

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. OWENS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Commerce, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Committee on International Relations, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Resources, Committee on Science, Committee on Small Business, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the recess have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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 further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3230.

□ 1140

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 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. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 14, 1996, the en bloc amendments offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] had been disposed of.

By virtue of notice given pursuant to section 4(c) of the resolution, it is now in order to debate the subject matter of cooperative threat reduction with the states of the former Soviet Union.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] each will control 20 minutes.

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

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.)

□ 1145

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, allow me to review briefly the actions taken by the National Security Committee on the Cooperative Threat Reduction [CTR] Program in H.R. 3230.

First, the committee cut the \$327 million budget request by \$25 million. Specifically, as based on the availability of prior-year funds, the committee cut \$20 million from the fissile material storage facility in Russia. The committee also cut approximately \$4 million from chemical weapons destruction-related activities in Russia. Specifically, the committee denied the DOD request to initiate a new, as yet unjustified demolition project and reduced the amount for the Chemical Weapons Destruction Support Office, an information clearinghouse located in Moscow. The committee also cut \$1 million from CTR program overhead.

The bill also includes a provision that is intended to ensure that CTR funds are spent only on core dismantlement activities, such as destroying bombers, missiles, and silos. My colleagues may recall that noncore activities such as environmental restoration, job retraining, and defense conversion have been at the heart of the controversy surrounding this program in past years. This provision would prohibit use of fiscal year 1997 or prior-year, unobligated CTR funds for conducting peacekeeping activities with Russia, providing housing, performing environmental restoration, providing job retraining assistance, or for providing assistance to promote defense conversion.

I understand the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] plans to offer an amendment that would extend the prohibition on funding for defense conversion activities beyond the Department of Defense to include foreign assistance and related funding sources. I certainly support the gentleman's amendment.

Finally, the committee bill expresses deep concerns regarding the President's certification on a range of Russian behavior in the arms control and military modernization arenas. Evidence continues to mount that Russia is not adhering to its arms control obligations, including in the area of chemical and biological weapons. Likewise, it is hard to reconcile the President's certification with the fact that Russia is spending billions of dollars on a deep underground facility recently reported in the open press and on modernizing its strategic offensive forces.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] also plans to offer an amendment which would prohibit the further obligation of funds for the CTR program in Russia and Belarus until the President certifies to Congress that Russia has met 10 conditions relating to arms control compliance, foreign and military policy, and arms exports. I share the gentleman's concern that the President's certifications send the wrong signal to Moscow and may actually encourage non-compliant behavior.

I look forward to today's debate and discussion, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], a member of the committee.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me time. As many know, I have served for 24 years on this committee, and, because I am retiring from the Congress, I have tried not to take a lot of the committee's time in debating these different issues, thinking others should move forward.

But I must say that I think we are engaging in one of the most serious issues that we are going to deal with in this Congress, and that is whether we continue to use our brain, engage our brain, and continue to move forward with the Nunn-Lugar proposals that denuclearize and demilitarize Russia and Belarus, or whether we go with our glands, do our chest beating, scream, holler and yell, and adopt the amendments that I think are going to derail what we have been doing and the progress we are making.

So I stand here in a very solemn mode, saying I certainly hope that the Solomon amendment is defeated, and defeated resoundingly, because the reason that we are trying very hard to take down the nuclear weapons in the Soviet Union and to demilitarize the Soviet Union is for our own good, it is for NATO's good, it is for all of our allies in Asia's good.

Nuclear proliferation does not help anybody. The way I read the Solomon amendment and others is that what they are trying to pretend is like this is foreign aid; this is a big bennie for Russia.

It is not a bennie at all. This is a carrot that we are doing as part of our leadership internationally to try and make this planet a little safer.

The nuclear genie got out of the bottle in this century. We are about to close this century, and this has been a very serious effort by two of the most well thought of Members of the other body, Senator NUNN and Senator LUGAR, to try and put the nuclear genie back in the bottle, to try and demilitarize this huge colossus that we used to know as the Soviet Union.

What a phenomenal opportunity this is for our children. What a phenomenal opportunity this is for the 21st century. How shortsighted it would be to say "Oh, no, no, no, this is really just an aid bill. We are just doing this for the benefit of the Russians, and we ought to shut this off."

No; for people who really miss the cold war, I suppose they ought to vote for the Solomon amendment. I do not miss the cold war. I do not miss the old drills of duck and cover. I do not miss that kind of terror. I hope people listen to this serious debate and vote "no" on the Solomon amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Procurement.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me time. Let me respond to my friend who says she does not miss the cold war, the war is over, and Nunn-Lugar money is a good way to exit the war.

The problem, my colleagues, is that we apparently have not convinced the Russians that the cold war is over. We see a continuing drive to modernize their strategic systems, which costs them billions and billions of dollars, to do other things with respect to chemical systems and biological warfare systems, which again cost them in the hundreds of millions and billions of dollars. And in light of that, in light of that continued expenditure of hard dollars by the Russians, the question we have to ask is does it make sense for us to subsidize the Soviet Union to the tune of some \$300 million, which is what the full committee passed, or \$327 million, which is what the administration asked for, without requiring certain certifications that the Soviet Union is slowing down this drive to modernize its systems and to build this deep, underground complex, which is bigger, incidentally, than the District of Columbia, and which could be used by the Russians to carry on weapons activities after a nuclear attack.

So let me go over some of the concerns we have that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] meets with his amendment. First, a Yamantau Mountain underground complex, something that disturbs all of our war planners, all of our strategic thinkers, because this could be used to continue to weaponize the Soviet Union after a first strike.

Why do they have this mindset that somehow a first strike is survivable and could be survived? They are breaking chemical and biological weapons

treaties. They are continuing to develop biological weapons at great costs. They are improving the SS-25 ICBM, really building what I call the SS-27 ICBM. It costs them a ton of money. They are building a new nuclear submarine, and they are selling nuclear reactors to Iran.

Mr. Chairman, let us send a message to the Soviets, back the Solomon amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I want to especially thank the chairman for his acceptance in advance of the Solomon amendment, which much of the debate already has focused upon.

One of my colleagues across the aisle suggested that support for the Solomon amendment would somehow require one to long for the days of the cold war. But the truth is that the Nunn-Lugar moneys for Russia were approved in that headier, indeed giddy time after the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the Soviet Union itself, when the Congress typically sought to show its approval, its support for something, by showering money upon it.

Over \$1.5 billion has now gone not to the people of Russia, but to the Government, and the Government of Russia, particularly after the next two rounds of elections in June and July, may well be back in the hands of a Communist imperialist, Gennadi Zyuganov. There was never much of a budget for these moneys to begin with. President Clinton expanded the purpose for which Nunn-Lugar aid might be spent to include housing for officers, defense conversion, and so on.

In this bill there is an attempt to address that. But what Chairman SOLOMON is talking about doing is even more important. President Clinton ought to be able to certify before the American taxpayers send a third of a billion dollars, as requested this year, President Clinton should be able to certify that Russia is complying with arms control agreements. If they are not, why should U.S. taxpayers subsidize them?

Russia should not be modernizing its nuclear arsenal at the very time we are allegedly paying for dismantling nuclear weapons. What could be more reasonable? President Clinton should be able to make that certification.

Russia should not be sharing intelligence with Cuba. If you are interested in supporting with United States taxpayer funds Russia sharing intelligence with Cuba, I do not understand that. The President should be able to certify that Russia is willing to respect the sovereignty of Lithuania.

My own concern about Russian deployment in Kalinigrad, where they have twice as many Russian troops on Lithuania's sovereign soil as American troops have deployed in all of Europe, cause me to have reservations about this.

Mr. Chairman, this is a fine amendment and I urge Members to support it.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize Members of Congress have many things to do, but I would like to hope that when a Member takes the floor of this body on a significant piece of legislation, they would at least take time to read the legislation so that they would not speak based upon ignorance. If my distinguished colleague, the previous speaker, had read page 362 of this bill, bill language, it points out that moneys for housing are specifically prohibited.

Second, if the gentleman had taken time to understand Nunn-Lugar in substantive intellectual terms, the gentleman would understand that no money goes to the Russian people.

This money goes to American firms providing the services to dismantle warheads that just a few years ago were aimed at the United States to destroy, maim, and kill at a level of mega death beyond people's ability to comprehend.

It defies logic. It defies logic, Mr. Chairman, to talk about issues that are of lesser significance when there ought to be one thing that we universally accept, and that is that the danger of nuclear weapons has a significance and an imperative unto itself.

□1200

The Nunn-Lugar effort is an effort to dismantle these weapons. It is an effort to dismantle chemical and biological warfare, to destroy the facilities in Russia and Belarus. They are moving diligently in that area.

It defies understanding. I believe it is almost even bizarre for Members to challenge this piece of legislation when during the decade of the 1980's we spent in excess of \$300 billion a year, prepared to wage war against the Soviet Union, even contemplated the idiocy and the insanity of nuclear war and we are not prepared to spend pennies to help Russia dismantle nuclear weapons that threaten our security. This is in our interest.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the ranking member, whom I have great respect for, the truth of the matter is that we are subsidizing the Russian Government to dismantle old nuclear missiles while still they are in the process of modernizing and building up other nuclear missiles.

Mr. Chairman, the Nunn-Lugar Foreign Aid Program, paying the former Soviet Union to dismantle some of their defensive missiles, was initially premised on the belief that the new Democratic States of the former Soviet Union wanted to destroy some of their

massive war arsenals but were simply too poor to pay for this endeavor. That is what the initial premise was. Thus, for 5 years now it has been assumed that it was in our interest to divert some of our defense budget to help destroy some of those weapons, but not all of them. It is time to challenge that very complacent assumption, Mr. Chairman, at least in the case of Russia, and that is what my amendment does. It does not speak to Ukraine, it does not speak to Kazakhstan, it speaks to Russia.

Anyone who has been reading the papers knows that today Russia is spending billions of dollars on a host of activities that range from the legal to the illegal morally abhorrent, but all of which are contrary to our American national interests.

Mr. Chairman, and listen up over there, if Russia can cough up \$5 billion to kill Chechnyans, if they can cough up \$5 billion to kill them or \$2 billion to produce new advanced submarines, and who knows how much to build a nuclear command bunker the size of Washington, DC, why can Russia not come up with the \$200 million we have been allotting to them for the last 5 years under this program?

And let me tell my colleagues something. If we are giving them this money, it is freeing up other money to build housing for Russian officers while we are not taking care of our own American military personnel. That is outrageous. We have a 4.5 percent increase in housing in the gentleman's bill, and we are grateful that he did that, but we need a lot more.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to note that the Russia of today is not the Russia of 1992. The reformers in that country have long since been purged. That means thrown out. Since at least 1993, Russia has been pursuing foreign and military policies highly reminiscent of the old Soviet Union. Read through my list and Members will see. Mr. Chairman, obsession with whether or not the Communist party will win elections next month has led the Clinton administration to ignore that fact.

Mr. Chairman, some would say a tougher policy against Russia, such as linking our aid to their behavior, would weaken Mr. Yeltsin before the election. Proponents of this view are ignoring the reactionary and anti-western nature of Russia today, with Yeltsin as president. That is what is important, Mr. Chairman. And they are ignoring the fact that this negative trend in Russia has taken place in an atmosphere of unremitting appeasement, with unlinked foreign aid as a cornerstone of that appeasement policy.

Mr. Chairman, the defense budget of all places is no place to put this kind of money. We should save that kind of money and send them a message. Read the certifications necessary and Members will vote for the Solomon amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to have the attention of the distinguished gentleman from New York. I would like to read briefly and in part from a letter from the Secretary of Defense. It says, "I understand and share the concerns about Russian behavior that lie behind this amendment," speaking of the Solomon amendment, "but shutting down the CTR program would not be an effective method for addressing these concerns. Instead, shutting down the CTR program would severely damage our security."

Now, this is the Secretary of Defense. Damage our security. This is a dangerous amendment. We are jeopardizing American Security.

Now, to speak further,

The CTR is directly reducing the threat to the United States from former Soviet nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. Under CTR, the United States is directly facilitating the dismantlement of ICBM's and silos, bombers, ballistic missiles, submarines, and other weapons that were designed to destroy the United States. For example, CTR has provided critical support for the following achievements:

Over 3,800 nuclear warheads have been removed from deployment, and over 800 launchers have been eliminated. Kazakhstan has become a nuclear free area and the Ukraine and Belarus will become so during 1996, halting potential proliferation brought about by the breakup of the Soviet Union. Six hundred kilograms of highly enriched uranium, a proliferator's treasure trove, were secretly removed from Kazakhstan to safe storage in the United States.

Thirty-eight hundred warheads, Mr. Chairman, this is a program that speaks to our national security, and I believe that while the gentleman from New York may very well be well intended, this is a dangerous amendment and flies in the face of American national security.

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

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

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

As the gentleman knows, my amendment does not speak to Kazakhstan; it does not speak to Ukraine. Their new missiles threaten American security as far as I am concerned.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT], a member of the committee.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, we have been trying to move to verify how these Nunn-Lugar funds are being spent. I had an incident occur in Fort Riley, KS, which is just north of my district, which we checked into the financing of.

What happened is we paid for the jet fuel for two IL-76's to bring over approximately 150 Russian soldiers. They then went to Fort Riley and we showed them our latest hardware. Then we put them on charter buses and ran them over to Topeka, KS, to show them the treasures of the czar. Then we hauled them back and eventually brought

them back down to McConnell Air Force Base, near Wichita, and flew them back to Russia, all at taxpayers' expenses.

So I inquired where did these funds come from, from the Pentagon, and lo and behold some of these funds come from Nunn-Lugar. Now, whether this is a good opportunity or not, I think we should have Russians as friends rather than enemies, but these funds are not being spent as they were intended. They are not reducing the amount of chemical weapons and biological weapons and not reducing the nuclear threat as they were intended to.

So, if they are not going to do it, the administration fails to verify, where is the evidence this is actually occurring in Russia? We hear about other countries, but what about Russia?

Why should we borrow money from our children's future to fund these trips over here to America to the treasures of the czar and not let the money go for the specific purposes? That is why I am supporting the Solomon amendment, is that we do not have any verification that they are actually doing what we intended them to do and that they are misusing these funds, in my mind. If we want to do these sort of trips, then we should do it under that aspect and let it go through Congress, let us debate it and bring it up here and vote on it.

But let us make sure if we are going to spend money to reduce the nuclear threat that the money actually goes for that purpose. And I do not think it is going that way and that is why I am supporting the Solomon amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], my distinguished colleague.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition of the Solomon amendment and I rise in strong support of the Nunn-Lugar program. This is a program that does more to kill Russian nuclear weapons with a pen than any hope that we could every have of killing these with dollars and with nuclear weapons or any other kind of weapons ourselves.

It is an example of some of the most wrong-headed, convoluted thinking that I have ever witnessed on the House floor. Somehow we think that, or maybe some people think that there is an opportunity here to try to accuse Democrats or anyone that is in favor of Nunn-Lugar funds of being soft on communism, of being some kind of pinko Communist that is not willing to stand up to the hard Russian threat.

The truth of the matter is, these dollars go, in vast majority, to United States companies to go out and get rid of Russian nuclear weapons. It is a rough equivalent to us saying that because someone has a gun to our head, what we are going to do is pull out a six-shooter and blow off each one of our toes in order to show an example of how tough we are, and if we are not willing to blow off the other six toes

then somehow we are easy or light on communism.

This is craziness. What we should do is recognize that is the United States best interest to make sure that we can get rid of as many Russian nuclear armaments as we possibly can. And if we can do that and pay U.S. companies to get the job done, then why not go forward? What are all of these strings that we want to attach?

Of course, we want to get rid of Russian threats in terms of biological weapons, of course, we want to get rid of radar systems, of course, we want them to agree to a whole range of additional issues, but this is the wrong vehicle to attach those concerns to. I am very much in support of almost every goal that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] puts forward in his amendment to terms of the kinds of compromises we want the Russians to agree to, but this is the wrong way to achieve those compromises.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire as to the remaining amount of time on both sides of the aisle?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has 7½ minutes remaining.

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 me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I am understanding what is going on on the floor right now. Is it the understanding of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] that the fundamental purpose of these Nunn-Lugar funds are to reduce the nuclear threat and the threat of weapons of mass destruction to the United States?

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that is exactly the purpose of Nunn-Lugar; a bipartisan amendment, I might add.

Mr. SKAGGS. The amendments pending before the House would cut funding for that unless certain other conditions are met?

Mr. DELLUMS. If the gentleman would continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, the practical effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is to put constraints and cause certifications that the President could never certify, which means we would kill the program.

Mr. SKAGGS. In other words, if we do not do what the gentleman wants to do in these categories, we are going to shoot ourselves, is the practical effect of this.

Mr. DELLUMS. I would think the gentleman's characterization is correct.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I suspect the ultimate irony of this is that

in a year or two from now, if this becomes law, that we will have Members arguing that we need to increase defense spending because the nuclear threat from Russia has not been reduced, and the reason it will not have been reduced is because we have tried to attach extraneous conditions to one of the most effective programs we have ever seen in reducing the central security threat to this country.

Now, where in the world is the common sense in trying to perpetrate this kind of public policy? Does the gentleman have any idea how this could end up being helpful to our national security?

Mr. DELLUMS. If the gentleman would yield further, I do not think it is, and during the course of the earlier remarks in the general debate I quoted from a letter from the Secretary of Defense that said he believes that while he is concerned about the same issues the gentleman from New York is concerned about, he points out that this is an inappropriate vehicle to use, and at the end of the day to destroy the CTR program is to challenge America's national security.

Mr. SKAGGS. Again, as I understand it, just looking at Russia, the funds from the Nunn-Lugar program have involved removal of over 3,000 nuclear warheads in Russia.

Mr. DELLUMS. That is correct.

Mr. SKAGGS. Putting them ahead of schedule in complying with START I limits.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], a member of the committee.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full amount of time. But after looking at this, first I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I take a back seat to no one when it comes to a strong national defense. I also point out that the two Senators, the one from Georgia and the one from Indiana, who are the authors of the program, the Nunn-Lugar program, are also in the category of standing for a strong national defense.

What this program has done successfully is to reduce the nuclear threat, the nuclear warheads in the former Soviet Union.

□ 1215

I find myself in agreement so many times with my friend from New York. I find myself in agreement with the goals that he has set forth. But to require the President to certify things that are absolutely impossible for him to certify would gut the Nunn-Lugar program. I think that is a dangerous thing for the United States of America to do.

I find myself constrained to disagree with my friend from New York and to oppose this amendment. Though I am sure well-intentioned, it would have the unintended consequences of harming the security of the United States.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire whether the gentleman from

Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] yielded back any part of the 2 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] yielded back 30 seconds.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I enjoyed the time that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] spent on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I do not know whether it engaged him enough or what, but he only spent the better part of a year on there. I am in my eighth year on there.

I can tell my colleagues, you only have to be there a few months, read the National Intelligence Daily, and you will understand what a serious and dangerous world this is. With all the weapons that the Soviet Union has destroyed, they still keep the majority. Constantly in the open press we are reading about the danger of nuclear material and/or missile technology leaking out into the rogue nations of the world, North Korea, Iran, some unholy alliance between an oriental country and a radical Islamic terrorist state. This is a dangerous world.

When we look at the situation, the volatile situation in Russia, when they have crushed Christianity in their nation over the better part of this century and drove anti-Semitism and now they have a country that has partially lost its soul, its conscience, and they are into what I call dark capitalism, like pornography and prostitution and drug dealing and illegal corporate rip-offs, dark capitalism is ripping that country apart as they try to find their way through a free market economy.

So on this floor, I won, I think, 244 votes last year, that would cut off this Nunn-Lugar money until they certify in writing to Mr. Clinton, no more biological/chemical warfare. And they will not do it. They will not even let our auditors come over and find out what is happening to our money. What kind of madness is this?

You can take the position of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] and say, why are we giving our children's money, borrowing money, going into debt for this, but we cannot even get it audited?

I will stand and vote with Mr. SOLOMON on this, as 244 Members of this House voted with me in the last authorization bill, and then it was gutted in the star chamber of the Senate conference.

I will include my remarks for the RECORD. Biological testing is going on in Russia.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I will tell you the concern I have about this

amendment. If you remember, the subcommittee on defense, as it was called then, is the one that funded this initially. This was not funded or authorized; they asked us to fund it in a supplemental. We put several hundred million dollars in. We put very strict interpretations on the language about how it could be spent, because we knew of the concern in the House about how this money should be spent.

