economic crisis, a crisis which was interrupted by world war, but which was widely thought to be systemic, and which would accordingly resume. No one seemed to know how to make a modern industrial economy work. Some economists had ideas about this, but these were not widely subscribed to. A more common view was that industrial democracies were inherently unstable and would necessarily disappear. It helps in this time of vast unease associated with the breakdown of family structure to recollect with some tranquillity that capitalism was deemed doomed not a half century ago.

Here are the specifics for the statute:

(a) CONGRESSIONAL POLICY.—The Congress hereby declares that—(1) it is the policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to reduce the rate at which and the degree to which families depend on income from welfare programs and the duration of welfare receipt, consistent with other essential national goals; (2) it is the policy of the United States to strengthen families, to ensure that children grow up in families that are economically self-sufficient and that the life prospects of children are improved, and to underscore the responsibility of parents to support their children; (3) the Federal Government should help welfare recipients as well as individuals at risk of welfare receipt to improve their education and job skills, to obtain child care and other necessary support services, and to take such other steps as may be necessary to assist them to become financially independent; and (4) it is the purpose of this section to provide the public with generally accepted measures of welfare receipt so that it can track such receipt over time and determine whether progress is being made in reducing the rate at which and, to the extent feasible, the degree to which, families depend on income from welfare programs and the duration of welfare receipt.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF WELFARE INDICATORS AND PREDICTORS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary'') in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture shall—(1) develop—(A) indicators of the rate at which and, to the extent feasible, the degree to which, families depend on income from welfare programs and the duration of welfare receipt; and (B) predictors of welfare receipt; (2) assess the data needed to report annually on the indicators and predictors, including the ability of existing data collection efforts to provide such data and any additional data collection needs . . . [The Welfare Indicators Act of 1994, as incorporated in the Social Security Act Amendments of 1994, P.L. 103–432].

No notice was taken of the measure at the time of enactment, and so it is not inappropriate to do so now that the appointments to the Advisory Board are completed. An interim report is due from the Secretary by next October 31, 2 years from enactment, as provided in the statute, with a regular annual report to be prepared thereafter. I would note that the measure was a long time coming; indeed, that we seemed somehow reluctant to learn too much about this subject. In March 1991, the Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy of the Senate Committee on Finance held hearings at which a number of the Nation's most respected social scientists, including several experts who are now members of the Advisory Board, commented on the subject of ''Welfare Dependency.'' Many urged the need for a continuing Federal assessment of this matter, as baffling in our time as was the issue of unemployment a half century ago. That eminent scholar, Douglas J. Besharov of the American Enterprise Institute, noted that ''There used to be a National Center for Social Statistics * * * . It was a Federal agency and had a client. Its client was the * * * Social and Rehabilitative Service.'' But when that program was reorganized there was no client to support the Center and it simply faded away. Now, however, we have the responsibility firmly lodged with the Secretary of Health and Human Services. We can expect diligent attention from the distinguished incumbent, Donna Shalala, and from her ingenious, industrious and committed associate, Wendell Primus, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Service Policy.

The Secretary will receive, I cannot doubt, great good counsel from this Advisory Board, now finally constituted. Its distinguished members are as follows:

Appointed by the Senate majority leader are Jo Anne B. Barnhart, political director, National Republican Senatorial Committee; Martin H. Gerry,

director of the Center for Study of Family, Neighborhood, and Community Policy, University of Kansas; Gerald H. Miller, Director, Michigan Department of Social Services.

Appointed by the Senate minority leader is Paul E. Barton, director of the Policy Information Center, Educational Testing Service.

Appointed by the President are Judith M. Gueron, president, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation; Kristin A. Moore, executive director of Child Trends, Inc.; Joan M. Reeves, Commissioner, Department of Human Services, city of Philadelphia; Gary J. Stangler, Director, Missouri Department of Social Services.

Appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives are Eloise Anderson, Director, California Department of Social Services; Wade F. Horn, director, National Fatherhood Initiative; Marvin H. Costers, resident scholar and director of Economic Policy Studies, American Enterprise Institute.

Appointed by the minority leader, House of Representatives is Robert Greenstein, executive director, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

I am sure the Senate will join me in congratulating the board members and in expressing our expectation that the first welfare dependency report, due next fall, will mark the onset of a new age of information in this troubled area of social policy. ●

TRIBUTE TO SISTER MARY BENITA O'CONNOR, R.S.M.

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay a special tribute to Sister Mary Benita O'Connor, R.S.M. It is a great pleasure to recognize Sister Mary Benita for her 60th anniversary in the religious profession and for her lifelong dedication to serving others.

A former member of St. Munchin's Parish in Cameron, MO, Sister Mary Benita entered the Sisters of Mercy novitiate in Council Bluffs, IA, on August 6, 1933. She made her first vows in March, 1936, and in August of the same year was assigned to teach business education, English, and religion classes at St. Mary's High School in Independence, MO. Following teaching assignments at Glennon High School, Kansas City, and the College of St. Mary's in Omaha, NE, Sister Mary Benita was once again assigned to St. Mary's, Independence.

After completing 40 years of teaching, Sister Mary Benita became active in St. Mary's Parish Council where she served as parish ministries coordinator. As director of social ministries for the parish, she coordinated St. Vincent de Paul's outreach to the poor, the Legion of Mary's evangelization efforts, youth service activities, the Over 50 Club and Marian ministry. She continues her ministry to the hospitalized and homebound.

Sister Mary Benita has been an active member of the Neighborhood Council, a board member on Meals on Wheels, has participated in neighborhood education programs and has held a continued interest in St. Mary's High School Alumni activities.

Currently, Sister Mary is sponsoring faith development groups and is the librarian for the parish library. It is an honor to congratulate Sister Mary Benita on her long-lasting faithfulness to the Church and the Independence community. I wish her the best of luck on May 19, 1996 at her celebratory Mass of Thanksgiving at St. Mary's, and also in all of her future pursuits. ●

HOUSE INVESTIGATION OF IRANIAN ARMS SHIPMENTS TO BOSNIA

● Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, last week the House of Representatives decided on an almost strict party line vote to create a special subcommittee to investigate the Clinton administration's decision not to stop Iran from shipping weapons to the Bosnian Government in violation of the arms embargo. And they voted to spend an additional $995,000 above their planned budget to conduct this investigation. $995,000. While not technically correct, I hope you can indulge me if I just round up and call it an even million. That's really what it is.

Mr. President, while I believe Congress should look into this matter, we also need to be concerned about how we conduct our investigations.

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence has already held five hearings on the administration's decision not to intervene and prohibit the shipment of Iranian arms into Bosnia. Chairman SPECTER, myself, and the other members of the committee are well into our investigation at this point and will press on expeditiously to finish in a timely manner. It is important to note, however that we have conducted these hearings and will conduct further hearings as part of our normal oversight responsibilities using our regular committee staff fully within our regular committee budget for fiscal year 1996. And we have done this with the cooperation of both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, this is why I find the House Republican's actions so disconcerting. We on this side of the Capitol can investigate this matter with the cooperation of both parties, and without additional space, staffing, funding, and committees. Meanwhile, our House Republican counterparts have voted to spend an additional $1 million above their normal budget to acquire more space, to hire more staff, and to form another subcommittee to investigate this same issue. Knowing how difficult it is to start up a new organization, I'd bet we on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence will probably finish our investigation before the House's special subcommittee gets moved into its new offices.

I know the House is just as concerned as the Senate about the cost of performing necessary Government functions in these times of billion dollar budget deficits. The new Republican House leadership took some important, difficult measures to cut the cost of running Congress when they took control in 1994. I believe that was the right thing to do. So why spend a million dollars unnecessarily? Especially in this election year, you do not have to be a cynic to believe it was for political reasons. But even a cynic would be dumbfounded trying to figure out why the House Republicans went this extra, excessive step to try to try and make a political point.

Mr. President, when you talk day-in and day-out about billion dollar weapons systems, hundreds of billion dollar deficits, and trillion dollars budgets, a one with just six zeroes after it doesn't seem to be very much. And I guess 9–9–5 plus three zeroes looks even smaller. But it takes 135 average Nebraska families working full time for 3 months to produce $1 million dollars in tax revenue. When there's already a committee structure, staffing, and budget to do the job, the $1 million House Special Committee to investigate Iranian arms flow into Bosnia is a prime example of superfluous Government spending.

Mr. President, I say, let's perform our legislative oversight responsibilities, let's look for the truth in this matter, let's determine who did what when and whether their actions were within the letter and spirit of the law. But let's do it the way we are already organized to do it and within the budgets we set for ourselves. Let's live within out means like we expect or citizens to do.●

BERTHA M. GLOTZBACH—55 YEARS OF GOVERNMENT SERVICE

● Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, too often we are ready to criticize those who work for the Government but rarely recognize individuals who have dedicated their lives to public service. That is why, today, I would like to pay tribute to Bertha Glotzbach of the U.S. Agency for International Development [USAID]. On April 23, 1996, Ms. Glotzbah completed 55 years of Government service.

Born on the Fourth of July raised in my home State of Kansas, Ms. Glotzbach attended Strickler's Business College in Topeka. Her Government career began just before World War II on April 23, 1941, with the Department of Labor. Ms. Glotzbach first worked for the Bureau of Labor Statistics and later with the Special Assistant for International Relations to the Secretary of Labor.

In 1949, Ms. Glotzbach joined the Economic Cooperation Agency, which Congress created in 1948 to administer the Marshall plan. She has worked continuously for foreign assistance agencies ever since. In addition to the numerous awards and commendations Ms. Glotzbach has received over the years, her service with USAID and its predecessor agencies sets a 47-year record.

Mr. President, it is with great pleasure and gratitude that I rise today with USAID, to honor and congratulate Ms. Glotzbach for her dedicated service to the Nation.●

SELFRIDGE AIR NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, in my home State of Michigan, we are both proud and fortunate to have Selfridge Air National Guard Base located in Harrison Township, Macomb County. Though the base started as an Air Force Base and was transferred in 1971 to the Michigan Air National Guard, it is the home of many diversified branches of the U.S. military. ''Team Selfridge'' takes pride in being the only Reserve Forces base to have permanently assigned units from all five of the uniformed services: Army, Air Force, Marine Corps, Navy, and the Coast Guard, including the Air Force Reserve as well as the Air National Guard. This feature makes Selfridge unique among U.S. military bases.

On May 18, 1996, the 927th Air Refueling Wing will be celebrating Bosses Day. Each year, the 927th pays tribute to local employers who support their Reserve employees. Reservists invite their employers to Selfridge so that they can gain an up-close view of the patriotic and unselfish manner in which reservists are serving their community and Nation. The 927th first arrived at Selfridge in 1963. For nearly 33 years it has depended on the flexibility and support of local employers for much of its success.

National Guard and Reserve Forces will play an even greater and more diverse role in the times ahead, as the Nation comes to rely more on them in peacetime and in war. It is the vital support of America's employers that enables the National Guard and Reserves to continue to strengthen our Nation's security. We owe these employers our gratitude for being part of our national security team.

This celebration of Bosses Day on May 18 will be particularly appropriate because that is the day this country will be observing Armed Forces Day, a day when we recognize and honor the service and sacrifice of our Armed Forces. On that day we can give our thanks to the men and women in the Armed Forces, as well as to the employers who support the Guard and Reserve members.●

MONTGOMERY ACADEMY FORENSICS TEAM WINS ALABAMA FORENSICS CHAMPIONSHIP

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment today to share with my Senate colleagues the outstanding accomplishments of a very talented group of students from Montgomery. On April 13, the Montgomery Academy Forensics Team won the State forensics championship at the Alabama Forensic Educators Association State Tournament. While this is wonderful achievement, it was an even more impressive showing, for this is the second consecutive year the Montgomery Academy team has won this award.

For the past 5 years, the team has been led my Mr. James W. Rye III. Mr. Rye founded the forensics program at Montgomery Academy, and in those 5 years, the team has grown in both size and strength, and I would like to congratulate and commend him for his efforts today.

Mr. President, I would also like to extend my congratulations to the young men and women from Montgomery Academy who performed so well at this year's tournament. To win two consecutive State championships is an impressive accomplishment, and I wanted to share their success with my colleagues. The Montgomery Academy Forensics Team has certainly earned their award, and I would wish them the best of luck in next year's competition and in all of their future endeavors.●

PUBLIC BUILDING REFORM ACT

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 1005 as reported by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. I believe that this bill incorporates many valuable concepts which would save the Federal Government money by imposing controls on the design and costs of Federal buildings, and in particular courthouses.

When I became chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I presented some broad principles which I felt the committee should use to prioritize General Services Administration projects. At that time, the Administrative Office of the Courts had never sent to our committee a priority ranking of courthouse projects making authorization on the basis of need very difficult.

Today, at my request, I am pleased to report that the Judicial Conference has approved a 5-year plan, which is a step in the right direction. However, additional reforms in the area of public buildings are still needed.

Under S. 1005, the General Services Administration and the Administrative Office of the Courts will be required to submit triennial plans in order of priority. Courthouse prospectuses will be required to include the current number of Federal judges and courtrooms as of the date of submissions, and the projected number of Federal judges and courtrooms expected to be accommodated by the proposed project.

These projected figures will then be justified by further information on the authorized positions of Federal judges and the number of judges expected to take senior status, as well as the level of security risk at the current courthouse as determined by the Administrative Office of the Courts.

If a courthouse is not part of the triennial plan for a given fiscal year, it is not my expectation that the committee will approve that particular project.

Mr. President, S. 1005 also addresses ongoing concerns over the U.S. Courts Design Guide. Many of you have heard about Foley Square and the Boston Courthouse, as well as many other costly courthouse construction projects which have been built in the last several years. S. 1005 will require the General Services Administration to rewrite the design guide in consultation with the courts and the Fine Arts Commission. It is my expectation that this will enable the General Services to ultimately control courthouse construction costs with the input of the courts.

S. 1005, not only addresses concerns raised over courthouse construction, but it also will require the General Services Administration to file a biennial public buildings plan, to help the committee to evaluate and set priorities for all projects that require construction, alteration, or leased space—whether it is a courthouse, Federal building, border station et cetera.

In this time of Government downsizing, our Federal agencies will have to justify their priority ranking or request for additional space needs for ultimate approval by both the House and the Senate.

The biennial plan will include a 5-year strategic capital asset management plan. Under the plan, the GSA would be able to take advantage of market changes that affect building construction and availability, thereby potentially saving our American taxpayer dollars.

In light of the austere budget environment we are currently operating under, we need reforms in the area of public buildings. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I strongly support S. 1005, and urge its swift passage.

A TRIBUTE TO BILL NAITO, 1925–96

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, Portland, OR, has long been hailed as a city of innovation and vigor. While all denizens of the city bask in that community energy, there are a handful of people who can be credited with fostering Portland's uncommon spirit. Through visionary imagination and bold leadership, they have made Portland the progressive city it is today. Bill Naito, who died last week, was one of those leaders.

Naito was a Portland businessman who combined his business acumen with a deeply-felt sense of civic obligation. Working with his brother, he started his career in 1962 as the proprietor of a bustling import business. The brothers soon bought the building that housed their business, and thus began Bill Naito's long legacy as a property developer. Over the next three decades, he repeatedly built thriving developments in areas shunned by other businessmen. Skid Road, home of the Naito

brothers Import Plaza, grew into revitalized Historic Old Town. An abandoned department store building became the Galleria shopping center, the 1980's anchor of Portland's commercial revitalization. He turned an old warehouse district into the McCormick Pier apartments, luring middle-income residents into downtown Portland.

While he prospered personally from his business initiatives, Bill Naito was generous with his time and assets, and his sense of civic responsibility enriched Portland endlessly. In addition to serving on countless boards and civic organizations, he donated space in office buildings to nonprofit or public agencies. He was a founder of Artquake, a long-running annual arts festival. He also donated land to help launch Saturday Market, a weekly showcase of local performers and artisans that has drawn tourists and suburbanites to downtown Portland for a generation. He was perhaps most popularly noted for preserving the White Stag landmark when the company moved out of Portland. Thanks to Bill Naito's sense of whimsy, each Christmas season west-bound motorists enjoy the White Stag reindeer's illuminated red nose.

Though he was never one to trumpet his own accomplishments, it was clear that Naito took the greatest pride in the creation of the Japanese-American Historical Plaza in Tom McCall Waterfront Park. Naito is the son of Japanese immigrants, and his family was forced to relocate to Utah in 1942 to avoid the internment forced on Portland's Japanese community. Though he seemed to carry little personal bitterness from those war years—in fact, he joined the Army himself in 1944—he worked the rest of his life to make sure that Oregonians wouldn't forget the lessons learned from the Japanese internment. The memorial he spearheaded, dedicated in 1990, is a moving tribute to the families interned during World War II, and serves as a reminder of the guarantees the Bill of Rights provides for us all.

The accomplishments I have enumerated only begin to convey the varied contributions Bill Naito made to Portland throughout his life. This 70-year-old, who worked long days at an age when most men are content in retirement, spent a lifetime fusing community and business pursuits. Bill Naito seemed the image of hard-working vigor and energy when cancer snuck up on him, and he died just a week after being diagnosed. His death saddens those he touched personally, and he enriched the lives of many more Oregonians who live, work, and visit the city to which he brought so much life. The nose of the White Stag reindeer burned red last week in tribute to Bill Naito. Portland has truly lost a treasure, Mr. President, and I want to pay tribute to him again here today. ●

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 57

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, at the request of the Republican leader, I ask unanimous consent that at 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, May 15, the Senate begin consideration of the budget resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, at the request of the Republican leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on today's Executive Calendar: Executive Calendar nomination Nos. 543 through 548, and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Coast Guard.

Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc; that any statements relating to the nominations appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations were considered and confirmed en bloc, as follows:

COAST GUARD

The following regular officers of the United States Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

John E. Shkor	Douglas H. Teeson
Paul E. Busick	Edward J. Barrett
John D. Spade	

The following regular officers of the United States Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of rear admiral (lower half):

Joseph J. McClellan, Jr.	Paul J. Pluta
	Thad W. Allen
John L. Parker	

Vice Adm. James M. Loy, U.S. Coast Guard to be chief of staff, U.S. Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Vice. Adm. Richard D. Herr, U.S. Coast Guard, to be vice commander, U.S. Coast Guard, with the grade of admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. Kent H. Williams, U.S. Coast Guard, to be commander, Atlantic Area. U.S. Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Roger T. Rufe, Jr., U.S. Coast Guard, to be commander, Pacific Area, U.S. Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

The following officer of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve for promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Richard W. Schneider

The following officer of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve for promotion to the grade of rear admiral (lower half):

Jan T. Riker

Coast Guard nominations beginning Michael S. Fijalka, and ending Kimberly J. Nettles, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 28, 1995.

Coast Guard nominations beginning George J. Santa Cruz, and ending Kevin M. Pratt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 22, 1996.

Coast Guard nominations beginning Steven D. Poole, and ending Kevin J. Macnaughton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 9, 1996.

Coast Guard nomination of Sherry A. Comar, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 20, 1996.

Coast Guard nominations beginning Gerald E. Anderson, and ending Constantina A. Stevens, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 1996.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 1996

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 15, further that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, and the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the Senate then begin consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. So the Senate will begin tomorrow morning discussion of the budget resolution. That resolution is limited to a 50-hour statutory time. So we can expect late night sessions and votes throughout the remainder of the week.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after I make a brief statement and the Senator from Mississippi makes a statement and Senator DASCHLE makes a statement that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I will take just a minute of the Senate's time to express my disappointment that we were unable to agree on any of the unanimous-consent requests that we presented to my colleagues on the other side with respect to the pending gas tax repeal, the TEAM Act, minimum wage, taxpayer bill of rights, and the White House travel legislation.

It was my hope that we could reach an understanding. I thought, based on conversations, we might be able to work out some procedure to ensure that the three main issues—the gas tax repeal, the TEAM Act, and the minimum wage were split into three separate bills—that the Senate would be able to reach an agreement on an overall consent that would include these issues in a relatively short timeframe. But unfortunately that does not seem to be the case.

I think it is fair to say that we have offered pretty much what my colleagues had requested, with some minor changes, a consent agreement that does, in fact, divide the three issues into separate bills and limits time on each issue. I think they could be concluded in as little as 5 or 6 hours.

But now I understand that there are additional requests to not only separate the issues, but also to require the approval of the final language that the House is marking up in the committee today relative to the minimum wage. Obviously, I cannot dictate what the House does with minimum wage and cannot ensure what might finally come out of the conference.

But it seems to me that what we should do is move ahead before Memorial Day, resolve these three issues, as well as the taxpayer bill of rights, which I understand there is no opposition to.

The gas tax repeal is being held hostage because of the demands about the minimum wage. The so-called TEAM Act is unacceptable to my colleagues on the other side. I understand there will be a filibuster on that issue. I guess the bottom line is, we have been trying to figure out some way to resolve this issue. We have not reached it yet.

I do not believe we will ever be in a position to say to my colleagues on the other side that we will guarantee, notwithstanding it is a Republican House of Representatives and a Republican Senate, that you draft the minimum wage proposal. I do not think that will happen because we have some ideas, amendments for the minimum wage. I do not know what my House colleagues have in mind, but they may report that out later on today.

So I just suggest that we continue to work with the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE. Time is running. I hope that we can act on all these issues prior to Memorial Day. But this week we will probably be on the budget. Next week we hope to do the missile defense measure, along with the DOD authorization bill. That would not leave a lot of time for these three issues.

So I just want to report to the Senate that we have not given up. But I do not believe we can ever agree that, in effect, we first have to clear it with the President before we pass it. I am not certain that will ever happen.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader as to the desire to find a way to finish our work on all of these important matters prior to Memorial Day. I am relatively optimistic that is possible.

The majority leader indicated that it is very difficult to make some assumption with regard to what the House may do on minimum wage. I understand what is normally a difficult set of circumstances in anticipating anything that the House would or would not do, but I am all the more confident that it is possible, given what has just happened on the budget.

The distinguished majority leader asked if we could go to the budget in an expeditious way tomorrow. We are prepared to do that. I have indicated to him after consulting with a number of my colleagues that is possible. I want to go back to that point in a moment.

That entire budget was preconferenced by Senate and House Republicans. Every single detail of the budget we are going to get tomorrow was preconferenced with the House. They decided what the defense number was. They decided what the discretionary number was. They decided what the tax number was. They decided what the entitlement numbers were. They decided what the overall budget plan would be. All of it was done.

It seems to me if we can negotiate an entire budget for 6 years with the House of Representatives, certainly we could find our way to do one tiny little bill on the minimum wage. I hope we could find a way with which to address that. We have been working in good faith with the majority leader to find a way to make that happen. I feel we are making progress in that regard. All we are asking is one tiny little bill. The minimum wage is a tiny bill. But it has profound repercussions for the economic well being, the lives of millions and millions of people.

As the majority leader made reference last week to rocket scientists, it does not take a rocket scientist to recognize the House could come up with a package surrounding the minimum wage increase that might be unacceptable. To declare this agreement acceptable, without any assurance of what the House would do—the House could come up with a package that we have to vote against, that the President would have to veto—that is no agreement, Mr. President. That is not what we are attempting to do. We want to find a way to accommodate the concerns of the majority in dealing with this tax issue in spite of the fact we have very serious misgivings on our side. We will have some amendments to address those misgivings.

The Travel Office legislation—again, some of us have very serious misgivings in terms of the precedent it would set. We want to deal with that. Obviously, there is the TEAM Act, about which we have extraordinary misgivings. We will deal with that. Then there is the taxpayer bill of rights for which there is apparently some consensus. We will deal with that. Those are four pieces of legislation the majority wants to deal with. We say we want one, the minimum wage. All we ask is that we are not going to be embarrassed in coming to an agreement that ultimately allows us this freestanding vote that we all say we want but then the President will have to veto. That is not acceptable. Everybody understands that. That is all we are saying—continue to work, ensure we know what the House's intentions are. If we can do it on a complete budget agreement, it seems to me we can do it on one little bill, the minimum wage bill. That is what we are talking about.