I appreciate what the gentleman from New York is trying to do, but everything I have seen, and I had great concern about this amendment initially, is that this program has been successful. They are demilitarizing nuclear weapons.

I would hope we are not trying to interfere in the Soviet elections because I think that would backfire in our case. And I would hope that we would base our decision on the merits of whether this is working or not. Everything I have seen, from Secretary Perry, is that it is working.

We may need to make some changes. We made need to make some sort of certification. But I think the certification that is required in this amendment by the gentleman from New York, which has entirely good intentions, I think goes too far. So I would hope at some point we could come up with adequate restrictions but certainly not this kind of a certification.

I ask the Members to vote against the Solomon amendment at this point and see if we cannot maybe in conference work something out. I feel very strongly that what we are doing with the money we are making available to the Russians is not going to something else. It is going to the very specific purpose we have said. And if they are using other money, they just would not demilitarize their nuclear weapons. That is what it amounts to. So we are getting a tremendous benefit from the amount of money that we are spending in this area.

I ask the Members to consider very carefully voting against this amendment at this point and then later on making some sort of an adjustment in the conference to add restrictions which the President is able to adhere to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has 5½ minutes remaining, as does the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has the right to close.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], and he is and so are many other Members, let me tell you what they are using this money for. They are using it to dismantle the missile

carriers. They have not destroyed one single warhead. You know it and I know it. So while they are destroying old, obsolete missile carriers, they are building new ones.

That is what this debate is all about. We want to be able to certify that they are not doing that.

Let us vote for the Solomon amendment, go to conference, and let us work it out then. If you do not go to conference with the Solomon amendment, it will not even be discussed. That is the problem.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe my colleague, Mr. SOLOMON's, amendment is an important one that opens a debate that this body needs to have.

Many of us here have been supportive of the goals of the Cooperative Threat Reduction program—or Nunn-Lugar program as it is commonly known.

Few, if any, of the Members of this House have difficulty in accepting that it is in our national interest to help the states of the former Soviet Union dismantle a large portion of their weapons of mass destruction and safely store nuclear warheads and other materials.

None of us deny that the denuclearization of Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus, by lessening the number of nuclear-armed states in the world, was a real achievement.

The problem now lies in the fact that we cannot ignore other American interests that lie beyond the process of reducing weapons of mass destruction.

What my colleague's amendment does is simply make that case.

We cannot long ignore the fact that the Russian military is spending large sums on its brutal operation in the separatist region of Chechnya, or that it may be better able to defray the cost of that operation due to Nunn-Lugar assistance elsewhere in the Russian military budget.

We cannot ignore the many outstanding questions about the status of Russia's chemical and biological arsenals, or questions about the strategic facilities it is still constructing and the weapons modernization it is still pursuing despite the relative paucity of funds for its military budget.

And, once again, those costs are, inadvertently, defrayed by United States assistance for demilitarization costs in the Russian military budget.

Mr. Chairman, the problems in the United States-Russian relationship will not simply disappear.

Instead, we must have this debate, and we must make it clear to Russia that we have strong concerns—very strong concerns—about its actions. This amendment sends the right message.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], distinguished colleague and ranking member of the House Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Solomon amendment. There has been very strong bipartisan support over the past year for the Nunn-Lugar program. That program is very much in the American national interest. It is not foreign aid. It is not a gift. It is in investment in our own national security. It directly reduces the threat that the United States faces from Russia. It expedites dismantlement.

This amendment, let us be very clear about it, this amendment would kill the Nunn-Lugar program. That program has destroyed 800 bombers and missile launchers. It has removed 3,800 nuclear warheads from deployment in the former Soviet Union. I do not see how you get a bigger bang for the defense dollar than when you directly dismantle Soviet nuclear power.

This amendment would stop a program to complete the denuclearization of Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan. It would stop a program that is making the biggest contribution to nonproliferation in the very part of the world which represents the greatest nonproliferation threat. It would stop a program that every single day reduces the nuclear threat to the United States.

This amendment is self-defeating. These conditions that are set out, these objectives are all very worthy. The problem is the President cannot certify many of them, if any of them. And if he is not able to certify those conditions or objectives, then the program will collapse.

If we insist that those goals become preconditions before we provide help to Russia in dismantling these nuclear weapons, we will clearly harm the national interest of the United States.

May I say to my colleagues that one of the facts missing from all of this debate is what is happening today in the Russian defense budget. It is has declined 20 percent in the past year. It is 45 percent of what it was in 1992. It is less than 20 percent of what it was at its peak. The Russian defense budget, then the Soviet defense budget, in 1988. The Russian defense budget is in a freefall. Its defense establishment is in turmoil.

If we want some stability and if we want some security with regard to these nuclear weapons in Russia, then we are going to have to help provide them. May I say it is also a fact that Russia does itself contribute to the dismantlement of these programs.

I urge the defeat of the Solomon amendment. It just goes way too far and, I think, works against the American national interest.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from

Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], a member of the committee.

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

I never thought I would be here doing this. Last year I voted for it. I think I voted for it every time. But I reluctantly oppose the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, who I believe is a real patriot. We agree more often than not, but I cannot agree to gut the cooperative threat reduction or Nunn-Lugar program.

This program succeeded in moving former Soviet personnel and forces out of and away from eastern Europe. It has encouraged U.S. corporations to invest in defense conversions all over Russia. Nunn-Lugar has removed warheads, dismantled launchers, and brought nuclear material for storage in the U.S. Just think back 10 years ago, who would have dreamt that this could happen?

We won the cold war. Why snatch defeat from the jaws of victory and bring genuine progress to a halt? Make no mistake, by no stretch of the imagination have we solved all of our problems with Russia. I happen to agree with virtually everything that Mr. SOLOMON says about Russia, but effectively terminating Nunn-Lugar is precisely the wrong thing to do, the wrong signal to send, especially before the Russian elections.

It is veto bait that harms not only a good, sensible effective policy, but puts all other good things we achieve in this bill at risk.

I ask Members to oppose this amendment. We can revisit hopefully this issue in separate legislation this summer. I will try to get it out of the committee to do that. I am concerned about the Russian elections. We have a lot at stake. I would ask Members to vote against it.

□ 1230

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 45 seconds.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to suggest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] that some of the gentleman's conditions were beyond the ability to certify. Let me give our colleagues a couple of examples.

It says here Russia is not developing offensive chemical or biological weapons. If there is a pharmacological industry, how in the world can we certify with respect to biological weaponry? That flies in the face of reality.

Second, Russia is not modernizing its nuclear weapons. Why are we modernizing ours? For safety and reliability that are constrained by treaty, my colleagues.

Third, now, this one is extraordinarily bizarre. Mr. Chairman, it says Russia is not providing any intelligence information to Cuba. Now, how can the President of the United States

certify with certainty that Russia is not providing intelligence information to Cuba? It defies logic.

This is a killer amendment to a significant piece of legislation. At the appropriate point I hope we defeat the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield our remaining time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Procurement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues let us go over the state of play here with exactly what we are talking about. Every single reduction in strategic systems that the gentleman from California spoke of and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] spoke of are taking place; all those reductions are taking place because we signed START I. The Russians signed START I. We signed START I. And we agreed to reduce these nuclear weapons with our own taxpayer dollars. That means the Russians agreed to reduce their systems with rubles, we agreed to reduce our systems at our expense with dollars, and we proceeded on that course to go down approximately from 12,000 nuclear weapons to about 6,000, and we have been proceeding on that course.

We never agreed that we would pay the Russians for the reduction that they were making under START I. We never agreed we would subsidize that. But in 1991 we felt that the Russians were so fragile with that new democracy and that attempted democracy that we would help them. So we implemented Nunn-Lugar, and a lot of us agreed with that; it was a good program.

The point is that the Russians need to have their feet held to the fire.

Now, it is a good deal if two neighbors agree to disarm, and if the gentleman from California Mr. DELLUMS, agrees to disarm, and I agree to disarm, and Mr. DELLUMS says, "I need a little extra money to disarm, Mr. HUNTER; could you help," that is a good deal.

But it is not a good deal if my neighbor then takes some of the money or the resources that are freed up from my subsidizing his disarmament and builds some new weapons.

We are not concerned about the new SS-25. It is extremely accurate. We are concerned about their new strategic ballistic missile submarine system. We are concerned about their biological weapons development.

Now, I assure my colleagues in the end, when the smoke clears, there is going to be some Nunn-Lugar money on the table. But we need to have some conditions on money, and this starts the process. The Solomon amendment holds the Russians' feet to the fire, and let me just say the sales of nuclear technology to Iran, the biological weapons development that we know

violates the biological weapons conventions, their new strategic missiles that they are building, are not in the spirit of the reductions that we have made, if not the law.

So this holds the feet of the Russians to the fire. Vote for these certifications. We are going to end up looking like dummies. We are going to be the guys that paid money to the Soviet Union to dismantle weapons while they were building new ones. Let us not be in that position. Please support Solomon.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendments printed in part A of the report relating to cooperative threat reduction with the former Soviet Union, which shall be considered in the following order:

Amendment A-1 offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and amendment A-2 offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

AMENDMENT A-1 OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. 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. SOLOMON: In section 1104 (page 362, beginning on line 17)—

(1) insert "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "None of the funds"; and

(2) add at the end (page 363, after line 12) the following:

(b) ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO RUSSIA AND BELARUS.—None of the funds appropriated for Cooperative Threat Reduction programs for any fiscal year may be obligated for any activity in Russia or Belarus until the President submits to Congress, after such funds are appropriated, a current certification of each of the following:

(1) Russia is in compliance with all arms control agreements.

(2) Russia is not developing offensive chemical or biological weapons.

(3) Russia has ceased all construction of and operations at the underground military complex at Yamantau Mountain.

(4) Russia is not modernizing its nuclear arsenal.

(5) Russia has ceased all offensive military operations in Chechnya.

(6) Russia has begun, and is making continual progress toward, the unconditional implementation of the Russian-Moldovan troop withdrawal agreement, signed by the prime ministers of Russia and Moldova on October 21, 1994, and is not providing military assistance to any military forces in the Transdnistria region of Moldova.

(7) Russian troops in the Kaliningrad region of Russia are respecting the sovereign territory of Lithuania and other neighboring countries.

(8) The activities of Russia in the other independent states of the former Soviet Union do not represent an attempt by Russia to violate or otherwise diminish the sovereignty and independence of such states.

(9) Russia is not providing any intelligence information to Cuba and is not providing any assistance to Cuba with respect to the signal intelligence facility at Lourdes.

(10)(A) Russia is not providing to the countries described in subparagraph (B) goods or technology, including conventional weapons, which could contribute to the acquisition by these countries of chemical, biological, nuclear, or advanced conventional weapons.

(B) The countries described in this subparagraph are Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Cuba, or any country, the government of which the Secretary of State has determined, for purposes of section 6(j)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(6)(j)(1)), has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and a Member opposed each will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It would prohibit any further obligation of Nunn-Lugar aid to Russia and Belarus but allow the funds to go ahead to Ukraine and to Kazakhstan, which is fast becoming a military satellite of Russia, until or unless the President certifies that Russia is in compliance with the conditions in my amendment.

First, Russia must be in compliance with all arms control agreements. Who can disagree with that? Russia must not be producing any offensive biological or chemical weapons. Who can disagree with that?

Russia must cease the ongoing construction of the massive bunker at Yamantau, which is widely perceived to be a nuclear command center.

Russia must cease modernization of its nuclear forces, and they are at present developing new classes of weapons, and we are paying for it.

Mr. Chairman, last, Russia is not exporting goods or technology to terrorist nations that could help them acquire advanced conventional weapons or weapons of mass destruction. Mr. Chairman, this is just common sense. Russia is engaged in all of these activities, all of which are contrary to our national interests, yet the aid continues to flow.

Mr. Chairman, many of these activities are addressed in the form of conditions in the previous cooperative threat reduction legislation, but they are so vague. For instance, the law states that the President must certify that Russia is "committed to arms control compliance," and that is what he has been doing. Well, either they are complying or they are not complying, and we all know that they are not. I just read the list. Every one of our colleagues knows they are not complying.

Mr. Chairman, we have had enough vagueness and enough unlinked foreign aid. With these policies we have done nothing to stem Russia's reactionary slide over the past 2 or 3 years. We have set no boundaries on Russia's behavior whatsoever, while shelling out hundreds of millions of American taxpayer dollars, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, let me just read to our colleagues from the GAO report, October 1994. Everybody should listen to this. Currently Nunn-Lugar officials appear to have overestimated the probable impact of similar projects in Russia. Russia can meet, without U.S. aid, its Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty obligations and eliminate thousands of

strategic nuclear delivery vehicles and launchers over the next decade.

That is what their GAO says. They do not need our money; they have the money to do it.

What we are doing is financing their modernization of a new class of weapons; they are tearing down the obsolete silos, building new ones with our money so that these warheads that they are not abolishing or doing away with can be remounted. We should not be paying for it.

I will move my amendment at the appropriate time, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to just hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will turn down this amendment.

I realize that disarming the Soviet Union is the most important foreign policy objective we have. I think this amendment will make it harder to actually accomplish that reality that we all hope for, and I would simply remind Members, whatever their view on specific parts of this amendment, please remember there is an election in Russia next month. Can my colleagues imagine how it is in our interests to say to the Russian people that we want to stop and move back from an effort we have made together to get rid of nuclear arms as they are going to the polling booths to vote for whether they want to return to communism and to totalitarianism or whether they want to continue with democracy?

This is a bad amendment, it is a bad idea, it is bad timing, and I urge Members to vote against this amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, the Solomon amendment purports to condition Nunn-Lugar funding. In fact, we all know what it would do. It would stop it, stop it dead in the water, and I think that is a tragic mistake, and I strongly oppose it.

Nunn-Lugar has three laudable goals, which I do not understand how anybody can possibly oppose, to destroy and dismantle weapons that were designed, developed, and deployed, the deadliest weapons in this world, to devastate this country. It is also designed to take the components of those weapons and make sure that they do not spread, fall into the hands of other countries, terrorist groups who might use them against us. And, astutely, it is also to be used so that the knowledge and the expertise of former Soviet

scientists cannot be used by these same terrorist groups or rogue nations against us.

This law is for our benefit, not for their benefit, and it is in our best interests. And let us see what it accomplished. First of all, all of the nuclear warheads deployed in the former Soviet Union, in Kazakhstan and Ukraine and Belarus, will be removed, gone from those three countries, leaving only one nuclear State in the former Soviet Union. Thirty-eight hundred warheads will be freed up, removed from the former Soviet Union, putting Russia ahead in implementation of the START-I Treaty. Thirty-two of those warheads, missiles, will be SS-18's. That is 320 SS-18 reentry vehicles, more than any RV's, reentry vehicles, that we could possibly take out with any missile defense system we are going to develop in the near future. Eight hundred strategic launchers were removed; 200 missile silos removed.

Now, what is the money that is coming in this bill? What will it do? Among other things, it will help us continue eliminating those SS-18 missiles. Thirty-two have been eliminated so far; 170 remain to go. It will help implement START-I, help ratify START-II, carry it out if it is completed.

It will help destroy 10 mobile launch pads in Belarus, seal up 30 nuclear test tunnels in Kazakhstan, provide 150 United States-made containers to transport nuclear materials to save storage.

And let me stop here and say that it is true that a lot of those components have not been destroyed. What we want to do is build a facility in Tomsk, Siberia; been built, the site has been chosen and the design is completed. It is under construction. This money will help to go toward the construction and completion of this facility where those components will be taken, they will be accurately accounted for and safely stored.

Time does not allow me to keep on going, but I could iterate point after point about how we are protecting ourselves and protecting the rest of the world in this Nunn-Lugar program. It is a program of proven success, and it has much yet to be accomplished. It would be a tragic mistake in terms of timing, but in terms of our own self-interest and the protection of our country if we pass the Solomon amendment and terminated this program which has done so much to enhance the security of this country.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I speak on behalf of and am strongly supportive of the Solomon amendment.

Let us not make any mistake about what this is about. This is foreign aid to Russia, and we can cloak it in all kinds of language and we can talk about it being a particular program

that has to do with the dismantling of nuclear warheads. The fact is that it is foreign aid, it is \$1.2 billion, of which \$500 million has already been spent, that goes from American taxpayers to Russia. It is money that Russia does not have to spend on other things. START-I requires, and we have agreed with this and Russia has agreed to it, that all of these weapons be dismantled, and it says nothing whatsoever about who will pay for that.

It speaks, I mean the assumption is, that Russia will pay for the dismantling of the Russian weapons, and the United States will pay for the dismantling of our own weapons. The fact is that we are paying for both now, and as a result of that, because, in the words that I never find better language to describe, money is fungible, that means that the money that is being spent, that is being given to Russia for this, they do not have to spend on something else.

□ 1245

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HENRY HYDE, a very valuable member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs and chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, one of the most respected Members of this body.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the extravagant introduction.

Mr. Chairman, I am troubled by this amendment. I do not want to vote for this, because if there is a program that is diminishing the nuclear threat to our country, no matter what other aberrational things that are going on, such as selling submarines to Iran, I think anything that diminishes a nuclear threat to our country ought to be supported.

However, I learned that the Russians are modernizing their nuclear capability. "Russia test-launched new ICBM yesterday. Missile will replace SS-18's destroyed under Nunn-Lugar," on and on about how they are modernizing the nuclear capability. How does that diminish the threat to our country? It enhances it. So with one hand we are giving them money to sweep away the old stuff, the garbage, and then free up their own money to develop and modernize a nuclear threat. Support Solomon.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in the past I have supported the Solomon amendment, but as a number of well-attended hearings of this committee pointed out, our Nation does not have the ability to stop a sin-

gle missile coming from the Soviet Union, the former Soviet Union, pointed our way.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, it makes more sense than ever to try to destroy as many of those 26,000 nuclear warheads that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] just told us about while they are on the ground, while they are still in the Soviet Union, before they fall into the hands of a terrorist Nation like Iraq or Iran or Libya, North Korea, or Cuba. We cannot stop them in the air and we cannot inspect the 4 million cargo containers that come into this country, should someone want to smuggle them into our country.

I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], it would make a whole heck of a lot more sense to fix the program we have and destroy them while they are on the ground in the former Soviet Union. Therefore, until the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] can fix some of those things that he knows the Soviets will not do, I am going to have to vote against his amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], whom I respect on these matters, that I respect the comment that the gentleman made; that there is adversity in this amendment.

But I would like to point out to my colleague with respect to the missiles that he spoke of, if he goes back to the START-II arrangement, it talks about the removal of SS-18's. They are trying to get rid of all of them, so we move away from virtually all, if not all, land-based missiles.

The treaty itself favors sea-based missiles. The missile to which the gentleman addressed his remarks is a sea-based missile. What constrained us were land-based missiles. What had us concerned were fixed-based ICBM's, the SS-18. That is what is being dismantled. So when we look at what they are doing in terms of modernization, we have to put that within some kind of perspective.

Staff can put a memo in front of us and say, gee, they are advancing this weapon, but ask staff to tell us what is that weapon attempting to do. It is a sea-based weapon, so all of this activity is confined within the treaty that we are party to. It is constrained by treaty.

Mr. Chairman, I pointed out earlier in my remarks that this gentleman wished we had never gone down the road toward nuclear weapons. We are the only species on the face of the Earth that have developed the capacity to destroy ourselves and all other life. But we went down that road. We went down that road to the tune of thousands of nuclear warheads and nuclear weapons. Nunn-Lugar is an effort to step back away from that. We are modernizing our weapons for several rea-

sons: for safety and reliability I am assuming that they are doing that as well. We are doing it within the constraints of the treaties to which we have subscribed and on which we are appropriate signatories.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me say, the gentleman from New York has laid out a number of laudable concerns. I do not challenge the concerns. What I am saying is one does not cut off his nose to spite his face. Linkages make sense to us as politicians, but sometimes in the real world linkages do not make sense.

When we link the danger of nuclear weapons to a foreign policy consideration, it does not say the foreign policy concern is not legitimate, but it says that we have to balance these matters. We have to prioritize these matters. In our minds, it seems to me we ought to internalize the notion that nuclear weapons are dangerous, they are an imperative unto themselves. To link this unnecessarily is to destroy what it is we are trying to do.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] eloquently and articulately laid out the three goals of the nuclear warhead program, a bipartisan effort to dismantle, ultimately to destroy, to retard this kind of development of nuclear weapons, and weapons of mass destruction, including chemical and biological.