Now, with regard to the budget, as I said, I have agreed to go to the budget resolution early tomorrow, after consultation with our caucus at noon and with individual Members who raised some very serious concerns and even though we have not yet been allowed to see the report. We are not going to make a big deal of the fact we do not have a report. Our colleagues on the Budget Committee were not even allowed to write it. No minority report. That was not allowed. There was no consultation with Democrats, at all—locked out completely.

This proposal is the most partisan budget we have seen in many, many years. In fact, at the news conference I recall, the Nation was told this is a Bob Dole budget. It was not the Senate Budget Committee document. We were told, ''This is the Bob Dole budget.'' I must say, with all this interest in bipartisanship and accommodation and cooperation, when it came to the budget, we are not getting a great deal of it. We have not seen much yet. What goes around comes around.

In spite of the fact that we have not been given very much, if any, consideration with regard to the budget so far procedurally, and it is going to get worse, we will go to the budget resolution and, eventually, to the three reconciliation bills that in my view are flatout illegal. We will have to face all of that in the future. We will go to the budget tomorrow, because in good faith we are trying to work through these things. We will try to deal with the budget. And we are trying to deal with these five bills. But we will not be pushed.

I have had to assure my colleagues we will take all the time we need to have a good debate, to offer amendments. We will do all of that. We will

go to the floor tomorrow as requested of us in order to accommodate the majority in what we know to be a very full schedule. I hope we can continue to work. I am very hopeful we can achieve all that I know the distinguished majority leader wants to accomplish prior to the time we get into the Memorial Day recess.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. My question, just so I am fully in tune with the points you were making, the majority leader is telling us that he cannot accommodate us in terms of the minimum wage; he says he cannot have any control over the way it is handled in the House. What I heard my leader say is when it comes to the budget, which is a huge document and is actually a 6-year budget, that, in fact, there was cooperation between the Senate Republicans and the House Republicans. They did, in fact, preconference many of these issues so that they were in step.

Am I right in assuming when it comes to the minimum wage, the majority leader says: Gee, he just cannot control it, so we could agree to all the other measures. You point out this caucus on this side is split on something because we so much want to see the minimum wage take effect and start helping people, millions of people. I might say the majority of them are women, and we talk a lot about the gender gap around here. I think the women in this country know who is fighting for them.

When it comes to this, we could give away our position, our leverage, and wind up with all the other bills and not the minimum wage increase. Is that the fear that has been expressed by the Democrat leader?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator from California says it so ably and succinctly. That is our concern. She used the word ''cooperation'' between the House and the Senate. It was cooperation. But I did not go further. It was absolute unanimity, agreement right down the line, word for word, paragraph for paragraph, provision for provision. There was no disagreement. The joint news conferences by the chairs of both the House and the Senate Budget Committees certainly made that point. There was no disagreement whatsoever. Normally you would expect cooperation. This was lockstep agreement on every single detail of a 6-year budget agreement.

It seems to me with that kind of precedent there ought to be an opportunity for one little bill, this minimum wage bill, which has such a profound effect on so many people all through the country. That is all we are hoping to do. I intend to work with the majority leader to ensure that happens. I yield the floor.

GAS TAX REPEAL, MINIMUM WAGE, AND THE BUDGET

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it is unfortunate, indeed, that we are not getting a vote on the repeal of the gasoline tax that was imposed in 1993, the 4.3-cent gasoline tax that has been debated and discussed here on the floor for these past 2 weeks now.

When the Senate came back into session following the recent recess, the majority leader indicated to the Senate that the order of business would be that we would debate and dispose of the so-called taxpayer bill of rights, legislation that has been reported from the Senate Finance Committee, that had been discussed for some time over a period of the last several years; as a matter of fact, a priority of Senators on both sides of the aisle. I can recall when my good friend from Arkansas, Senator PRYOR, introduced legislation along that line some time ago and invited Senators to cosponsor. I joined in cosponsoring the legislation.

There have been enactments of similar legislation in the past but this seemed to address the current problems. It had bipartisan support. To that legislation, the majority leader proposed to add a temporary repeal of the gasoline tax that had been imposed at the President's request, and with the opposition, the active opposition of all Republicans in the Congress.

The fact of the matter is, this was a part of the initial deficit reduction package proposed by President Clinton soon after he came into office. It was opposed by Republicans because for the first time there would be Federal taxation of gasoline that would not be earmarked for road and bridge construction under the Highway Trust Fund Act.

Gasoline, tires, batteries, and accessories had been taxed in the past, at the initiative of President Eisenhower some time ago, to try to build a national defense highway system. It was thought at the time that the American people would support that, if the highway users could support and pay for it through Federal taxes on gasoline, oil, batteries, and the like, those things that would be purchased by the users of the Nation's highways, those funds would be dedicated for that purpose.

Now, President Clinton comes into office as President and, for the first time, suggests that there be a Federal tax on gasoline that would go into the General Treasury, which would not be a part of the highway trust fund. There was strong objection to that. We had a rollcall vote in the Congress, and Republicans unanimously voted against that tax. With gasoline prices rising, with people finding it more and more difficult to operate their trucks and cars with these new, high prices, it was appropriate, in the view of this side of the aisle, that we act to repeal, temporarily, that gasoline tax.

Mrs. BOXER. Will my friend yield for a question?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mrs. BOXER. I have a question because my friend made a statement that President Clinton was the first President to suggest that gasoline taxes be used to reduce the deficit. In 1990, under George Bush, there was a tax put in until 1995 on gasoline which was used to reduce the deficit. It was part of an agreement under the leadership of President Bush. So I just wanted to know whether my friend was aware of that.

Mr. COCHRAN. I would like to respond by saying I do not think that was a suggestion by President Bush. I think at the time of that summit——

Mrs. BOXER. He signed onto it. It happened under his administration, and he signed the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not yield further, Mr. President. I am responding to the Senator's question. I will continue to respond. That summit meeting was held for a lot of purposes, to try to deal with a lot of issues that had been brought up in the Congress. The gasoline tax was not proposed by President Bush.

I stand by what I said. President Clinton is the first President who suggested an addition to the gasoline tax that would not be used as a part of the highway trust fund.

The fact is, the Republican leader in the Senate proposed that there be a repeal of this 1993 tax. He stated the reasons for it. It had almost unanimous support on this side of the aisle and, I think, support on the Democratic side as well. What happened next was, the Democrats offered an amendment that they wanted to have voted on before the gasoline tax repeal would be voted on, which was to increase the minimum wage. Now, it is not unusual to have some Senator offer an amendment on a completely different subject from the legislation that is pending before the Senate. It is one of the unique characteristics of the Senate that any Senator on either side of the aisle, at any time, can offer an amendment to any bill or any other amendment and discuss the merits of that proposal without interruption for as long as that Senator seeks to do so, or at least until 60 Senators vote to impose cloture and cut off debate. That is one of the unique features of this body. So I am not criticizing Senators who seek to use the rules to call to the attention of the Senate a matter of some urgency that needs the immediate consideration of the U.S. Congress.

What is curious about that proposal and that amendment, though, was that, for 2 years, the Democrats controlled both Houses of Congress and the administration. President Clinton came into office talking about giving a middle-class tax cut, talking about helping working people meet their goals and achieve their ambitions. Not once did a committee chaired by a Democratic Senator report out legislation to increase the minimum wage. Not once did a Democratic Senator offer an amendment to any bill to increase the

minimum wage and call this to the attention of the Senate as some matter of urgency or something that would have merit and ought to be considered by the Congress. But it was advanced as a way to prevent a vote on the repeal of a tax, a temporary repeal of a gasoline tax. It was suggested that this was of such grave national urgency—the increase in the minimum wage—that it ought to be considered in advance of any other issue that could be brought before or considered or voted on by the U.S. Senate.

Now, if that is not political posturing and grandstanding, I do not know what is. The fact is, for 2 long years, the Democrats—suggesting that they are the friends of the working man, they are going to do what they can to help make life better for those who work for a living—never suggested through legislative proposals on this floor of this Senate that the minimum wage should be increased.

But at a time when there was a matter brought up by the Republican leader, who is in charge of the schedule of the Senate, for the orderly consideration of legislation that there be a repeal of the gasoline tax that this President requested be imposed and which the Democrats had agreed to impose, there was this cry to, ''Wait, you cannot even vote on that in the Senate until you not only vote on, but commit yourself to and enact an increase in the minimum wage.'' There is a difference between a vote on an amendment, or debate of an amendment, and a vote on a motion to table that amendment or a vote on that amendment as amended.

Any Senator has the right, as I said, under the rules—and we are not criticizing that right—to suggest a change in the law, to suggest a discussion on any subject at any time. The purpose for that is so that no one party, no one leader, no one region, no one faction can keep the Senate from considering an issue that is of importance to the national interest. No one can keep that from happening. No one is that powerful in the U.S. Senate. No party is that powerful, no majority so great that that is prohibited or frustrated. That is why the Senate is so unique.

In the House of Representatives, for example, on the other hand, if a Member of that body wanted to offer an amendment or call to the attention of the House of Representatives some issue, it would have to be approved by the Rules Committee, first of all. The Rules Committee is dominated by members of one party. That is the way it is. The Rules Committee is an arm of the leadership of the House of Representatives. In my experience as a member of the other body, even if you are a Member of the legislative standing committee and would like to offer an amendment in that committee for consideration, you have very little chance of success, if the chairman of that committee is intent on defeating your amendment, in getting an amendment approved by that legislative committee and then finding its way to the floor as a part of a bigger bill.

Now, I will admit that, in recent years and since I have been in the Senate, those rules have been modified somewhat, I am told. But I can recall when it was nigh unto impossible to bring an issue to the attention of the House of Representatives on the floor of the House—except in a 1-minute speech, but I am talking about in a vehicle that could be voted on or enacted—without the permission of the higher-ups, the leadership, the people who control the House.

Well, that is not the case in the Senate. We are all members of the Rules Committee here. Every Senator has a right to say what should be discussed or debated or considered by the U.S. Senate and can bring that issue up at any time there is a legislative issue on the floor of the Senate. So that is what the Democrats did and took advantage of for the opportunity to bring to the attention of the Senate the minimum wage issue. But what needs to be remembered in all of this as we proceed now to consider the budget resolution instead of the taxpayer bill of rights, which has been on the schedule and scheduled for consideration by the leader, is that this is being used as a device to prevent the Senate from conducting the business that was proposed to be conducted by the Republican leader. He has sought to reach an agreement for consideration of a minimum wage amendment, and he has done that in a variety of different configurations—that there be three separate bills, that there be separate votes on amendments. There have been negotiations now for the last 2 weeks, and a strong effort has been made by the Democratic leader, I must say—and I agree that he has made every effort—to resolve some of these differences about how we proceed to consider the gas tax repeal, the minimum wage issue, and other labor related issues. The TEAM Act has been discussed as well.

I might say that the Democratic leader suggested that now it is a part of the requirement that is being made for proceeding by the other side that the bill, as passed by the House containing the minimum wage increase, must be subject to review before any agreement for consideration of that issue can be made here in the Senate for the purpose of ensuring that whatever amendment is adopted here would not cause that bill, as passed by the House, to be vetoed by the President.

So what is being sought is not an opportunity to debate an issue of some national urgency, not an effort to vote on an issue to put Senators on record, but to enact a change in the law. That sounds sort of like extortion, does it not? It sounds like extortion. It may not technically and legally be extortion but it sounds like it to me.

Well, where we are now is, with the agreement of the Democrats, we are proceeding next to consider the budget resolution which we ought to do. And we all agree, Republicans and Democrats alike, that we ought to proceed to the consideration of the budget resolution because it is a matter of high priority. And in the orderly course of legislative process following the budget resolution we will be able to then take up bills to reconcile the law with the resolution, requiring reductions in spending, or changes in the law so that we can achieve the goals set forth in the budget resolution, and so that the appropriations bills can be enacted consistent with the limits that will be contained in the budget resolution.

So as we begin the funding process for the departments of the Government for the fiscal year that begins on October 1, we will not see—I hope we will not see—what we saw last year. And that was a logjam of activities that frustrated the orderly funding and authorization of Government programs so that there were shutdowns, there were conflicts—some serious—between the House and Senate, between Senators and among Congressmen of both parties, and with the President that we had the frustrating experience of seeing the Government actually having to shut down because of the inability of the Congress and the President to agree on the levels of funding for various activities.

So it is with the hope that we will avoid that result this year that we can agree quickly on a resolution on the budget, then move to the timely consideration of reconciliation bills and appropriations bills, and conclude this session of the Congress in a way that serves the collective interests of the American people. That is my hope. I did not say that ''serves'' the interest of a political party. I think there has been too much consideration in this body this year and last of what serves the interests of the political factions and not what proposals are really going to solve the problems this country faces.

Some of us think the gasoline tax repeal would help solve a problem, that taxes are too high. Republicans are on record wanting to vote on that right now and to take up other tax reduction measures, too, as a part of the budget resolution, and we will get to that.

But I am hopeful that the beginning of the debate on the budget resolution may signal a turn, a change in direction, at least in emphasis between political posturing and a good-faith committed effort toward achieving goals like reducing the deficit, tax reform, welfare reform, making Government more efficient, eliminating unnecessary and wasteful uses of tax dollars and all the rest that go into making for good Government and Government that is one that restores the confidence of the American people in our political system. That is important.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I note the order is to go out. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, very much, Mr. President.

I listened carefully to my friend and to my colleagues on the other side as well as to the Democratic leader. I would like to put a little bit of perspective on where I see we are as my friends have done; my friend from Mississippi.

First, I would like to bring out—in my question to him he was very kind enough to yield to me on—that in fact this is not the first time the gas tax has been used to reduce the deficit. Actually it came about under a Republican President, George Bush, a temporary tax for 5 years to reduce the deficit.

My friend made the point, Well, it was not George Bush's idea. I do not know whose idea it was. Although I served at that time on the Budget Committee of the House, I was not at Andrews Air Force Base. But the President then, President Bush, a Republican President, agreed that we needed to reduce the deficit, and that was part of the plan. So this is not the first time gas taxes have been used to reduce the deficit.

I have to say that what is so interesting to me is the passion that we see coming from the other side of the aisle on this reduction of the gas tax of 4.5 cents, a passion that goes so deeply that they do not even have anything in their bill that would make sure it goes back to the drivers. We have experts from all over the country saying that in fact it is very probable that the decrease in the tax would go into the pockets of the oil refiners, and we are going to try on this side—and we hope this comes up; we are all supporting bringing these bills up—that we can amend it in such a way to ensure that the oil companies have to give it back.

So I find the passion on the other side about returning $27 a year to the average driver without any guarantee that they will get it—I find it interesting since there is a lack of passion when it comes to an increase in minimum wage, which is at a 40-year low in terms of its buying power, an increase in wages for millions of people to the tune of $1,800 a year. And it would make a difference because I have met some of those working people. They work hard, and they have a hard time getting health insurance and paying for it. They have a hard time meeting their obligations. Sometimes they have to choose between going to a doctor or forgoing that for food on the table. These are real people, and where is the passion on that side? It is not there, and God bless the American people. Seventy percent of them agree that we ought to have an increase in the minimum wage.

And my friend says, ''Where are the Democrats? Why didn't they bring it up before?'' We probably should have, you know. We miscalculated. We brought up the health care issue because we wanted to help working people, and we decided that we made an error in that regard to go with health care first. And we know we overreached, and we all know that we made a mistake. I am not afraid to admit mistakes.

Now I hope we can get to the Kennedy bill to start addressing the issue of health care. But the fact of the matter is we postponed it, and that makes it all the more important to get it done now, Mr. President, because inflation continues to move. It is at a low level. But still, it moves. The minimum wage is not tied to inflation, as we all know. Congress can make it better. It has been my privilege to vote for the increases before—the last one under George Bush, where we came together as Republicans and Democrats.

All we are asking on this side of the aisle is that you are passionate about the repeal of the gas tax, most of which is going to go to the oil companies. How about showing a little compassion and action for the people who work so hard for a minimum wage?

If you have that same commitment with us, let us pass both bills. Let us get them to the President's desk. He says he will sign them both. He says he will sign them both. So instead of working at cross purposes, let us work together. It simply is not enough to say, well, we cannot guarantee what the House will do. I served over there for a long time, and my friend is right. There are different rules over there. But it turned out in the budget, in a document that addresses the issues for the next 6, 7 years in our country, there was no problem between the majority here and the majority there. Every issue, every detail was talked out before, and everyone here knows what the budget is going to look like. We are going to debate that tomorrow, and I cannot wait to debate that budget. I cannot wait to point out the differences between the two sides, but I will wait until tomorrow to do that, because we see huge differences in the parties in that document, which is really the vision of the future for this country.

The point that the Democratic leader was making, I thought quite eloquently, is this, simply, that if a budget that is so complicated and so large and so encompassing, with so many issues, can be preconferenced between the House and Senate Republicans, why can they not come up with a clearly defined way to assure us that a minimum wage bill will get to the President's desk. You know on the other side how strongly we feel about that.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. My question is whether or not the Senator is aware that today the leadership on the House side, the Speaker and the majority leader, sent a letter to the Republican leader here—a copy was given to the Democratic leader—which says as follows:

> In the next 2 weeks, the House will consider H.R. 2391 to allow low wage earners greater choice and flexibility in their work schedules. At that time, the Rules Committee will make in order an amendment to increase the minimum wage as well as other amendments to create jobs, expand worker training and education opportunities, and increase take-home pay for low wage workers. It complements our belief that a first job is the best training for life-long success in the world of work. We look forward to taking this measure to conference with the Senate and getting legislation to the President's desk.

Is the Senator aware that that commitment has been made?

Mrs. BOXER. Absolutely. And let me tell the Senator, that is exactly the problem. What we are asking for is a clean minimum wage bill. We agreed to a clean, temporary repeal of the gas tax. We want a clean bill that increases the minimum wage. That is all we want.

What my friend read makes the point of why the Democratic leader is not going to go down this road with you. I have been around this place for a while. We do not even know what all those things mean—a guarantee of greater take-home pay. We do not know what all these things mean. You could cut Social Security and you might wind up with a bigger paycheck, too. We do not know what that means.

So the bottom line is, my friend made my point. A vague promise that in 2 weeks there will be another bill to which they will attach an amendment on minimum wage is not the vehicle. The President wants to break the logjam. He said: Send me a clean repeal of the gas tax and send me a clean increase on the minimum wage.

I think the Democratic leader has laid it out. That is what we want, and that is not what we are getting. So I think we have a capability of coming together here. We are friends. I think we can come together as legislators. It is pretty easy. Let us make sure we have a package that results in a separate bill going to the President's desk on minimum wage and a separate bill on the gas tax.

My friend mentioned other issues that are important to his side. We are willing to let those go through if we have an opportunity to amend, and so on, even though some of us have reservations about them. But that is not what has happened. So I think you are going to see Democrats in the Senate stand pretty firm. We are willing to give and give and give. We want to get a little. And when I say a little, I mean a little.

We are talking about a minimum wage bill. We think it is good for the country. We know that workers are under stress today. We know there is downward pressure on wages. We know

the minimum wage is at a 40-year low. We know that 58 percent of the people on minimum wage are women who are struggling. The majority leader says he wants to get hold of that gender gap and make it smaller. He has a shot at doing that, it seems to me, if he would embrace this idea. If we could send a clean bill to the President, that is going to be good for the country, good for women, good for families.

So I think we are really close to an agreement, I say to my friend. We are getting there. And I think if the majority leader would work with the leadership in the House the way he did on the budget, getting certain guarantees, getting agreement on how both Houses would handle it and do the same thing on minimum wages, we will be here passing that minimum wage, addressing the issue of the gas tax and the other issues that my friend is anxious to address.

So I look forward to seeing us move together. I think the American people want us to reach across the party aisle. They are really crying out for that. And we have an opportunity to do it. I think the President gave us the way. He said: Send me a clean bill on the gas tax; send me a clean bill on minimum wage.

I think we can make that happen. And if we do, everyone has fulfilled his or her responsibility, it seems to me, to his or her constituencies.

So I am not overly pessimistic at the turn of events because I think we are making some progress, but I think we can really do better. I look forward to the budget debate that is coming tomorrow. I look forward to debating my friend again on some of those issues—Medicare, Medicaid, education, environment, deficit reduction, earned income tax credit. These are so important to the well-being of the people.

With an increase in the minimum wage, I have to say that can do more to change the lives of working people for the better than almost anything else we can do. And I hope we will see it done. I hope we will cross party lines to do it. I might note that we have been blocked from doing it. A majority of the Senate has voted to increase the minimum wage. The majority leader has filled the tree to block us from offering it on certain bills. I just look forward to the day when the majority here, the majority of Senators here, get to vote on that minimum wage and we do the business of the people.

I thank the Presiding Officer very much.

Mr. President, as I understand it, this has completed the Senate's business.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate now stands in adjournment until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:58 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 15, 1996, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 14, 1996:

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF ADMIRAL IN THE U.S. NAVY WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. J. PAUL REASON, 000–00–0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL IN THE U.S. NAVY WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. (SELECTEE) PATRICIA A TRACEY, 000–00–0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL IN THE U.S. NAVY WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. (SELECTEE) JAMES O. ELLIS, JR., 000–00–0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT AS RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PERFORM DUTIES AS INDICATED.

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

THOMAS R. BIRD, 000–00–0000
WILLIAM A. DYKES, JR., 000–00–0000

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 12203 AND 8379, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE. PROMOTIONS MADE UNDER SECTION 8379 AND CONFIRMED BY THE SENATE UNDER SECTION 12203 SHALL BEAR AN EFFECTIVE DATE ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 8374, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.

LINE

WARREN J. ANDERSEN, 000–00–0000
PHILIP M. BENDER, 000–00–0000
MICHAEL F. BROWN, 000–00–0000
ROGER C. CHENOWETH, 000–00–0000
RAFAEL A. ROVIRA, 000–00–0000
RAYMOND R. TERRY, 000–00–0000
KIMBERLY A. TOWNSEND, 000–00–0000
BARCLAY A. TREHAL, 000–00–0000

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERALS DEPARTMENT

To be lieutenant colonel

GRANT V. BERGGREN, 000–00–0000
ESTHER A. RADA, 000–00–0000

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

STEVEN P. CORUM, 000–00–0000
RALPH S. ENGLISH, 000–00–0000
JULIUS JEFFERSON, 000–00–0000

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

PETER J. GOODMAN, 000–00–0000

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

DOUGLAS T. CROMACK, 000–00–0000
ERIK L. JOHNSON, 000–00–0000
LEROY H. PARKS, 000–00–0000

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

MARK S. JOHNSON, 000–00–0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE U.S. AIR FORCE UNDER SECTION 307 OF TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE, AND SECTIONS 12203 AND 8363 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

To be colonel

LINE

KENNETY D. ALLEN, JR., 000–00–0000
MYRON G. ASHCRAFT, 000–00–0000
ANTHONY AUGELLO, 000–00–0000
PATRICK A. AYRES, 000–00–0000
RONALD D. BALL, 000–00–0000
TERRY R. BISTODEAU, 000–00–0000
GERARD A. BRANGENBERG, 000–00–0000
BRADLEY H. COPELAND, 000–00–0000
GARY A. CORBETT, 000–00–0000
WILLIAM R. COTNEY, 000–00–0000
BILL J. COX, 000–00–0000
THOMAS N. EDMONDS, 000–00–0000
RONALD G. ELLIOTT, 000–00–0000
JAMES H. FLYNN, 000–00–0000
DAVID V. GARDNER, 000–00–0000
LARS G. GRANATH, 000–00–0000
JAMES B. HAMILTON, 000–00–0000
ELWYN R., HARRIS, JR., 000–00–0000
WILLIE D. HARRIS III, 000–00–0000
EMIL D. HARVEY, JR., 000–00–0000
RICHARD C. HASTINGS, JR., 000–00–0000
WILLARD G. HILL, 000–00–0000
ROBERT E. HORSTMAN, 000–00–0000
CHARLES V. ICKES II, 000–00–0000
STEPHEN A. JAMESON, 000–00–0000
PETER M. JANAROS, 000–00–0000
ROBERT J. JARECKE, 000–00–0000
DAVID L. JONES, 000–00–0000
WALTER K. KANEAKUA, JR., 000–00–0000
JAMES C. KAPITAN, 000–00–0000
RONALD A. KEITH, 000–00–0000
DAVID D. KIRTLEY, 000–00–0000
CARL J. KOCK, 000–00–0000
CRAIG L. LARCOM, 000–00–0000
ALEXANDER T. MAHON, 000–00–0000
MARION J. MARTIN, 000–00–0000
VERNON D. MARTIN, 000–00–0000
DAVID V. MASSEY, 000–00–0000
HOWARD F. MAY, 000–00–0000
DONALD E. MCKELVEY, JR., 000–00–0000
CLINTON E, MCNABB, 000–00–0000
RONALD G. MOORE, 000–00–0000
KEVIN L. MORRIS, 000–00–0000
MARK R. MUSICK, 000–00–0000
ROGER C. NAFZIGER, 000–00–0000
VICTOR S. NATIELLO, 000–00–0000
PETER S. PAWLING, 000–00–0000
MANUEL G. PEREIRA, 000–00–0000
JESS B. PITTS, 000–00–0000
WILLIAM K. RICHARDSON, 000–00–0000
ROBERT B. ROESSLER, 000–00–0000
EUGENE SALANIUK, 000–00–0000
WILLIAM N. SEARCY, 000–00–0000
GARY M. SHANNON, 000–00–0000
HOMER A. SMITH, 000–00–0000
DERLE M. SNYDER, 000–00–0000
RALPH B. STEWART, JR., 000–00–0000
CHARLES W. WARREN, 000–00–0000
HERBERT C. WHEELER, 000–00–0000
LAWRENCE H. WOODBURY, 000–00–0000
JAMES R. WYNNE, 000–00–0000

CHAPLAIN CORPS

GEORGE F. ZECK, 000–00–0000

JUDGE ADVOCATE

ROLAND F. BERLINGO, 000–00–0000
WILLIAM H. ELLIS, JR. 000–00–0000
ROBERT I. GRUBER, 000–00–0000
ALEXANDER S. NICHOLAS 000–00–0000
JAMES E. THOMPSON, 000–00–0000
FANK A. TITUS, 000–00–0000

MEDICAL CORPS

MICHAEL N. BROTHERS, 000–00–0000
JAMES D. FEARL, 000–00–0000
EARL R. HARRISON JR., 000–00–0000
CLARENCE J. HINDMAN, 000–00–0000
CHARLES E. KELLY, 000–00–0000
ROGER W. KEMP, 000–00–0000
MICHAEL J. PALETTA, 000–00–0000
RICHARD B. TERRY, 000–00–0000

NURSE CORPS

SUSAN J. AUGUSTUS, 000–00–0000
CAROL ANN FAUSONE, 000–00–0000

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

ALBERT L. SHERBURNE, 000–00–0000

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive Nominations Confirmed by the Senate May 14, 1996:

IN THE COAST GUARD

VICE ADMIRAL RICHARD D. HERR, U.S. COAST GUARD TO BE VICE COMMANDANT, U.S. COAST GUARD, WITH THE GRADE OF ADMIRAL WHILE SO SERVING.

THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE'S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

THE FOLLOWING REGULAR OFFICERS OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL:

JOHN E. SHKOR
PAUL E. BUSICK
JOHN D. SPADE
DOUGLAS H. TEESON
EDWARD J. BARRETT

THE FOLLOWING REGULAR OFFICERS OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF):

JOSEPH J. MCCLELLAND, JR.
JOHN L. PARKER
PAUL J. PLUTA
THAD W. ALLEN

VICE ADMIRAL JAMES M. LOY, U.S. COAST GUARD TO BE CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. COAST GUARD, WITH THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE SO SERVING.

VICE ADMIRAL KENT H. WILLIAMS, U.S. COAST GUARD TO BE COMMANDER ATLANTIC AREA, U.S. COAST GUARD, WITH THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE SO SERVING.

REAR ADMIRAL ROGER T. RUFE, JR., U.S. COAST GUARD, TO BE COMMANDER, PACIFIC AREA, U.S. COAST GUARD, WITH THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE SO SERVING.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING MICHAEL S. FIJALKA, AND ENDING KIMBERLY J. NETTLES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 28, 1995.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING GEORGE J. SANTA CRUZ, AND ENDING KEVIN M. PRATT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 22, 1996.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING STEVEN D. POOLE, AND ENDING KEVIN J. MACNAUGHTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 9, 1996.

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF SHERRY A. COMAR, WHICH NOMINATION WAS RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 20, 1996.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING GERALD E. ANDERSON, AND ENDING CONSTANTINA A. STEVENS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 5, 1996.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING STEPHEN ADLER, AND ENDING KIMBERLY ZUST, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 11, 1996.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING RICHARD W. SCHNEIDER, AND ENDING JAN T. RIKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 22, 1996.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO BISHOP AND MRS. COUSIN OF THE BRIDGE STREET A.M.E. CHURCH AS THEY HOST THE 174TH NEW YORK CONFERENCE OF THE AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Philip Robert Cousin, Sr., the 96th Bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal denomination as he joins over 100,000 congregants from throughout New York State and the Nation to celebrate their religious and cultural heritage, while also attending worship and legislative sessions. Founded in 1787, the African Methodist Episcopal church is the oldest of its kind in the United States and has grown up to 7,000 churches nationwide. Bishop Cousin has worked tirelessly to mobilize African-American communities throughout the United States with his spiritual strength and courageous leadership. The people of Brooklyn and New York have benefitted a great deal from Bishop Cousin and the Bridge Street A.M.E. church as he hosts another spiritually enlightening conference.

I would also like to honor Mrs. Margaret Joan Cousin for her work in expanding AIDS education and awareness within the African-American community in the United States. As a dedicated leader and educator, Mrs. Cousin was responsible for developing the national standard for a curriculum in African-American culture, education and history—a model that has been adopted by academic institutions nationwide. Her work as a teacher in North Carolina has earned her the esteemed honor of Teacher of the Year, and was awarded Supervisor of Quadrennium by the Women's Missionary Society from 1987 to 1991. Mrs. Cousin has brought boundless energy and vision to the Eleventh and First Episcopal Districts of the African Methodist Episcopal Church with her focus on AIDS education.

It pleases me greatly to participate in this historic conference. I wish all the friends, families, ministers, community leaders and supporters of the Bridge Street African Methodist Episcopal Church abundant success in organizing the New York annual conference.

KATHRYN SOSINSKI, LeGRAND SMITH SCHOLARSHIP WINNER

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let it be known, that it is with great respect for the outstanding record of excellence she has compiled in academics, leadership and community service, that I am proud to salute Kathryn Sosinski, winner of the 1996 LeGrand Smith Scholarship. This award is made to young adults who have demonstrated that they are truly committed to playing important roles in our Nation's future.

As a winner of the LeGrand Smith Scholarship, Kathryn is being honored for demonstrating that same generosity of spirit, intelligence, responsible citizenship, and capacity for human service that distinguished the late LeGrand Smith of Somerset, MI.

Kathryn Sosinski is an exceptional student at Bronson High School and possesses an impressive high school record. Kathryn's involvement in student government and school activities began her freshman year and continued through her senior year as the class president. She is a member of the National Honor Society and the Varsity Club. Kathryn was a member of the homecoming court and attended Girl's State. Outside of school, Kathryn has spent much of her time volunteering for several local organizations.

In special tribute, therefore, I am proud to join with her many admirers in extending my highest praise and congratulations to Kathryn Sosinski for her selection as a winner of a LeGrand Smith Scholarship. This honor is also a testament to the parents, teachers, and others whose personal interest, strong support, and active participation contributed to her success. To this remarkable young woman, I extend my most heartfelt good wishes for all her future endeavors.

NATIONAL COALITION OF TITLE I/CHAPTER 1 PARENTS—REGION II 22d ANNUAL IN-SERVICE PARENT TRAINING CONFERENCE

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 31, 1996, at the Sheraton Hotel in Eatontown, NJ, the National Coalition of Title I/Chapter 1 Parents—Region II will hold its 22d Annual In-Service Parent Training Conference.

It is with great honor that I pay tribute to the National Coalition of Title I/Chapter 1 Parents and proclaim this day as ''Title I Day''. Title I is the largest federally funded elementary and secondary education program. Evolving from President Lyndon Johnson's Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I has provided academic assistance to economically and educationally disadvantaged children. In a time when spending cuts for educational programs are threatening the futures of our children, I have stood up to defend and maintain the educational system in this country. It is a welcome relief to see the fine work that this organization is responsible for and to know that parents everywhere are receiving the necessary assistance for improving the quality of their children's education.

Mr. Speaker, this 22d annual conference is an important event and one that should remind us all of the importance of a sound educational system and the future of our children that we hold in our hands.

TEN YEARS OF SERVICE BY THE INTERFAITH SHELTER NETWORK

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate 10 years of dedicated service by 10,000 volunteers of the Interfaith Shelter Network in San Diego County, CA.

Ten years ago, the Network began as an idea in the minds of several people who were trying to resolve some problems of the homeless in the region. In 1985, the Network was formed as a joint effort between San Diego County community, civic, and religious leaders—and it started on a small scale, with approximately a dozen congregations.

The Network offers 8 to 10 weeks of shelter for each participating guest who is referred by a social service agency. Congregations provide sleeping accommodations and meals as the guests work on transitional plans with their social service agencies to get back into their own housing. Participating congregations have developed a family-style environment where the volunteers become an important extended family for their guests.

Responding to the need with rapid growth, the Interfaith Shelter Network now includes more than 130 Christian, Jewish, and Baha'i congregations in seven regions of San Diego County. More than 4,100 people have been provided with over 81,000 nights of shelter—and more than half of the 4,100 guests have left the Network's shelters for their own housing. When the program started, many of the people served were single men. Two years ago, families became the largest group served, as they also became the fastest growing segment of the homeless population.

The Network, administered by the Ecumenical Council of San Diego County under the supervision of Executive Director Glenn Allison, began its second program in 1990—the Transitional Housing Program. To date, this new program has assisted more than 25 families, including 110 people, with education and counseling.

The 10th anniversary of the Interfaith Shelter Network will be commemorated with an anniversary service and Thank-You Picnic this coming Sunday, May 19. On this joyous occasion, I commend the Ecumenical Council, the city and county of San Diego, and the many private donors who, with their donations and other means of support, have made the idea of the Network a reality.

I commend the guests of this program who have enriched the lives of their host congregations and those who, with determination, have left the ranks of the homeless.

● This ''bullet'' symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

And I commend the thousands of volunteers from the Christian, Jewish, and Baha'i communities who, with their generosity of time and spirit, have made the Network work.

So often, we look around at the problems overwhelming our cities and despair that nothing can be done. In contrast, the Interfaith Shelter Network is an example of how people can make a positive difference in their communities.

REV. BILLY GRAHAM: A SOCIETY POISED ON THE BRINK OF SELF-DESTRUCTION

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to you and our colleagues the following transcript from the marvelous speech by the Rev. Billy Graham delivered in a jam-packed rotunda on May 2, 1996. I urge everyone to heed its words.

THE HOPE FOR AMERICA

(By Dr. Billy Graham)

Mr. Vice President; Speaker Newt Gingrich; Majority Leader Bob Dole; Senator Strom Thurmond; Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate; distinguished guests and friends.

Ruth and I are overwhelmed by the very kind words that have been spoken today, and especially by the high honor you have just bestowed on both of us. It will always be one of the high points of our lives, and we thank you from the bottom of our hearts for this unforgettable event. We are grateful for all of you in the Senate and House who have had a part in it; and President Clinton for his support in signing the resolution.

As we read the list of distinguished Americans who have received the Congressional Gold Medal in the past—beginning with George Washington in 1776—we know we do not belong in the same company with them, and we feel very unworthy. One reason is because we both know this honor ought to be shared with those who have helped us over the years—some of whom are here today. As a young boy I remember gazing at that famous painting of Washington crossing the Delaware. Only later did it occur to me that Washington did not get across that river by himself. He had the help of others—and that has been true of us as well. Our ministry has been a team effort, and without our associates and our family we never could have accomplished anything.

I am especially grateful my wife Ruth and I are both being given this honor. No one has sacrificed more than Ruth has, or been more dedicated to God's calling for the two of us.

However, I would not be here today receiving this honor if it were not for an event that happened to me many years ago as a teenager on the outskirts of Charlotte, North Carolina. An evangelist came through our town for a series of meetings. I came face-to-face with the fact that God loved me, Billy Graham, and had sent His Son to die for my sin. He told how Jesus rose from the dead to give us hope of eternal life.

I never forgot a verse of Scripture that was quoted. ''As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name'' (*John 1:12,* KJV). That meant that *I* must respond to God's offer of mercy and forgiveness. I had to repent of my own sins and receive Jesus Christ by faith.

When the preacher asked people to surrender their lives to Christ, I responded. I had little or no emotion; I was embarrassed to stand with a number of other people when I knew some of my school peers saw me; but I meant it. And that simple repentance and open commitment to Jesus Christ changed my life. If we have accomplished anything at all in life since then, however, it has only been because of the grace and mercy of God.

As Ruth and I receive this award we know that some day we will lay it at the feet of the One we seek to serve.

As most of you know, the President has issued a proclamation for this day, May 2, 1996, to be a National Day of Prayer. Here in Washington you will see and hear of people throughout the District of Columbia praying today. It is encouraging and thrilling that here, and across the country people have committed themselves to pray today for our leaders, our nation, our world, and for ourselves as individuals. I am so glad that before business each morning, both the House of Representatives and the Senate have a prayer led by Chaplain Ogilvie of the Senate, who has had so much to do with this event today, and Chaplain Jim Ford, who used to be chaplain at West Point when I went almost every year to bring a message to the cadets.

Exactly 218 years ago today—on May 2, 1778—the first recipient of this award, George Washington, issued a General order to the Amrican people. He said, ''The . . . instances of Providential Goodness which we have experienced and have now almost crowned our labors with complete success demand from us . . . the warmest returns of Gratitude and Piety to the Supreme Authority of all Good.'' it was a message of hope and trust, and it also was a challenge for the people to turn to God in repentance and faith.

We are standing at a similar point in our history as less than four years from now the world will enter the Third Millennium. What will it hold for us? Will it be a new era of unprecedented peace and prosperty? Or will it be a continuation of our descent into new depths of crime, oppression sexual immorality, and evil?

Ironically, many people heralded the dawn of the 20th Century with optimism. The steady march of scientific and social progrsss, they believed would vanquish our social and economic problems. Some optimistic theologian even predicted the 20th Century would be ''The Christian Century'', as humanity followed Jesus' exhortation to love your neighbor as yourself. But no other century has been ravaged by such devastating wars, genocides and tyrannies. During this century we have witnessed the outer limtis of human evil.

Our mood on the brink of the 21st Century is far more somber. Terms like ''ethnic cleansing'' ''random violence'' and ''suicide bombing'' have become part of our daily vocabulary.

Look at our own society. There is much, of course, that is good about America, and we thank God for our heritage of freedom and our abundant blessings. America has been a nation that has shown a global compassion that the rest of the world seemingly does not understand. After World War II because we had the Atom Bomb, we had the opportunity to rule the world, but America turned from that and instead helped rebuild the countries of our enemies.

Nevertheless, something has happened since those days and there is much about America that is no longer good. You know the problems as well as I do; racial and ethnic tensions that threaten to rip apart our cities and neighborhoods; crime and violence of epidemic proportions in most of our cities; children taking weapons to school; broken families; poverty; drugs; teenage pregnancy; corruption; the list is almost endless. Would the first recipients of this award even recognize the society they sacrificed to establish? I fear not. We have confused liberty with license—and we are paying the awful price. We are a society poised on the brink of self-destruction.

But what is the real cause? We call conferences and consultations without end, frantically seeking solutions to all our problems; we engage in shuttle diplomacy; and yet in the long run little seems to change. Why is that? What is the problem? The real problem is within ourselves.

Almost three thousand years ago King David, the greatest king Israel ever had, sat under the stars and contemplated the reasons for the human dilemma. He listed three things that the world's greatest scientists and sociologists have not been able to solve, and it seems the more we know, and the greater our technology, the more difficulties we are in. In perhaps the best-known passage of the Old Testament, Psalm 23, he touches on the three greatest problems of the human race.

First, David said, is the problem of emptiness. David wrote: ''The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.'' He was not talking just about physical want, but spiritual want.

I stood on the campus of one of our great universities some time ago, and I asked the Dean, ''What is the greatest problem on your campus?'' He replied in one word: ''Emptiness.'' The human heart craves for meaning, and yet we live in a time of spiritual emptiness that haunts millions.

''Nirvana'' is the Hindu word for someone who has arrived into the state of perpetual bliss. Media reports said that Kurt Cobain, the NIRVANA rock group's leader, was the pacesetter for the nineties, and the ''savior of rock and roll.'' But he said the song in the end which best described his state of mind was ''I hate myself and I want to die!'' And at age 27 he committed suicide with a gun.

Second, is the problem of guilt. David wrote: ''He restoreth my soul, he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness.'' Down inside we all know that we have not measured up even to our own standards, let alone God's standard.

Third, David pointed to the problem of death. ''Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me.'' Death is the one common reality of all human life. Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown did not realize his time had come when he stepped on that plane in Croatia a few weeks ago.

From time to time I have wandered through Statuary Hall and looked at all those statues of some of the greatest men and women in our nation's history. But one thing is true of every one of them: They are all dead.

Yes, these three things—emptiness, guilt, and the fear of death—haunt our souls. We frantically seek to drown out their voices, driving ourselves into all sorts of activities—from sex to drugs or tranquilizers—and yet they are still there.

But we must probe deeper. Why is the human heart this way? The reason is because we are alienated from our Creator. That was the answer David found to these three problems: ''The Lord is my shepherd.'' This is why I believe the fundamental crisis of our time is a crisis of the spirit. We have lost sight of the moral and spiritual principles on which this nation was established—principles drawn largely from the Judeo-Christian tradition as found in the Bible.

What is the cure? Is there any hope?

Ruth and I have devoted our lives to the deep conviction that the answer is yes. There

is hope! Our lives can be changed, and our world can be changed. The Scripture says, ''You must be born again.'' You could have a spiritual rebirth right here today.

What must be done? Let me briefly suggest three things.

First, we must repent. In the depths of the American Civil War, Abraham Lincoln called for special days of public repentance and prayer. Our need for repentance is no less today. What does repentance mean? Repentance means to change our thinking and our way of living. It means to turn from our sins and to commit ourselves to God and His will. Over 2700 years ago the Old Testament prophet Isaiah declared: ''Seek the Lord while he may be found: call on him while he is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the evil man his thoughts. Let him turn to the Lord, and he will have mercy on him, and to our God, for he will freely pardon'' (Isaiah 55:6-7, NIV). Those words are as true today as they were over two and a half millennia ago.

Second, we must commit our lives to God, and to the moral and spiritual truths that have made this nation great. Think how different our nation would be if we sought to follow the simple and yet profound injunctions of the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. But we must respond to God, Who is offering us forgiveness, mercy, supernatural help, and the power to change.

Third, our commitment must be translated into action—in our homes, in our neighborhoods, and in our society.

Jesus taught there are only two roads in life. One is the broad road that is easy and well-traveled, but which leads to destruction. The other, He said, is the narrow road of truth and faith that at times is hard and lonely, but which leads to life and salvation.

As we face a new millennium, I believe America has gone a long way down the wrong road. We must turn around and go back and change roads. If ever we needed God's help, it is now. If ever we needed spiritual renewal, it is now. And it can begin today in each one of our lives, as we repent before God and yield ourselves to Him and His Word.

What are YOU going to do?

The other day I heard the story of a high school principal who held an assembly for graduating seniors, inviting a recruiter from each branch of the service: Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines to each give a twelve minutes presentation on career opportunities they offered to the students. He stressed the importance of each staying within their allocated time.

The Army representative went first, and was so eloquent that he got a standing ovation, but went eighteen minutes. Not to be outdone, the Navy presentation was equally superb, but took nineteen minutes. Air Force then gave a sterling presentation, which lasted twenty minutes. By now, the principal was irate, and admonished the Marine recruiter that he had only three minutes before the students had to leave for the next class!

During the first two minutes of his shortened time, the Marine didn't say a word, but individually and carefully studied the faces of each student. Finally, he said, ''I've looked across this crowd and I see three or four individuals who have what it takes to be a United States Marine. If you think you are one of them, I want to see you down front immediately after the assembly.''

Who do you think drew the biggest crowd!

This afternoon, as I look out across this distinguished group gathered here, I see more than a few men and women who have what it takes, under God to lead our country forward ''through the night'' into the next millenium—individuals who represent civic and governmental authority—as well as doctors, lawyers, clergy, artists and media.

Again, Ruth and I are deeply humbled by this award, and we thank you for all that it represents.

We pledge to continue the work that God has called us to do as long as we live.

Thank you.

HONORING THE FLYNNS LICK VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Flynns Lick Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, ''These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return.''

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

IN CELEBRATION OF NFPA'S CENTENNIAL

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the National Fire Protection Association [NFPA] as it celebrates its 100th anniversary. Organized in 1896, the NFPA is an international nonprofit organization with headquarters in Quincy, MA. Over 68,000 members and 300 employees are dedicated to helping all Americans reduce the burden of fire on the quality of life by advocating scientifically based consensus codes and standards, research and education for fire and related safety issues.

The NFPA's national consensus codes and standards are respected worldwide. Over 5,300 individuals serve voluntarily on technical committees that develop over 300 safety codes and standards which are widely adopted and enforced throughout the land. Among the most widely used codes are the ''National Electric Code,'' the ''Life Safety Code,'' the ''Flammable and Combustible Liquids Code,'' the ''Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems,'' the ''Standard for the Storage and Handling of Liquefied Petroleum Gases,'' ''National Fire Alarm Code,'' and the ''Standard for Health Care Facilities.'' These documents, when adopted by Federal, State, or local government make our daily lives safer. From the buildings we live in to the training of the firefighters who dedicate themselves to protecting lives and preserving property, the NFPA has been the leader in advocating fire safety throughout its 100 years.

NFPA presents its public education programs about fire safety in a positive, nonthreatening manner to children. The ''Learn Not to Burn [LNTB]'' curriculum stresses how to prevent fires and teaches basic fire safety behavior. This successful program is used by schools in all 50 States and is credited with saving over 300 lives.

At the Eighth Annual Fire and Emergency Services Dinner on April 30, NFPA was honored with the Congressional Fire Services Institute's Partnership Award. This award recognizes NFPA's outstanding commitment to the fire service community and its many contributions to fire safety.

I would like to invite the U.S. Congress to join me in congratulating NFPA on this historic anniversary. As the association enters its second century, its dedicated membership will continue to make the United States a safe place for all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating NFPA on its 100th anniversary.

ALICESON ROBINSON, LEGRAND SMITH SCHOLARSHIP WINNER

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let it be known that it is with great respect for the outstanding record of excellence she has compiled in academics, leadership, and community service, that I am proud to salute Aliceson Robinson, winner of the 1996 LeGrand Smith Scholarship. This award is made to young adults who have demonstrated that they are truly committed to playing important roles in our Nation's future.