If we have foreign policy concerns, there are other fora, there are other places where we can fight that battle. But to use the CTR program as the vehicle to challenge on all these other bases I would suggest, to underscore for emphasis, that it cuts off our noses to spite our face.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I listened carefully to all of the debates and discussion that my colleagues have raised. They have only raised one issue, that money is fungible. Big deal. We had to come to Congress to learn that, that money is fungible? So we can create any kind of scenario for our political purposes, but the fact of the matter is that this is a serious policy program that has specific implications. We should not attempt to play the game of "money is fungible" to create this.

One of my colleagues even talked about a few Russians coming to the United States and placed that in juxtaposition to removing 3,800 warheads. It is a joke. I would be willing to challenge the gentleman anytime, anywhere, anywhere, to make that kind of assertion about taxpayers' dollars. We are talking about our children and our children's children.

It is important for us, Mr. Chairman, to reject the gentleman's amendment. This is dangerous. It flies in the face of American national security. That has been stated by the Secretary of Defense. It has been stated by a number of other persons. I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this amendment. It is qualitatively different, more dangerous than the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]

last year; make no mistake about it. I urge my colleague to reject the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for those people who are in a mood to cut money and authorization from the defense bill, now is their chance.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me just praise the gentleman for the work he has done on this overall bill. It is a very good bill. For those who think it is too much money, let us point out that it is only 2.4 percent more than was being spent last year. That hardly pays for the raises for our military personnel. It hardly pays for the housing improvements needed so desperately. I wanted to say that about the overall bill.

About my amendment, Mr. Chairman, 40 percent of Nunn-Lugar will continue to go ahead with or without any Presidential certification that Russia is behaving itself in these areas we have been talking about. Forty percent of that money will continue to go to countries like Ukraine, who are good citizens, and countries like Kazakhstan, who are good citizens, who are actually out there destroying missiles and warheads.

By contrast, Russia is not destroying one single warhead. Not one has been destroyed. They simply are taking them out of the old dilapidated, antiquated silos that they have now, they are laying them over here, and then they are building these new, highly state-of-the-art silos and launching systems which they will take, and these warheads, and put them back in these new silos. Where is the diminishing of a threat then?

I am not going to use all this time because we have to get on with the bill, but let me tell the Members, their nuclear missiles threaten American security. Their weapons export sales to terrorist nations like Iran and Iraq and Syria and Libya, that is what threatens security of American citizens, both overseas and right here in America.

Mr. Chairman, if Members are sincere about wanting to deal with these issues like the Russians modernizing their equipment, if Members are interested in dealing with stopping them from their biological and chemical weapons development, and if they are interested in stopping them from exporting nuclear technology to Iran and Cuba, 90 miles off out shore, they will vote for the Solomon amendment.

Then they will go to conference with the Senate and pick out the most important ones, perhaps, of my listed items here. Then we will have held the Russians' feet to the fire.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I would just say let us accept the efficacy of the gentleman's argument that the Russians are bad guys. If they are, then those are the very people we want to help dismantle the weapons, so I accept the gentleman's argument and come to a very different conclusion.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would tell the gentleman from California, accept my amendment. We will go to the Senate and we will really accomplish what both the gentleman and I want to accomplish.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to these attempts to block cooperative threat reduction funding to Russia.

Cooperative threat reduction, also known as Nunn-Lugar, is not foreign aid. It is an investment in United States security. This program reduces the threat to the United States from nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Nunn-Lugar funding improves the security of these weapons to keep them out of the hands of terrorists and aids in critical denuclearization efforts in Russia, Kazakhstan, Belarus, and Ukraine.

I share many of the concerns raised in this amendment. I strongly support the sovereignty of the independent states of the former Soviet Union, and would oppose any efforts on Russia's part to violate this independence. I also want to ensure that Russia is not providing assistance to Iran, Iraq, Libya, or Syria. But this amendment is not the way to do that.

Mr. Chairman, cooperative threat reduction is strengthening U.S. security. Blocking funding for these critical programs would only hurt U.S. efforts to expedite the dismantlement of weapons of mass destruction. I urge my colleagues to defeat this destructive amendment.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Solomon part A amendment to H.R. 3230, the fiscal year 1997 Defense Authorization Act. The Solomon amendment would place restrictions on the cooperative threat reduction denuclearization program in Russia. CTR is also known as the Nunn-Lugar program, after its bipartisan sponsors in the Senate.

Nunn-Lugar provides for the release of American funds to help speed the destruction of Russia's massive nuclear weapons stockpile. Russia's nuclear weapons are often poorly guarded and the threat of nuclear terrorism, either through theft or illicit sales of Russian fissile material, is all too real. The Nunn-Lugar program is a sensible approach to this serious problem, and represents one of the best investments we can make in our national security.

The Solomon amendment requires that Russia meet 10 conditions before funds could be released to Russia. While all of the conditions represent goals I would like to see reached, such as Russia's full withdrawal of troops from Chechnya and Moldova, I do not believe it is a good idea to allow Russia to maintain a large, insecure nuclear stockpile that might reach the hands of terrorists. If anything, we should raise the amount of money allocated to destroying Russia's nuclear weapons instead of trying to eliminate funding.

The Solomon amendment is dangerous, unnecessary, and effectively guts one of the best bipartisan programs around. I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, to condition the expenditure of funds for the Nunn-Lugar program.

Mr. Chairman, Nunn-Lugar protects American citizens from Russian missiles and nuclear warheads. Conditioning funds for this program on our ability to influence Russian leaders on specific policy goals, however admirable those goals are, is contrary to our own national interests.

Nunn-Lugar has been a successful program. Designed to meet the complex challenges which followed the break-up of the Soviet Union, it assures that weapons of mass destruction, as well as the equipment, material, and services supporting them, are dismantled. Since 1992, over 3,800 nuclear warheads have been removed from deployment, and over 800 launchers have been eliminated. That's good for America.

Because of Nunn-Lugar, Russia is ahead of schedule in meeting its obligations to reduce its number of warheads as set forth under the START agreement. That's good for America.

Nunn-Lugar has helped convert at least 17 Russian industrial facilities previously dedicated to building weapons to civilian manufacturing. And it has redirected the work for more than 11,500 former Russian weapons scientists.

As a result of this program, proliferation has been halted. Kazakhstan is nuclear-free, with more than 600 kilograms of weapons-grade uranium removed to the United States.

In the Ukraine, more than 460 nuclear warheads and 46 SS-19 silos have been deactivated because Nunn-Lugar provided the necessary heavy equipment to do so. In fact, both the Ukraine and Belarus are expected to become nuclear-free later this year. That, too, is good for America.

I don't doubt my friend's sincerity in wanting to change Russian behavior on a wide range of critical issues affecting our security and that of Russia's neighbors. I agree with them.

But I believe a more effective approach to achieving the goals outlined in my friend's amendment would be to engage the Russians directly—not to cut funds on a program whose greatest beneficiary is the United States.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Chairman. We need to remember that the greatest beneficiary of the Nunn-Lugar program is the United States, not Russia. To halt progress, even temporarily, on reducing the threat represented by the remaining Russian missiles and warheads is to put our citizens, American citizens, at risk.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment offered by my friend from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 220, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

AYES—202

Allard	Frisa	Nethercutt
Andrews	Funderburk	Neumann
Archer	Gallegly	Ney
Army	Gekas	Norwood
Bachus	Gilchrest	Nussle
Baker (CA)	Gillmor	Oxley
Baker (LA)	Gilman	Packard
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Pastor
Barr	Goodling	Pombo
Bartlett	Goss	Porter
Barton	Graham	Portman
Bass	Greene (UT)	Pryce
Bateman	Greenwood	Quillen
Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Quinn
Bliley	Hall (TX)	Radanovich
Blute	Hancock	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hansen	Riggs
Boehner	Hastert	Roberts
Bonilla	Hayes	Rogers
Bono	Hayworth	Rohrabacher
Brownback	Hefley	Ros-Lehtinen
Bryant (TN)	Heineman	Roukema
Bunn	Herger	Royce
Bunning	Hilleary	Salmon
Burr	Hobson	Sanford
Burton	Hoekstra	Saxton
Buyer	Hoke	Scarborough
Callahan	Hostettler	Schaefer
Calvert	Hunter	Schiff
Camp	Hutchinson	Seastrand
Canady	Hyde	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Inglis	Shadegg
Chenoweth	Istook	Shaw
Christensen	Jacobs	Shuster
Chrysler	Johnson, Sam	Skeen
Clinger	Jones	Smith (MI)
Coble	Kasich	Smith (NJ)
Coburn	Kelly	Smith (TX)
Collins (GA)	Kim	Smith (WA)
Combest	Kingston	Solomon
Condit	Klug	Souder
Cooley	Knollenberg	Spence
Cox	LaHood	Stearns
Crane	Largent	Stockman
Crapo	Latham	Stump
Cremeans	Laughlin	Talent
Cubin	Lazio	Tate
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Tauzin
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Lightfoot	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart	Linder	Torkildsen
Dickey	Livingston	Trafficant
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Vucanovich
Dornan	Lucas	Walker
Dreier	Manzullo	Walsh
Duncan	Martini	Wamp
Dunn	McCollum	Watts (OK)
Ehrlich	McCrery	Weldon (FL)
Emerson	McHugh	Weller
Ensign	McInnis	White
Everett	McIntosh	Wicker
Ewing	McKeon	Wolf
Fields (TX)	Metcalfe	Young (AK)
Flanagan	Meyers	Young (FL)
Foley	Mica	Zeliff
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Zimmer
Fox	Myers	
Franks (CT)	Myrick	

NOES—220

Abercrombie	Castle	Durbin
Ackerman	Chambliss	Edwards
Baesler	Clay	Ehlers
Baldacci	Clement	Engel
Barcia	Clyburn	English
Barrett (NE)	Coleman	Eshoo
Barrett (WI)	Collins (IL)	Evans
Becerra	Collins (MI)	Farr
Bellenson	Conyers	Fattah
Bentsen	Costello	Fawell
Bereuter	Coyne	Fazio
Berman	Cramer	Fields (LA)
Bevill	Cummings	Filner
Bilbray	Danner	Foglietta
Bishop	Davis	Ford
Bonior	de la Garza	Frank (MA)
Borski	DeFazio	Franks (NJ)
Boucher	DeLauro	Frelinghuysen
Brewster	Dellums	Frost
Browder	Deutsch	Furse
Brown (CA)	Dicks	Ganske
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Gejdenson
Brown (OH)	Dixon	Gephardt
Bryant (TX)	Doggett	Geren
Campbell	Dooley	Gibbons
Cardin	Doyle	Gonzalez

Gordon	Mascara	Roth
Green (TX)	Matsui	Roybal-Allard
Gunderson	McCarthy	Rush
Gutierrez	McDermott	Sabo
Hall (OH)	McHale	Sanders
Hamilton	McKinney	Sawyer
Harman	McNulty	Schroeder
Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Schumer
Hastings (WA)	Meek	Scott
Hefner	Menendez	Serrano
Hilliard	Millender	Shays
Hinchee	McDonald	Sisisky
Horn	Miller (CA)	Skaggs
Houghton	Minge	Skelton
Hoyer	Mink	Slaughter
Jackson (IL)	Moakley	Spratt
Jackson-Lee	Mollohan	Stark
(TX)	Montgomery	Stenholm
Jefferson	Moran	Stokes
Johnson (SD)	Morella	Studds
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Stupak
Johnston	Nadler	Tanner
Kanjorski	Neal	Taylor (MS)
Kaptur	Oberstar	Tejeda
Kennedy (MA)	Obey	Thomas
Kennedy (RI)	Olver	Thompson
Kennelly	Ortiz	Thornberry
Kildee	Orton	Thornton
King	Owens	Thurman
Kleczka	Pallone	Torres
Klink	Parker	Towns
Kolbe	Payne (NJ)	Upton
LaFalce	Payne (VA)	Velazquez
Lantos	Pelosi	Vento
LaTourette	Peterson (FL)	Visclosky
Leach	Peterson (MN)	Volkmer
Levin	Petri	Ward
Lewis (GA)	Pickett	Waters
Lincoln	Pomeroy	Watt (NC)
Lipinski	Poshard	Waxman
Lofgren	Rahall	Weldon (PA)
Longley	Rangel	Whitfield
Lowe	Reed	Williams
Luther	Regula	Wilson
Maloney	Richardson	Wise
Manton	Rivers	Woolsey
Markey	Roemer	Wynn
Martinez	Rose	Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Chapman	Holden	Moorhead
Clayton	Johnson (CT)	Paxon
Flake	McDade	Torrice
Fowler	Molinari	

□ 1316

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Paxon for, with Mr. Holden against.

Messrs. NADLER, MATSUI, FORD of Tennessee, WYNN, and CHAMBLISS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DOOLITTLE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, during roll-call vote No. 170 on H.R. 3230, the Solomon amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. A-2 printed in part A of the report.

AMENDMENT A-2 OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. GILMAN. 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. GILMAN: In section 1103 (page 362, beginning on line 1)—

(1) insert "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "None of the funds";

(2) strike out paragraph (3) and redesignate paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(3) add at the end (page 362, after line 16) the following:

(b) LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO DEFENSE CONVERSION ASSISTANCE.—None of the funds appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act may be obligated or expended for the provision of assistance to Russia or any other state of the former Soviet Union to promote defense conversion, including assistance through the Defense Enterprise Fund.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is about saving millions of taxpayer dollars from being spent in Russia and the other NIS States for dubious defense conversion projects.

The bill before us, as reported by the Committee on National Security, prohibits any DOD moneys from being spent for defense conversion in the former Soviet Union. My amendment simply broadens that prohibition to make certain that no United States funds, DOD or otherwise, can be used to promote defense conversion in the former Soviet Union.

This amendment is being offered for two significant reasons: First, because I believe it is important for the Congress to go on record on whether it wants to continue to support a profusion of aimless and uncoordinated programs for defense conversion in the former Soviet Union; and, second, because I am deeply frustrated the administration continues to try and fund the defense enterprise fund.

Let me address each of these. My colleagues, I want to make certain that you know just how many separate and overlapping programs are being utilized to implement this so-called defense conversion project.

First of all, there are already in existence several enterprise funds operating in the States of the former Soviet Union with financing provided through the Freedom Support Act Program. There is the United States-Russia Investment Fund, the Western NIS Enterprise Fund, and the Central Asian American Enterprise Fund. Let us not forget we already have the U.S. Export Bank, the U.S. Overseas Private Invest Corporation, and the U.S. Trade and Investment Agency all working in this direction.

Have I mentioned the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which we help fund, or the World Bank's International Finance Corporation, which works in the field of privatization and which we help fund, or our AID programs on privatization?

In short, we need to slow down, step back and ask do we need all of these programs and determine exactly what we are achieving.

I want to make certain that we appreciate the enormity of the task we are facing. One estimate is it will cost over \$150 billion and will take 12 to 15 years to convert just Russia's defense industry, much less any of the other FSU States. Is that something that this Congress is prepared to take on, even in small part?

Now, with respect to the defense enterprise fund, that fund, known as DEF, is a prime example of why we should not fund defense conversion projects. The DEF is a so-called private venture capital fund whose purpose is to finance joint ventures and promote defense conversion in the former Soviet Union. The GAO reports that DOD officials believe that we need to capitalize that fund at a minimum of \$120 million in order for that fund to be viable and self-sustaining. I note that the DEF has not raised one dollar in private fund raising to date.

So where are we going to find the \$120 million in U.S. taxpayer subsidies? To date DOD has agreed to provide \$30 million, and that is it. The Congress has made clear that no more money is coming from the defense budget for the DEF. So what did the administration do? They transferred responsibility for funding and implementation of the DEF in fiscal year 1997 from the Department of Defense to the Department of State. This follows a pattern of transferring other CTR programs to the 150 budget function, including placing the export control programs under the nonproliferation and disarmament Fund. I do not need to explain to any one here the absurdity of finding extra money in foreign assistance funds to support this fund. It is not there and it never will be.

So let us send a message to the administration that this Congress does not see how our national security interests are being served by spending our hard earned taxpayers' dollars for defense conversion. Let us put the DEF out of business once and for all. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, the author of the amendment, the distinguished gentleman from New York, is the chairperson of the appropriate committee. This is less about dollars than it is about orderly process and procedure.

Let the Secretary come before the distinguished gentleman's committee and make the case. If the gentleman opposes what he wants to do, then zero it out. But to come here prematurely to offer a ban flies in the face of appropriate process and dignified procedure.

And the gentleman is the chairperson. He has the power and the authority to call the Secretary before the committee.

Now, with the remaining time, let me make a few remarks. The Gilman amendment attacks the defense enterprise fund because of the Secretary of Defense's request that it be funded from foreign operations appropriations. Last year the Secretary was told in no uncertain terms, Mr. Chairman, and I am a member of the committee that told him that, "Do not request defense funds for this program. If you want them, then secure them from foreign aid accounts." That is what he was told by the House Committee on National Security.

Because the Committee on International Relations had not given the Secretary an opportunity to testify on this issue, it seems to me it is unfair, premature, to pass an amendment prohibiting any expenditures, when the maker of the motion has the authority to call the Secretary before the committee. Let the Secretary make his case. If the Committee on Foreign Affairs rejects the offers, then they should zero out the request.

This amendment is premature. It sends all the wrong signals to the Russians about our willingness to help them to meet our common security requirements of preventing the proliferation of the technology and information on weapons of mass destruction. I urge my colleagues to oppose this.

Mr. Chairman, let me make a few further comments. If Nunn-Lugar is designed to prevent nuclear weapons proliferation, one needs to be concerned with scientific expertise as well as the nuclear materials themselves.

It is remarkably shortsighted, Mr. Chairman, to disallow expenditures in which efforts can be made that establish such a program that would make sense to the overall program objectives. Because of the notification requirements imposed on this program, Congress will always have the opportunity, will always have the opportunity to review in advance the type of activities against which obligations are purported to be placed.

One final comment. It seems especially troublesome, now that the administration has been responsive to Congress' demand not to spend defense dollars on these types of efforts, expenditures that are fully justified in themselves as national security activities, but that was the will of the body, that the effort is now launched to close off other avenues of supporting such high priority activities.

My point is very simple: If the body said to the Secretary of Defense, "Don't spend defense dollars for this high priority matter; put them in a foreign affairs account, put them in that account," then the chairperson of the Committee on International Relations, who had the authority to bring the Secretary before the committee, have appropriate testimony, make some de-

isions, then comes to the defense authorization bill to offer an amendment to ban the process.

I would suggest, sir, this flies in the face of intelligent and rational process and procedure, and this is one gentleman that feels that whether we disagree on the policy matters, the place where we ought to always be willing to come together is on orderly process, intelligent procedure, and dignified activities as we debate these matters.

I think this is premature, I think it is unfair, I think it makes no sense, and I ask my colleagues to reject the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is entirely correct in stating no hearings have been held on the recently submitted fiscal year 1997 budget on this issue. I would note that the Committee on International Relations has been closely involved in the Nunn-Lugar program since its inception in 1991, and has held numerous hearings in past years on the program. The issue of defense conversion, and in particular of the Defense Committee's desire to curtail funding for defense conversion and other activities such as housing, environmental restoration, are familiar to all of us.

That is why it is so frustrating to note that, without any consultation with the Congress, the responsibility for funding and implementing defense conversion activities in the former Soviet Union for fiscal year 1997 has been entirely transferred to the International Affairs budget. I do not need to convene exhaustive hearings or even one hearing to know we do not have the resources to do all of this.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 45 seconds.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, in 45 seconds let me reiterate, the administration submits a budget request. In this instance, they submitted a budget request based upon what we asked them to do. We said "Don't spend defense dollars." The Secretary said, "OK. Whether I agree or disagree, that is what you said, that is what I will do."

Now it seems to me orderly process means that the Committee on International Relations should then, if they had any question, call the Secretary before the committee and allow the Secretary to make his case. If it does not make sense, you can zero it out. But to do it without even holding hearings, without even bringing the Secretary, who simply responded to Congress' request, does not make sense.

Again, I press my point, defeat this amendment. It makes no sense.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, the Gilman amendment prohibits defense conversion. It prohibits, in particular, funds for the Defense Enterprise Fund.

To date, the Defense Enterprise Fund has received \$30 million. The request for fiscal year 1997 is for \$20 million. This request is not from the Defense Department budget, but from the foreign affairs (150) budget, in the jurisdiction of the International Relations Committee.