As a winner of the LeGrand Smith Scholarship, Aliceson is being honored for demonstrating that same generosity of spirit, intelligence, responsible citizenship, and capacity for human service that distinguished the late LeGrand Smith of Somerset, MI.

Aliceson Robinson is an outstanding student at Homer High School and her high school

record is exceptional. President of the National Honor Society, Aliceson has also earned the Jackson Citizen Patriot Class Act Award, the Albion College Sleight Leadership Award, and was listed in ''Who's Who Among American High School Students.'' As captain of the Quiz Bowl Team, a science olympiad participant, she has excelled academically. Aliceson has also been involved with student government and a member of SADD and other community organizations.

In special tribute, therefore, I am proud to join with her many admirers in extending my highest praise and congratulations to Aliceson Robinson for her selection as a winner of a LeGrand Smith Scholarship. This honor is also a testament to the parents, teachers, and others whose personal interest, strong support, and active participation contributed to her success. To this remarkable young woman, I extend my most heartfelt good wishes for all her future endeavors.

HONORING THE FAIRGROUNDS VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Fairgrounds Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, ''These fireman must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return.''

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

U.S. HOUSING ACT OF 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2406) to repeal the United States Housing Act of 1937, deregulate the public housing program and the program for rental housing assistance for low-income families, and increase community control over such programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2406, the United States Housing Act of 1996. Let me say at the outset that, while I appreciate the efforts of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to improve the Federal housing stock in this Nation, these reforms come at the expense of the most vulnerable in our society—the poor, elderly, and disabled.

The most revealing element of this measure can be found in the opening section entitled ''Declaration of Policy to Renew American Neighborhoods''. This policy statement includes a declaration that ''the Federal Government cannot through its direct action or involvement provide for the housing of every American citizen, or even a majority of its citizens, but it is the responsibility of the Government to promote and protect the independent and collective actions of private citizens to develop housing and strengthen their own neighborhoods''.

This declaration reverses a longstanding policy of nearly 60 years which expresses a goal of our Nation that all citizens have decent and affordable housing. What follows in H.R. 2406 substantiates this reversal from a moral obligation the United States as a world leader once advocated on behalf of its citizens.

For example, take the provision that retreats on the Brooke amendment which protects people from paying excessive and disproportionate amounts of their income on housing. The bill before us would only apply the Brooke amendment to current residents of public housing with incomes below 30 percent of median income, and for current elderly and disabled residents. No future elderly or disabled recipients would get the protection of the Brooke amendment if they are under 30 percent of median income.

This bill would also diminish the percentage of housing units available to the very lowest income families; causing irreparable harm to those in need. Current law provides that 85 percent of public housing units be provided to families with incomes at or below 30 percent of median income. H.R. 2406 requires only 25 percent of these units be set aside for these families. While a local housing authority can provide more units to the very poor, they will be losing Federal assistance—and will likely be desperate to rent to higher income families in order to make up the deficit from the dwindling Federal revenues. This situation comes at the expense of the very poor.

Mr. Chairman, this measure takes housing reform to new heights by including a provision that creates tenant self sufficiency contracts. We expect a person—who is often uneducated, unskilled and without work—to negotiate a contract with a housing authority that states how long they think they will need this assistance. What is so damaging about this contract is that when it ends, the resident graduates or, simply put, loses assistance.

Like many other Members of Congress, I recognize the need to examine and reassess our public and section 8 housing programs because of the many changes that have occurred since these programs were first established. During the 103d Congress, similar reforms as those proposed in H.R. 2406 were passed by the House in a bipartisan vote. H.R. 2406 includes most of these reforms. Unfortunately, as we have seen with most of the legislation promulgated by our colleagues on the majority side of the House, this bill goes too far and will cause irreparable harm to thousands of the poorest, the most vulnerable, the most needy of our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, not every community in this Nation can boast the leadership of a top-notch and experienced Public Housing Authority director as we do in Cleveland. If we had the absolute knowledge that this would be the case, few of us would argue against much of what is in this bill. But that is not the situation. As proposed in this bill, the future of thousands of Americans would be left to local authorities without Federal regulation. Reasonable reform is one thing; indifference to the plight of the poor is another. I urge my colleagues to vote no ''on'' H.R. 2406.

HONORING THE FAIRVIEW VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Fairview Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, ''These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return.''

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

U.S. HOUSING ACT OF 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2406) to repeal

the United States Housing Act of 1937, deregulate the public housing program and the program for rental housing assistance for low-income families, and increase community control over such programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I must vote against H.R. 2406, the Housing Act of 1995. While I support the provisions which reduce burdensome regulations for public housing authorities and consolidate numerous programs, I do not support the provisions which will limit housing options for our Nation's most vulnerable residents and families.

During House debate, I spoke in favor of Representative FRANK's amendment to retain the Brooke amendment, an amendment which would have ensured that residents in public housing do not pay more than 30 percent of their limited income toward rent. Although the House was successful in retaining this important provision for our Nation's elderly and disabled, and those with incomes below 30 percent of the area median, H.R. 2406 still contains language which will effectively shut out low-income working Americans from affordable, decent housing. I have long held that we need meaningful welfare reform and that there ought to be a safety net for those Americans trying to get their feet back on the ground. Repealing the Brooke amendment will severely hurt our Nation's low-income, working residents who are struggling to afford a home, food, clothing, and medicine.

In addition to repealing the Brooke amendment, the House bill also changes regulations regarding income targeting. I commend Chairman LAZIO for his efforts on compromise language with Representative KENNEDY from Massachusetts to reserve more public and assisted housing for the very poor. I also share the goal of integrating a broader range of incomes for people in public housing, but I remain concerned that many low-income Americans will still be cut off from housing assistance while housing authorities seek to attract people with higher incomes. It is my hope that the House-Senate conference will result in an agreement to ensure that those who are in dire need of housing are able to receive assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I heard from hundreds of Rhode Islanders who expressed serious concerns about this bill and the repeal of the Brooke amendment. At a time when Americans are already coping with drastic budget cuts, it does not make sense to disadvantage working residents and families by placing affordable, decent housing out of their reach.

Mr. Speaker, everyone needs a place to live, and, as such, housing legislation should be a bipartisan effort. The Senate has taken this to heart and passed bipartisan legislation which preserves the Brooke amendment. It is my hope that the final bill will be more like the Senate version, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure safe, decent, affordable housing for all Americans.

HONORING THE FRANKLIN VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Franklin Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, ''These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return.''

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school at Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

ADOPTION PROMOTION AND STABILITY ACT OF 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1996

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Adoption Promotion and Stability Act. I commend Congresswoman MOLINARI for bringing the important issue of adoption to the floor. H.R. 3286 attempts to correct the disproportionate representation of minorities in the foster care system by preventing discrimination in the placement of children on the basis of race, color or national origin. This bill also provides adoptive parents up to $5,000 in tax credits to assist in adoption expenses.

Mr. Speaker, the promotion of adoption is one of the most important things we can do to strengthen American families. All children, regardless of age, sex ethnicity, and physical and emotional health are entitled to a family. Adoption enables children, whose parents cannot or will not raise them, to become part of a permanent family. Furthermore, it serves as a second chance for the thousands of children who have been removed from their families because of abuse or neglect.

The high cost of adoption can be an impediment to many families wanting to adopt. With the inclusion of legal fees, court costs and charges levied by adoption agencies, the cost of an adoption can exceed $15,000. This is a heavy burden for America's low- and middle-income families who desire to adopt. The $5,000 adoption tax credit included in this may make the difference between a child in foster care becoming part of an adoptive family or remaining in foster care indefinitely.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to express my concern regarding the title III provision in H.R. 3286 which would overhaul the Indian Child Welfare Act [ICWA]. I supported the Young-Miller amendment which would have eliminated title III from this bill, and am hopeful that further consideration will be given to convening hearings or meetings with the Indian community on the title III provision.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3286 represents a positive approach in finding homes for our Nation's needy children. Although the bill is not flawless, I support this effort to facilitate the adoption of children, and to decrease the time that many of our children languish in the foster care system. I join with my colleagues in support of this legislation.

HONORING THE FORKS RIVER VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Forks River volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, ''These fireman must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return.''

Preparaton includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

KELLY BUNCH, LeGRAND SMITH SCHOLARSHIP WINNER

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let it be known that it is with great respect for the outstanding record of excellence she has compiled in academics, leadership and community service, that I am proud to salute Kelly Bunch, winner of the 1996 LeGrand Smith Scholarship. This award is made to young adults who have demonstrated that they are truly committed to playing important roles in our Nation's future.

As a winner of the LeGrand Smith Scholarship, Kelly is being honored for demonstrating

that same generosity of spirit, intelligence, responsible citenship, and capacity for human service that distinguished the late LeGrand Smith of Somerset, MI.

Kelly Bunch is an exceptional student at Tecumseh High School and possesses an impressive high school record. A member of the National Honor Society, Kelly has also been a student council representative and the treasurer of her senior class. She was nominated to National Young Leaders Conference, and was listed in ''Who's Who Among American High School Students.'' Kelly also was a member of the softball team and the varsity volleyball team. Outside of school, Kelly was involved with the Fellowship of Christian Athletes.

In special tribute, therefore, I am proud to join with her many admirers in extending my highest praise and congratulations to Kelly Bunch for her selection as a winner of the LeGrand Smith Scholarship. This honor is also a testament to the parents, teachers, and others whose personal interest, strong support and active participation contributed to her success. To this remarkable young woman, I extend my most heartfelt good wishes for all her future endeavors.

HONORING THE FLAT CREEK VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Flat Creek Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, ''These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return.''

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

TRIBUTE TO THE WINNERS OF THE JOHN F. KUBIK HUMANITARIAN AWARD

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to the winner of this year's John F. Kubik Humanitarian Award, Ms. Vlasta Sneberger.

Ms. Sneberger, a regional branch manager for MidAmerica Federal Savings Bank in Berwyn, IL, was presented with the award last month by the Sequin Retarded Citizens Association at their annual award dinner.

Ms. Sneberger was recognized for her tireless service to the community. The John F. Kubik Award, named for a local newspaper journalist and publisher, was established to embody the community spirit and dedication of its namesake.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Ms. Sneberger on receiving this award and wish her many more years of service to her community.

IN HONOR OF THE GIBBSTOWN FIRE CO.

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to honor the volunteers of the Gibbstown Fire Co. These brave individuals risk their lives every day protecting the citizens of Gibbstown. I commend all of them for their invaluable services to our community.

On May 11, 1996, the company dedicated the opening of their new fire station. The firemen themselves helped with the cost of the building by raising $140,000. The new station has the capability to house up to five firemen, is completely computerized, and handicapped accessible. Along with the countless hours of training and dedication required to serve as a fireman, this building will help save lives.

I ask my colleagues to stand with me and applaud the selfless efforts of the Gibbstown Fire Co., and all fire companies for that matter. These heroes sacrifice their own lives to make our communities a safer place.

HONORING THE FOSTERVILLE VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Fosterville Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, ''These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return.''

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

HONORING THE HILB, ROGAL, & HAMILTON CO. OF NEW JERSEY

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to rise today in honor of a special group from my district in New Jersey. Over the past 5 years the Hilb, Rogal, & Hamilton Co. of New Jersey has devoted itself in serving our communities. They have generously supported local churches and youth organizations by donating their volunteer services and materials to veterans and young people throughout the State of New Jersey.

Therefore, I congratulate Arthur C. Hanebury, C.P.C.U., president and the entire Hilb, Rogal, & Hamilton Co. for their honorable work and dedication. Hence, I officially proclaim March 16, 1996, to be Hilb, Rogal, & Hamilton Co. Day in the First Congressional District of New Jersey. Speaking not only for my district, but for the State of New Jersey as well, we are very fortunate to have such a charitable group gracing our State.

HONORING THE EAST CLAY VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the East Clay Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteer, ''These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return.''

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they

need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee fire training school in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF CINCINNATI

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Jewish Federation of Cincinnati. The federation has a proud history. Its predecessor organization was founded in 1896 to help those many immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe who fled repressive policies and practices of their native countries. Its efforts to help refugees and immigrants continued through the events leading up to and following the Holocaust in Europe in the 1940's and have been renewed in this decade as a result of the opening of the borders of the former Soviet States and the Eastern bloc countries. As Jewish immigrants stream out of Eastern Europe, the Jewish Federation has helped local agencies provide relocation and resettlement services in the Cincinnati area and in Israel. Since 1989, the federation has assisted with the resettlement of more than 1,200 Jewish immigrants and refugees in Cincinnati alone. During the same period, the federation has supported programs to help over 600,000 Jewish immigrants who have taken refuge in Israel.

Over time, the Jewish Federation has expanded its activities to include educational, cultural, and humanitarian programs for all members of the community. For example, it works with community organizations to provide services for Jewish youth and the elderly. The federation should also be commended for its commitment to improve interfaith and intergroup relations in Cincinnati and around the world.

I would like to offer my warmest congratulations to the Jewish Federation for 100 years of excellent and meaningful contributions to the Jewish community and to the promotion of international human rights. I wish the Jewish Federation of Cincinnati and all its members continued success in the coming century.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL PIEKARSKI AND DARLENE SOBCZAK

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to two outstanding guardians of public safety from Cicero, IL. Firefighter Michael Piekarski and Police Detective Darlene Sobczak, who were recently recognized by the Cicero Lions Club on Lions Club World Service Day.

Firefighter Piekarski and Detective Sobczak were honored for their outstanding contributions as part of the Lions Clubs' effort to recognize those who risk their lives to protect their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, congratulate these two fine public servants on this award and extend thanks on behalf of all my fellow citizens for their efforts and those of their colleagues who protect our lives and property.

SCOTT KNUDSON, GUAM'S REPRESENTATIVE TO THE 1996 GEOGRAPHY BEE

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have always considered myself an educator first and foremost. This is why I always welcome with great pleasure students who take the time to visit my office. Sometime this month, I highly anticipate meeting a student from Guam. He is Scott Knudson, the winner of this year's Guam Geography Bee.

On March 29, finalists from 12 elementary and middle schools competed in this event open to students from grades four to six. Since Scott was the winner of the competition, he will be representing the island of Guam in the National Geography Bee competition that will be held here in Washington on May 28 and 29.

Scott, the son of Marilyn Knudson and the late Kenneth Knudson, is a sixth-grade student at Inarajan Middle School. His achievements have brought much pride to his family, school and community. I am sure that all his hard work will once again be exhibited in the national competition.

I would like to congratulate Scott for winning the Guam Geography Bee competition and wish him the best in the national competition. In addition, I would also like to commend all who participated in the competition and recognize the efforts of Mr. James Szafranski for organizing this year's event. I urge everyone to keep up the good work.

THE SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

HON. MAC COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Georgia State Senate recently adopted a resolution that urges the Congress of the United States to reject the proposal to sell the facilities used to generate electric power marketed by the Southeastern Power Administration. For the RECORD I submit a copy of the resolution adopted by the Georgia State Senate on February 13, 1996.

A RESOLUTION

Urging the United States Congress to reject the proposal to sell the facilities used to generate electric power marketed by the Southeastern Power Administration; and for other purposes.

Whereas, a proposal has been made to the United States Congress to sell facilities used by the Southeastern Power Administration (SEPA) which is headquartered in Elbert County, Georgia; and

Whereas, these facilities, which include nine hydroelectric dams, provide electric power and reservoirs for Georgia; and

Whereas, all of these facilities, operated by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, also provide the public with needed fish and wildlife resources, municipal, industrial, and agricultural water supplies, flood control, reservoir, and downstream recreational uses, and river water level regulation; and

Whereas, such proposed sale would give too little assurance that these assets will be administered with due consideration to the purposes of the facilities not related to power production, such as water supply, flood control, navigation, recreation, and environmental protection; and

Whereas, the revenue from the electricity generated by the hydroelectric dams exceeds the retirement obligations of the construction bonds and costs of operation and maintenance for these facilities; and

Whereas, many Georgians served by these facilities could likely experience significant rate increases in electricity and water as a result of this sale.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate that the members of this body urge the United States Congress to reevaluate the negative impacts of this proposal and avoid any transfer of federal dams, resources, turbines, generators, transmission lines, and related power marketing association facilities.

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to transmit an appropriate copy of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the presiding officer of the United States Senate, and members of the Georgia congressional delegation.

HONORING THE FAIRVIEW VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Fairview Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civil-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, ''These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for other while expecting nothing in return.''

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars

where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee Fire Training School in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. JOEL COTTON

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives the accomplishments of Mr. Joel Cotton, a high school teacher in Rifle, CO.

Mr. Cotton is 1 of 100 teachers and 100 students from across the United States to be awarded a Tandy Technology Scholar prize. These scholars were chosen for the excellence in computer science, math, and science.

Mr. Cotton has worked diligently to educate his students by using innovative classroom techniques. He has written his own math programs, including Design a Ranch and Gliding Through Algebra on Mountain Bikes. He has also been named Colorado Teacher of the Week twice, and also teaches computer science at the Colorado Mountain College.

He plans to unselfishly use his prize money to purchase a more powerful computer and software, to design new programs for teaching computer science and math.

Mr. Cotton is a dedicated professional, and the children of the Third Congressional District will be better off because of him.

TRIBUTE TO THE ALL-PUERTO RICAN 65TH INFANTRY REGIMENT

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the all-Puerto Rican 65th Infantry Regiment that fought in the Korean war.

The 65th regiment, nicknamed the ''the Borinqueneers'' became one of the most decorated units during the Korean conflict. One hundred twenty-five soldiers of the 65th were awarded the Silver Star and four received the Distinguished Service Cross.

The heroism of the 65th brought the unit admiration and accolades from our Nation's highest-ranking military officers. The most famous and important letter came from General Douglas MacArthur.

The 65th had been ordered to do reconnaissance behind the enemy front lines and relocated to the command post of the Third U.S. Infantry Division. One night the command post was attacked by more than one thousand North Korean regulars who had penetrated U.S. lines without detection. The 65th was alerted to the threat and went into action to protect vital U.S. supply lines. Their quick reaction enabled them to counter and destroy the North Korean force, thereby saving the Third Division Commander, staff and troops from being captured or killed.

In response to the actions of the 65th, General MacArthur, who had rejected the 65th for combat in World War II, wrote in 1951:

> The Puerto Ricans forming the ranks of the gallant 65th Infantry on the battlefields of Korea by valor, determination and a resolute will to victory give daily testament to their invincible loyalty to the United States and the fervor of their devotion to those immutable standards of human relations to which Americans and Puerto Ricans are in common dedicated. They are writing a brilliant record of achievement in battle and I am proud indeed to have them in this command. I wish that we might have many more like them.

Other triumphs of note for the 65th were the rescue of the First Marine Division from Hagaru-ri where the division had been surrounded by Chinese military forces. The 65th provided a safe corridor for the Marines to escape and formed the protective rear guard on their road to Hungnam.

In his book, ''Puerto Rico's Fighting 65th Infantry,'' Brigadier General W.W. Harris (Ret.) writes:

> I have not encountered any people more dedicated and zealous in support of the democratic principles for which the United States stands. Many Puerto Ricans have fought to the death to uphold them.

General Harris commanded the 65th during the Korean War.

On March 29, 1996, at Puerto Rican Affirmation Day ceremonies in Washington, thousands of people gathered at the Vietnam Memorial to pay tribute to veterans of Puerto Rican heritage and in particular to the 65th Infantry that fought so courageously in the Korean war. Secretary of Veterans Affairs Jesse Brown praised the 65th, much as Generals MacArthur and Harris had in the 1950's.

So today, I rise to pay tribute to these valiant soldiers for democracy and freedom and to honor their contributions to our Nation and to the people of Puerto Rico. The memory of the 65th Infantry should never be allowed to fade.

HELP DECISIONMAKERS UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF LEARNING ANOTHER LANGUAGE

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following excerpts from essays by Colorado students who participated in the first essay contest sponsored by the Colorado Congress of Foreign Language Teachers. Their theme was, ''Help Decisionmakers Understand the Importance of Learning Another Language.'' Students from kindergarten through university level participated. I commend these students for their efforts.

''Learning a foreign language weakens barriers that some use to justify resentment.''—Karin Wangberg, grade 11, Aurora

''By learning another language, you can discover a whole new world.''—Anne Cook, grade 8, Littleton

''Many of today's stereotypes and hostilities between nations lie in a misunderstanding and lack of appreciation for cultures outside of one's own. Learning a foreign language inspires a respect and an understanding of each other's uniqueness.''—Tiffiny Shea Wine, college student, Federal Heights

''It is good to know how to speak another language to help others who don't know your language. You can teach other people too and they could help other people.''—Heaven Tapia, grade 2, Denver

''I think kids should get a good education, and foreign languages are part of a good education. It is just as important as math, writing and spelling, etc. It is fun, interesting, exciting and educational.''—Caroline Lea, grade 4, Lakewood.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE RIGHT REVEREND FATHER MOUSHEGH MARDIROSSIAN

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday May 3, 1996, in Los Angeles the Right Reverend Father Moushegh Mardirossian, Locum Tenens was elected as Prelate of the Western Prelacy of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America. I wish to add my sincere congratulations to Prelate Mardirossian upon his elevation.

Prelate Mardirossian studied at the Armenian Seminary of the Great House of Cilicia in Antellias, Lebanon. Upon graduation from the clerical college of the seminary in June 1974 he was ordained deacon.

He served in the Catholicosate as vice sacristan-sexton and secretary to Catholicos Khoren I and Catholicos Karekin II in the chancery. In the seminary he served as administrator and an educator, while teaching courses.

In 1979, he was assigned pastor to the Armenian Community of Thessalonika of Greece. When in Thessalonika, he attended classes in Greek language and philosophy at the Aristotelian University.

For his thesis on a translation and critical analysis of John's Gospel, he earned a doctorate of the Armenian Church, in December 1979.

Beginning in 1982, he served as assistant to the Prelate and held pastoral positions in the Prelacy of the Armenian Apostolic Church of North America. In recognition of his service, in 1987, he was elevated to the rank of Father Superior and was ordained. In the same year, he was assigned to the post of dean of the Forty Martyrs Armenian Apostolic Church of Orange County.

With the Western Prelacy he has been a member of the National Representative Assembly and member and chairperson of the Religious Council. Since 1991, he has served as vicar general to the Prelate.

Prelate Mardirossian is currently pursuing a master's degree at Fuller Theological Seminary.

On November 17, 1995, the Joint Session of the Religious and Executive Councils of the Western Prelacy of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America unanimously elected the Right Reverend Moushegh Mardirossian Locum Tenens of the Prelacy.

On May 3, 1996, in Los Angeles, he was elected to the position of Prelate of the Western Prelacy of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America and for this honor I sent my sincere congratulations. I wish Prelate Mardirossian every continued success in his new position serving the Armenian Church and the Armenian people, many of whom I have the honor of representing in California's 19th District.

WOMAN OF SPIRIT: CAROL ANTON MURPHY

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Carol Anton Murphy, a life-long resident of the Pittsburgh community, who was recently recognized as a Carlow College Woman of Spirit.

Carlow College created the Woman of Spirit Award to highlight women in the Pittsburgh area who personify the college's ideals of a Catholic liberal arts education: to involve young women in a process of self-directed, life-long learning which will free them to think clearly and creatively, to challenge or affirm cultural and aesthetic values, to respond reverently and sensitively to God and others, and to render competent and compassionate service in personal and professional life. The college has certainly fulfilled the purposes of the award in the admirable life of Carol Anton Murphy.