The goal of the Defense Enterprise Fund is to spark the process of defense conversion. The Fund, while small in size, serves as an important model to reorient enterprises from producing weapons of mass destruction to producing civilian goods. This Fund, and other U.S. Government activities, are a critical part of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

So what has the Fund achieved to date? It has made 7 investments, and has achieved a leverage ratio of \$6 of outside funds for every dollar committed by the U.S. Government. Those investments bring U.S. firms into partnership with former defense firms. Completed deals include converting nuclear sub parts to earthmovers; converting military electronics to IBM and minicomputer software; converting IBCM telemetry to civilian telecommunications; and converting nuclear weapons design to wood sterilization, to kill bugs in Russian timber.

The Defense Enterprise Fund is small, but its work is a triple win for the United States—a win for United States security, a win for United States business, and a win for the new enterprises struggling to build a free market economy in Russia.

The Gilman amendment kills funding for the Defense Enterprise Fund. Not only that, it has several other harmful impacts:

First, this amendment is so broadly written that it threatens to shut down much of the work of the United States Government in the former Soviet Union. That country was very heavily militarized. So much of what the United States does to promote economic reform in the New Independent States also has some aspect of defense conversion.

This amendment harms U.S. trade and investment. The Overseas Private Investment Corporation [OPIC] to date has approved more than \$500 million in finance and insurance support for defense conversion projects, 5 of them in Russia. Under this amendment, OPIC would have to pull the plug on these projects.

The trade and development agency has approved 16 projects in the NIS related to defense conversion and the promotion of U.S. exports. Eleven of them are still in progress. Under this amendment, TDA would have to pull the plug on those projects.

This amendment harms Department of Commerce programs, including the SABIT program, which trains business leaders from the NIS to privatize and restructure enterprises, including defense enterprises.

This amendment harms the work of Commerce's BISNIS center, which helps U.S. firms find NIS partners, including former defense enterprises, for mutual economic benefit in civilian production.

This amendment harms market economic reform. It could stop the ability of the United States to help with the next stage of privatization in Russia. The next stage of privatization involves cash auctions and tender offers for shares in strategic industries. This amendment could harm United States assistance for privatization in Ukraine and the Baltic States in a similar way.

This amendment harms nonproliferation, because defense conversion is an important part of the work of the International Science and Technology Centers, where crack Russian and Ukrainian scientists work on peaceful projects instead of weapons design.

Second, this amendment applies to all activities of the United States Government in the former Soviet Union—past, present, and future. This amendment will stop current obligations and expenditures. It will stop programs in their tracks. It will require the review and re-writing of hundreds of existing contracts. This amendment should be renamed the Paperwork Creation Act.

Third, this amendment is contrary to understandings the administration reached last year with the defense committees. Last year, those committees told the administration: "Defense conversion doesn't belong in the defense bill." The administration listened. It shifted that funding request this year to the international affairs (150) budget.

Now, the chairman of the International Relations Committee has had the administration's budget request for about a month. He has not held a single hearing, or a single briefing for Members on defense conversion. He has not heard testimony on the administration's request for the New Independent States from either the State or Defense Departments.

Few members of the International Relations Committee know anything about this defense conversion request.

I am hard pressed to understand—in the context of a defense bill that is \$12.4 billion above the administration's request—why the House needs to act today to block a \$20 million request in the foreign affairs—150—budget in another committee's jurisdiction.

I would urge the chairman not to rush to judgment. I would urge him to withdraw this amendment, let the International Relations Committee review the request, and let the committee do its work.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support a provision sponsored by Chairman GILMAN which is included in the en bloc amendment. I commend Chairman GILMAN for his work on this important issue, and for his inclusion of language in the amendment which will favorably impact on repair work at American shipyards.

The Gilman amendment is the text of H.R. 3221, which passed the House of Representatives by voice vote on April 16. Among other things, it authorizes the transfer of 10 naval vessels to six different nations, within 2 years after the enactment of the bill.

Under the provisions of the amendment, 6 of the 10 vessels will be sold or leased to three nations in the Western Pacific. New Zealand will buy one hydrographic ocean surveillance ship, Taiwan will buy three frigates and lease one tank landing ship and Thailand will buy one frigate.

As a condition of transfer, the amendment directs the Secretary of Defense to require that any necessary repair or refurbishment of such vessels will be performed at a U.S. shipyard. However, it is my understanding that the requirement to repair these vessels at an American shipyard ceases after the transfer is complete.

I would urge the repair requirement a step further than the current language of the amendment. In implementing this program, I would urge the Secretary of Defense to link

the transfer of these ships with their continued repair at U.S. shipyards over the lifetime of the vessel. The Secretary should request that "to the maximum extent possible" host countries repair these ships at American shipyards. Additionally, the Secretary should inform host countries that the United States will look favorably on future transfers if the repair work over the lifetime of the ships is performed at American shipyards.

As most of my colleagues know, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission [BRAC] closed the ship repair facility [SRF] on Guam last year. SRF-Guam is facing a difficult transition on its way to becoming a privatized facility and is looking for repair work on which to bid. Since Guam is the only American shipyard within about 4,000 miles of New Zealand, Taiwan and Thailand, it is my hope that some of the six vessels which are transferred to them will be repaired at a newly privatized SRF-Guam.

The repair of some of these ships at SRF-Guam not only serves Guam's interest, but furthers the Pentagon's long-term national security goals in the region. The Pentagon has long-term requirements in the Western Pacific which are better served by an SRF on U.S. soil in Guam. Over the next few years, a successful transition for SRF will require a certain base workload from Naval vessels.

Guam's geographic location in the Western Pacific makes it an ideal location for the repair of vessels in the region, including the six Navy vessels being transferred to New Zealand, Taiwan and Thailand. But SRF-Guam requires Secretary Perry to go to bat for it in negotiations. I understand the Secretary has the statutory authority to request from host nations repair these vessels at U.S. shipyard. In next year's transfer bill, I look forward to working with Chairman GILMAN and other interested Members on specific provisions which will require "to the maximum extent possible" the repair of these ships at U.S. shipyards over the lifetime of the vessels.

A Secretary Perry implements this program and sets conditions for the transfer of the vessels, I strongly encourage him to link the transfer of the vessels to their continued repair and to use his leverage to benefit American workers at U.S. shipyards. Again, I thank Chairman GILMAN for his work on this issue and for offering this amendment today. I urge my colleagues to support the en bloc amendment.

□ 1330

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 249, noes 171, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

AYES—249

Andrews	Baker (CA)	Barrett (NE)
Archer	Baker (LA)	Bartlett
Armey	Baldacci	Barton
Bachus	Ballenger	Bass
Baesler	Barr	Bateman

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combust
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham

Greene (UT)
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle

NOES—171

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bliley
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)

Campbell
Cardin
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch

Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson

Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutiérrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Horn
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton

Allard
Brown (CA)
Chapman
Conyers
DeLay

Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeke
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roybal-Allard

NOT VOTING—13

Ehrlich
Flake
Ford
Holden
Kaptur
McDade
Molinari
Paxon

□ 1350

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Paxon for, with Ms. Kaptur against.

Messrs. BOEHNER, BALDACCI, KASICH, and EDWARDS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 171, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of the report. Does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] wish to offer his amendment?

If not, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of the report. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] wish to offer his amendment?

If not, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part B of the report. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] wish to offer his amendment?

If not, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part B of the report.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

Mr. KLUG. 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. KLUG: Strike out section 743 (page 297, line 12, through page 298, line 2), relating to continued operation of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

SEC. 743. UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES AND ARMED FORCES HEALTH PROFESSIONS SCHOLARSHIP AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) CLOSURE OF USUHS REQUIRED.—Section 2112 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—
(A) by inserting “and the closure” after “The development”; and

(B) by striking out “subsection (a)” and inserting in lieu thereof “subsections (a) and (b)”; and

(2) by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

“(b)(1) Not later than September 30, 2000, the Secretary of Defense shall close the University. To achieve the closure of the University by that date, the Secretary shall begin to terminate the operations of the University beginning in fiscal year 1997. On account of the required closure of the University under this subsection, no students may be admitted to begin studies in the University after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

“(2) Section 2687 of this title and any other provision of law establishing preconditions to the closure of any activity of the Department of Defense shall not apply with regard to the termination of the operations of the University or to the closure of the University pursuant to this subsection.”

(b) FINAL GRADUATION OF USUHS STUDENTS.—Section 2112(a) of such title is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking out “, with the first class graduating not later than September 21, 1982.” and inserting in lieu thereof “, except that no students may be awarded degrees by the University after September 30, 2000.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “On a case-by-case basis, the Secretary of Defense may provide for the continued education of a person who, immediately before the closure of the University under subsection (b), was a student in the University and completed substantially all requirements necessary to graduate from the University.”

(c) TERMINATION OF USUHS BOARD OF REGENTS.—Section 2113 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) The board shall terminate on September 30, 2000, except that the Secretary of Defense may terminate the board before that date as part of the termination of the operations of the University under section 2112(b) of this title.”

(d) PROHIBITION ON USUHS RECIPROCAL AGREEMENTS.—Section 2114(e)(1) of such title is amended by adding at the end of the following new sentence: “No agreement may be entered into under this subsection after the date of the enactment of this sentence, and all such agreements shall terminate not later than September 30, 2000.”

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS REGARDING USUHS.—(1) Section 178 of such title, relating to the Henry M. Jackson Foundation for the Advancement of Military Medicine, is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by inserting after “Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences,” the following: “or after the closure of the University, with the Department of Defense.”;

(B) in subsection (c)(1)(B), by striking out “the Dean of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences” and inserting in

lieu thereof "a person designated by the Secretary of Defense"; and

(C) in subsection (g)(1), by inserting after "Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences," the following: "Or after the closure of the University, the Secretary of Defense".

(2) Section 466(a)(1)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 286a(a)(1)(B)), relating to the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, is amended by striking out "the Dean of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences,".

(f) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of section 2112 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "**§2112. Establishment and closure of University**".

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 104 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"2112. Establishment and closure of University."

(g) ACTIVE DUTY COMMITMENT UNDER SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—(1) Section 2123(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "one year for each year of participation in the program" and inserting in lieu thereof "seven years following completion of the program".

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to members of the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance program who first enroll in the program after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, what we are going to talk about for the next few minutes is the subject of military physicians. In 1972, in order to guarantee there were enough physicians in the military, we took two steps in Congress. One was to set up a scholarship program to send medical students to places like the University of Wisconsin in Madison, and to Harvard, and to Virginia, and to Stanford, and Chicago, and Nebraska, and any university you might want to pick out. At the same time, we established in Bethesda, MD, the Department of Defense's very own medical school.

Now, that was 1972. Just 3 years later, in 1975, the Defense Manpower Commission reported that, quote, it was an unjustifiably costly method to meet current and future procurement and retention goals for military professional and medical personnel. Three years after the medical school in Bethesda was started, it cost \$200,000 for each graduate, and the scholarship program cost each student just \$34,000. Now keep in mind today as we kind of run through this list of how expensive this school is that today the school in Bethesda only provides about 11 percent of the doctors in the United States armed services.

In 1975, a House Appropriations Committee backed up the study done by the Defense Manpower Commission and

said this is just too expensive to do it that way. In 1976, the General Accounting Office, just 3 years after the program was founded said the same thing, it is not cost effective for the Department of Defense to run its own medical school.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me Republicans should be about privatization more so than anything else, and you have to ask us why today we were running for plants and printing offices and what are we doing in the medical school business? Well, that was 20 years ago.

So last year we came back one more time and asked the General Accounting Office again to take a look at the military school run by the U.S. military in Bethesda. Do my colleagues know what they came back and said? For every scholarship program student in the country, it cost \$125,000. For everybody who comes out of Bethesda, it is over a half million dollars, \$556,000.

Now, proponents will point out that students who go through the medical school tend to stay in the military a little bit longer than folks who come through the private scholarship program. So our amendment does a second thing as well as phasing out the medical school. It says that what we are going to do is that everybody who goes through the scholarship program also has to go make a 7-year commitment to the service the same way they are if they graduate from the DOD's medical school in Bethesda.

Mr. Chairman, we think we have a very commonsense amendment in front of us. It takes a program that is almost four times more expensive than what it cost to send people to the best medical schools in the country, phases out the medical school class, raises the scholarship program requirement for service. We think we save taxpayers money and at the same time get just as qualified a supply of military physicians in order to serve this country's needs.

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the gentleman from Wisconsin for his efforts to save money, but he has chosen the wrong target. There have been no hearings or an in-depth analysis of the effects of closing the university. In fact, the GAO report, which he just cited says: As Congress makes decisions regarding both physician accession programs, it will need information not only about the programs' relative costs, but also about their effects on the short- and long-term requirements for military physicians and the value of the other university activities.

Acting without an understanding of the full implications of these actions could have a devastating impact upon

military medical readiness, as well as medical recruiting and retention.

The proposal to close the school is based on a very selective and misleading use of the GAO study results. While the GAO report did indeed find the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences to be the most expensive source of military physicians, when comparing educational costs only, it also found that when all Federal costs are considered, the cost of a university graduate is comparable to that of the scholarship program graduates.

The chart for which the gentleman just referred does not take into account all Federal costs. It does not spread out all costs on the years of service or, in fact, take in the requirement of having to militarily train these doctors. This action is premature. It would be premature to undertake an action that could have a significant impact on both the department's short-term and long-term ability to recruit and train physicians to perform the department's medical requirements.

The GAO report also relied upon the 733 study which before our Subcommittee on Military Personnel was slammed. Not only was it slammed by a lot of the chiefs, it was slammed by the Democrats and Republicans in attendance, to also include Dr. Steven Joseph. So I think it is premature for us to act at this time.

The GAO report also, I would cite, states the alternative strategy to meet DOD's long-term enrichment needs could include an enrichment component, in other words, stretching out the tenure in which someone serves. That is much what the gentleman is requiring in his amendment. But this amendment only provides for that longer obligation.

□ 1400

It does not include any additional benefits or training that would entice physicians to accept a longer obligation.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me point out to my colleague and good friend from Indiana that actually over the course of the last 20 years when this program has been in effect, there have been no more than 15 separate studies that have been done on it, including hearings in the Committee on Armed Services in 1994, 1992, and 1991.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the Klug amendment to phase out the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, the Defense Department's very own medical school.

What this debate is about is setting priorities at the Pentagon, eliminating duplicative functions and finding more

cost-effective measures to train our defense forces as we enter the 21st century and the limited Federal dollars which will be available as we prepare to balance the budget by the year 2002.

Let us make it clear that DOD currently offers tracks for training of medical personnel, and clearly one is more taxpayer-friendly. In 1995 the General Accounting Office concluded that the DOD medical school is more costly to educate and retain graduates than the health professional scholarship program run by that same organization. Clearly, from the charts, \$566,000 compared to \$126,000 is a clear savings to the taxpayers. Yes, \$250 million will be saved over 5 years. DOD graduates from their medical school make up only 11 percent of all military school graduates while the balance comes from the scholarship program. Clearly, out of the total 987 graduates, 155 were from DOD.

I urge the passage of the Klug amendment.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Personnel.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Chairman and Members, I would say that money is not the issue here. We do not try to buy the cheapest rifles for our military; we do not try to buy the cheapest artillery. We try to buy the very best for our military people, and we want them to have this as far as health care is concerned, too.

This resource is vital to our Nation's security. Military officers who are trained in multiple care disciplines get the military culture and a military career commitment at the same time. Military officers at this school are prepared and are tuned to the needs of a joint force. They go to school, and they work together jointly so when they come out they do not have to be trained in joint activities. They also get the essential background and military doctrine and leadership, a very important component for those people who are committed to a career in military medicine.

This is a national resource that provides a center for joint medical doctrine and research, and without this backbone for the military medical community in our country we would be far less prepared and we will not have a ready force. This is an issue of readiness, it is an issue of specialization, it is an issue of commitment to quality health care for our military people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members here to oppose this amendment.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in the strongest possible opposition to this Klug amendment.

As my colleagues know, the GAO report that was quoted, I must reinterpret these figures because when all the factors are in in terms of the costs,

USUHS costs \$181,575 per year per student. Alternative costs are \$181,169. The difference is \$406; \$406.

Now, what does that \$406 buy? Higher retention rates; the expected service of USUHS' graduates is 1.9 times higher than the alternative, and GAO says that; better care. DOD data indicates that university graduates are cited for fewer adverse clinical privileging actions than other military physicians. That is a direct quote.

Increased readiness; all of the commanders of major military units proceed to physicians from the university, have a greater overall understanding of the military rate of commitment to the military, better preparation for operations, assignments, better leadership for leadership roles and preparation.

Support the best medical care for our troops. Vote "no" on Klug.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I just have 1 minute remaining. I yield myself the balance of my time.

If I could, I want to rebut a couple of arguments that have been made. My colleague from the other side of the aisle made the argument to say we need the best physicians possible for the armed services, and I do not disagree. But I think we can train them at Harvard and Stanford and Chicago and Virginia and Wisconsin and Michigan, Northwestern and any other schools across the country, and we are not sending them to bargain-rate universities. For \$125,000 we can do it at the best medical schools in the United States.

Now, second, my colleague from Maryland indicated that we somehow misread the GAO numbers. This is a Congressional Budget Office analysis that says, based on figures from 1994, USUHS is the most expensive source of military physicians at \$562,000 a person. By comparison, scholarships cost \$125,000, and the financial assistance program and the volunteers program range in cost from \$19,000 to \$58,000.

Mr. Chairman, in a world in which we had all the money to spend, I think it would be a terrific idea to keep up and to maintain the Department of Defense's kind of old and private little military medical school castle, but I think at a time when we are asking every single Government agency to tighten its belt, we can no longer justify the expense.

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

Mr. Chairman, the service Surgeon Generals have consistently testified at both House and Senate hearings that the university provides a unique medical training that cannot be readily secured at other sources.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 20 seconds.

Mr. HUNTER. My colleagues, the question is what do we get for what we

give? It is \$556,000 per student, but we get on the average a 18-year doc for the military. It is \$125,000 here if we do strictly scholarships, but we only get about 6 years of service to our country. So we are going to have an experienced doctor corps if we stay with the school.

Vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Klug amendment.

During the Persian Gulf war, if we would have had casualties that would have been higher or even normal, Mr. Chairman, we would have had to implement the draft of doctors. We did not have enough doctors. We did not have them then, and we do not have them now.

Now, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT] has said, we want the best. Now, the Uniformed Services University, they train medical students. These medical students know how to treat wounds, and then when they graduate, they go out and train other doctors.

The American Legion and VFW have done a study. They oppose this amendment, plus 20 military retirees associations oppose the amendment, and we are talking about 5 million members in this group I have just mentioned.

Please vote against this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I believe that I can address this issue from a unique perspective in that I am a physician who participated in the health profession scholarship program. I worked my way through college, and I did not want to borrow money to go to medical school, and I was very attracted to the scholarship program. I remember distinctly sitting down in my parents' dining room and figuring out what it would cost me to borrow my way through medical school versus going into the military.

Now, I have to say the main reason I went into the military was that I really felt the Good Lord was leading me to go in and serve my country and put the uniform on. And it was the best experience, I think, in my life.

But I do not know if I would have done it if I had had a 7-year obligation, because when a doctor finishes his training and goes out into practice, he can typically pay off his student loans in about 4 years, and this 7-year requirement that the gentleman has added to his amendment, in my opinion, is going to make it very, very difficult for our armed services to recruit good quality physicians into the scholarship program.

I additionally would like to point out that perhaps the DOD would only pay

this much money for the students in the scholarship program, but this is really what it costs every medical school. There is lots of other money that goes into training a doctor, grant money that comes in, State money that come in, and, yes, other Federal moneys.

So, in my opinion, this is an ill-conceived amendment, and I would encourage, as a former Army physician who participated in HPSP and worked with many of the armed services medical students, and they were some of the best doctors in the armed medical corps when I was in it, I would highly encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on the Klug amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], a very valuable member of our committee.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I speak against this amendment. Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences is a military medical school. It is one that specializes and prepares doctors, young men and young women, to stay in the military and to serve those who are injured on the battlefield and to serve their families in time of peace. I think it would be a sad mistake to terminate this medical school.

If my colleagues want a professional medical program, if my colleagues want people to stay the minimum of 18 to 20 years, keep this medical school. If we want the very best for those men and women, if we want the very best for their families, we must keep this medical school because those who go through the scholarship program are less apt to stay in and make a career of it. This is a career training ground, educational ground, for those who wish to serve their Nation as a full-time doctor.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from California, Mr. DUNCAN HUNTER, hit it right on the head, this university's graduates are expected to serve 18.5 years and about 50 percent are expected to stay on active-duty service for 20 years or longer. In comparison, regular scholarship graduates are expected to serve about 9.8 years, while deferred scholarship program graduates serve 5.3 years on average.

Now, military medical commanders also believe that the university's approach produces physicians who are at least initially better prepared than their civilian-educated peers to meet the demands of military medicine.

Additionally, the medical commanders believe that compared with other military physicians the university graduates have a better understanding of the military mission, organization, customs that are more committed to the military and to a military career.

I would also, Mr. Chairman, place into the RECORD a letter from the

American Legion in support of the university, along with the Military Coalition. This is supported by not only the American Legion, the Air Force Association, the Army Aviation Association, Commissioned Officers Association, CWO, and the Enlisted Association of the National Guard.

The list goes on and on and on.

The letters referred to are as follows:

VOTE AGAINST THE KLUG AMENDMENT TO ELIMINATE THE UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES

The Military Coalition (signatures enclosed) representing more than five million current and former members of the uniformed services, is very concerned over Representative Scott Klug's proposed amendment to the FY 97 Defense Authorization Act to close the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences (USUHS). The rationale that it is less costly to train physicians in civilian medical schools than through USUHS is defective.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) cost estimates cited by Representative Klug are misleading in that they fail to account for the taxpayer subsidies and other resources (\$4.2 billion) given in grants, research and clinical services to civilian medical schools. In fact, in its report (page 33), the GAO also concedes that the total federal costs for USUHS graduates and Armed Forces Health Professional Scholarship Program (AFHPSP) graduates are virtually identical. Aside from cost considerations, USUHS graduates a military officer who is well trained in military operations and fully prepared for joint service leadership positions. Finally, the retention rate for USUHS graduates is considerably greater than those in AFHPSP (86 percent versus 14 percent) making their education a sound investment in the future of this country.

Representative Klug proposes to increase the AFHPSP service obligation with a view toward increasing career retention in that program. However, based on past recruiting experience, an increased service obligation is expected to aggravate AFHPSP accession problems, and is not expected to materially improve the retention of enrollees in that program.

The Military Coalition strongly urges you to retain USUHS as a national training resource by voting against Representative Klug's amendment. We appreciate your support on this very important issue.

THE MILITARY COALITION

Air Force Association;
Army Aviation Assn. of America;
Commissioned Officers Assn. of the US
Public Health Service, Inc.;
CWO & WO Assn. US Coast Guard;
Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the US;
Fleet Reserve Assn.;
Jewish War Veterans of the USA;
Marine Corps League;
Marine Corps Reserve Officers Assn.;
National Military Family Assn.;
Naval Enlisted Reserve Assn.;
Navy League of the US;
Reserve Officers Assn.;
The Military Chaplains Assn. of the USA;
The Retired Enlisted Assn.;
The Retired Officers Assn.;
United Armed Forces Assn.;
USCG Chief Petty Officers Assn.;
US Army Warrant Officers Assn.;
Veterans of Foreign Wars of the US.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, May 14, 1996.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The American Legion is asking you to oppose an amendment

to the FY 1997 DOD Authorization bill which would close the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS).

Each year as the national budget is debated we are made ever more aware of how austere funds are and how acute the need for support of so many diverse programs. One program that has been mentioned for elimination, but serves a very unique purpose, is the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS).

A recent GAO report concluded that the total monetary cost for USUHS compared to the Armed Forces Health Professional Scholarship Program (AFHPSP) for civilian institutions are identical. However, unlike civilian medical programs, the USUHS provides military doctors well trained in primary care medicine, as well as combat casualty care, tropical medicine, combat stress and other injuries and illnesses unique to military deployments and combat conditions. Also, according to DOD, the retention rate in the armed forces is eighty-six percent for USUHS graduates compared to fourteen percent for AFHPSP.

This very special institution is a source of military physicians for the armed forces of the United States and the Public Health Service. It provides our military with a corps of dedicated career medical officers instilled with the commitment and selflessness only found in doctors who are trained and skilled in providing combat casualty care. In addition, this facility offers a full range of instruction and care in those maladies typically suffered primarily by military personnel. These include tropical, epidemiological and parasitic ailments.

Military medical officers serve beside and in support of U.S. service personnel when our forces are deployed to conflict. This environment is harsh, chaotic and demanding. The graduates of USUHS are trained to deal with these extreme and difficult conditions and in fact, work and improvise in some of the most deplorable circumstances where U.S. military forces are stationed.

To close the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences would be a great disservice to our men and women in uniform. We must do everything we can to provide our armed forces with the best health and battle casualty care available.

Once again, The American Legion urges you to oppose an amendment to the FY 1997 DOD Authorization bill which would close the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences. We appreciate your support and commitment on important veterans issues.

Sincerely,

DANIEL A. LUDWIG,
National Commander.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this is an important discussion, and in the spirit of fairness I would like to provide the opportunity for the author of the amendment to have a chance to respond to or rebut the arguments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] for that purpose.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from California. Briefly, Mr. Chairman, because I also know that we have other issues we want to discuss today, I want to essentially kind of rebut some of the arguments that have been raised point by point this afternoon about this discussion about whether 22 years later the Federal Government really needs to be in the business of running a medical

school. We do not run other kinds of colleges and universities, and again fundamentally we can send folks to the best medical schools in the country, in fact, the best medical schools in the world, for a fraction of the cost.

One of the arguments that has been made is that this program has not been studied and has not been analyzed, and if we somehow begin to phase out the school, it will crash the medical physician program in the U.S. military. Again, let me point out page after page after page of study dating all the way back to 1975, just 2 years after this program was established, and every single one of them concluded it costs too much money.

□ 1415

It is not a bad program. It is not a bad idea. In the best of all worlds, we would love to do it. But let me remind my Republican colleagues, if we are going to cut the deficit, we have to ask the military to make tough choices.

Will there still be enough doctors in the military if we eliminate this? Keep this in mind: 89 percent of the physicians who presently serve in the Department of Defense came out of the scholarship program and other avenues. It is only 11 percent. The argument is, well, these people serve longer, so it is a better investment. But the General Accounting Office, again, and I hate to keep bringing us back to the facts, said that the main influencing factor for a graduate of either program to remain in the military is the minimum service requirement.

I expect my colleague who is a physician, the gentleman from Florida who brought up and said maybe he would not have picked the scholarship program if he had been required to serve 7 years rather than just a couple of years, but I think, given the rising cost of education, there would be a lot of people in the country who would have the opportunity to go through the DOD scholarship program, again, to go to the best medical schools in the United States and to go to the best medical schools in the world.

I think this all comes down to philosophy. That is what it really comes down to. It comes down to a simple judgment. In 1996, 24 years after this program was set up, does it really fundamentally make sense for the U.S. Government to be in the business of running a medical school? I think the answer has to be, fundamentally, no.

The argument is specialized training is needed for combat. Come on, we all know Bethesda. Where is the expertise that comes? Are we not better off if we want doctors to be trained in surgical procedures in a combat situation to send them into hospitals where they have to deal with gunshot victims and knife victims on a regular basis? We are not going to find that in Bethesda, MD.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, let me suggest that this was a terrific program when it was first established. We have

had 24 years of experience. Every program and every analysis that has come back since 1975, 3 years after this program started, said it is too expensive. We cannot maintain it. It does not make sense. Expand the scholarship program, raise the number of years of requirement, and begin to phase out the DOD military program.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, the figures that I mentioned from the GAO report which indicate a \$400 difference are if we factor in the number of years these people serve.

I would also like to point out an experience I recently had at USUHS. I was there because a medal of honor was given by the Secretary of the Navy to a man named Michael Charissis, who was the person who saved lives in the Amtrak MARC accident in Silver Spring, MD, recently. He did it quietly. They had to work to determine who it was. How did he know how to do it? The kind of training he had had equipped him for that.

I also want to remind this group, in terms of putting human faces, we had outstanding people who served in the Persian Gulf conflict. We had Rhoda Cornum, who was a graduate from there. We have had so many others, and such a distinguished group of people, and all of the military commanders who deal with medicine have come out in favor of it, all of the organizations that we know of. The American Legion, just to cite that, plus a lot of others, have all come out in favor of it. It is our only medical military university in the United States of America. I really think that we would be penny wise and pound foolish if we were to vote for this amendment, so vote against it.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 82, noes 343, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

AYES—82

Andrews	Boehlert	Brownback
Barrett (WI)	Brown (CA)	Camp
Barton	Brown (FL)	Campbell

Chenoweth	Klug	Rohrabacher
Chrysler	Largent	Ros-Lehtinen
Coble	Lipinski	Roth
Conyers	Lofgren	Royce
Cox	Luther	Sabo
Cubin	Martinez	Salmon
DeFazio	McDade	Sanford
Dellums	McDermott	Schroeder
Duncan	Meehan	Sensenbrenner
Ehlers	Metcalf	Serrano
Foley	Miller (CA)	Shadegg
Forbes	Minge	Shays
Frank (MA)	Neal	Skaggs
Franks (NJ)	Neumann	Slaughter
Goodlatte	Obey	Smith (MI)
Gutknecht	Olver	Souder
Hamilton	Orton	Tiahrt
Hayworth	Owens	Upton
Hoekstra	Pelosi	Visclosky
Hoke	Peterson (MN)	Watt (NC)
Houghton	Petri	Weller
Jackson (IL)	Ramstad	White
Kennedy (MA)	Rangel	Zimmer
Kennedy (RI)	Reed	
Kleccka	Roemer	

NOES—343

Abercrombie	Cummings	Hansen
Ackerman	Cunningham	Harman
Allard	Danner	Hastert
Archer	Davis	Hastings (FL)
Armey	de la Garza	Hastings (WA)
Bachus	Deal	Hayes
Baesler	DeLauro	Hefley
Baker (CA)	DeLay	Hefner
Baker (LA)	Deutsch	Heineman
Baldacci	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Ballenger	Dickey	Hilleary
Barcia	Dicks	Hincheey
Barr	Dingell	Hobson
Barrett (NE)	Dixon	Horn
Bartlett	Doggett	Hostettler
Bass	Dooley	Hoyer
Bateman	Doolittle	Hunter
Becerra	Dornan	Hutchinson
Beilenson	Doyle	Hyde
Bentsen	Dreier	Inglis
Bereuter	Dunn	Istook
Berman	Edwards	Jackson-Lee
Bevill	Ehrlich	(TX)
Bilbray	Emerson	Jacobs
Bilirakis	Engel	Jefferson
Bishop	English	Johnson (CT)
Bliley	Ensign	Johnson (SD)
Blute	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Boehner	Evans	Johnson, Sam
Bonilla	Everett	Johnston
Bonior	Ewing	Jones
Bono	Farr	Kanjorski
Borski	Fattah	Kaptur
Boucher	Fawell	Kasich
Brewster	Fazio	Kelly
Browder	Fields (LA)	Kennelly
Brown (OH)	Fields (TX)	Kildee
Bryant (TN)	Filner	Kim
Bryant (TX)	Flanagan	King
Bunn	Foglietta	Kingston
Bunning	Ford	Klink
Burr	Fowler	Knollenberg
Burton	Fox	Kolbe
Buyer	Franks (CT)	LaFalce
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Calvert	Frisa	Lantos
Canady	Frost	Latham
Cardin	Funderburk	LaTourette
Castle	Furse	Laughlin
Chabot	Gallegly	Lazio
Chambliss	Ganske	Leach
Chapman	Gejdenson	Levin
Christensen	Gekas	Lewis (CA)
Clay	Gephardt	Lewis (GA)
Clayton	Geren	Lewis (KY)
Clement	Gibbons	Lightfoot
Clinger	Gilchrest	Lincoln
Clyburn	Gillmor	Linder
Coburn	Gilman	Livingston
Coleman	Gonzalez	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Goodling	Longley
Collins (IL)	Gordon	Lowe
Collins (MI)	Goss	Lucas
Combust	Graham	Maloney
Condit	Green (TX)	Manton
Cooley	Greene (UT)	Manzullo
Costello	Greenwood	Markey
Coyne	Gunderson	Martini
Cramer	Gutierrez	Mascara
Crane	Hall (OH)	Matsui
Crapo	Hall (TX)	McCarthy
Cremeans	Hancock	McCollum

McCrary	Porter	Stump
McHale	Portman	Stupak
McHugh	Poshard	Tanner
McInnis	Pryce	Tate
McIntosh	Quillen	Tauzin
McKeon	Quinn	Taylor (MS)
McKinney	Radanovich	Taylor (NC)
McNulty	Rahall	Tejeda
Meek	Regula	Thomas
Menendez	Richardson	Thompson
Meyers	Rivers	Thornberry
Mica	Roberts	Thornton
Millender-	Rogers	Thurman
McDonald	Rose	Torkildsen
Miller (FL)	Roukema	Torres
Mink	Roybal-Allard	Torricelli
Moakley	Rush	Towns
Mollohan	Sanders	Trafficant
Montgomery	Sawyer	Velazquez
Moorhead	Saxton	Vento
Moran	Scarborough	Volkmer
Morella	Schaefer	Vucanovich
Murtha	Schiff	Walker
Myers	Schumer	Walsh
Myrick	Scott	Wamp
Nadler	Seastrand	Ward
Nethercutt	Shaw	Waters
Ney	Shuster	Watts (OK)
Norwood	Sisisky	Waxman
Nussle	Skeen	Weldon (FL)
Oberstar	Skelton	Weldon (PA)
Ortiz	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield
Oxley	Smith (TX)	Wicker
Packard	Smith (WA)	Williams
Pallone	Solomon	Wilson
Parker	Spence	Wise
Pastor	Spratt	Wolf
Payne (NJ)	Stark	Woolsey
Payne (VA)	Stearns	Wynn
Peterson (FL)	Stenholm	Yates
Pickett	Stockman	Young (AK)
Pombo	Stokes	Young (FL)
Pomeroy	Studds	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—8

Durbin	Holden	Riggs
Flake	Molinari	Talent
Hilliard	Paxon	

□ 1439

Messrs. BONO, FLANAGAN, and DEUTSCH changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. McDERMOTT, WELLER, FORBES, NEAL of Massachusetts, BROWN of California, SKAGGS, and HOKE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1445

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, on the last amendment adopted, the Klug amendment, I voted "yes." I intended to vote "no."

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part B of the report.

Does the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] wish to offer her amendment?

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. SPENCE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 430, I offer amendments en bloc consisting of part B amendments numbered 13; 17, as modified; 19, as modified; 20, as modified; 28; 31, as modified; 32; 34; and 35, as modified.

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 part B amendments numbered 13; 17, as modified; 19, as modified; 20, as modified; 28; 31, as modified; 32; 34; and 35, as modified, offered by Mr. SPENCE:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF TEXAS OR MR. GREEN OF TEXAS (AMDT B-13 IN HOUSE REPORT 104-570)

In section 733(b)(2) (page 281, line 21), relating to the time for implementation of the uniform health benefit option by Uniformed Services Treatment Facilities, strike out "October 1, 1996" and insert in lieu thereof "October 1, 1997".

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WATERS OF CALIFORNIA (AMDT B-17 IN HOUSE REPORT 104-570)

The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of title VIII (page 316, after line 14), insert the following new section:

SEC. 832. STUDY OF EFFECTIVENESS OF DEFENSE MERGERS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on mergers and acquisitions in the defense sector. The study shall address the following:

(1) The effectiveness of defense mergers and acquisitions in eliminating excess capacity within the defense industry.

(2) The degree of change in the dependence by defense contractors on defense-related Federal contracts within their overall business after mergers.

(3) The effect on defense industry employment resulting from defense mergers and acquisitions occurring during the three years preceding the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) 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 on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN OF NEW YORK (AMDT B-19 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. TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS TO CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER NAVAL VESSELS.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to other nations and instrumentalities vessels as follows:

(1) EGYPT.—To the Government of Egypt, the Oliver Hazard Perry class frigate Gallery.

(2) MEXICO.—To the Government of Mexico, the Knox class frigates Stein (FF 1065) and Marvin Shields (FF 1066).

(3) NEW ZEALAND.—To the Government of New Zealand, the Stalwart class ocean surveillance ship Tenacious.

(4) PORTUGAL.—To the Government of Portugal, the Stalwart class ocean surveillance ship Audacious.

(5) TAIWAN.—To the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (the Taiwan instrumentality designated pursuant to section 10(a) of the Taiwan Relations Act)—

(A) the Knox class frigates Aylwin (FF 1081), Pharris (FF 1094), and Valdez (FF 1096); and

(B) the Newport class tank landing ship Newport (LST 1179).

(6) THAILAND.—To the Government of Thailand, the Knox class frigate Ouellet (FF 1077).

(b) FORM OF TRANSFER.—(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), each transfer authorized by this section shall be made on a sales basis under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761), relating to the foreign military sales program.

(2) The transfer authorized by subsection (a)(4) shall be made on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j), relating to transfers of excess defense articles.

(3) The transfer authorized by subsection (a)(5)(B) shall be made on a lease basis under section 61 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2796).

(c) COSTS OF TRANSFERS.—Any expense of the United States in connection with a transfer authorized by this section shall be charged to the recipient.

(d) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority granted by subsection (a) shall expire at the end of the two-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) REPAIR AND REPAIRMENT OF VESSELS IN UNITED STATES SHIPYARDS.—The Secretary of the Navy shall require, to the maximum extent possible, as a condition of a transfer of a vessel under this section, that the country to which the vessel is transferred have such repair or refurbishment of the vessel as is needed, before the vessel joins the naval forces of that country, performed at a shipyard located in the United States, including a United States Navy shipyard.

At the end of division A (page 416, after line 9), insert the following new title:

TITLE XV—DEFENSE AND SECURITY ASSISTANCE**Subtitle A—Military and Related Assistance**
SEC. 1501. TERMS OF LOANS UNDER THE FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM.

Section 31(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2771(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Loans available under section 23 shall be provided at rates of interest that are not less than the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities."

SEC. 1502. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM.

(a) AUDIT OF CERTAIN PRIVATE FIRMS.—Section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) For each fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense, as requested by the Director of the Defense Security Assistance Agency, shall conduct audits on a nonreimbursable basis of private firms that have entered into contracts with foreign governments under which defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services are to be procured by such firms for such governments from financing under this section."

(b) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO CASH FLOW FINANCING.—Section 23 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2763), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) For each country and international organization that has been approved for cash flow financing under this section, any letter of offer and acceptance or other purchase agreement, or any amendment thereto, for a procurement of defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services in excess of \$100,000,000 that is to be financed in whole or in part with funds made available under this Act or the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be submitted to the

congressional committees specified in section 634A(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under that section.

“(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘cash flow financing’ has the meaning given such term in the second subsection (d) of section 25.”.

(c) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS FOR DIRECT COMMERCIAL CONTRACTS.—Section 23 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2763), as amended by subsection (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) Of the amounts made available for a fiscal year to carry out this section, not more than \$100,000,000 for such fiscal year may be made available for countries other than Israel and Egypt for the purpose of financing the procurement of defense articles, defense services, and design and construction services that are not sold by the United States Government under this Act.”.

(d) ANNUAL ESTIMATE AND JUSTIFICATION FOR SALES PROGRAM.—Section 25(a) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2765(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (11);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (12) as paragraph (13); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following new paragraph:

“(12)(A) a detailed accounting of all articles, services, credits, guarantees, or any other form of assistance furnished by the United States to each country and international organization, including payments to the United Nations, during the preceding fiscal year for the detection and clearance of landmines, including activities relating to the furnishing of education, training, and technical assistance for the detection and clearance of landmines; and

“(B) for each provision of law making funds available or authorizing appropriations for demining activities described in subparagraph (A), an analysis and description of the objectives and activities undertaken during the preceding fiscal year, including the number of personnel involved in performing such activities; and”.

SEC. 1503. DRAWDOWN SPECIAL AUTHORITIES.

(a) UNFORESEEN EMERGENCY DRAWDOWN.—Section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2318(a)(1)) is amended by striking “\$75,000,000” and inserting “\$100,000,000”.