Carol Anton began a career of service after graduating from Carlow College in 1957 as a speech therapist for the Allegheny County School System and later for the Dioceses of Pittsburgh. Carol Anton married Maurice ''Mossie'' Murphy in 1959. Together, they started a family in 1964. Today, Carol and Mossie Murphy are the proud parents of 7 children and 15 grandchildren. A model family woman, Carol was the first recipient of the Commitment to Family Award by Carlow College in 1974.

Carol Murphy has demonstrated constant commitment to community and church through volunteer work. At St. Philomena, Carol delivered communion and prayer on Sundays. Along with fellow St. Philomena parishioners, Carol started Eucharist Ministers for the Sick and House Bound. She has also volunteered at Presbyterian Hospital as an Eucharistic Minister delivering communion to hospital patients.

A strong supporter of education and the right of every child to a quality education, Carol has been an active fundraiser for many Pittsburgh schools. She has worked on the behalf of St. Philomena's Guild, Central Catholic Mother's Guild, and Duquesne University Women's Advisory Board. She has also had an active history on the Carlow College Alumnae Board, serving as chair of the student alumnae parties, board president, and co-chair of the annual fund.

Carol Anton Murphy knows her Carlow College education prepared her to be an active Christian woman and taught her the importance of service and commitment to her community and the city of Pittsburgh. Carol Anton Murphy has led an exemplary life and is unquestionably a Woman of Spirit. I want to congratulate Carol Anton Murphy for receiving this prestigious award.

A TRIBUTE TO BARBARA GIBILISCO

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Barbara Gibilisco, a student a Neumann College in Aston, PA, Ms. Gibilisco is the recipient of the Pennsylvania Association for Adult and Continuing Education 1996 Award Recognizing Outstanding Adult Students in Higher Education.

Criteria for judging undergraduate nominees are: contributions to institution and community; clearly defined goals; grades; innovative approaches to meeting educational needs; overcoming difficult circumstances in order to pursue higher education; sensitizing the institution to the needs of adult students; success in coping with numerous roles; support of others returning to school; and strength of nomination material.

Those criteria, while impressive and difficult to meet, do not capture the courage, the commitment, nor the generosity of this woman. Barbara Gibilisco is a wheelchair mobile student graduating from Neumann College in May 1996, with a bachelor's degree in liberal studies. Even though Barbara lives independently with her mother, she attends classes at Inglis House, a wheelchair community in West Philadelphia which serves as an extension site campus for Neumann College. She has maintained a perfect 4.0 grade point average throughout her career.

In addition to being a student, Barbara Gibilisco owns and operates a home-based answering service; tutors the residents of Inglis House on the pre-GED and adult basic education level in reading, math, and computer literacy; is a certified Gateway tutor for the mayor's commission on literacy; is a part-time learning therapist for the Department of Education; and acts as a spokesperson for the Muscular Dystrophy Association and the Orleans Vocational Center. As a hobby, she is a licensed class amateur radio operator.

After graduation, Barbara Gibilisco plans to work full-time to support herself and her mother. Her personal objectives are to design computer software programs related to compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act; to serve as a consultant to small businesses and firms that seek to comply with the mandates of the Americans With Disabilities Act; and to work in an educational setting as a mentor, teacher, or small group leader with students in need of adult basic literacy education.

Obviously, Barbara Gibilisco is deserving of this award. The courage and commitment she has brought to fulfilling her goals for a college education combined with a generosity of spirit reflected in her efforts to bring education to others makes Barbara Gibilisco a role model for all.

TRIBUTE TO VFW POST 7337 OF CASTLETON, NY

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, as you know, one group I have a particular admiration for is our veterans. It was one of the reasons I asked for a seat on the Veterans Affairs Committee in my first term, and it's one of the reasons I fought so hard to have the Veterans' Administration elevated to a full, Cabinet-level department.

And one group was always right beside me in such efforts, Veterans of Foreign Wars. I can think of no group has done more to promote the interests of our Nation's veterans. Today, I'd like to single out one VFW post, a very special one which is typical of VFW posts across the country.

VFW Post 7337 of Castleton, NY, is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year. Think of that, Mr. Speaker. It's first members were, of course, the boys just returning from Europe and the Pacific and every other theater of World War II. Then, in the early fifties, they were joined by veterans from the Korean war. In another 15 years, the veterans of the Vietnam war arrived on the scene. And finally, in this decade, we've seen those who served in the Persian Gulf join their older comrades.

From its beginning, Post 7337 was made up of citizen heroes, who left their homes and loved ones to undergo incredible hardships and sacrifices, including the supreme sacrifice, in defense of our freedoms. But the majority survived to return home, complete their educations, find jobs, raise families, and become the most respected members of their communities.

I've met many of the members of Post 7337. I was thinking of them and of other veterans like them when Ronald Reagan signed into law my measure making the Veterans' Administration a Cabinet department in 1988. With that signature, we made sure the interests of veterans would always have the ear of the U.S. President.

It is to those same interests that Post 7337 has so faithfully applied itself for 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, with the approach of Memorial Day, that special day for all veterans, I ask you and all members to join me in a special salute to VFW Post 7337 of Castleton, NY, as it celebrates its 50th year.

POST-COLD-WAR COOPERATION

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House to praise the spirit of unity and cooperation between two nations, the United States and the Republic of Lithuania, whose peoples just a few short years ago knew very

little about each other. This spirit has been fostered by the men and women of the Pennsylvania National Guard's Military Support Division. Under the leadership and guidance of Maj. Gen. James W. Mac Vay, the Adjutant General of the Pennsylvania National Guard, the Military Support Division oversees the Guard's State Partnership Program [SPP] with the Republic of Lithuania.

The State Partnership Program with Lithuania began in May 1993, increasing in size and scope over the past years. The mission of the State Partnership Program, one of the many that the Military Support Division fulfills, is to conduct a bilateral military outreach program with Lithuania designed to assist that nation in the building of an essential military infrastructure compatible with the traditions of a democratic society. Since July 1994, soldiers of the Pennsylvania National Guard have visited with their Lithuanian counterparts 22 times, providing valuable expertise on a variety of issues. In addition, Lithuanian experts visit Pennsylvania and learn first hand how our military and government agencies work together.

These visits have fostered tremendous goodwill between members of both delegations. There is an American military liaison team chief in Lithuania who works very closely with the U.S. Ambassador to Lithuania, the Lithuanian military, the European Command and National Guard Bureau. Today, in fact, we were honored to have three members of the Lithuanian delegation visit our Nation's Capitol. It was a joy to see the delight in their faces as they walked through these hallowed halls and sat in the gallery of this body. Col. Algirdas Stulginskis, Lt. Col. Romualdas Kiseliunas, and Maj. Vidas Astrauskas have learned much about our country during their stay here; not simply technical aspects about government agencies and emergency programs, but about the spirit of freedom and all for which America stands.

Groups of Lithuanian soldiers have visited Pennsylvania a total of 20 times. Every visit consists of meetings with members of Pennsylvania communities and learning about how a democratic society operates. American and Lithuanian visits are crucial to the success of the democratization of eastern Europe, and the fact that they are conducted by citizen soldiers from both countries cannot be ignored. During this time of military downsizing, we are asking our men and women of the Reserves and National Guard to do far more than ever before. The simple fact is that these dedicated people are doing their jobs exceedingly well with no complaints.

The men and women of the Pennsylvania National Guard can teach us all something about sacrifice and commitment to the principles which made our Nation what it is today—a shining example of freedom and democracy. We thank our Lithuanian visitors for their dedication to the cause of democracy and welcome them back to learn more about the beauty of our wonderful form of government. We look forward to learning from them as well, since they are all too familiar with how easily freedom can be lost.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read on the front page of the Washington Post that the administration is finally considering imposing sanctions on China for the piracy of United States intellectual property rights.

The flagrant and illegal piracy of United States intellectual property rights continues to flourish in many parts of the globe, most notably in China. USRT has estimated that the piracy of U.S. patents and copyrights and the counterfeiting of our trademarks costs the U.S. economy billions of dollars annually.

Piracy undermines our ability to compete in the global marketplace by denying U.S. companies access to new markets. Such unfair trading practices ultimately result in the loss of jobs here at home.

The piracy of intellectual property rights is an issue which I have followed for several years. I, along with many of my Texas colleagues, have written the United States Trade Representative on several occasions requesting that strong action be taken against China for the piracy of United States intellectual property rights.

in fact, this week, I agreed to cosponsor a measure soon to be introduced by Congresswoman PELOSI to impose sanctions against China for their intellectual property rights violations.

I firmly believe that the United States Government must take forceful action to convince China to crack down on this piracy. The United States simply cannot tolerate the theft of its industries' valuable intellectual property. I urge the Clinton administration to follow through on their warnings and impose stiff sanctions on China.

EBIL MATSUTARO, WINNER OF THE 1996 GUAM SCRIPPS HOWARD SPELLING BEE

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, students representing schools from Guam, the Republic of Palau, and the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands recently gathered in Guam to participate in the local competition of the Scripps-Howard Spelling Bee. Originally open only to Guam students, the annual event allowed contestants from the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of Palau, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Marshall Islands in 1989. This year marks the first time a student from Palau is declared the first place winner.

Ebil Matsutaro, this year's winner, will be our representative in this year's National Spelling Bee competitions to be held here in Washington. She is the daughter of Francis and Lucy Matsutaro. An eighth grade student at the Seventh Day Elementary School in Korror, Palau, this active 13-year-old is a member of the yearbook staff, the secretary of her class, and has a 4.0 GPA. She also has a brother, Ngerbol, and a sister, Erbai.

I congratulate Ebil for being the first Guam Scripps-Howard Spelling Bee to hail from the Republic of Palau and wish her the best in the national competition. In the same respect, all of this year's participants deserve special recognition. On behalf of the sponsors, the Pacific Daily News and the Rotary Club of Guam, I commend Ebil and the contestants of this year's Spelling Bee competition.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to a family emergency, on May 10, 1996, I was absent from the Capitol and missed votes on rollcall No. 163, approving the Journal; rollcall No. 164, the Young amendment to H.R. 3286; rollcall No. 165, passage of H.R. 3286; and rollcall No. 166, passage of House Resolution 430. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall No. 163, ''no'' on rollcall No. 164, ''yes'' on rollcall No. 165, and ''yes'' on rollcall No. 166.

WHAT I LEARNED ABOUT HOW WE PICK OUR PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Lamar Alexander has written a very insightful article for the Weekly Standard about what he learned during his run for the Presidency. Our electoral process would be better if every American would read this article. I would like to call this piece to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

[From the Weekly Standard, Mar. 25, 1996]

WHAT I LEARNED ABOUT HOW WE PICK A PRESIDENT

(By Lamar Alexander)

While my wounds are fresh, let me offer several ways to fix how we nominate presidents. First, for those who only see it on Inside Politics, let me describe what running for president really feels like (especially when you have just lost). It is like scaling a cliff for three years in the dark to earn the privilege of shooting one NBA-range three-point shot, i.e., the New Hampshire primary. It is like walking above Niagara Falls on a swaying tightrope as the wind blows and the crowd shouts, ''FALL!'' This by itself is one reason to salute Bob Dole for making his way so well through such an obstacle course.

Now, to fix the process (although I should proclaim up front and loudly that it is the candidate who must accept responsibility for losing, not the process):

Report on those who are actually running for president. It sometimes seemed that 90 percent of the political news during 1995 was about numerous Americans, estimable as they may have been, who had no intention of running or who couldn't win even if they did.

Ban the phrase ''the motley crew.'' Referring to those of us actually running, this phrase usually begins to appear after several months of stories about those who aren't running. Isn't it time after 200-plus years of presidential elections to realize that any

American looks better rocking on the porch than he (or she) does trudging through the mud buck-naked with spotlights turned on (another way to describe participation in the current presidential nominating process)?

Raise the limits on individual giving to campaigns from $1,000 to $5,000. The well-intentioned $1,000 limit, placed into the federal law after Watergate, was meant to reduce the influence of money in politics. As with many federal laws, it has done just the opposite. For example, to raise $10 million in 1995 for my campaign, I attended 250 fund-raising events. This took about 70 percent of my time. I became unusually well acquainted with a great many good Americans capable of giving $1,000 (who probably represent a cross section of one percent of all the people in the country). Wouldn't I have been a better candidate—and the country better off had I been elected—if I had spent more time traveling around America and visiting our allies abroad? (I actually did this during 1994, when I was not meeting nice people who could give $1,000.)

Remove the state spending limits. This is step two in the crusade to deal with the phenomenon of the zillionaire in politics. Think of it this way: Say the fifth-grade teacher organizes a contest for class president with water pistols as the weapon of choice; then some kid arrives with a machine gun. Either take away the new kid's machine gun (Bill Bradley suggests a constitutional amendment to limit what individuals can spend on their own campaigns) or give the rest of the fifth graders the freedom to raise and spend enough money to buy their own machine guns. In one week just before the New Hampshire primary, Steve Forbes bought 700 ads on one Boston television station in one week, most of them negative adverting against Dole (plus a few gentler ads against me). Forbes, let us remember, spent almost no time raising his money and had no limits on what he spent per state. The rest of us did. If New Hampshire is most of the ballgame in the presidential primaries, why shouldn't we be permitted to defend ourselves even if we use up all the money the government allows us to spend during the entire campaign?

Deregulate the election process. The Federal Election Commission is full of competent people trying to do their jobs (several of whom are about to audit my campaign, which, if everything works out perfectly, will only take only about three years. I am not kidding). The campaigns are grossly overregulated. of the $10 million our campaign raised during 1995, about $1 million went for accountants and lawyers for compliance with the federal rules. Is it really necessary, for example, for the federal government to decide that a candidate's campaign T-shirts need not bear the ''Paid for by . . .'' disclaimer? Fewer rules and full disclosure should be the bywords here.

Start the coverage earlier. From the moment the networks began to cover the campaign (this year it was not until late January), you could feel the lift. As a candidate, you can also feel the collapse. I cannot help but think that there are ways—even many months out—to relate the day's news about, say, the failure of the Hartford school system's private-management contract to what the presidential candidates say about how schools should be run.

Spread it out. At a breakfast in Washington in November, I said this to my friends in the news media: ''If you guys were sportswriters, you would arrive during the last quarter of the Final Four championship game and claim you had covered the entire basketball season.'' You can imagine how many friends I made with this statement, but I was right. By my count, the news media covered the presidential race aggressively for just 21 days, from the Iowa caucus on February 10 until the South Carolina primary on March 2. Most of what went before consisted of asking people like me, ''Why are you behind Bob Dole 72–3 in the polls?'' at a time when everyone knew Dole and no one had ever heard of me. After South Carolina, the most frequently asked question was, ''When are you going to get out?'' So, most of us did. Let us hope the national political writers never decide to become umpires. The World Series wouldn't last more than one inning.

Now, in defense of the media, it is hard to cover a 21-day wild rollercoaster ride, which is what the nominating process has become: 38 primaries in 25 days. Let's change this: Let Iowa and New Hampshire go it alone in February. Then, require all the other states to hold their primaries on the second Tuesday of March, April, or May. This would give winners a chance to capitalize on successes, voters a chance to digest new faces, and candidates a chance to actually meet voters. What do you think would have happened this year if after the surprising New Hampshire primary (Buchanan winning, Dole stumbling, me surging, Forbes falling) there had been three weeks to campaign before a March 12 primary in a bunch of states? Then another month until another set of primaries? Lots more interesting—and lots more conductive to sound judgment by the voters, too.

Create a new C–SPAN channel to cover the country outside Washington. Chief executives from outside Washington sometimes make the best chief executives in the country. Why not a cable channel devoted entirely to Michigan governor John Engler's charter schools, San Antonio county executive Cyndi Krier's crime program, Milwaukee's school-choice program? Give these leaders as much C–SPAN face-time as members of Congress. This will give the public more exposure to state and local politicians who might then have a better chance of winning national office.

Let the candidates speak more often for themselves. Praise the media here. C-SPAN's Road to the White House on Sunday nights set the pace. I was astonished how many told me they saw C-SPAN's 50-minute coverage in July of my walk across New Hampshire. The New York Times printed excerpts from candidates' speeches, even some very long excerpts. The networks all showed unedited stump speeches of the major candidates.

Find the good and praise it. These were always the words of my friend the late Alex Haley. I can find the good easily about this process, even with its flaws. During the last year I walked across New Hampshire meeting several hundred people a day, spent 80 days in Iowa in maybe 200 meetings that ranged from 20 to 300 people, and had at least 50 meetings in Florida with the delegates to the Presidency III straw poll. During most of these meetings I was little known and unencumbered by news media. At least the news media presence was so small it did not disrupt the flow of the session.

I remember wishing time after time that anybody who had any sense of cynicism about our presidential selection process could be with me, as a fly on the wall—because they could not be cynical after hearing and seeing and feeling what I saw. The audience always listened carefully. Their questions went straight to the heart of what kind of country we could have, of our jobs, our schools, our neighborhoods, and our families. In meeting after meeting, I came away certain that this is a nation hungry for a vision contest, not one willing to tolerate a trivial presidential election. There is a great market in the American electorate for a full-fledged discussion about what kind of country we can have in the year 2000 and beyond.

The reason to make certain we have a properly functioning presidential nominating process is that the presidency itself is our most important institution as we go into the new century, and the debate about who should be that president is our most useful national discussion.

HONORING THE DRY HOLLOW VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Dry Hollow Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, ''These fireman must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return.''

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in firefighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee Fire Training School in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well-trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

HON. MAC COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Georgia State Senate recently adopted a resolution that encourages the Congress of the United States to enact health care reform measures that include Medical Savings Accounts [MSA's]. State legislators realize that MSA's will eliminate barriers to health insurance and increase access for millions of Americans. For the record I submit a copy of the resolution adopted by the Georgia State Senate on March 5, 1996.

A RESOLUTION

Encouraging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide for medical savings accounts; and for other purposes.

Whereas, it is estimated 37 million Americans are without health insurance, many while between jobs, and more are underinsured because of the effects of rising health

care costs and spending. The costs of health care are escalating, forcing employers to trim the level and availability of health care benefits to their employees; and

Whereas, overutilization of health care services for relatively small claims is one of the most significant causes of health care cost and spending increases. Currently, more than two-thirds of all insurance claims for medical spending are less than $3,000.00 per family per year in this country; and

Whereas, in response to the runaway cost increases on health care spending in this country, the private sector has developed the concept of medical savings accounts. This initiative is designed to ensure health insurance availability for Americans. It is predicated on providing incentives to eliminate unnecessary medical treatment and encourage competition in seeking health care; and

Whereas, through employer-funded medical savings account arrangements and reduced cost qualified higher deductible insurance policies, millions of Americans could insure themselves for both routine and major medical services. Under the concept of medical savings accounts, an employer currently providing employee health care benefits would purchase instead a low cost, high deductible major medical policy on each employee. The employer may then set aside the saved premium differential in a medical savings account arrangement. The participating employees would use the money in the account to pay their medical care expenses up to the deductible. However, any account money unspent by the participating employees in a plan year would then belong to the employees to save, spend on medical care, or use otherwise. This would be a strong incentive for people not to abuse health expenditures and to institute ''cost-shopping'' for medical care services; and

Whereas, by setting aside money for employees to spend on health care, employees could change jobs and use the money they had so far earned to buy interim health insurance or to cover health care expenses, thereby eliminating the problems of uninsureds between jobs and helping to reduce ''job-lock''; and

Whereas, by making medical care decisions the employee's prerogative, individual policyholders have a strong stake in reducing costs. This simple financial mechanism will expand health insurance options to others who presently have no insurance. Most importantly, this move to decrease health care cost burdens in this country would require no new federal bureaucracy and would be revenue neutral to employers.

Now, Therefore, be it Resolved by the Senate that the members of this body encourage the Congress of the United States to enact legislation swiftly and in good faith to enable Americans to establish medical savings accounts.

Be it further Resolved that the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to transmit an appropriate copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and all members of the Georgia congressional delegation.

OLIVER SETH TRIBUTE

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I honor today a great New Mexican and a great American.

Oliver Seth, who served on the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals for more than 30 years, died on March 27, 1996, at 80 years of age.

Judge Seth was born and raised in New Mexico. He later graduated from Stanford and then Yale Law School, returning to Santa Fe to join his father's reputable law firm, Seth and Montgomery, now Montgomery and Andrews. At the outbreak of World War II, Judge Seth joined the Army and was subsequently shipped to the European front, where he participated in the Normandy Invasion and the Battle of the Bulge. He achieved the rank of major and was decorated by the French Government.

After World War II, Judge Seth returned to Santa Fe and his father's firm. He married Jean MacGillivrary, who, along with two daughters, Laurel and Sandy, and brother, Jim, survive him. Many prominent New Mexicans became Judge Seth's clients, including the late artist, Georgia O'Keeffe. He remained with his father's firm until being appointed to the bench in 1962, serving simultaneously on numerous boards and organizations in Santa Fe and helping found Santa Fe Preparatory School. He is fondly remembered by the law clerks for whom he served as mentor, many of whom became New Mexico attorneys and judges.

Oliver Seth was highly respected as an attorney, as a judge and as a kind, thoughtful and dignified human being. He will be greatly missed by many in New Mexico as well as around the nation. I respectfully invite all my colleagues to join me in giving tribute to this highly esteemed New Mexican.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAY DICKEY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I was excused from official business the evening of Thursday, May 9, 1996, and Friday, May 10, 1996. I am proud to say that I was absent in order to be present for my daughter's graduation. Had I been present my votes would have been cast as indicated below:

Rollcall No.	*Vote cast*
	Vote cast
159	Yes
160	No
161	Yes
162	Yes
163	Yes
164	No
165	Yes
166	Yes

''HIGHWAYS AND YOU: THE ROAD TO OUR FUTURE''

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to insert the following article entitled ''Highways and You: The Road to Our Future'' into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This superb article was written by an old friend and respected colleague of mine by the name of Paul C. Mellott, Jr. Paul is the chairman of the board and executive vice president of H.B. Mellott Estate Inc. and the current chairman of the board of the National Stone Association. His remarks represent a keen insight into what the future of transportation policy holds and the exciting challenges that lie ahead for us as a Nation. Paul's words speak loud and clear to all of us who understand that an investment in infrastructure is an investment in the future prosperity of our country.

HIGHWAYS AND YOU: THE ROAD TO OUR FUTURE

(By Paul C. Mellott, Jr.)

As we approach the millennium and the impending 21st Century, a formidable array of new and exciting challenges loom on the horizon. Many of these issues could in varying degrees, after the way which aggregate producers do business as well as impacting on the ultimate future well-being of our industry.

While emerging technology continues to open windows of opportunity for streamlining the production techniques and general administration of quarry business, the ever growing impact of government legislation and regulation overshadows virtually everything on our agenda.

The effectiveness with which our industry interacts with government will be a major determining factor in building the road to our future in the aggregates industry. It entails such crucial aspects as determining the future levels of federal investment in the highway program and other infrastructure activities.

Because of the central role which government affairs is destined to play in our future, the Association will—during my tenure as NSA Chairman—be placing a major focus on augmenting and upgrading the Government Affairs Program. However, it is important to point out that this emphasis is not intended in any way to detract from any of our other ongoing programs, such as our effort to emphasize the value inherent in aggregate products, our industry recognition activities, environmental stewardship, improved safety and health in the workplace, and the whole range of membership services which NSA provides on a day-to-day basis.

A SPLENDID TRACK RECORD

NSA's Government Affairs Division had a splendid track record in 1995. Our top accomplishment was securing enactment of legislation designating the 160,000-mile National Highway System (NHS) late in the first Congressional session. This ''crown jewel'' of NSA's legislative program establishes an enduring federal presence in the nation's highway network and will provide $13 billion in federal aid for the NHS over the next two years.

This success certainly was a major milestone in the road to our future. As an added bonus, the NHS bill also contained a provision, strongly advocated by our industry, repealing the mandated use of crumb rubber in asphalt pavement—a provision that had been a part of the original Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA).

As a result of the Transportation Appropriations legislation, funding for the core Federal Aid Highway Program grew by $400 million and highway spending for the current year was set at $19.9 billion. Therefore, our strategy to work toward expanding highway appropriations in a year of declining federal spending on transportation proved to be successful. Furthermore, we believe that this offers tangible proof that Congress realized the inherent value of highway mobility to all Americans.

But seasoned Capitol Hill observers readily concede that there are no ''final victories'' in Washington. Indeed, there is little time—if any—for complacency and savoring our 1995 wins, because there is much to be done in the second season of the 104th Congress in preparation for such crucial issues as ISTEA reauthorization and taking the Highway Trust Fund off-budget.

DIVISION RE-ENGINEERING

A centerpiece of our government affairs emphasis activity will be a ''re-engineering'' of NSA's Government Affairs Division, which will be implemented on my watch as Chairman, I wish to emphasize at the outset that this revamping was not generated by any shortfall in meeting legislative goals and expectations. It is a recommendation that was generated from within the Division, and is intended simply to involve substantially more of our industry's leaders in developing policies and positions regarding legislation. Another important aspect of the re-engineering effort is to significantly broaden involvement of industry laymen in the political process via our rapidly growing Grassroots Network.

The initial step in re-engineering the Government Affairs Division was to create an expanded Steering Committee. This 30-member unit consists of a broad cross-section of leaders throughout the industry. The Steering Committee—headed by Government Affairs Division Chairman Craig Bearn of the Melvin Stone Company—will provide leadership for the Association's legislative, political action and government affairs programs. It also will serve as the mechanism for developing NSA policy and positions on key issues facing the industry in areas such as transportation infrastructure, federal spending, tax policy, labor/management relations and regulatory reform.

Our plan is for the Steering Committee to meet semiannually—once at the spring Government Affairs Conference, in Washington, and once at the call of the Chairman. A key element in the success of the Steering Committee concept is vigorous member participation. By agreeing to serve on this group, the participants are making a solemn commitment to the industry—either to participate in Committee deliberations personally, or by designating a senior representative from the company as an alternate.

The Steering Committee Chairman will appoint a limited number of ad hoc Task Forces on specific legislative issues especially crucial to aggregates industry interests, such as the upcoming ISTEA reauthorization and/or the percentage depletion allowance, both of which are high on the Congressional agenda in 1996.

Besides the Steering Committee, our re-engineering master plan calls for only one other standing committee—the Grassroots Network Committee, chaired by Bill Sandbrook of Tilcon New York Inc. I am extremely enthusiastic about NSA's Grassroots program, because I have long felt that the key to successful lobbying is grassroots member involvement.

There is a definite role for lobbyists in the legislative process and NSA has utilized its lobbying staff very effectively. Lobbyists can cite facts and figures and articulate policies and positions, but Congressmen want to hear from the folks back home. Often, when it comes time for the lawmaker to cast his vote on a critical issue his thinking can be tempered by strong constituent response. As the late Speaker of the House ''Tip'' O'Neill so aptly observed ''All politics are local!''

EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION

Currently, NSA's Grassroots Network has grown to more than 550 individuals who are committed to contacting their Congressmen and Senators on issues vital to the aggregates industry when the need arises. In 1995 alone we made more than 1,500 Congressional contacts on issues ranging from the National Highway System to the pending Ballenger Bill on regulatory reform.

This provided an excellent start for getting the Grassroots program off the ground. But I am hopeful that our 1995 effort is just the beginning.

Successful recruitment into the Grassroots Network is not a matter that is limited to the NSA staff. I firmly believe that in a $7.75 billion industry, which employs some 80,000 people throughout the nation, the number of participants in the Grassroots Network ought to be at least several times its current size.

It is incumbent on each member producer to encourage broad employee participation in the Grassroots effort. Because of the ultimate potential of this program, I believe that it is something that an employer would want to encourage all of his employees—and members of their families—to seriously consider participating in.

FY 1997 APPROPRIATIONS TESTIMONY: ARGUING FOR RELIABILITY AND CONSISTENCY

During my appearance before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation on February 29th, I urged Congress to apply the basic formula of I=P=SL/QL in allocating funding for the nation's future surface transportation mobility needs: an upgraded infrastructure (I) equals increased productivity (P), which in turn paves the way to an increased American standard of living (SL) and quality of life (QL).

We further urged that, in evaluating competing funding requests, Congress recognize the basic fact that highways are the way we move the vast majority of people and goods in America. Citing research by noted economist Dr. David Aschauer, which clearly demonstrates the role of infrastructure investment in enhancing productivity and job growth, NSA maintained that both equity and practicality argue for increased federal user-fee financed programs to focus their attention on the most productive infrastructure investments—highways, airport runways and waterways.

My testimony strongly emphasized the need for reliability and consistency in the overall funding process for infrastructure. I pointed out that 40 to 60 percent of any quarry's market typically comes from road and construction repair. It is important for us to receive accurate and reliable forecasts for the future Federal Aid Highway Program so that we can prepare our business plans accordingly.

HIGHWAY INVESTMENT: THE ROAD TO OUR FUTURE

In our legislative deliberations with Capitol Hill, NSA has increasingly articulated the need for American investment in transportation infrastructure as a necessary requisite for securing the United States' position in a global economy. And simultaneously we have clearly stated our own industry's need for a reliable source of infrastructure funding in order to successfully carry out our role in ensuring our nation's mobility.

Our message has been clearly articulated, but because of a growing number of competing interests, it must be perpetually reinforced—on an almost daily basis. It must be reinforced by NSA's own lobbyists: it must be reinforced through participation in coalitions which share our mutual interests; and it must be reinforced by our Association's own members, via our Grassroots NSA work.

I urge everyone to participate, because highway investment is truly the road to our future!

RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE HAS TOO MANY COSTS

HON. WAYNE ALLARD

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, with the political season winding into high gear, Republicans and Democrats are facing off over another highly-charged issue: raising the minimum wage. As the rhetoric and accusations fly, let's not lose sight of the real goal at hand: to put more money in our workers' paychecks.

Some people think we can do that by boosting the minimum wage by 90 cents in 2 years. I think we can raise take-home pay by reducing the tax burden on our citizens in a number of ways, foremost by balancing our national budget. Another boost would be the $500-per-child tax credit.

The effects of raising the minimum wage have been analyzed by countless economists, and the results vary widely, often according to the political leaning of the experts. We have to ask ourselves what risks are we willing to take, and do the benefits outweigh them?

After looking over different estimates and analyses, I am concerned that raising the minimum wage will have more negative effects.

I know firsthand the effects of raising the wage. When I owned my veterinary clinic, I had to let go of a part-time worker when the wage was increased. I know other small business owners will not be able to maintain their current levels of employment if the wage is raised.

Instead of earning an extra $36 a week, some workers will be laid off and end up earning nothing, or have their hours cut and earn less.

Raising the wage is also likely to force owners and managers to raise wages at other levels as well. Unless they keep salaries proportionate, owners may sow worker discontent and salary inequity. Raising everyone's salary, however, could lead to an inflationary spiral, and offset the gains made by increasing the bottom wage.

A number of people in the service industry are likely to be laid off as well. Instead of paying people the minimum wage to pump gas, for example, we now rely on self-service. I can see this happening in other industries as well, such as cleaning and lawn care, and even such simple jobs as washing animals in a pet hospital.

Although small businesses and the private sector are going to be hit by a minimum wage increase, they are not the only ones who will feel the effects. One reliable study estimates that State and local governments will have to pay an additional $1 billion from 1996 to 2000 in salaries if the increase is approved. Unless Federal assistance is provided to offset these added expenditures, Congress will be forcing another unfunded mandate on the States in violation of a new law.

Who makes minimum wage? In 1994, roughly 4.8 million workers were paid at or below $4.25 an hour. All these workers were over 16, and 63 percent of them were over 20. Of these, 58 percent were women and 47 percent of them held full-time jobs. Today, about 12 million people make less than $5.15 an hour.

In fact, a vast majority of economists agree that the Democrat plan to raise the minimum

wage will hurt the people most in need: low-skilled workers, women, and inner-city residents.

Historically, we can see how raising the minimum wage affects the economy and unemployment.

In the past 20 years, the minimum wage has been increased nine times, each time phased in over 2 years. During every 2-year period the wage was increased since 1973, unemployment also increased. This happened regardless of whether the economy was growing or shrinking.

The only exception was in 1977–79, when the economy grew at a rate of 5.6 percent. We are looking at a 21-percent increase in the minimum wage over 2 years now. The economy's annual rate of growth was 2.8 percent in the first quarter of 1996, and 2 percent for all of 1995.

That kind of growth doesn't appear strong enough to support such a high wage increase without causing more unemployment.

On the surface, raising the minimum wage might look like a nice thing to do for those workers at the bottom of the pay scale. But only on the surface. The potential effects on the economy overall, not to mention on the people we are purporting to help, could be devastating.

Instead of trying to score easy political points, we should institute policies that will have a lasting, positive effect on everyone in the economy. Balancing the budget would have the most profound lasting effect, by lowering interest rates on homes, cars, and credit cards.

Furthermore, we can also approve the $500 per child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, adoption tax credits, and reduce the Federal gas tax.

That's the kind of relief we need, and the kind of relief President Clinton has vetoed.

INDIAN ELECTION-RIGGING

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to meet with several prominent Kashmiri leaders to discuss the Indian Government's intentions to force elections upon the people of Indian-occupied Kashmir on May 23 and May 30, 1996. While I was not surprised to hear that Indian security forces are continuing to commit numerous human rights abuses against innocent Kashmiris, I was astonished to learn of how far the Indian Government is going to deceive the outside world into believing that Kashmiris actually support the upcoming elections.

I have been informed that the Indian Army is going door to door telling Kashmiris that they were legally bound to participate in the election and threatening physical retaliation against Kashmiris who fail to vote. Buses are being diverted from their normal routes to transport people to rallies supposedly in favor of elections. I have also been told that the Indian Government has organized 50,000 people to pose as Kashmiris and to travel throughout Kashmir on election day casting votes at every stop all under the watchful eyes and cameras of a select few reporters chosen by India to paint the elections as a great success.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite well known by everyone who follows the Kashmir issue that the only vote people of Indian-occupied Kashmir desire is a vote which includes the option of independence from India. This option, while promised on numerous occasions by the United Nations, has been continually denied by the brutal Government of India. Why is self-determination deemed an inalienable right for so many peoples of the world, yet so taboo when talk turns to Kashmir? Are the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Armenia, and Azerbaijan more capable or worthy of self-government than the people of Kashmir? Historically, Kashmir has been ruled as a princely state far longer than it has been part of India—a country which has existed less than 50 years. Its claims to independence are just as strong as those of the former Republics of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard some political theorists argue that granting the Kashmiris their independence would prove destabilizing to South Asia and could facilitate the breakup of India. Hogwash! What could be more stabilizing for India than to give the Kashmiris, who clearly do not want Indian rule, their freedom. No longer would India have to devote hundreds of thousands of troops and huge amounts of money to suppressing the Kashmiris. Even if the transition to independence proved turbulent, would it be any more turbulent than the transition of the former Soviet Republics to New Independent States? Is avoiding potential instability a higher goal than freeing people from an oppressive ruler?

Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone in the United States will be watching the upcoming elections in Kashmir very carefully. It is obvious that the Indian Government wants the world to stop asking these tough questions and wants the world's eyes to turn away from this troubled part of the world. That is why the Indian Government is going to such extremes to stage these elections. However, this should not come as a surprise to anyone who has had an opportunity to see what India is willing to do here in the United States to shield itself from United States congressional scrutiny. I encourage all my colleagues in the Congress to read the Thursday, May 9, 1996, Baltimore Sun article which documents how the Indian Embassy recently funneled $46,000 in illegal campaign contributions to United States congressional candidates whom it perceived to be sympathetic to India. Such tampering in United States electoral politics by the Indian Embassy cannot be tolerated.

[From the Baltimore Sun, May 9, 1996]

CAMPAIGN FUND-RAISER ADMITS GUILT

(By Jim Hanker and Mark Matthews)

A prominent fund-raiser for Maryland Democrats pleaded guilty yesterday to election fraud in a scheme to launder at least $46,000 in illegal campaign contributions he received from an official at the embassy of India in 1994.

Lalit H. Gadhia—a 57-year-old immigration lawyer and former campaign treasurer to Gov. Parris N. Glendening—confessed in U.S. District Court in Baltimore to his role in the scheme to influence congressional lawmakers involved in foreign-policy decisions affecting India.

An immigrant from Bombay, India, who was active in Baltimore's early civil rights movement, Gadhia now faces up to five years in prison and $250,000 in fines. Sentencing is scheduled for this summer.

Prosecutors say the case against Gadhia is one of only a handful of cases in which foreign citizens or governments have been linked to illegal campaign contributions in a U.S. political race, and may be the first time an official of a foreign embassy has been implicated.

''The fact that the money came from the Indian Embassy and that so many people were manipulated into participating in the scheme takes this case to a higher level than we normally see in these kind of investigations,'' said U.S. Attorney Lynn A. Battaglia. ''Obviously, we have not seen a case like this in Baltimore before.''

Among those who received the illegal funds were four members of the Maryland delegation and congressmen in Pennsylvania, New York and Ohio. According to documents filed in the case, federal authorities could find no evidence that any of the recipients was aware of the true source of the contributions.

''The campaign assumed that these were appropriate contributions,'' said Jesse Jacobs, press secretary for Sen. Paul S. Sarbanes, the Marylander who is the third-ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Sarbanes received $4,500 of the questionable contributions.

Other Maryland Democrats who received $3,000 contributions each were Reps. Benjamin L. Cardin and Steny H. Hoyer and former Rep. Kweisi Mfume.

In all, 19 Democratic candidates nationwide got the money shortly before the 1994 elections through a network of prominent Indian-American businessmen in Maryland, their families and employees of their companies. The donors then were reimbursed by Gadhia, who admitted yesterday that he used money from a minister at the Embassy of India in Washington.

Under Foreign Election Commission rules, it is illegal for noncitizens to make political contributions or for anyone to make donations in another person's name. But Gadhia never informed donors that the money was coming from India—or told them that it was a crime to accept reimbursement for a donation.

''The vast majority of people in the Indian-American community nationally are going to be appalled by this,'' said Subodh Chandra, 28, a Los Angeles lawyer who heads a political action committee that unwittingly received at least $31,400 of the illegal contributions from Gadhia.

''We can only hope at this point that these were the acts of a lone bumbler or group of bumblers and not some sort of international intrigue involving the Indian government. Whatever the case may be, it has harmed an immigrant community in this country that has worked hard for political recognition,'' Chandra said.

The scheme first came to light last year after a two-month investigation by The Sun into Chandra's PAC, the Indian-American Leadership Investment Fund. Federal campaign finance records showed that almost all of the group's money came from Baltimore donors with ties to Gadhia, who then was Glendening's campaign treasurer.

Donating mostly in $1,000 and $500 increments, contributors ranged from prominent Indian-American engineers and doctors to cooks, busboys, students and secretaries who never before had made a political donation.

A half-dozen contributors interviewed said they were paid by Gadhia or his nephew to write the checks, but had no idea the practice was illegal.

Satish Bahl, a part owner of the Akbar Restaurant on Charles Street—where kitchen employees made $13,500 in bogus contributions—echoed other Baltimore donors in saying he now feels badly used by his former friend.

''I had no idea—absolutely no idea,'' he said yesterday. ''We were not aware of the consequences. We were only involved third-hand. We never thought about how far this could go.''

Gadhia denied the allegations at the time of The Sun's investigation. But the case against him continued to build last summer as FBI agents issued subpoenas to those who gave to the PAC or who attended fund-raisers held by Gadhia for Maryland congressional candidates, Baltimore Mayor Kurt L. Schmoke and presidential aspirants Bill Clinton and Michael S. Dukakis.

FORMER MD OFFICIAL

Gadhia was at the height of his political influence, having been rewarded by Glendening with an $80,000-a-year post as his deputy secretary of international economic development. Within days, the governor demanded his resignation.

The allegations of wrongdoing stunned Baltimore's close-knit Indian-American community because Gadhia was its de facto political leader—the man with the golden Rolodex who could produce thousands of dollars in contributions with a round of telephone calls.

Then, on May 8, 1995, FBI agents seized documents from Gadhia's Charles Street office that quickly expanded the investigation beyond the PAC contributions.

According to records released yesterday by the U.S. attorney's office in Baltimore, the courier bill was addressed to a minister named Devendra Singh at the ''Embassy of India'' and it contained checks not only to the PAC but to 12 Democratic lawmakers.

The records enabled the FBI to trace some $46,000 in illegal contributions back to Singh at the embassy, Battaglia said.

Singh, who now is a high-ranking police official in Rajasthan state in India, was minister for personnel and community affairs at the embassy at the time. Among his duties was to reach out to prominent Americans who had immigrated from India and seek their support for the government.

NO SUCH CONTRIBUTION

The current minister for community affairs, Wajahat Habibullah, denied that the embassy is involved in trying to influence U.S. foreign policy through campaign contributions.

''I have not made any such contribution,'' he said, adding that diplomats at the embassy have a budget for entertaining dignitaries but not for political donations. ''Certainly it is not part of our work.''

But it is not the first time the issue has come up.

India's current ambassador has been in Washington only since April. But his predecessor, Siddhartha Ray, who is now running for Parliament in India, drew harsh criticism from Indiana Republican Rep. Dan Burton for his statements backing certain members of Congress who were known to be strong supporters of India.

''We are very concerned about political activities at the Indian Embassy,'' Burton's chief of staff, Kevin Binger, said of the Gadhia guilty plea. ''We feel very strongly that it should stay out of political races. Any allegation that this is going on should be investigated and made an issue with the Indian government.''

Said embassy spokesman Shiv Mukherjee: ''The Indian Embassy operates fully within the bounds of diplomatic propriety.''

Officially, the State Department had no comment. Privately, however, officials chalked up the illegal contributions that were funneled through Gadhia's Maryland political network to a lack of sophistication in how to influence the American political system.

One official said the Indians had made a fumbling start in their attempt to copy the formidable clout wielded on Capitol Hill by such countries as Greece and Israel, which are aligned with powerful and well-financed Washington lobbies.

India and its supporters in Washington have been extremely vocal in trying to limit U.S. military assistance to India's longtime adversary, Pakistan—most recently, the sale of 38 F–16 fighters.

As the Clinton administration has tried to improve trade and political ties with India while not damaging relations with Pakistan, much of this debate has played itself out before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House International Relations Committee.

Federal Election Commission records show that the committee members have become magnets for campaign contributions from Pakistani and Indian immigrants living in the United States—and for Gadhia's laundered contributions.

In addition to Sarbanes, other Democratic committee members targeted were Sen. Charles S. Robb of Virginia, $2,000; Rep. Gary L. Ackerman of New York, $3,000; Rep. Sherrod Brown of Ohio, $3,000; Rep. Lee H. Hamilton of Indiana, $3,000; Rep Eliot L. Engel of New York, $3,000; Robert E. Andrews of New Jersey, $3,000; and Rep. Howard L. Berman of California, $2,800.

State Department officials said yesterday's revelations were unlikely to do serious damage to U.S.-Indian relations. Nor does the Gadhia case appear to rise to the level of other campaign financing scandals involving foreign nationals.

The Justice Department is investigating the campaign finances of Rep. Kim, a California Republican and the first Korean-American member of Congress.

Since December, four Korean companies—Hyundai Motor America, Korean Air Lines, Daewoo International (America) Corp. and Samsung America—have paid a total of $1.2 million in fines in connection with illegal campaign contributions to Kim that were laundered through company employees.

In 1994, a number of Japanese citizens and corporations paid a $162,225 civil penalty to the FEC for making more than $300,000 in illegal contributions in Hawaii during the 1980s.

Perhaps the most famous episode of foreign intervention in recent history was the Korean scandal of the 1970s, in which a wealthy South Korean businessman funneled hundreds of thousands of dollars in bribes and contributions to U.S. politicians.

Among those caught in the scandal, which implicated more than 30 members of Congress, was Hancho C. Kim, a Maryland businessman. He was sentenced to six years in prison in 1978 for accepting $600,000 in funds from the Korean government to influence members of Congress.

HOW THE MONEY MOVED

Aug. 16, 1993. Indian American Leadership Investment Fund registers as a political action committee (PAC) with the Federal Election Commission. In first 13 months, it raises $700.

October 1994. Lalit H. Gadhia sends 41 checks totaling $34,900 written by various individuals to the PAC. Between Oct. 30 and Nov. 3 the PAC sends $34,800 to 14 congressional candidates and to the Massachusetts. Democratic Party's Victory '94 fund. Federal prosecutors say that Gadhia selected the candidates to receive contributions and that he reimbursed the authors of most of the checks, using money obtained from an official at the Indian Embassy in Washington.

October–November 1994. Another $16,000 in contributions from individuals is made directly to 12 candidates, including eight who also received money from the PAC. The contributors are reimbursed by Gadhia, using money from the Indian Embassy official.

Dec. 1, 1994: Gadhia sends a report on the use of the campaign funds to the embassy official, Devendra Singh.

May 3, 1995. Gadhia resigns as Gov. Parris N. Glendening's campaign treasurer following a report in The Sun describing his fundraising activities. He also takes leave of absence from his $80,000 post as assistant secretary of international economical development in the Maryland Department of Economic and Employment Development.

May 8, 1995: FBI searches Gadhia's law office and finds evidence of the scheme to launder illegal campaign contributions.

June 30, 1995: Gadhia resigns his state job.

Yesterday: Gadhia appears in federal court and admits his role in the scheme.

MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS: DELTA DENTAL EXPLAINS WHY THEY ARE ABOUT AS GOOD FOR HEALTH CARE AS AN ABSCESSED TOOTH

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, following is a letter in opposition to medical savings plans from Delta Dental, the large dental health care plan that serves about 27 million Americans.

MAY 3, 1996.

Hon. FORTNEY PETE STARK,

U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STARK: I am writing to urge you to oppose the inclusion of Medical Savings Accounts (MSAs) in healthcare reform legislation currently pending in Congress (HR3103).

As you know, Delta Dental Plan of California is the state's oldest and largest dental health plan, covering almost 12 million people in our commercial and government programs throughout California and the nation. We are a member of the nationwide Delta Dental Plans Association, which serves more than 27 million Americans and includes participation of 67 percent of the nation's dentists.

Delta Dental Plan of California supports the primary objectives of the current incremental healthcare reform legislation to provide portability and limit preexisting medical exclusions. It is important to note that dental coverage plays an essential role in our nation's healthcare system. In fact, dental benefits embody the qualities being sought in healthcare reform by emphasizing primary care and preventive services, holding patients responsible for a portion of the services they receive and controlling costs. According to the Institute of Medicine, regular dental care dramatically reduces dental disease, saving $4 billion annually. As a share of national health expenditures, dental costs have actually declined over the past three decades—from 7.4 percent in 1960 to 5.3 percent in 1990. While medical care costs were skyrocketing, the cost of dental care rose at a rate less than half that of physicians' services and one-third the rate of hospital costs.

While MSAs may help lower healthcare costs for some, they run counter to the principles of a sound dental care program.

MSAs discourage preventive care. Unlike physicians, dentists have an extensive, cost-effective set of preventive procedures to draw upon. By emphasizing preventive services, dental insurance helps improve health and lower treatment costs. MSAs, on the other hand, tend to discourage preventive, routine services. I am concerned that individuals will treat MSAs as cash savings and be more likely to regard dental care as something that can be postponed. By delaying routine care until dental problems are at more advanced stages, the eventual cost of treatment will be higher.