(b) ADDITIONAL DRAWDOWN.—Section 506 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2318) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(A), by striking “defense articles from the stocks” and all that follows and inserting the following: “articles and services from the inventory and resources of any agency of the United States Government and military education and training from the Department of Defense, the President may direct the drawdown of such articles, services, and military education and training—

“(i) for the purposes and under the authorities of—

“(I) chapter 8 of part I (relating to international narcotics control assistance);

“(II) chapter 9 of part I (relating to international disaster assistance); or

“(III) the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962; or

“(ii) for the purpose of providing such articles, services, and military education and training to Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos as the President determines are necessary—

“(I) to support cooperative efforts to locate and repatriate members of the United States Armed Forces and civilians employed directly or indirectly by the United States Government who remain unaccounted for from the Vietnam War; and

“(II) to ensure the safety of United States Government personnel engaged in such cooperative efforts and to support Department of Defense-sponsored humanitarian projects associated with such efforts.”;

(2) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking “\$75,000,000” and all that follows and inserting “\$150,000,000 in any fiscal year of such articles, services, and military education and training may be provided pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this paragraph—

“(i) not more than \$75,000,000 of which may be provided from the drawdown from the inventory and resources of the Department of Defense;

“(ii) not more than \$75,000,000 of which may be provided pursuant to clause (i)(I) of such subparagraph; and

“(iii) not more than \$15,000,000 of which may be provided to Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos pursuant to clause (ii) of such subparagraph.”; and

(3) in subsection (b)(1), by adding at the end the following: “In the case of drawdowns authorized by subclauses (I) and (III) of subsection (a)(2)(A)(i), notifications shall be provided to those committees at least 15 days in advance of the drawdowns in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under section 634A.”.

(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESS OF EXERCISE OF SPECIAL AUTHORITIES.—Section 652 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2411) is amended by striking “prior to the date” and inserting “before”.

SEC. 1504. TRANSFER OF EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 516. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized to transfer excess defense articles under this section to countries for which receipt of such articles was justified pursuant to the annual congressional presentation documents for military assistance programs, or for programs under chapter 8 of part I of this Act, submitted under section 634 of this Act, or for which receipt of such articles was separately justified to the Congress, for the fiscal year in which the transfer is authorized.

“(b) LIMITATIONS ON TRANSFERS.—The President may transfer excess defense articles under this section only if—

“(1) such articles are drawn from existing stocks of the Department of Defense;

“(2) funds available to the Department of Defense for the procurement of defense equipment are not expended in connection with the transfer;

“(3) the transfer of such articles will not have an adverse impact on the military readiness of the United States;

“(4) with respect to a proposed transfer of such articles on a grant basis, such a transfer is preferable to a transfer on a sales basis, after taking into account the potential proceeds from, and likelihood of, such sales, and the comparative foreign policy benefits that may accrue to the United States as the result of a transfer on either a grant or sales basis;

“(5) the President determines that the transfer of such articles will not have an adverse impact on the national technology and industrial base and, particularly, will not reduce the opportunities of entities in the national technology and industrial base to sell new or used equipment to the countries to which such articles are transferred; and

“(6) the transfer of such articles is consistent with the policy framework for the Eastern Mediterranean established under section 620C of this Act.

“(c) TERMS OF TRANSFERS.—

“(1) NO COST TO RECIPIENT COUNTRY.—Excess defense articles may be transferred under this section without cost to the recipient country.

“(2) PRIORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the delivery of excess defense articles under this section to member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on the southern and southeastern flank of NATO and to major non-NATO allies on such southern and southeastern flank shall be given priority to the maximum extent feasible over the delivery of such excess defense articles to other countries.

“(d) WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EXPENSES.—Section 632(d) shall not apply with respect to transfers of excess defense articles (including transportation and related costs) under this section.

“(e) TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED COSTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), funds available to the Department of Defense may not be expended for crating, packing, handling, and transportation of excess defense articles transferred under the authority of this section.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The President may provide for the transportation of excess defense articles without charge to a country for the costs of such transportation if—

“(A) it is determined that it is in the national interest of the United States to do so;

“(B) the recipient is a developing country receiving less than \$10,000,000 of assistance under chapter 5 of part II of this Act (relating to international military education and training) or section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763; relating to the Foreign Military Financing program) in the fiscal year in which the transportation is provided;

“(C) the total weight of the transfer does not exceed 25,000 pounds; and

“(D) such transportation is accomplished on a space available basis.

“(f) ADVANCE NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS FOR TRANSFER OF CERTAIN EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may not transfer excess defense articles that are significant military equipment (as defined in section 47(9) of the Arms Export Control Act) or excess defense articles valued (in terms of original acquisition cost) at \$7,000,000 or more, under this section or under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) until 15 days after the date on which the President has provided notice of the proposed transfer to the congressional committees specified in section 634A(a) in accordance with procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under that section.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Such notification shall include—

“(A) a statement outlining the purposes for which the article is being provided to the country, including whether such article has been previously provided to such country;

“(B) an assessment of the impact of the transfer on the military readiness of the United States;

“(C) an assessment of the impact of the transfer on the national technology and industrial base and, particularly, the impact on opportunities of entities in the national technology and industrial base to sell new or used equipment to the countries to which such articles are to be transferred; and

“(D) a statement describing the current value of such article and the value of such article at acquisition.

“(g) AGGREGATE ANNUAL LIMITATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The aggregate value of excess defense articles transferred to countries under this section in any fiscal year may not exceed \$350,000,000.

“(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The limitation contained in paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to fiscal years beginning after fiscal year 1996.

“(h) CONGRESSIONAL PRESENTATION DOCUMENTS.—Documents described in subsection (a) justifying the transfer of excess defense articles shall include an explanation of the general purposes of providing excess defense articles as well as a table which provides an aggregate annual total of transfers of excess defense articles in the preceding year by country in terms of offers and actual deliveries and in terms of acquisition cost and current value. Such table shall indicate whether such excess defense articles were provided on a grant or sale basis.

“(i) EXCESS COAST GUARD PROPERTY.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘excess defense articles’ shall be deemed to include excess property of the Coast Guard, and the term ‘Department of Defense’ shall be deemed, with respect to such excess property, to include the Coast Guard.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.—Section 21(k) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761(k)) is amended by striking “the President shall” and all that follows and inserting the following: “the President shall determine that the sale of such articles will not have an adverse impact on the national technology and industrial base and, particularly, will not reduce the opportunities of entities in the national technology and industrial base to sell new or used equipment to the countries to which such articles are transferred.”.

(2) REPEALS.—The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(A) Section 502A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2303).

(B) Sections 517 through 520 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321k through 2321n).

(C) Section 31(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2771(d)).

SEC. 1505. EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES FOR CERTAIN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

Notwithstanding section 516(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, during each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997, funds available to the Department of Defense may be expended for crating, packing, handling, and transportation of excess defense articles transferred under the authority of section 516 of such Act to countries that are eligible to participate in the Partnership for Peace and that are eligible for assistance under the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989.

Subtitle B—International Military Education and Training

SEC. 1511. ASSISTANCE FOR INDONESIA.

Funds made available for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to carry out chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347 et seq.) may be obligated for Indonesia only for expanded military and education training that meets the requirements of clauses (i) through (iv) of the second sentence of section 541 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2347).

SEC. 1512. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Section 541 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347) is amended in the second sentence in the matter preceding clause (i) by inserting “and individuals who are not members of the government” after “legislators”.

(b) EXCHANGE TRAINING.—Section 544 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2347c) is amended—

(1) by striking “In carrying out this chapter” and inserting “(a) In carrying out this chapter”; and

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

“(b) The President may provide for the attendance of foreign military and civilian defense personnel at flight training schools and programs (including test pilot schools) in the United States without charge, and without charge to funds available to carry out this chapter (notwithstanding section 632(d) of this Act), if such attendance is pursuant to an agreement providing for the exchange of students on a one-for-one basis each fiscal year between those United States flight training schools and programs (including test pilot schools) and comparable flight training schools and programs of foreign countries.”.

(c) ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN HIGH-INCOME FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Chapter 5 of part II of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2347 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 546. PROHIBITION ON GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN HIGH INCOME FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available for a fiscal year for assistance under this chapter may be made available for assistance on a grant basis for any of the high-income foreign countries described in subsection (b) for military education and training of military and related civilian personnel of such country.

“(b) HIGH-INCOME FOREIGN COUNTRIES DESCRIBED.—The high-income foreign countries described in this subsection are Austria, Finland, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, and Spain.”.

(2) AMENDMENT TO THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.—Section 21(a)(1)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761) is amended by inserting “or to any high-income foreign country (as described in that chapter)” after “Foreign Assistance Act of 1961”.

Subtitle C—Antiterrorism Assistance

SEC. 1521. ANTITERRORISM TRAINING ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 571 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2349aa) is amended by striking “Subject to the provisions of this chapter” and inserting “Notwithstanding any other provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries (other than sections 502B and 620A of this Act)”.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Section 573 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2349aa-2) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “SPECIFIC AUTHORITIES AND”;

(2) by striking subsection (a);

(3) by redesignating subsections (b) through (f) as subsections (a) through (e), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (c) (as redesignated)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively; and

(C) by amending paragraph (2) (as redesignated) to read as follows:

“(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), funds made available to carry out this chapter shall not be made available for the procurement of weapons and ammunition.

“(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to small arms and ammunition in categories I and III of the United States Munitions List that are integrally and directly related to antiterrorism training provided under this chapter if, at least 15 days before obligating those funds, the President notifies the appropriate congressional committees specified in section 634A of this Act in accordance with

the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under such section.

“(C) The value (in terms of original acquisition cost) of all equipment and commodities provided under this chapter in any fiscal year may not exceed 25 percent of the funds made available to carry out this chapter for that fiscal year.”.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 574 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2349aa-3) is hereby repealed.

(d) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Section 575 (22 U.S.C. 2349aa-4) and section 576 (22 U.S.C. 2349aa-5) of such Act are redesignated as sections 574 and 575, respectively.

SEC. 1522. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EXPENSES.

Funds made available for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to carry out chapter 8 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2349aa et seq.; relating to antiterrorism assistance) may be made available to the Technical Support Working Group of the Department of State for research and development expenses related to contraband detection technologies or for field demonstrations of such technologies (whether such field demonstrations take place in the United States or outside the United States).

Subtitle D—Narcotics Control Assistance

SEC. 1531. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) POLICY AND GENERAL AUTHORITIES.—Section 481(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act (22 U.S.C. 2291(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (F) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

“(D) International criminal activities, particularly international narcotics trafficking, money laundering, and corruption, endanger political and economic stability and democratic development, and assistance for the prevention and suppression of international criminal activities should be a priority for the United States.”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by adding before the period at the end the following: “, or for other anticrime purposes”.

(b) CONTRIBUTIONS AND REIMBURSEMENT.—Section 482(c) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 2291a(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “CONTRIBUTION BY RECIPIENT COUNTRY.—To” and inserting “CONTRIBUTIONS AND REIMBURSEMENT.—(1) To”; and

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

“(2)(A) The President is authorized to accept contributions from foreign governments to carry out the purposes of this chapter. Such contributions shall be deposited as an offsetting collection to the applicable appropriation account and may be used under the same terms and conditions as funds appropriated pursuant to this chapter.

“(B) At the time of submission of the annual congressional presentation documents required by section 634(a), the President shall provide a detailed report on any contributions received in the preceding fiscal year, the amount of such contributions, and the purposes for which such contributions were used.

“(3) The President is authorized to provide assistance under this chapter on a reimbursable basis. Such reimbursements shall be deposited as an offsetting collection to the applicable appropriation and may be used under the same terms and conditions as funds appropriated pursuant to this chapter.”.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE.—Section 482 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2291a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(f) TREATMENT OF FUNDS.—Funds transferred to and consolidated with funds appropriated pursuant to this chapter may be

made available on such terms and conditions as are applicable to funds appropriated pursuant to this chapter. Funds so transferred or consolidated shall be apportioned directly to the bureau within the Department of State responsible for administering this chapter.

“(g) EXCESS PROPERTY.—For purposes of this chapter, the Secretary of State may use the authority of section 608, without regard to the restrictions of such section, to receive nonlethal excess property from any agency of the United States Government for the purpose of providing such property to a foreign government under the same terms and conditions as funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this chapter.”

SEC. 1532. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The authority of section 1003(d) of the National Narcotics Control Leadership Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1502(d)) may be exercised with respect to funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) and with respect to the personnel of the Department of State only to the extent that the appropriate congressional committees have been notified 15 days in advance in accordance with the reprogramming procedures applicable under section 634A of that Act (22 U.S.C. 2394).

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 1533. WAIVER OF RESTRICTIONS FOR NARCOTICS-RELATED ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE.

For each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997, narcotics-related assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) may be provided notwithstanding any other provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries (other than section 490(e) or section 502B of that Act (22 U.S.C. 2291j(e) and 2304)) if, at least 15 days before obligating funds for such assistance, the President notifies the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 481(e) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 2291(e))) in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under section 634A of that Act (22 U.S.C. 2394).

Subtitle E—Other Provisions

SEC. 1541. STANDARDIZATION OF CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR ARMS TRANSFERS.

(a) THIRD COUNTRY TRANSFERS UNDER FMS SALES.—Section 3(d)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2753(d)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “, as provided for in sections 36(b)(2) and 36(b)(3) of this Act”;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “law” and inserting “joint resolution”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) If the President states in his certification under subparagraph (A) or (B) that an emergency exists which requires that consent to the proposed transfer become effective immediately in the national security interests of the United States, thus waiving the requirements of that subparagraph, the President shall set forth in the certification a detailed justification for his determination, including a description of the emergency circumstances which necessitate immediate consent to the transfer and a discussion of the national security interests involved.

“(D)(i) Any joint resolution under this paragraph shall be considered in the Senate

in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976.

“(ii) For the purpose of expediting the consideration and enactment of joint resolutions under this paragraph, a motion to proceed to the consideration of any such joint resolution after it has been reported by the appropriate committee shall be treated as highly privileged in the House of Representatives.”

(b) THIRD COUNTRY TRANSFERS UNDER COMMERCIAL SALES.—Section 3(d)(3) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2753(d)(3)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” after “(3)”;

(2) in the first sentence—

(A) by striking “at least 30 calendar days”; and

(B) by striking “report” and inserting “certification”; and

(3) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: “Such certification shall be submitted—

“(i) at least 15 calendar days before such consent is given in the case of a transfer to a country which is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or Australia, Japan, or New Zealand; and

“(ii) at least 30 calendar days before such consent is given in the case of a transfer to any other country,

unless the President states in his certification that an emergency exists which requires that consent to the proposed transfer become effective immediately in the national security interests of the United States. If the President states in his certification that such an emergency exists (thus waiving the requirements of clause (i) or (ii), as the case may be, and of subparagraph (B)) the President shall set forth in the certification a detailed justification for his determination, including a description of the emergency circumstances which necessitate that consent to the proposed transfer become effective immediately and a discussion of the national security interests involved.

“(B) Consent to a transfer subject to subparagraph (A) shall become effective after the end of the 15-day or 30-day period specified in subparagraph (A)(i) or (ii), as the case may be, only if the Congress does not enact, within that period, a joint resolution prohibiting the proposed transfer.

“(C)(i) Any joint resolution under this paragraph shall be considered in the Senate in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976.

“(ii) For the purpose of expediting the consideration and enactment of joint resolutions under this paragraph, a motion to proceed to the consideration of any such joint resolution after it has been reported by the appropriate committee shall be treated as highly privileged in the House of Representatives.”

(c) COMMERCIAL SALES.—Section 36(c)(2) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)) is amended by amending subparagraphs (A) and (B) to read as follows:

“(A) in the case of a license for an export to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, any member country of that Organization or Australia, Japan, or New Zealand, shall not be issued until at least 15 calendar days after the Congress receives such certification, and shall not be issued then if the Congress, within that 15-day period, enacts a joint resolution prohibiting the proposed export; and

“(B) in the case of any other license, shall not be issued until at least 30 calendar days after the Congress receives such certification, and shall not be issued then if the Congress, within that 30-day period, enacts a joint resolution prohibiting the proposed export.”

(d) COMMERCIAL MANUFACTURING AGREEMENTS.—Section 36(d) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(d)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “(d)”;

(2) by striking “for or in a country not a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) A certification under this subsection shall be submitted—

“(A) at least 15 days before approval is given in the case of an agreement for or in a country which is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or Australia, Japan, or New Zealand; and

“(B) at least 30 days before approval is given in the case of an agreement for or in any other country;

unless the President states in his certification that an emergency exists which requires the immediate approval of the agreement in the national security interests of the United States.

“(3) If the President states in his certification that an emergency exists which requires the immediate approval of the agreement in the national security interests of the United States, thus waiving the requirements of paragraph (4), he shall set forth in the certification a detailed justification for his determination, including a description of the emergency circumstances which necessitate the immediate approval of the agreement and a discussion of the national security interests involved.

“(4) Approval for an agreement subject to paragraph (1) may not be given under section 38 if the Congress, within the 15-day or 30-day period specified in paragraph (2)(A) or (B), as the case may be, enacts a joint resolution prohibiting such approval.

“(5)(A) Any joint resolution under paragraph (4) shall be considered in the Senate in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976.

“(B) For the purpose of expediting the consideration and enactment of joint resolutions under paragraph (4), a motion to proceed to the consideration of any such joint resolution after it has been reported by the appropriate committee shall be treated as highly privileged in the House of Representatives.”

(e) GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT LEASES.—

(1) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Section 62 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2796a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “Not less than 30 days before” and inserting “Before”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking “determines, and immediately reports to the Congress” and inserting “states in his certification”; and

(ii) by adding at the end of the subsection the following: “If the President states in his certification that such an emergency exists, he shall set forth in the certification a detailed justification for his determination, including a description of the emergency circumstances which necessitate that the lease be entered into immediately and a discussion of the national security interests involved.”; and

(C) by adding at the end of the section the following:

“(c) The certification required by subsection (a) shall be transmitted—

“(1) not less than 15 calendar days before the agreement is entered into or renewed in the case of an agreement with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, any member country of that Organization or Australia, Japan, or New Zealand; and

“(2) not less than 30 calendar days before the agreement is entered into or renewed in the case of an agreement with any other organization or country.”

(2) CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL.—Section 63(a) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2796b(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking “(a)(1)” and inserting “(a)”;
 (B) by striking out the “30 calendar days after receiving the certification with respect to that proposed agreement pursuant to section 62(a),” and inserting in lieu thereof “the 15-day or 30-day period specified in section 62(c) (1) or (2), as the case may be;” and
 (C) by striking paragraph (2).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply with respect to certifications required to be submitted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.
SEC. 1542. INCREASED STANDARDIZATION, RATIONALIZATION, AND INTEROPERABILITY OF ASSISTANCE AND SALES PROGRAMS.

Paragraph (6) of section 515(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321i(a)(6)) is amended by striking “among members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and with the Armed Forces of Japan, Australia, and New Zealand”.

SEC. 1543. DEFINITION OF SIGNIFICANT MILITARY EQUIPMENT.

Section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(9) ‘significant military equipment’ means articles—

“(A) for which special export controls are warranted because of the capacity of such articles for substantial military utility or capability; and
 “(B) identified on the United States Munitions List.”.

SEC. 1544. ELIMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT RELATING TO THE SPECIAL DEFENSE ACQUISITION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 53 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2795b) is hereby repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 51(a)(4) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2795(a)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(a)”; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B).

SEC. 1545. COST OF LEASED DEFENSE ARTICLES THAT HAVE BEEN LOST OR DESTROYED.

Section 61(a)(4) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2796(a)(4)) is amended by striking “and the replacement cost” and all that follows and inserting the following: “and, if the articles are lost or destroyed while leased—

“(A) in the event the United States intends to replace the articles lost or destroyed, the replacement cost (less any depreciation in the value) of the articles; or
 “(B) in the event the United States does not intend to replace the articles lost or destroyed, an amount not less than the actual value (less any depreciation in the value) specified in the lease agreement.”.

SEC. 1546. DESIGNATION OF MAJOR NON-NATO ALLIES.

(a) DESIGNATION.—

(1) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2311 et seq.), as amended by this title, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 517. DESIGNATION OF MAJOR NON-NATO ALLIES.

“(a) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The President shall notify the Congress in writing at least 30 days before—

“(1) designating a country as a major non-NATO ally for purposes of this Act and the

Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.); or

“(2) terminating such a designation.

“(b) INITIAL DESIGNATIONS.—Australia, Egypt, Israel, Japan, the Republic of Korea, and New Zealand shall be deemed to have been so designated by the President as of the effective date of this section, and the President is not required to notify the Congress of such designation of those countries.”.

(2) DEFINITION.—Section 644 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2403) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(q) ‘Major non-NATO ally’ means a country which is designated in accordance with section 517 as a major non-NATO ally for purposes of this Act and the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.).”.

(3) EXISTING DEFINITIONS.—(A) The last sentence of section 21(g) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761(g)) is repealed.

(B) Section 65(d) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2796d(d)) is amended—

(i) by striking “or major non-NATO”; and
 (ii) by striking out “or a” and all that follows through “Code”.

(b) COOPERATIVE TRAINING AGREEMENTS.—Section 21(g) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761(g)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “similar agreements” and all that follows through “other countries” and inserting “similar agreements with countries”.

SEC. 1547. CERTIFICATION THRESHOLDS.

(a) INCREASE IN DOLLAR THRESHOLDS.—The Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(d) (22 U.S.C. 2753(d))—

(A) in paragraphs (1) and (3), by striking “\$14,000,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$25,000,000”; and

(B) in paragraphs (1) and (3), by striking “\$50,000,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$75,000,000”;

(2) in section 36 (22 U.S.C. 2776)—

(A) in subsections (b)(1), (b)(5)(C), and (c)(1), by striking “\$14,000,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$25,000,000”;

(B) in subsections (b)(1), (b)(5)(C), and (c)(1), by striking “\$50,000,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$75,000,000”; and

(C) in subsections (b)(1) and (b)(5)(C), by striking “\$200,000,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$300,000,000”; and

(3) in section 63(a) (22 U.S.C. 2796b(a))—

(A) by striking “\$14,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000”; and
 (B) by striking “\$50,000,000” and inserting “\$75,000,000”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) apply with respect to certifications submitted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1548. DEPLETED URANIUM AMMUNITION.

Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2370 et seq.), as amended by this title, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 620G. DEPLETED URANIUM AMMUNITION.

“(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available to carry out this Act or any other Act may be made available to facilitate in any way the sale of M-833 antitank shells or any comparable antitank shells containing a depleted uranium penetrating component to any country other than—

“(1) a country that is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

“(2) a country that has been designated as a major non-NATO ally (as defined in section 644(q)); or

“(3) Taiwan.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition contained in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the use of funds to facilitate the sale of antitank shells to a country if the

President determines that to do so is in the national security interest of the United States.”.

SEC. 1549. END-USE MONITORING OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND DEFENSE SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) is amended by inserting after chapter 3 the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 3A—END-USE MONITORING OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND DEFENSE SERVICES

“SEC. 40A. END-USE MONITORING OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND DEFENSE SERVICES.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF MONITORING PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to improve accountability with respect to defense articles and defense services sold, leased, or exported under this Act or the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), the President shall establish a program which provides for the end-use monitoring of such articles and services.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS OF PROGRAM.—To the extent practicable, such program—

“(A) shall provide for the end-use monitoring of defense articles and defense services in accordance with the standards that apply for identifying high-risk exports for regular end-use verification developed under section 38(g)(7) of this Act (commonly referred to as the ‘Blue Lantern’ program); and
 “(B) shall be designed to provide reasonable assurance that—

“(i) the recipient is complying with the requirements imposed by the United States Government with respect to use, transfers, and security of defense articles and defense services; and
 “(ii) such articles and services are being used for the purposes for which they are provided.

“(b) CONDUCT OF PROGRAM.—In carrying out the program established under subsection (a), the President shall ensure that the program—

“(1) provides for the end-use verification of defense articles and defense services that incorporate sensitive technology, defense articles and defense services that are particularly vulnerable to diversion or other misuse, or defense articles or defense services whose diversion or other misuse could have significant consequences; and

“(2) prevents the diversion (through reverse engineering or other means) of technology incorporated in defense articles.

“(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this section, and annually thereafter as a part of the annual congressional presentation documents submitted under section 634 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the President shall transmit to the Congress a report describing the actions taken to implement this section, including a detailed accounting of the costs and number of personnel associated with the monitoring program.

“(d) THIRD COUNTRY TRANSFERS.—For purposes of this section, defense articles and defense services sold, leased, or exported under this Act or the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) includes defense articles and defense services that are transferred to a third country or other third party.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 40A of the Arms Export Control Act, as added by subsection (a), applies with respect to defense articles and defense services provided before or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1550. BROKERING ACTIVITIES RELATING TO COMMERCIAL SALES OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 38(b)(1)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(b)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "As prescribed in regulations" and inserting "(i) As prescribed in regulations"; and

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

"(ii)(I) As prescribed in regulations issued under this section, every person (other than an officer or employee of the United States Government acting in official capacity) who engages in the business of brokering activities with respect to the manufacture, export, import, or transfer of any defense article or defense service designated by the President under subsection (a)(1), or in the business of brokering activities with respect to the manufacture, export, import, or transfer of any foreign defense article or defense service (as defined in subclause (IV)), shall register with the United States Government agency charged with the administration of this section, and shall pay a registration fee which shall be prescribed by such regulations.

"(II) Such brokering activities shall include the financing, transportation, freight forwarding, or taking of any other action that facilitates the manufacture, export, or import of a defense article or defense service.

"(III) No person may engage in the business of brokering activities described in subclause (I) without a license, issued in accordance with this Act, except that no license shall be required for such activities undertaken by or for an agency of the United States Government—

"(aa) for use by an agency of the United States Government; or

"(bb) for carrying out any foreign assistance or sales program authorized by law and subject to the control of the President by other means.

"(IV) For purposes of this clause, the term 'foreign defense article or defense service' includes any non-United States defense article or defense service of a nature described on the United States Munitions List regardless of whether such article or service is of United States origin or whether such article or service contains United States origin components."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 38(b)(1)(A)(ii) of the Arms Export Control Act, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to brokering activities engaged in beginning on or after 120 days after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1551. RETURN AND EXCHANGES OF DEFENSE ARTICLES PREVIOUSLY TRANSFERRED PURSUANT TO THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.

(a) REPAIR OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.—Section 27(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(1) REPAIR OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.—

"(I) IN GENERAL.—The President may acquire a repairable defense article from a foreign country or international organization if such defense article—

"(A) previously was transferred to such country or organization under this Act;

"(B) is not an end item; and

"(C) will be exchanged for a defense article of the same type that is in the stocks of the Department of Defense.

"(2) LIMITATION.—The President may exercise the authority provided in paragraph (1) only to the extent that the Department of Defense—

"(A)(i) has a requirement for the defense article being returned; and

"(ii) has available sufficient funds authorized and appropriated for such purpose; or

"(B)(i) is accepting the return of the defense article for subsequent transfer to another foreign government or international organization pursuant to a letter of offer and acceptance implemented in accordance with this Act; and

"(ii) has available sufficient funds provided by or on behalf of such other foreign government or international organization pursuant to a letter of offer and acceptance implemented in accordance with this Act.

"(3) REQUIREMENT.—(A) The foreign government or international organization receiving a new or repaired defense article in exchange for a repairable defense article pursuant to paragraph (1) shall, upon the acceptance by the United States Government of the repairable defense article being returned, be charged the total cost associated with the repair and replacement transaction.

"(B) The total cost charged pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be the same as that charged the United States Armed Forces for a similar repair and replacement transaction, plus an administrative surcharge in accordance with subsection (e)(1)(A) of this section.

"(4) RELATIONSHIP TO CERTAIN OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—The authority of the President to accept the return of a repairable defense article as provided in subsection (a) shall not be subject to chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law relating to the conclusion of contracts."

(b) RETURN OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.—Section 21 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2761), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(m) RETURN OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may accept the return of a defense article from a foreign country or international organization if such defense article—

"(A) previously was transferred to such country or organization under this Act;

"(B) is not significant military equipment (as defined in section 47(9) of this Act); and

"(C) is in fully functioning condition without need of repair or rehabilitation.

"(2) LIMITATION.—The President may exercise the authority provided in paragraph (1) only to the extent that the Department of Defense—

"(A)(i) has a requirement for the defense article being returned; and

"(ii) has available sufficient funds authorized and appropriated for such purpose; or

"(B)(i) is accepting the return of the defense article for subsequent transfer to another foreign government or international organization pursuant to a letter of offer and acceptance implemented in accordance with this Act; and

"(ii) has available sufficient funds provided by or on behalf of such other foreign government or international organization pursuant to a letter of offer and acceptance implemented in accordance with this Act.

"(3) CREDIT FOR TRANSACTION.—Upon acquisition and acceptance by the United States Government of a defense article under paragraph (1), the appropriate Foreign Military Sales account of the provider shall be credited to reflect the transaction.

"(4) RELATIONSHIP TO CERTAIN OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—The authority of the President to accept the return of a defense article as provided in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law relating to the conclusion of contracts."

(c) REGULATIONS.—Under the direction of the President, the Secretary of Defense shall promulgate regulations to implement subsections (l) and (m) of section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act, as added by this section.

SEC. 1552. NATIONAL SECURITY INTEREST DETERMINATION TO WAIVE REIMBURSEMENT OF DEPRECIATION FOR LEASED DEFENSE ARTICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 61(a) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2796(a)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking " or to any defense article which has passed

three-quarters of its normal service life"; and

(2) by inserting after the second sentence the following new sentence: "The President may waive the requirement of paragraph (4) for reimbursement of depreciation for any defense article which has passed three-quarters of its normal service life if the President determines that to do so is important to the national security interest of the United States."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The third sentence of section 61(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, as added by subsection (a)(2), shall apply only with respect to a defense article leased on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1553. ELIGIBILITY OF PANAMA UNDER ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.

The Government of the Republic of Panama shall be eligible to purchase defense articles and defense services under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), except as otherwise specifically provided by law.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT OF OHIO (AMDT B-20 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. ANNUAL REPORT RELATING TO BUY AMERICAN ACT.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress, not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, a report on the amount of purchases by the Department of Defense from foreign entities in that fiscal year. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.) was waived pursuant to any of the following:

(1) Any reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding described in section 849(c)(2) of Public Law 103-160 (41 U.S.C. 10b-2 note).

(2) The Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.)

(3) Any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS (AMDT B-28 IN HOUSE REPORT 104-570)

At the end of title X (page 359, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1041. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING ASSISTING OTHER COUNTRIES TO IMPROVE SECURITY OF FISSIONABLE MATERIAL.

(A) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) With the end of the Cold War, the world is faced with the need to manage the dismantling of vast numbers of nuclear weapons and the disposition of the fissile materials that they contain.

(2) If recently agreed reductions in nuclear weapons are fully implemented, tens of thousands of nuclear weapons, containing a hundred tons or more of plutonium and many hundreds of tons of highly enriched uranium, will no longer be needed for military purposes.

(3) Plutonium and highly enriched uranium are the essential ingredients of nuclear weapons.

(4) Limits on access to plutonium and highly enriched uranium are the primary technical barrier to acquiring nuclear weapons capability in the world today.

(5) Several kilograms of plutonium, or several times that amount of highly enriched uranium, are sufficient to make a nuclear weapon.

(6) Plutonium and highly enriched uranium will continue to pose a potential threat for as long as they exist.

(7) Action is required to secure and account for plutonium and highly enriched uranium.

(8) It is in the national interest of the United States to—

(A) minimize the risk that fissile materials could be obtained by unauthorized parties;

(B) minimize the risk that fissile materials could be reintroduced into the arsenals from which they came, halting or reversing the arms reduction process; and

(C) strengthen the national and international control mechanisms and incentives designed to ensure continued arms reductions and prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In light of the findings contained in subsection (a), it is the sense of Congress that the United States has a national security interest in assisting other countries to improve the security of their stocks of fissile material.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA (AMDT B-31 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. SOUTHWEST BORDER STATES ANTI-DRUG INFORMATION SYSTEM.

It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should support and encourage the full utilization of the Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information System.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF MISSISSIPPI (AMDT B-32 IN HOUSE REPORT 104-570)

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII (page 459, after line 5), insert the following new section:

SEC. 2816. PLAN FOR UTILIZATION, REUTILIZATION, OR DISPOSAL OF MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to Congress a plan for the utilization, reutilization, or disposal of the Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, Hancock County, Mississippi.

At the end of title XXVI (page 443, after line 21), insert the following new section:

SEC. 2602. NAMING OF RANGE AT CAMP SHELBY, MISSISSIPPI.

(a) NAME.—The multi Purpose Range Complex (Heavy) at Camp Shelby, Mississippi, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the "G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery Range". Any reference to such range in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery Range.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect at noon on January 3, 1997, or the first day on which G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery otherwise ceases to be a Member of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3230, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON (AMDT B-34 IN HOUSE REPORT 104-570)

In section 3104 (title XXXI):

Insert at the end of paragraph (8) (page 519, after line 19) the following new paragraph (and renumber the next paragraph accordingly):

(9) For nuclear security/Russian production reactor shutdown, \$6,000,000.

Designate the text of such section as subsection (a) and insert at the end (page 520, after line 20) the following new subsection:

(b) ADJUSTMENT.—The total amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section is the sum of the amounts specified

in subsection (a) reduced by \$6,000,000 for use of prior year balances.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF OHIO (AMDT B-35 IN HOUSE REPORT 104-570)

The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XXXI (page 543, after line 17), insert the following new section:

SEC. 3145. WORKER HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AT DEFENSE NUCLEAR COMPLEX, MIAMISBURG, OHIO.

(a) WORKER HEALTH AND SAFETY ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of Energy shall carry out the following activities at the defense nuclear complex at Miamisburg, Ohio.

(1) Within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, completion of the evaluation of pre-1989 internal radiation dose assessments for workers who may have received a dose greater than 20 rem.

(2) Installation of state-of-the-art automated personnel contamination monitors at appropriate radiation control points and facility exits, and purchase and installation of an automated personnel access control system.

(3) Upgrading of the radiological records software and integration with a radiation work permit system.

(4) Implementation of a program that will characterize the radiological conditions of the site and facilities prior to decontamination so that radiological hazards are clearly identified and results of the characterization validated.

(5) Review and improvement of the evaluation of continuous air monitoring and implementation of a personal air sampling program within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(6) Upgrading of bioassay analytical procedures to ensure that contract laboratories are properly selected and independently validated by the Department of Energy and that quality control is assured.

(7) Implementation of bioassay and internal dose calculation methods that are specific to the radiological hazards identified at the site.

(b) FUNDING.—Of the funds authorized in section 3102(e), \$5,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Energy to perform the activities required by subsection (a) and such other activities to improve worker health and safety at the defense nuclear complex at Miamisburg, Ohio, as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting applicable statutory or regulatory requirements relating to worker health and safety.

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 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the Committee on National Security in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to eliminate the Department of Defense MANTECH program because I believe the program has serious flaws. After examining one Navy manufacturing technology center of excellence in my district, I became concerned that the taxpayer dollars were not being spent wisely. I found that despite significant Federal investment, the center had not lived up to its promises. Job promises had not been realized. overhead appeared excessive.

As an example, I read news reports of purchases of \$69 tape dispensers and \$6,000 conference tables. Executive compensation was, I believe, out of line with the center's responsibilities. As an example, the director received a \$50,000 pay raise at the same time the company shrunk by two-thirds, increasing his compensation to \$261,000 a year.

This led me to the 1992 GAO study of the MANTECH program. I would like to quote from the 1992 study. This is a direct quote.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense does not have reasonable assurances that the MANTECH program is being effectively implemented.

The cost savings or financial benefits being attributed to the MANTECH projects are not reliable.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense has not established a methodology for assessing the program's impact.

In response to the 1992 GAO study, the Department of Defense expressed concern that congressional earmarks has not been evaluated against any selective criteria, no benefits had been quantified, and no analysis of cost effectiveness had been performed.

I understand that the Committee on National Security and the Congress did move in 1992 and 1994 to address some of these problems. I commend the gentleman from South Carolina and his committee for these efforts. The program has apparently been tightened up and further controls put on spending.

However, I remain concerned that Congress still lacks the complete knowledge needed to evaluate this program. The Congress still does not know if doing business through the military's centers of excellence is an effective way to get the most for the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman consider requesting a follow-up to the 1992 GAO report to provide the knowledge needed to further evaluate the effectiveness of this program?

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

Mr. NEUMANN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, although the committee has no knowledge of the claims by the gentleman in his district, I will agree that a GAO study is timely, since the Congress has taken serious steps to ensure a strong manufacturing program in the Department of Defense.

Mr. NEUMANN. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina and look

forward to working with his committee on this issue.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the efforts of the committee to support key modernization efforts for our services and wish to compliment both Chairman SPENCE and Ranking Member DELLUMS for their efforts in meeting the needs of our armed services. However, I would like to point out some deep concern regarding the HMMWV.

The HMMWV, manufactured in South Bend, IN, is the world leader in light tactical wheeled vehicles which are needed for rapid deployment forces. Its versatility also allows it to serve as a platform for newly developed command and control, shelter, and weapons systems programs. The new UpArmored version is also critical to protecting our troops now serving in Bosnia from the extensive threat of mines. The HMMWV might also be used to help the INS patrol our borders and the U.N. keep the peace.

The HMMWV budget request for fiscal year 1997 is not sufficient to prevent a gap in both the vehicle and armoring production lines. General Reimer, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, placed the HMMWV near the top of his unfunded requirements priority list in testimony before Congress. An increase of \$66 million above this request is required to avoid a production gap and meet priority vehicle fielding requirements. I note the Senate version of the bill includes this additional authorization for fiscal year 1997 and urge my colleagues to support this level of funding in the upcoming authorization conference in order to ensure protection of our troops in Bosnia and other hostile areas.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I share the concerns of my distinguished colleague from Indiana, and I recognize the importance of the HMMWV Program and its extensive role in meeting the services' current requirements. I would further like to assure the gentleman from Indiana that this issue will be considered during the upcoming conference, and I yield to the gentleman for a final remark.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman and former chairman of the committee for his support and articulate words.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. HASTINGS].

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I rise in support of this amendment. I applaud the committee's decision to accept my amendment in this end bloc amendment, providing funding for the Russian Reactor Conversion Program. In spite of the fact that the cold war is over, Russia continues to use many of its nuclear reactors to produce weapons grade plutonium. My amendment, which utilizes existing funding, will allow us to shut down these reactors, reducing the direct threat to the United States. Nearly everyone I talked to supports this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to take a minute to mention an issue of particular interest to my district. This bill includes provisions in the committee mark to streamline the DOE's environmental management program, including, No. 1, granting additional authority to local site managers to cut through redtape and get the cleanup job done, placing strict limits on burdensome paperwork known as DOE orders and otherwise streamlining the DOE orders, and more important, requiring performance based contracts to assure contractors are given incentives to spend our tax dollars wisely.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

For more than a decade, we have sat by as our Nation's defense spending has been dramatically reduced. In fact, spending on procurement has fallen by 70 percent since 1985. Thus, the committee's action to increase funding over the President's request is a welcome change—one which will ensure that our military remains the best equipped and best trained in the world.

I also want to take a minute to mention two issues that are of particular interest to my district.

First, I applaud the committee's decision to accept my amendment providing funding for the Russian Reactor Conversion Program. In spite of the fact that the cold war is over, Russia continues to use many of its nuclear reactors to produce weapons-grade plutonium.

The Department of Energy runs a small program which focuses on either shutting down these reactors, or converting them so that they will not be able to produce plutonium. The program also leverages U.S. expertise in spent nuclear fuel management, in order to prevent reprocessing.

My amendment asks for no new funding. It will fund the program out of unspent balances from prior years. Nearly everyone who I have spoken to supports the program, and the debate thus far has simply been over which Federal agency should fund it—not whether it should be funded. By authorizing the use of existing funds, my amendment will preserve an important non-proliferation initiative, without taking funding away from crucial defense programs.

A related DOE project, the International Nuclear Safety Program, works to ensure the security and safety of Russian power-producing nuclear reactors. I understand that the sub-

committee chairman believes that funding for this program should come out of foreign assistance funding, rather than out of defense spending, and I would propose that we work together to see that this program is adequately funded in this manner.

Second, I applaud the committee for accepting my legislation to streamline the Department of Energy's Environmental Management Program. My bill codifies important steps that the Department has taken in the past few months, including:

Granting additional authority to local site managers to cut through the redtape and get the cleanup job done;

Allowing site managers to transfer funding to the most critical cleanup projects;

Placing strict new limits on burdensome internal paperwork requirements—also known as DOE orders;

Encouraging performance based contracts, to ensure that private contractors are given an incentive to spend our tax dollars wisely;

Encouraging streamlined approval processes for new technology; and,

Allowing budget savings at cleanup sites to be used for other key projects.