MSAs are less cost-effective. MSAs may actually result in higher employer benefit costs. Most healthcare dollars are spent on a small portion of the population in high amounts. Yet under an MSA option, individuals who are otherwise low utilizers to healthcare would be eligible to receive the full MSA contribution from their employers.

MSAs could lead to adverse selection and higher premiums. Young, healthy and financially well-off individuals are more likely to choose MSAs, leaving the poorer, sicker individuals in the insured population. Under those circumstances, employer premium costs would increase significantly.

I urge you to oppose the inclusion of MSAs in the final healthcare legislation. Should you have any questions or need further information, please feel free to call me.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM T. WARD,
President and Chief Executive Officer,
Delta Dental Plan of California.

DALLAS LOSES A COMMITTED CITIZEN

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, sadly today, I must report the loss of a friend, supporter, and committed citizen, Elsie Cohen Pearle. Mrs. Pearle, passed away at her Dallas home this past week following a battle with cancer.

Born as Elsie Cohen in Pittsburgh, she graduated from Schenley High School. Shortly afterward, she met and married Stanley Pearle. The couple moved to Texas after Dr. Pearle graduated from optometry school and she became very involved in the family's optometry businesses, which preceded the founding of Pearle Vision optical stores. She worked as an executive for the firm and handled all of the advertising.

Elsie Cohen Pearle was a charter life member of the National Council of Jewish Women, Greater Dallas section and she has been described by her friends and associates as a tireless and inspiring leader in the fundraising efforts of that organization. In Dallas, however, Mrs. Pearle was best known for her love of art and her support of numerous organizations. She was a member of the Dallas Jewish Historical Society, the League of Women Voters, the National Organization for Women, and Emily's List. She also chaired the women's division campaign of the Jewish Federation of Greater Dallas. She has also been active in every national political campaign since 1960. She attended State Democratic conventions and cochaired breakfasts, luncheons, and art shows on behalf of many political candidates.

In 1988 she was honored with the Israel Bonds Woman of Valor Award, and she and her husband were awarded the Torch of Conscience Award by the Dallas Chapter of the American Jewish Congress. Mrs. Pearle formerly served on the aesthetics committee of Temple Emanu-El, where she also served on the board of the music committee. She was to have been honored in November as the first honorary chairwoman of the National Council of Jewish Women's Gala Affair in Dallas.

Elsie, you will be missed.

TRIBUTE TO MARIAN KLEBANOFF

HON. KAREN McCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Ms. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Marian Klebanoff who will receive the State of Israel's Heritage Award on Sunday, May 19, 1996, in Wichita, KS. Marian has dedicated her life to her family and to her community and to the State of Israel.

Marian was born in 1916 in Kansas City, MO, the second child of Edith and Benjamin Bell. She graduated from Linwood Elementary School and Central High School. Marian attended the Kansas City Art Institute, the University of Kansas, and the University of Tulsa. In 1940 she married Nathan Wedlan of Kansas City where they lived most of their married life. The had two daughter, Myrna who is married to David Lyons and Bobbi who is married to Larrie Weil.

Marian first visited Israel in 1973 with her husband who died later that year. In 1978 she moved to Wichita, KS, to marry Joseph Klebanoff who has two sons, Gary and Alan. She and Joe have been blessed with seven wonderful grandchildren: Jonathan Wedlan Lyons, Brett Harrison Lyons, Parker Anders Weil, Sarah Marion Weil, Sarah Annie Klebanoff, David James Klebanoff, and Kara Klebanoff.

Marian's devotion to her family is equaled only by her commitment to helping others. She began her public service as a high school student when she volunteered at Congregation Beth Shalom in Kansas City, MO, as a librarian. A great lover of children, Marian taught Sunday school and nursery school and was camp director at Beth Shalom.

Marian has lived several places during her adult life and has always been actively involved in her community. In Kansas City Marian served as the director of Jewish education and art gallery coordinator for the Jewish Community Center; she also was a board member of Congregation Beth Shalom Sisterhood, National Council of Jewish Women, Hadassah, and Jewish Federation. While living in Tulsa, OK, Marian was president of the National Council of Jewish Women and served on the board of directors of Hadassah, Jewish Federation, and ORT.

More recently Marian has served on the board of directors of Jewish Federation of Wichita, Temple Emanu-El Temple, Temple Emanu-El Sisterhood, Hadassah, and B'nai N'rith Women. She has been president of Temple Emanu-El Sisterhood and also has served as chairperson of the Education and Anti-Defamation League communities as well co-chair of the women's division of the Jewish Federation. Marian is also a member of the Wichita Gardens Botanica, Wichita Art Museum, Wichita Center for the Arts, Wichita Symphony Association, Wichita-Sedgwick County Historical Museum, American Civil Liberties Union, and the Mainstream Coalition.

I am proud to list the many organizations with which Marian has worked, but Marian's life has been much more than the sum of all the wonderful parts. The Hebrew language has no word which directly corresponds to the English word ''charity.'' The closest word for ''charity'' in Hebrew is ''Tzedakah'' which is a Judiac admonition to be righteous, compassionate, and, above all, help one's fellow man. Marian is a most perfect example of this combination of community service and responsibility.

I am honored to rise before this distinguished body to recognize Marian Wedlan Klebanoff who has earned my respect and that of her family and her friends. She is a worthy recipient of the State of Israel's Heritage Award for her devotion to her family, to her synagogue, to her community, and to the State of Israel.

A TRIBUTE TO DAVID M. MARSHALL, JR.

HON. MIKE WARD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to an outstanding citizen in my district, Mr. David M. Marshall, Jr. Mr. Marshall has been a loyal employee of the Louisville Naval Ordnance Station for 38 years and retired as of May 3, 1996.

Mr. Marshall's long years serving at the Naval Ordnance Station are a credit to his dedication to the United States and its Armed Forces. During his long tenure, he was key in developing many defense technologies. His talents as a mechanical engineer will surely be missed. I would like to personally thank him for his commitment and to extend my best wishes to him and his family as they celebrate his retirement this weekend.

POLISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to the Polish-American War veterans in my congressional district, who are celebrating their 50th Anniversary as a veterans organization in the Metro East and will celebrate that distinguished anniversary on June 1, 1996.

This local Polish-American War veterans organization was formed immediately after World War II, when so many local Polish-Americans living in Southwestern Illinois left their homes and families to fight to free Europe and preserve democracy here in America. Upon their return, these veterans decided to form their own local PAWV organization.

According to the local organization, these original ideas were nurtured at the S.M. (Steve

Mizulski) Tavern in East St. Louis, where planning sessions took place. The PAWV was subsequently chartered in May 1946 by the State of Illinois. The first officers were Stanley Gula, President; Stanley Boryczko, Vice-President; Joseph Skowron, Secretary; Michael Bartosz, Treasurer; and Adam Wondolowski, Sergeant-at-Arms. Other active leaders were Walter Kolczak, Les Kloczak, Aloysius Szablowski, Edward Cich, Ed Wondolowski, as well as John Radon, Ted Skrabacz, and Ben Nieciecki.

Over the years, events were staged throughout the Metro East, with its 25th Anniversary celebrated on October 2, 1971, at the Catholic Knights and Ladies Hall in Belleville. Under the leadership of Albert (Butch) Rolek and other committed members, a permanent site for the PAWV was found in 1979 on North 81st Street in Caseyville.

The PAWV sponsors a variety of community events every year, including the annual Father's Day program, ethnic celebrations, children's events, as well as national and State holiday observations. The Ladies Auxiliary, a group of dedicated wives and mothers, supports the activities and continues to work to foster an understanding and love of the Polish community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the PAWV on its 50th Anniversary.

BLOOMFIELD CITIZENS COUNCIL AWARDS

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a number of Pittsburgh residents who were honored on May 3 with Bloomfield Citizens Council awards. Every year, the citizens council grants these awards to members of the community who have made a significant contribution to the quality of life in Bloomfield.

For decades of countless volunteer hours and for her tireless dedication as the editor of the Spirit of Bloomfield newsletter, Janet Scullion was presented for the first time in the history of the council with a dual award, receiving both the Mary Cercone Outstanding Citizen Award and the Distinguished Leadership Award.

For her dedication to the education and spiritual commitment of two generations of Bloomfield children, Sister Mary John Cook is being honored with the Lifetime Achievement Award, Sister Mary John has served as the principal of Immaculate Conception School for 16 years.

Two community members received recognition for their commitment to athletics and were jointly awarded the Outstanding Athletic Leadership Award. Dan Brannigan worked tirelessly for several years to develop and support basketball and volleyball programs for young people in the Bloomfield community. George Savarese has given his heart and soul to the success of the hockey league program which helps Bloomfield boys build character and self-discipline.

For knowing the streets and encouraging everyone to join together and work with the police, the Public Safety Award was bestowed upon BILL BRADLEY.

Never refusing to help his community through countless hours of service with the Bloomfield Lions Club, the St. Joseph Nursing Home, and the Meals on Wheels Program—and for always being willing to go the extra mile—Emil Del Cimmuto was recognized with the Extra Mile Award.

An impressive record of attendance at meetings, hearings, and hundreds of volunteer hours of committee work on everything from youth to seniors made the selection of Phyllis McQuillan as the recipient of the Community Commitment Award unquestionable.

City Council President Jim Ferlo, longtime community activist, was the founder and driving force behind such organizations as the Patient's Right Program, the Pennsylvania Alliance for Jobs & Energy, and the Save Nabisco Action Coalition. For his numerous community activities, and because Jim is always there as a loyal friend with an optimistic vision when the citizens of Bloomfield needed him, Jim Ferlo has been honored with the Neighborhood Loyalty Award.

A dedicated and outspoken 15-year-old who volunteers at West Penn Hospital, Kristen DiGiacomo has been honored with the Junior Patriotism Award. This remarkable young woman is truly a model for all young people in the city of Pittsburgh.

For his partnership with the Bloomfield Citizens Council to advance the educational opportunities for Bloomfield children at Immaculate Conception School with microscopes, lab equipment, and computers, Charles O'Brien was honored with the Academic Advancement Award.

Greg Feigel and Larry Camerota are the two recipients of the Outstanding Athletic Achievement Award.

The recipients of the posthumous awards this year were Mary Lou Johnson and Gilda Zolabinski. Mary Lou's life was marked by her dedication to family, friends, and community. Gilda also had a deep commitment to the people she loved, and to the quality of life in Bloomfield.

For his creative display of more than 6,000 lights and different winter scenes which are admired by everyone, Jack Rice received the Creative Christmas Award.

For their admirable effort, the following people received an honorable mention for the Creative Christmas Award: Michael Armenti, Gary Caldwell, Humphrey DiGiacomo, John Fugil, and Michael Magliocco.

All of these individuals have made significant contributions to the people and community of Bloomfield in Pittsburgh. It is only through such efforts that the quality of life in our communities can be maintained. They deserve our thanks and commendation. I salute them.

GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to salute a group of outstanding young women who will be honored on May 22, 1996, by Tropical Florida Girl Scout Council in Miami, FL, for earning the highest achievement in U.S. Girl Scouting. They are Julie Vilaboy of Girl Scout Troop No. 52, Jessica Tejera, Rusonda Solomon of Girl Scout Troop No. 79, Lauren Schwartz of Troop No. 75, Laura Santos of Troop No. 52, Marisa Key of Troop No. 535, Carrie Hoffman of Troop No. 79, Jennifer Harvey of Troop No. 79, Luvy Delgado of Troop No. 140, Alicia Castellanos of Troop No. 52, Jessica Bernabei of Troop No. 140, Maria Beotequi of Troop No. 140, and Tracey Adams of Troop No. 711.

The Girl Scout Gold Award symbolizes outstanding accomplishments in the areas of leadership, community service, career planning, and personal development. The award can be earned by girls aged 14 to 17, or in grades 9 through 12.

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., an organization serving over 2.5 million girls, has awarded more than 20,000 Girl Scout Awards to Senior Girl Scouts since the inception of the program in 1980.

To receive the award, a Girl Scout must earn four interest project patches, the Career Exploration Pin, the Senior Girl Scout Leadership Award, and the Senior Girl Scout Challenge, as well as design and implement a Girl Scout Award project. A plan for fulfilling these requirements is created by the Senior Girl Scout and is carried out through close cooperation between the girl and an adult Girl Scout volunteer.

As members of the Tropical Florida Girl Scout Council, these outstanding young women began working toward the Girl Scout Award as early as September of last year. They completed their projects in programs such as self-awareness/self-help, youth monitoring, and education and community service.

I know that my colleagues will join with me in extending to these outstanding young women our congratulations for a job well done and for their service to our community and our country.

ARTHRITIS FOUNDATION HONORS NATHAN N. SCHIOWITZ

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nathan N. Schiowitz, who has been selected by the Northeastern Pennsylvania Unit of The Arthritis Foundation as its 1996 Community Leader of the Year. I am pleased to recognize Mr. Schiowitz as he receives this honor on May 15, 1996.

The Arthritis Foundation gives the Community Leader Award to those community leaders who demonstrate outstanding leadership qualities in their communities and who have selflessly given of themselves for the betterment of others. Nathan Schiowitz fulfills, and surpasses, these requirements. He is truly deserving of this award.

Nathan Schiowitz began his professional career in 1924 when he joined his father's company, the General Supply and Paper Co., located in Wilkes-Barre, PA. He quickly became a leader in the business, and rose to the position of president before his retirement in 1975.

As Nathan's leadership qualities grew with his experiences at the General Supply and Paper Co., he shared those qualities with his

community. From 1925 until 1940, Nathan served on the Jewish Welfare Agency's Board of Directors. In 1972, he served on the Flood Recovery Committee and worked to provide assistance to victims of the Hurricane Agnes flood which devastated much of the Wyoming Valley.

Currently, Mr. Schiowitz is president of the Congregation of Ohav Zedek, and serves on the board of the Jewish Community Center. He is vice president and treasurer of the Jewish Federation of Greater Wilkes-Barre, and is also treasurer of the Jewish Community Center's Trustee Board. He has been named honorary chairman of the United Hebrew Institute and serves on Jewish Family Service Board.

Nathan Schiowitz's leadership does not stop with these positions. He also serves as the treasurer of the Ecumenical Enterprise Corporation and is operations chairman of the Meadows Nursing Home Board. He is also a member of several Masonic organizations including the Irem Temple Mystic Shrine.

For his leadership roles, Nathan has been honored extensively. He has received the Ohav Zedek Endowment Award and was recognized in 1982 by the Jewish Federation of Greater Wilkes-Barre USA Campaign and the United Hebrew Institution 25th Anniversary Endowment Campaign. Nathan was honored with the National Council of Jewish Federations Endowment Acknowledgement in 1986 and received a Community Service Award from the B'nai B'rith in 1988. In 1991, he was honored by Wilkes University at the dedication of the Schiowitz Hall.

With his active participation in so many organizations, Nathan Schiowitz has become an outstanding leader throughout the Wyoming Valley. His capabilities and character have resulted in the innumerable accomplishments and successes. His interaction with others has been responsible for improving the lives of so many people.

Mr. Speaker, Nathan N. Schiowitz is truly deserving of The Arthritis Foundation's 1996 Community Leader of the Year Award. On behalf of his community, I would like to thank him for all that he has done to better the lives of others, and wish him continued success in all that he does on behalf of others.

IN HONOR OF RUTH JERNIGAN

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Ms. Ruth Jernigan. She retired on April 1, 1996, after a total of 44 years of tireless service as a community and legislative advocate.

Ruth began working in 1952 at McDonnell Douglas in Long Beach, CA, where she was employed until 1978. In 1978, she began 18 years of service to the United Auto Workers [UAW] as a UAW international representative, where she has served as a coordinator for the UAW Western Region Political and Legislative Program. Her territory included part of northern California from Fresno to Oregon, the States of Oregon and Washington, and parts of northern Nevada. Her responsibilities included serving as the direct liaison between the UAW and city, county, State, and Federal elected officials and advocating for legislative issues on behalf of UAW members, their families, and the community.

Throughout her long career, Ruth also served with distinction on several commissions. She was a commissioner for the Department of Water and Power in Los Angeles where her duties included planning and developing new programs for the department. She served as a commissioner on the Los Angeles County Commission for Women. In this capacity, she planned and developed programs to promote women to the highest levels of management in every department of the county of Los Angeles. She also served as a commissioner for Industrial Innovation for the State of California, an organization which provides a forum for debate and policy guidance for the Governor and the legislature on the role of technical innovation in maintaining California's leadership in the Nation's economy.

Ruth was also a founding member of the 100 Black Women Organization of Los Angeles County, a member of NAACP, the Urban League, and the Black Women Forum.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in recognizing Ruth Jernigan for all of her years of dedicated service. I wish her much happiness and success in her future endeavors.

THANK YOU SAM GIBBONS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. Speaker, I rise not to say goodbye but say thank you to a good friend and wonderful legislator who truly cares about the people he represented in Congress. I am speaking of Congressman SAM GIBBONS from Florida who is retiring from the House of representatives. I am sad to see him leave because I know how much he helped and how much he gave of his time to make sure that everyone in his district and in the Nation was heard.

He is a true public servant who worked to better his district in the State of Florida and the Nation as a whole. His 30-plus years of dedicated service to the House of Representatives has not only made the Congress a better place, it has overwhelmingly enhanced all Members of Congress who have had the pleasure to serve with him.

Senior citizens in my district know who SAM GIBBONS is because of his stand this year on Medicare and Medicaid issues. He stood up and made his voice heard for those seniors who could not come to Congress and speak to their own Representatives.

But, in his tenure in Congress he worked diligently to make the voice of the underdog heard. His senior position as ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee gave him the ability to keep in touch with issues that matter to everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I will greatly miss SAM GIBBONS when he leaves at the end of this Congress for all his strength, power, and wisdom. Congress is losing one of its best, an American hero, and I know in some capacity SAM will continue to work for the Nation.

THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS REVOLUTION

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, few pieces of legislation pass this body with the bipartisan support that the Telecommunications Act of 1996 enjoy. Last month I held a telecommunications conference in my district with the goal in mind of letting my constituents of the Sixth District of Texas know how this bill will positively change their lives for the better. I believe it is important that people understand the importance and the magnitude of this legislation. The keynote speech was delivered by the President of the National Cable Television Association, Decker Anstrom. The speech he delivered that day seemed to translate the importance of this bill quite well. I would like to respectfully submit that speech for the RECORD.

REMARKS OF NCTA PRESIDENT DECKER ANSTROM BEFORE CONGRESSMAN JOE BARTON'S CONFERENCE IN DALLAS, TEXAS

Thank you, Congressman Barton for inviting me here today. I know I speak for not just the cable industry, but for the entire communications industry, in expressing my appreciation for your unwavering commitment to telecommunications reform and for your firm determination to make it happen.

As you all probably know, Joe was quite a baseball pitcher, with a hard fastball. Now, in Washington, he's the Nolan Ryan of telecommunications, and will strike out any pointed-head regulator who dares to get in the way of competitive, deregulated markets.

It's great to be back in Texas, which, as the TV commercial says, is just like a ''whole another country.'' Of course, Washington, DC, is it's own world: 60 square miles surrounded by reality. But Texas is the real world.

In any event, it's only fitting that you should be focusing on the future of telecommunications, since telecommunications will have such a significant influence on the way we work, learn and live.

Today, you've heard from a wide range of leaders in telecommunications, representing the diverse and competitive nature of the industries. If you reflect on what they've said, there's little doubt that we're entering a period of significant change—and great opportunity.

Indeed, it's not an exaggeration to say that we are entering a revolutionary time in American telecommunications.

What I'd like to try to do this afternoon is to put this revolution a little broader context by asking the question: what forces have come together to shape the telecommunications revolution now underway? And to try to answer the most important question: what will this revolution mean for communities, families and businesses?

So, let me start with the first question: why a revolution now?

I'd point to three major factors: dramatic changes in technology; dramatic changes in consumer demand; and the dramatic change in law and regulation.

First, technology. Now I'm no engineer. In fact, I still can't tell you how TV signals can go through a solid wall—although if it's any comfort to others in my predicament, I've asked senior engineers and they confirmed my guess: it's magic!

But I can tell you that the competitive opportunities you heard about this morning

are being fueled by the 0's and 1's of the digital age, tiny computer chips, and fiber optics.

When we refer to digital technology we're really talking about technology that employs the language of computers—they communicate in digits, 0s and 1s. Until about 1990, we could only use that language to transmit data between computers.

But then, researchers discoverd a way to break down TV pictures and sounds into those same 0's and 1's computer language. That meant that a telephone call, an E-Mail message, or a movie could all be transmitted using 0's and 1's—rather than using sound waves. Those 0's and 1's don't take up much room, in the air or inside a wire. The result: we can move lots of information very efficiently and quickly.

Just think, only a few 0's and 1's gives you a chance to see and hear Roseanne perform while getting data on her weight and cholesterol levels at the same time! That's revolutionary—or maybe cause for a revolution!

Meanwhile, those thin little electronic chips that run computers and other gizmos have continued to get tinier and tinier—while their capabilities have improved dramatically and their costs have plunged. And all that, in turn, has made it increasingly cheaper and easier to not only build computers that are smarter and faster, but also the telecommunications networks and electronics that use them.

Further helping speed the development of the telecommunications revolution has been the rapid deployment of fiber optic wires, particularly in the cable industry. Through fiber optic cable, we can move those 0's and 1's at the speed of light. And as we all know, nothing moves faster than the speed of light. Except, of course, for Deion Sanders.

The second major factor driving the telecommunications revolution is the revolution in consumer demand. This is a force that companies ignore at their peril. The plain fact is, of course, that the engineers can design all the widgets they can dream of—but without consumer demand, those widgets will remain on factory loading docks.

Now, I don't propose to review thoroughly the profound changes that have been underway for at least a decade that are reshaping consumers' expectations and desires. But here are three significant economic, social and cultural changes that have affected us all and have helped drive the telecommunications revolution:

One: average Americans appear to have less time for their personal lives and leisure—making them demand more products and services that are more convenient to use, when they want to use them. In particular, we'd like to go to one place for a package of services. That's why we like shopping malls.

Two: continued inflation, coupled with sluggish growth in average wages, has turned most of us into more picky and choosy consumers—we're more price-sensitive and value-conscious when we buy things.

An three: the explosion of personal freedom and independence in our society has made people more discontented with limited choices in the marketplace—we want options in what we buy.

Think about how these forces have already been reflected in telecommunications just during the past 10–15 years:

In 1980, most consumers could choose from just three broadcast networks; today there are more than 100 cable and broadcast networks to choose from.

In the early 1980's, only 7 percent of U.S. households and a personal computer; today 40 percent do so.

In 1980, only 2 percent of U.S. TV households had a VCR; today it's nearly 80 percent.

And hold your hats on this one: In 1985, wireless phones were used by about 340,000 persons; that figure has since skyrocketed to 34 million!

These trends all point to one inescapable conclusion: consumers and businesses no longer will stand still for shoddy service, or poor price/value, or no choices.

If a telecommunications company can step in to address these concerns, they will win customers. With technology now enabling that to happen, that's why telecommunications markets like local phone service and cable, that historically have been characterized by a single provider, will change.

Which brings me to the third major factor fueling the telecommunications revolution: the dramatic change in law and regulation, represented by the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

The telecommunications reform legislation enacted in February replaces a crazy-quilt-patchwork of judicial decisions and laws and regulations that limited competition and hampered telecommunications' firms development with a new deregulated policy that will stimulate growth and development.

It's hard to believe, but the enactment of this legislation marked the first fundamental rewrite of federal communications laws in some 60 years. Not since 1934! Think about how very long ago that was. So long ago that the Dallas Cowboys were known only as people who rode horses and worked with cattle. So long ago that the New York Yankees were ''America's team''

As you all know, the new law lifts state and local legal barriers to competition in telecommunications. It's designed to make sure this competition is sustained—and kept on a level playing field—by requiring that local phone monopolies open their networks to competitors.

And once the local phone monopolies do show that they've opened their networks to competitors, they get the green light to enter the long distance market. And, of direct interest those of us in the cable industry, the second the legislation was signed by the President into law, telephone companies got the OK to offer video programming directly to their customers—as well as to manufacture telecommunications equipment and to continue to offer information services.

In short—everyone's market has been opened to competition.

The bottom line: telecommunications law has finally caught up with technology and consumer demand.

Now that the new telecommunications reform law has stripped away major competitive barriers, the path is clear for the digital revolution to pick up real steam. What will that mean for consumers and businesses? Fundamentally, it means competition and choices. But things may be confused and messy for a few years.

Clearly, now that telecommunications reform is fact, we can expect competition to take off in many places. Today's local phone monopolies, including the dominant Regional Bell Companies, will face competition for the first time—from cable companies, long distance companies, and other Bell companies.

For example, here in Texas, cable company Time Warner recently received approval from the state public utilities commission to offer local phone service. Teleport, which is fully owned by cable companies, has also received a green light to provide local phone services in Dallas.

In the long distance market, Bell companies will offer new competition to long distance companies like AT&T, MCI, and Sprint.

The television marketplace will become more competitive, too. The cable industry will continue to face fast-growing competition from direct broadcast satellite (DBS) firms, microwave-based cable systems (MMDS), and, of course, from telephone companies who will offer cable service. In Richardson, SBC Communications already is providing cable service in competition with the cable company, TCI.

But if I can add a parochial note here: Like those tough football linebackers from small Texas towns, we cable guys may be smaller than the bigger kids from Dallas and Houston, but we're faster and leaner—and we'll give the telephone companies a run for their money as we move to compete with them for phone service.

This new competition won't come easily. To construct new facilities, develop and market new services and continue to strengthen core businesses will cost telecommunications companies tens of billions of dollars in the next decade. And companies will need to acquire new marketing and technical expertise.

For many, the best route for entering new markets will be to seek out allies who have that missing ingredient necessary for competitive leadership—the right experience, the right technology, the right programming, or the right marketing know-how needed to obtain that prized competitive edge, not to mention the access to more capital!

So with the competition growing fiercer, expect all sorts of arrangements, alliances and mergers as companies battle for the hearts and minds of consumers and businesses. In some cases, it may involve consolidation within one sector, such as the just-announced merger between the two Bell companies, PacTel and SBC Communications. In other cases, it may involve mergers across sectors, such as the recently announced merger between phone giant U.S. West and Continental Cablevision.

There will also be partnerships and ventures across industry lines to help each company compete in new markets. Sprint, for example now has a partnership with three leading cable companies, TCI, Cox and Comcast, to provide local phone services, in combination with Sprint's long distance service.

Cooperative arrangements won't be limited to the biggest companies, however. For example, cable company TLCA, based in Tyler, Texas, is now reselling long distance phone services at competitive rates through an alliance with a small independent telephone company in Texas, Lufkin Conroe Telecommunications.

At first blush, all these mergers and alliances may seem to be anti-competitive. After all, aren't big companies simply getting bigger? Yes—but: keep your eye on the end-game. It's not to protect business-as-usual. Rather, these alliances are designed to build up the muscle needed for the competitive clashes ahead.

The ultimate goal of all these companies will be to become consumers' and businesses' first choice for one-stop shopping for voice, video and data services. And consumers and businesses will win—with firms offering convenient, often discounted packages of telecommunications services we can't even imagine today.

This competition won't be pretty. In the next few years you'll see plenty of confusion as consumers try to make heads or tails out of what's going on. We'll need a scorecard to know who's offering what—at what prices.

And be ready to have your dinner hour interrupted and your mailbox stuffed. We will undoubtedly be saturated by high-octaine marketing campaigns out to sign up customers for new packages of communications services. Remember when AT&T began to face heated competition from MCI and Sprint? A once quiet marketplace suddenly

turned into the telecommunications industry's equivalent of the New Hampshire primary—with TV ads and mail solicitations from the long distance competitors seemingly appearing almost daily. That may be tame to the marketing that we will see for all communications services!

Consumers may find it frustrating, at first, to try to sort out all the dramatic changes coming in this industry. But the telecommunications revolution, by providing competition and choices, will make consumers the ultimate winner. This revolution will have particular meaning in business, education, and technology.

Business, big and small, will benefit from increased efficiencies and worker productivity provided by enhanced communications services. New wireless paging systems and other communications devices will make business traveling easier and more productive. Video conferencing will reduce the need for it. Many will be increasingly able to work from home. And, lower local and long distance phone rates brought on by competition will help everyone's bottom line.

In education, through high-speed Internet access, students will increasingly have the means to connect, at the speed of light, to the world's best libraries—such as the Library of Congress—and top research centers. Television will make long-distance learning a reality. Quite simply, the telecommunications revolution will enable us to bring the world into every classroom.

Finaly, the digital revolution will not just provide consumers with far more choices in the home, but also help give them more control over how their families use those services. In our mass culture, families increasingly want—and need—to be able to control what their children experience. Through new viewer discretion technologies such as the v-chip, and other digital applications, and the new TV ratings system that cable and the broadcasters will introduce by early 1997, parents will have more tools to make more informed, smarter decisions about what their children see on TV and use on the Internet.

In conclusion, I want to again thank Congressman Barton for his leadership that made telecommunications reform law—and thereby created a deregulated marketplace that will allow the telecommunications revolution to flourish.

Like Texas, this revolution will be limited only by our imaginations.

THE LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1996

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, before me is a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 107 as adopted on April 24, 1996, by the Iowa 76th General Assembly. It is a concurrent resolution urging the U.S. Congress to authorize construction of the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System. I ask that the State assembly's resolution concerning this important project be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 107

(By Kibbie and Rensink)

A Concurrent Resolution urging the United States Congress to authorize construction of the Lewis and Clark rural water system.

Whereas, the Lewis and Clark rural water system was envisioned and organized to supply a safe and adequate drinking water supply to 180,000 residents of northwestern Iowa, southeastern South Dakota, and southwestern Minnesota; and

Whereas, five communities and two rural water systems in northwest Iowa, representing 24,000 residents of Iowa, joined the Lewis and Clark rural water system in hope of solving existing problems relating to inadequate supplies and poor quality of drinking water; and

Whereas, the 1993 Session of the Iowa General Assembly enacted legislation authorizing federal, state, and local governments to cooperate in managing and administering rural water districts; and

Whereas, federal legislation authorizing construction of the Lewis and Clark rural water system and federal, state, and local government cost-sharing to assist project sponsors in building the project has been introduced in the United States Congress; Now therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring, That the 1996 Session of the Iowa General Assembly is committed to supporting the Lewis and Clark rural water system and urges congressional approval of federal legislation authorizing the construction of the Lewis and Clark rural water system.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of the Senate to the members of Iowa's congressional delegation.

LEONARD L. BOSWELL,
President of the Senate.
RON J. CORBETT,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that this Resolution originated in the Senate and is known as Senate Concurrent Resolution 107, Seventy-sixth General Assembly.

JOHN F. DWYER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4985–S5024

Measures Introduced: Four bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1754–1757, and S. Res. 254. **Page S5004**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Reported on Monday, May 13, 1996, after the adjournment of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 57, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. (S. Rept. No. 104–271). **Page S5004**

White House Travel Office/Former Employees: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 2937, for the reimbursement of legal expenses and related fees incurred by former employees of the White House Travel Office with respect to the termination of their employment in that office on May 19, 1993, with the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S4989–93**

Pending:

(1) Dole Amendment No. 3952, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S4990–93**

(2) Dole Amendment No. 3953 (to Amendment No. 3952), to provide for an effective date for the settlement of certain claims against the United States. **Pages S4990–93**

(3) Dole Amendment No. 3954 (to Amendment No. 3953), to provide for an effective date for the settlement of certain claims against the United States. **Pages S4990–93**

(4) Dole Motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report back forthwith. **Pages S4990–93**

(5) Dole Amendment No. 3955 (to the instructions to the motion to refer), to provide for an effective date for the settlement of certain claims against the United States. **Pages S4990–93**

(6) Dole Amendment No. 3961 (to Amendment No. 3955), to provide for the repeal of the 4.3 cent increase in fuel tax rates enacted by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993. **Pages S4990–93**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate took the following action:

By 54 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 112), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate failed to agree to close further debate on Amendment No. 3961, listed above. **Page S4993**

Congressional Budget: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for the consideration of S. Con. Res. 57, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, on Wednesday, May 15, 1996. **Page S5018**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting the report on the national emergency relative to nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons; referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–143). **Page S5003**

Transmitting the report of one revised deferral of budgetary resources; which was referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on the Budget, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (PM–144). **Page S5003**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Vice Admiral James M. Loy, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Chief of Staff, United States Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Vice Admiral Richard D. Herr, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Vice Commandant, United States Coast Guard, with the grade of admiral while so serving.

Vice Admiral Kent H. Williams, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commander, Atlantic Area, United States Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Admiral Roger T. Rufe, Jr., U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commander, Pacific Area, United States Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Routine lists in the Coast Guard. **Page S5018**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

3 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force. **Pages S5023–24**

Messages From the President: **Page S5003**

Communications: **Pages S5003–04**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S5004**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S5004–10**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5010–11**

Authority for Committees: **Page S5014**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5014–18**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total–112) **Page S4993**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m., and adjourned at 5:58 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, May 15, 1996. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5018.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—NOAA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies held hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, receiving testimony from D. James Baker, Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

Subcommittee will meet again tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Foreign Operations held hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on narcotics budget and strategy issues, receiving testimony from Barry R. McCaffrey, Director, White House Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Subcommittee will meet again on Thursday, May 16.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported 444 military nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

Also, committee met to discuss certain provisions of proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1997 for intelligence activities of the United States.

AUTHORIZATION—FAA/AIP

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Aviation Administration and the Airport Improvement Program, after receiving testimony from David R. Hinson, Administrator, Anthony Broderick, Associate Administrator for Certification and Regulation, Susan Kurland, Associate Administrator for Airports, and Ellis Ohnstad, Manager of Program Guidance Branch, Financial Assistance Division, all of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation; Mayor Timothy G. Rich, Aberdeen, South Dakota; Edward A. Merlis, Air Transport Association of America, David Plavin, Airports Council International North America, both of Washington, D.C.; Chip Barclay, American Association of Airport Executives, Alexandria, Virginia; and Leonard Griggs, Lambert-St. Louis International Airport, St. Louis, Missouri.

DOE LITIGATION COSTS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations concluded oversight hearings to review the management and costs of class action lawsuits at Department of Energy facilities, including DOE's oversight of private firm attorneys and DOE's compliance with court orders directing the Department to provide documents relevant to the litigation, focusing on Rocky Flats and Hanford litigation, after receiving testimony from Victor S. Rezendes, Director, Energy, Resources, and Sciences Issues, Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, General Accounting Office; and Robert R. Nordhaus, General Counsel, Marc Johnston, Deputy General Counsel for Litigation, and Lisa Schiavo-Blatt, Assistant General Counsel, all of the Department of Energy.

NOMINATION

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Hubert T. Bell, Jr., of Alabama, to be Inspector General, Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

GAMBLING IMPACT STUDY COMMISSION

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, S. 704, to authorize funds to establish the Gambling Impact Study Commission to study and report to the President and the Congress, all matters relating to the impact of gambling on States and possible alternative sources of State revenue.

FALSE STATEMENTS PENALTY RESTORATION ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee held hearings on S. 1734, to prohibit false statements to Congress

and to clarify congressional authority to obtain truthful testimony, and related proposals, receiving testimony from Senator Levin; Representative Martini; Robert S. Litt, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice; Thomas B. Griffith, Legal Counsel, United States Senate; and Charles Tiefer, University of Baltimore Law School, Baltimore, Maryland.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

CHALLENGES OF THE ELDERLY

Committee on Labor and Human Resources: Subcommittee on Aging held hearings to examine the scope of challenges facing America's aging society, focusing on demographic trends confronting the nation as the baby boom generation moves toward retirement, and how well the nation is prepared to cope with these trends, receiving testimony from Robert J. Palacios, Economist (Pensions), World Bank; Robert J. Myers, former Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration; C. Eugene Steuerle, Urban Institute, and Carolyn L. Weaver, American Enterprise Institute, both of Washington, D.C.; and David M. Walker, Arthur Andersen LLP, Atlanta, Georgia.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

WHITEWATER

Special Committee to Investigate the Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters: Committee resumed hearings to examine certain matters relative to the Whitewater Development Corporation, receiving testimony from Patricia Solis, Special Assistant to the President, and Director of Scheduling for the First Lady; and Susan Thomases, Wilkie, Farr & Gallagher, New York, New York.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 9 public bills, H.R. 3448–3456; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 433–434, were introduced. **Page H5052**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 2297, to codify without substantive change laws related to transportation and to improve the United States Code, amended (H. Rept. 104–573); and

H.R. 3376, to authorize major medical facility projects and major medical facility leases for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 1997, amended (H. Rept. 104–574). **Page H5051**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker, wherein he designates Representative Foley to act as Speaker, pro tempore for today. **Page H4903**

Recess: House recessed at 1:14 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H4908**

Suspensions: House voted to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Healthy Meals for Children: H.R. 2066, amended, to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide greater flexibility to Schools to meet the Dietary Guidelines for Americans under the school lunch and school breakfast programs; **Pages H4910–13**

Selma to Montgomery Trail: H.R. 1129, amended, to amend the National Trails Systems Act to designate the route from Selma to Montgomery as a National Historic Trail; **Pages H4913–17**

Goshute Indian Reservation: H.R. 2464, to amend Public Law 103–93 to provide additional lands within the State of Utah for the Goshute Indian Reservation; **Pages H4917–18**

Carbon Hill National Fish Hatchery: H.R. 2982, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Carbon Hill National Fish Hatchery to the State of Alabama; **Page H4918**

Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation: H.R. 2967, amended, to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978; and **Pages H4920–21**

Absentee Ballots: H.R. 3058, amended, to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to extend the period for receipt of absentee ballots. **Pages H4921–22**

Bills Re-referred: H.R. 3387, to designate the Southern Piedmont Conservation Research Center located at 1420 Experimental Station Road in Watkinsville, Georgia, as the "J. Phil Campbell, Senior Natural Resource Conservation Center", which was referred to the Committee on Resources, was re-referred to the Committee on Agriculture. **Page H4913**

Amagansett National Wildlife Refuge: The House voted to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1836, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire property in the town of East Hampton, Suffolk County, New York, for inclusion in the Amagansett National Wildlife Refuge—clearing the measure for the President. **Pages H4918–19**

Water Resources Research: The Hose voted to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1743, to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to extend the authorizations of appropriations through fiscal year 2000—clearing the measure for the President. **Pages H4919–20**

Personal Privilege; Representative Gunderson rose to a point of personal privilege and was recognized for one hour. **Pages H4922–25**

Presidential Messages: Read the following messages from the President:

Weapons of Mass Destruction: Message wherein he transmits his report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order No. 12938 of November 14, 1994, in response to the threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons ("weapons of mass destruction") and of the means of delivering such weapons—referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 104–210); and **Page H4925**

Budget and Impoundment Control Act: Message wherein he transmits his report on one revised deferral of budgetary resources, totaling $1.4 billion, affecting the International Security Assistance program—referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 104–211). **Page H4925**

Department of Defense Authorization: The House completed all general debate and began consideration of amendments to, H.R. 3230, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense and to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1997. Consideration of amendments will resume on Wednesday, May 15. **Pages H4925–H5033**

Agreed To:

The Shays amendment that requires the President to seek increases in defense burden sharing by U.S. allies; provides authorities to the President to achieve

increases in burden sharing by U.S. allies; and requires the DOD to report on progress made by increasing allied burden sharing an alternative forward deployment configurations that would meet alliance requirements or U.S. national security interests (agreed to by a recorded vote of 353 ayes to 62 noes, Roll No. 168). **Pages H5023–27**

The Spence en bloc amendment that increases funding for chemical weapons demilitarization research; authorizes additional $10 million for development of field emission flat panel technology for MI Tank Upgrade; requires competitive procedures for dual-use cost shared programs and mandates cooperative agreements when such shared programs are infeasible; clarifies language concerning development of an improved high altitude, low observable, unmanned aerial reconnaissance vehicle; provides that the President will certify to Congress whether or not the U.S. has the capability to prevent illegal importation of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons; requires DOD to establish a natural resources assessment and training delivery system; provides DOD the authority to enter into cooperative agreements with State and local governmental agencies; clarifies Major Range and Test Facilities management constraints; allows a second opportunity to sign up for the mobilization Income Insurance Program for Guardsmen or Reservists; broadens military healthcare to include prostate and colon cancer screenings; codifies Congressional intent that the Monterey demonstration project was not to be delayed by regulatory requirements; permits transportation of health professionals engaged in the provision of humanitarian assistance; amends the foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to include excess property of the Coast Guard; requires the Secretary of Defense to develop uniform procedures for possible forfeiture of retired pay of members or former members of the uniformed services who willfully remain outside the U.S. to avoid criminal prosecution or civil liability; calls for the Army and FEMA to implement site-specific Integrated Product and Process Teams as a management tool of the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program; establishes a reporting requirement of all co-production deals between the U.S. and foreign countries; requires that violations of veterans' preferences in DOD hiring and promoting be treated as a prohibited personnel practice; sense of Congress calling on the President to impose the strongest sanctions available under U.S. law on Chinese companies involved in the export of military and industrial products, and sense of Congress regarding nuclear weapons proliferation and policies of the People's Republic of China; authorizes the transfer to the city of Vallejo, California of a nuclear submarine awaiting decommissioning in Pearl Harbor; allows the Secretary of Defense to evaluate equipment used in the 1996 Olympic Games to determine whether it would be appropriate for use in digital, audio, and visual global broadcasting; limits the White House Communications Agency to providing telecommunications support to the President; and provides confirmation that the authority granted to convey property at Ft. Sheridan in the fiscal year 1996 Military Construction Act be ongoing pending the environmental remediation expected to be completed in fiscal year 1997. **Pages H5027–33**

Rejected:

The DeLauro amendment that sought to reverse action taken last year which prohibited privately funded abortions for military women and dependents at overseas military hospitals (rejected by a recorded vote of 192 ayes to 225 noes, Roll No. 167). **Pages H5013–22**

Late Report: Committee on the Budget received permission to have until midnight on Tuesday, May 14, to file a report on a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997. It was made in order that the House consider the concurrent resolution on Wednesday, May 15 under the following terms: the Speaker may declare the House resolved into the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution; the first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with; all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution shall be waived; general debate shall be confined to the congressional budget and shall not exceed three hours (including one hour on the subject of economic goals and policies) equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; after general debate the Committee shall rise without motion; and no further consideration of the concurrent resolution shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House. **Page H5033**

Referrals: One Senate-passed measure was referred to the appropriate House committees. **Page H5049**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H5021–22 and H5026–27. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: Met at 12:30 a.m. and adjourned at 11:36 p.m.

Committee Meetings

USDA ADMINISTERED-INTRAMURAL AND EXTRAMURAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Resource Conservation, Research, and Forestry held a hearing

to review intramural and extramural research programs coordinated by the USDA. Testimony was heard from Catherine Woteki, Deputy Under Secretary, Research, Education, and Economics, USDA; and public witnesses.

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations; Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on Nobel Laureates. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Nobel Laureates Biomedical Research panel: Daniel Nathans, Johns Hopkins University; E. Donnall Thomas, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, Washington; and Eric Wieschaus, Princeton University.

EFFECTS OF MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs held a hearing on the Effects of a Minimum Wage Increase. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

INTELECTUAL PROPERTY ANTITRUST PROTECTION ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Held a hearing on H.R. 2674, Intellectual Property Antitrust Protection Act of 1995. Testimony was heard from Bruce A. Lehman, Assistant Secretary and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce; Joel I. Klein, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice; and public witnesses

YEAR 2000 SOFTWARE PROBLEM

Committee on Science: Subcommittee on Technology held a hearing on Solving the Year 2000 Software Problem: Creating Blueprints for Success. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the SSA: Dean Mesterharm, Deputy Commissioner, Systems; and Kathleen M. Adams, Assistant Commissioner, Office Systems, Design and Development; Robert Hebner, Acting Deputy Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

SMALL BUSINESS JOB PROTECTION ACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Ordered reported amended H.R. 3448, Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D435)*

H.R. 2024, to phase out the use of mercury in batteries and provide for the efficient and cost-effective collection and recycling or proper disposal of used nickel cadmium batteries, small sealed lead-acid batteries, and certain other batteries. Signed May 13, 1996. (P.L. 104–142)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 1996

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, to hold hearings to examine how the Commodity Futures Trading Commission oversees markets in times of volatile prices and tight supplies, 9:30 a.m., SR–332.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997 for the Department of the Interior, 9:30 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Defense, closed briefing on F–22, F–18 and Joint Strike Fighter Programs, 10 a.m., S–407, Capitol.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997 for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, 10 a.m., S–146, Capitol.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997 for the Department of Health and Human Services, 2 p.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997 for the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, 2 p.m., S–146, Capitol.

Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997 for the Executive Office of the President and the Office of Personnel Management, 2 p.m., SD–138.

Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on African Affairs, to hold hearings to update United States policy towards Nigeria, 2 p.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Governmental Affairs, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to hold hearings to examine Russian organized crime in the United States, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary, to hold hearings to examine issues relative to combatting violence against women, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration, to resume hearings on proposals to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a voluntary system of spending limits and partial public financing of Senate primary and general election campaigns, to limit contributions by multicandidate political committees, and to reform the financing of Federal elections and Senate campaigns, 10 a.m., SR–301.

Special Committee To Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters, to continue hearings to

examine certain issues relative to the Whitewater Development Corporation, 10 a.m., SH–216.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry and the Subcommittee on Risk Management and Specialty Crops, joint hearing to consider issues raised by a recently released study of trading practices and procedures on the National Cheese Exchange, 9:30 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary, on Secretary of State, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, hearing on the D.C. Fiscal Year 1997 Budget Request, 1 p.m., 2362 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on Members of Congress, 10 a.m. and 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, to mark up H.R. 3005, Securities Amendments of 1996, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Power, oversight hearing on Electricity Regulation: A Vision for the Future, 11 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, hearing on H.R. 3078, Federal Agency Anti-Lobbying Act, 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, to mark up H. Con. Res. 154, to congratulate the Republic of China on Taiwan on the occasion of its first Presidential democratic election; and to hold a hearing on the History of Armenian Genocide, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, hearing on H.R. 3396, Defense of Marriage Act, 1:30 p.m., 2226 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, to mark up the following: relating to PTO Government Corporation, Reexamination of Patents, Publication of Patent Applications, Prior Domestic User Rights, Patent Reexamining Reform, and Investor Protection Rights; relating to Copyright Protection in the Digital Arena, Music Licensing and Copyright Term Extension; and H.R. 359, to restore the term of patents, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, oversight hearing on U.S. Fish and Wildlife activities and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1997, 2 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Small Business, hearing on small businesses and entry-level employment opportunities, with emphasis on the minimum wage and other proposals for increasing entry-level employment opportunities, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, hearing on Small Satellites, 2 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 15

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will begin consideration of S. Con. Res. 57, setting forth the congressional budget.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Wednesday, May 15

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: House will meet at 9 a.m. and recess immediately to receive former Members of Congress;

Reconvene at 10 a.m. to complete consideration of H.R. 3230, the National Defense Authorization Act;

Consideration of H. Res. 303, providing for consideration of the bill, H.R. 1745, to designate certain public lands in the State of Utah as wilderness; and

Consideration of H. Con. Res. 179, the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 1997 (general debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $112.50 for six months, $225 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $118 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.