These provisions are a significant step towards fundamental reform of the DOE cleanup program. They will not only speed progress made on cleanup, but ensure that Federal resources are used effectively. As a result, I strongly urge that my colleagues support this legislation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I once made a statement with all this "Buy American" stuff when I heard all of the arguments that we could hire generals a lot cheaper from Korea. Evidently it helped me, and in 1994, I want to give credit to then Chairman DELLUMS who had helped me pass a law that says that if in fact a foreign country discriminates against certain types of American products, then there shall be no waivers of the blanket "Buy American" Act.

I think that is a very important piece of legislation. I want to thank the gentleman from helping with that. The reason why I have asked for the time is I want to engage in a colloquy with the chairman, and I commend the chairman for the fine job he has done.

But is that, because it was authorized in 1994 as a part of the Defense authorization bill, permanent law?

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. The operative provision of the gentleman's original amendment is already in law as part of the fiscal year 1994 Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. TRAFICANT. With that, Mr. Chairman, again I thank everybody. I want to thank Chairman DELLUMS because it took us some time to get that

done under his leadership. He took a loot at that.

Second of all, my amendment now calls for a report. I think we must know the status of when this buy American act is waived, what are the dollar amounts and what are the goods being produced and purchased overseas.

So I want to again thank the chairman for including this in the en bloc, and I want to thank Chairman DELLUMS under his leadership for enacting this that is now permanent law.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Research and Development.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, there is a provision in our bill about a program called Joint Advanced Strike Technology, also known to industry as the joint strike fighter, that very few Members of this body have any knowledge of.

Our committee recommendation in this bill on the Joint Advanced Strike Technology Program restricts funding and asks for further justification for the program. This action has been viewed as controversial by some because it is seen as directed at one particular military service. Others find our action controversial because they claim that the committee's action came as a surprise and without sufficient debate. I appreciate these views, however this body needs to more fully understand the basis for the committee's action on JAST.

First, let me say that while most of you have never heard of this program called JAST, CBO estimates it is a \$300 billion program. Yes, I said \$300 billion. That is more than 7 B-2 programs and is well over the total amount of the entire DOD budget that we are debating.

DOD wants to spend \$300 billion of your money, but the Pentagon refuses to classify JAST as an acquisition program—for reasons only Pentagon lawyers can seek to justify.

Section 2430 and 2432 of title 10, United States Code that govern Defense Department major acquisition programs, define what constitutes a major defense acquisition program and require that the Pentagon provide the Congress certain reports detailing overall costs and schedules for major acquisition programs so we can meet our oversight responsibilities.

However, while the Pentagon intends to spend \$300 billion of taxpayer money, it refuses to comply with the law. The Pentagon has spent \$400 million already and plans to spend nearly \$4 billion more during the next 6 years and ultimately \$300 billion for what the Pentagon continues to call a non-acquisition program.

No one should be surprised by our committee's action.

In 1993 the committee zeroed the funding for the Navy's request for the

predecessor program to JAST, called advanced short takeoff and vertical landing aircraft.

In 1994, the committee again zeroed the funding request for this program.

In 1995, the committee authorized the DOD request. However, in its report on the bill the committee stated it did so "more out of concern for the industrial base than as an endorsement of the requirement for such an aircraft."

So no one should be surprised by the committee's recommendation. The committee's views have been consistent through 4 years of Democrat and Republican leadership.

Now that more Members have expressed an interest in pursuing the details of this \$300 billion program, I intend to recommend to the chairman that we come out of conference with a requirement that first, the Pentagon comply with the law and that they meet the reporting requirements of a major defense acquisition program. Second, that an independent analysis be done regarding the so-called joint requirement for this program, and finally, that we restrict obligation of funding for JAST until the Pentagon complies with these two requirements.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking minority member for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I am offering is included in the chairman's en bloc amendment. The first section of my amendment contains language which requires the Army not later than 180 days after the enactment of the fiscal year 1997 defense authorization to submit to Congress a plan for the utilization, reutilization, or disposal of the Mississippi Army ammunition plant which is located in Hancock County, MS.

The second section of my amendment, which I think many will have a great interest in, would name the multipurpose range complex heavy tank training facility at Camp Shelby, MS, for Congressman G.V. "SONNY" MONTGOMERY.

As Mississippi Adj. Gen. James H. Garner wrote:

Congressman G.V. "SONNY" MONTGOMERY has been especially supportive in the development of Camp Shelby to meet the training needs for not only the Mississippi National Guard, but the many other States using Camp Shelby for their annual training * * * I feel that it would be very appropriate, in tribute to Congressman Montgomery as he retires at the end of this year, that the multipurpose range complex be named the G.V. "SONNY" MONTGOMERY multipurpose Range. I would wholeheartedly support such legislative initiative to honor Congressman Montgomery in this way.

Just briefly, since he was first elected in 1966, Representative MONTGOMERY has steadfastly served as the voice of the citizens of Mississippi's Third District in Congress and our Nation.

The gentleman from Mississippi is a veteran of the U.S. Army in World War II, a retired National Guard General, member of the House National Security Committee, and former chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. He has dedicated his life to serving the Nation both on the front lines of battle and in the Halls of Congress.

Incidentally, I would like to mention that during every single Christmas break during the Vietnam war, Chairman MONTGOMERY spent his Christmas in Vietnam with the troops.

His legislative legacy is impeccable. It includes the Montgomery G.I. bill, championing the concept of an All Volunteer military, making the Reserves truly a ready force, and equipping and strengthening the National Guard. He fought for reemployment rights for reservists and National Guard personnel who were called to active duty. He ensured that our Nation's veterans were eligible for basic benefits like healthcare, low-interest home loans, and a chance for a better education.

And, in spite of all his triumphs and personal successes, Congressman MONTGOMERY remains a kind and humble man. His successor will no doubt have huge shoes to fill.

Mr. Chairman, I am honored to have had the opportunity to serve with SONNY MONTGOMERY. I will be forever grateful for what he has done personally to assist me, the great things he has done for our State, our Nation's veterans, and our Nation. You will be missed, SONNY. Good luck in your retirement.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of joining the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. TAYLOR, in paying tribute to our colleague, SONNY MONTGOMERY, not only in naming this particular range after the gentleman from Mississippi, but for his long and distinguished service to this body.

As I said on yesterday and on other occasions too, I know of no person on either side of the aisle who has stood stronger for national defense over the years than SONNY MONTGOMERY. He is going to be sorely missed in this body and by this country when he retires.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN].

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

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, as an officer in the active and Reserve U.S. Army for over 30 years, I rise in support of H.R. 3230.

I would like to begin by thanking Chairman SPENCE and Chairman DORNAN for their support of title 12 of the defense authorization bill, known as the Reserve Revitalization Act of 1996.

They recognize the vitality and importance of our Reserve components in the national defense of the United States.

On behalf of my fellow reservists and guardsmen, I can tell you that their devotion to our Nation's citizen-soldiers is known and very appreciated.

In particular, I would like to express my appreciation to Congressman SONNY MONTGOMERY.

Without Mr. MONTGOMERY's support of the Revitalization Act and his years of dedication to the national security of our great land, our country would be a very different place.

I also would like to thank my friend from New Jersey, Mr. SAXTON, for withdrawing his amendment to the defense authorization bill.

I believe it is important that my fellow Members understand why it is so important that the Army Reserve report directly to the chief of Staff of the Army.

Simply stated, this will improve the readiness of the Army Reserve.

Of all the Reserve components, the U.S. Army Reserve has the lowest readiness of any of our military Reserve commands.

I agree with Mr. SKELTON that the Army Reserve readiness has improved somewhat.

But this improvement is not because of its command relationship with forscum.

It is because of congressional pressure. It is because of congressionally mandated equipment additions.

It is because of intensive oversight by this body over the years.

The Army Reserve is the only Reserve component which does not report directly to the service Chief of Staff.

During the authorization bill's markup in the Subcommittee on Personnel, this issue was specifically and thoroughly debated.

By an overwhelming vote, the subcommittee adopted the present bill language.

This language requires the commanding general of the Army Reserve to report directly to the Chief of Staff of the Army.

This arrangement mirrors the command relationships of all the other services.

It only makes sense that this will lead the Army Reserve toward the better readiness ratings earned by the Army's sister services.

The Army has resisted this change.

Unfortunately, this resistance to the will of Congress is not new.

In 1991, Congress mandated the establishment of the U.S. Army Reserve Command over the strenuous objections of the Department of the Army.

At one point, Congress was forced to threaten to withhold \$100 million from the Army budget before the Army leadership would follow the orders of Congress.

The 1991 Defense Authorization Act, in section 903, directed the Army to assign the Army Reserve Command to the U.S. Atlantic Command, a warfighting commander in chief.

Instead, the Army placed the Army Reserve Command under the control of forscum.

This year's legislation, in part, is another attempt to require the Army to improve the Readiness of the Army Reserve.

All former chiefs of the Army Reserve support the current bill language, based on their years of practical experience.

You heard Mr. MONTGOMERY read one letter that expressed the sense of those past leaders of the Army Reserve.

In addition, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps personally were involved in drafting this important language.

Each of them supports direct reporting between the Reserve Commander and the Chief of Staff as necessary and required for Reserve readiness.

Every study which has examined the Army Reserve has emphatically recommended that the Army Reserve Commander report directly to the Chief of Staff.

This is the best way to improve the Army Reserve's readiness, because it puts the chief of the Army Reserve at the table with the Army's top decisionmakers.

This is the same organization followed by all other of our Nation's military services—the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines.

Studies chaired by retired generals Richardson and Foss, as former commanding generals of the Army training and doctrine command, made these recommendations.

The congressionally mandated independent commission directly addressed this issue in 1992 when it recommended elimination of layering and recommended direct reporting to the Chief of Staff.

Finally, the Hay group in 1993 specifically recommended that the commanding general of U.S. Army Reserve Command, USARC, report directly to the chief.

It is high time that the consistent and repeated recommendations of several study groups be implemented by Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support this important authorization bill, and do what is right for the readiness of this Nation's active duty military members and for America's citizen-soldiers.

□ 1500

All former chiefs of the Army Reserve, as mentioned in the statement yesterday by the gentleman from Mississippi, SONNY MONTGOMERY, support this provision. This allows them to have one boss and to have one direct chain of command, and that is to the senior U.S. Army general on active duty.

It is very important that we raise the level of readiness of the Army Reserve, because they have consistently had the lowest level of readiness of our Reserves.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the defense authorization bill.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman

from California [Ms. WATERS], another of my distinguished colleagues.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman SPENCE, and the gentleman from California, Ranking Member DELLUMS, for including my amendment in the en bloc amendment.

As in other sectors of society, the defense industry has undergone a wave of mergers in the past few years. With this much consolidation, I think it makes good sense for the Department of Defense to take a hard look at some of the consequences of this massive change.

In 1994, Northrop and Grumman merged, Loral and IBM-Federal Systems merged, and Martin Marietta merged with both General Dynamics-Space Systems and Lockheed that year.

In 1995, Loral merged with Unysis-Defense. Litton merged with Teledyne-Electronics. Raytheon merged with E-Systems, and Hughes merged with Magnavox-Electronic Systems.

Already this year, Northrop-Grumman has merged with Westinghouse-Defense Electronics and Lockheed-Martin has merged with Loral-Defense.

The Defense Department would report their findings to Congress 6 months after the date of enactment of this bill. This would give us a reasonable chance to evaluate, analyze and digest the information before we begin next year's funding cycle.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support on the en bloc amendment. I think this addition of the en bloc will make this a better bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. J.C. WATTS, our Oklahoma quarterback.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and also the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman SPENCE, for as we fought these battles in committee they both conducted themselves with great professionalism and provided leadership on both sides of the aisle, and I appreciate their efforts and their professionalism.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 is a well-thought-out bill that gives much-needed support to the men and women of the Armed Forces.

Today, men and women of the United States military are protecting the cause of freedom in Bosnia, the Middle East, and other areas in the world. What better way to demonstrate our support for them than to offer legislation that enhances military pay, housing, and other earned benefits.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 remembers our Nation's defenders. In addition to increasing their basic pay, the bill speaks to important quality of life issues by increasing the basic allowance for quarters and giving thousands of military members housing choices that were previously unavailable.

I urge and call on my colleagues to offer their support for this legislation and the en bloc amendment to the 1997 authorization act.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] for the purposes of engaging in a colloquy.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California, Ranking Member DELLUMS, for yielding me this time, and I would like to engage the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] on two subjects, dual-use technology and the Nautilus program, both of which are included in this bill, and to thank him for his leadership and bipartisanship.

On the first subject, Mr. Chairman, we do not have the luxury any more of unlimited research and procurement funds in the defense budget, so saving money by using commercial products and technologies to solve military problems becomes more important than ever. Dual-use technology is an area of critical importance to us in the Congress as we work to get the most value for each tax dollar spent on defense.

Working on a bipartisan basis, we have crafted an innovative dual-use technology provision in this bill, which includes cost sharing and will make program managers in each service sector look to the commercial marketplace first for solutions to their technology needs.

I look forward to working with the gentleman from Pennsylvania to ensure this provision becomes law.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HARMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I could not agree with the gentlewoman more. This is an innovative proposal we have worked together on. I applaud her for her leadership and look forward to fully funding this new initiative, which I am very excited about, and thank her for her leadership on this issue.

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the chairman. Second, we have plussed up the ballistic missile defense piece of this defense bill, and I am fully supportive of that, but our program will not meet the threats for some years. There are immediate threats in some theaters around the world, one of which is Israel.

I have been a strong supporter, as the gentleman knows, of our collaboration with Israel on various aspects of the ballistic missile defense budget. Just a few weeks ago the President and Prime Minister Peres signed a statement of intent providing that the Nautilus, which is a ground-based theater missile defense system, would be developed and deployed as soon as possible.

I am disappointed that the administration has not included funding in this bill for the Nautilus program, but we in

our subcommittee and then in the full committee included supportive language. I would like to talk to the chairman about this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes, the remainder of our time, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Research and Development.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the balance of his time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee chairman and I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] for her leadership on this vital issue and program.

The Nautilus program is critical, critical to our overall missile defense program and critical to the security of Israel. I pledge to her what she has said today we will fully support.

The gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman SPENCE, and I assume the gentleman from California, Mr. DELLUMS, also support this vital initiative. But I have to again mention to all of our colleagues that this administration, which talked about the importance of the high energy laser program, the Nautilus, for the past 3 years has tried to zero out the entire program.

In fact, I have to correct, Mr. Chairman, a statement I made yesterday. I said the President requested \$3 million this year for the high energy laser program. What he did was requested \$3 million to terminate the program; to zero it out; to end it. Thank goodness this Congress has been there to make sure the funding is in place so that we can protect Israel.

Finally, this President is seeing the light and joining with this Congress and enlightened people like the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] in making sure that Israel's security is guaranteed by programs like the high energy laser program and missile defense technology. I applaud her, I look forward to working with her, and thank goodness, Mr. Chairman, the President has seen the light as well.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I would note that I have been a long-term supporter of these initiatives and will continue to be. I am pleased that the administration at this point has proposed its collaboration with Israel.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Procurement.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the full committee for the great job he has done in moving this bill through the commit-

tee process and through the floor, and say to my colleagues, Democrat and Republican, that we have put together an excellent bill.

I just want to take a minute, because we have had such a fast run on the House floor that I think it is important to kind of bring this thing back into the context of the total bill, and talk a little bit about what we have done overall. I see the gentleman from Pennsylvania, CURT WELDON, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, and the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPENCE, the full committee chairman, who both had as one of their goals to enhance missile defense.

I think it is appropriate that we have just had this discussion between the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] who has really been an advocate of missile defense and the cooperative program with Israel, because the administration has now agreed to undertake a program that, for all practical purposes, with the Nautilus missile defense system and the Arrow defense system that we have been building with Israel for some time, that will shoot down incoming missiles that are coming into Tel Aviv or other places. President Clinton has now agreed with the concept that we should defend the people of Israel against enemy missile attacks.

Now, that means a couple of things. First, he understands now that the possibility of those missile attacks exist. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] and I wrote a letter some 5 or 6 years ago advising Israel and our then head of SDI that we expected to have missile attacks on Israel at some point in the future using Soviet made rockets, missiles, and that did occur. So President Clinton now agrees that missile attacks may occur in Israel and it is good to defend against them and defend the people, the population, of Israel.

Our next job is to drag this President kicking and screaming into the idea that it would also be good to defend the people of the United States against missile attacks. That is the impetus of the language that we have put forward in this bill.

We also have the 3-percent pay raise for our troops. We have ammunition, we have the heavy equipment that our troops need to deploy worldwide, and we have enhanced sealift and airlift in this bill. So we have done quality of life and we have done power projection, and I hope that everybody, Democrat and Republican, will vote for this bipartisan defense bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for putting this all together, and the subcommittee chairmen, who really worked long and hard on this. I noticed the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] and his counterpart in the O&M subcommittee, put in lots of money so that we will have plenty of capability in ship repair and ordnance

repair and equipment repair at our depots. That is an important aspect of being able to move the Marines in short order into a forward deployed area.

Mr. Chairman, we have added some \$300 plus million, including \$96 million for M-16 bullets that the Marines told us they were short in terms of fighting the two-war scenario.

This is an excellent bill, Mr. Chairman, and I hope everyone will vote for this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Research and Development.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding to me, and I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], for his leadership. I encourage our colleagues to vote for this important piece of legislation, I think an historic piece of legislation that deals with the quality of life issues so important to our men and women serving around the country; that ensures we protect their pay increases, their housing, their quality of life priorities.

This bill also deals, Mr. Chairman, with our priorities in terms of rebuilding our acquisition and getting on to those platforms that can replace those aging items that need to be replaced.

I applaud the chairman for his leadership in allowing us to expand out and to put in a new innovative approach with the Russians in the area of missile defense, something we have never done before and which is a formal part of this bill.

I applaud the chairman for allowing us to expand from an environmental standpoint to allow the Navy to take a leadership role in more fully understanding the oceans, to allow the CNO to coordinate efforts among the nine Federal agencies doing oceanographic work into one effort headed up by the CNO of the Navy, supported by all the major environmental groups and the 45 major oceanographic institutions nationwide.

The bill is a good bill. It is a bill every Member of this body can support, just as in our committee, and I would encourage my colleagues to look at the vote out of committee. Forty-nine to two, Mr. Chairman was the vote. Overwhelming bipartisan support from Republicans and Democrats who have made the statement that we have reached a fair compromise.

Some of us might have liked to have had more money here or more money there, but we have covered all the major requirements, from impact aid to quality of life, to modernization, to missile defense, and we have done it in a bipartisan manner. The best evidence that we can show in terms of our support of this bill is now to take this piece of legislation that passed out of our committee 49 to 2 and have an overwhelming vote to send it to the Senate so that we can reach a fair com-

promise and send a bill to the President that he can support.

We can clean up some of the areas that Members have concern with, but, overall, we have an outstanding bill, one that I am proud to support and one I hope my colleagues will join with us in voting "yes" on.

□ 1515

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, but I rise particularly to offer my support for the Taylor amendment. The Taylor amendment includes a provision that honors our colleague and friend, the Honorable SONNY MONTGOMERY. No finer gentleman has ever served in this House or lived a life more dedicated to the armed services of our Nation. This honor included in the Taylor amendment is richly deserved.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I recognize that we are attempting to fill in for a few moments while our leaders come back from other places. Let me take this opportunity to point out, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that there are five members of our committee for whom this is the last time they will come to the floor to debate a defense authorization bill: the Messrs. MONTGOMERY, BROWDER, PETERSON, GEREN, and Mrs. SCHROEDER of Colorado.

With respect to three of my colleagues, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. BROWDER, is now seeking higher office in the other body; Mr. PETERSON is moving on to other things; and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN, has decided to return to Texas into private life and pursue the balance of his life. For these three persons, I would like to say to them that it has been a pleasure to serve with them, to serve with them in my capacity as subcommittee chairman of various committees, full committee chairman last year, this year as the ranking Democrat. And I wish them well.

For two of my colleagues, I have been around here for a long time, Mr. Chairman. I am now in my 26th year. For the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], I would like to lay out a couple of anecdotal bits. Mrs. SCHROEDER, as my colleagues well know, came to Congress 2 years after this gentleman. I was elected in 1970, sworn in in 1971. The gentlewoman from Colorado was sworn in in 1973. I remembered my first 2 years I served on the Foreign Affairs Committee. My second term, by a set of circumstances that is a whole other story, I managed to end up on the Armed Services Committee as the peacenik from Berkeley.

I recall that the person sitting next to me at the very bottom of the rung on the committee was the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROE-

DER]. It was very interesting that there were two of us new Members to the committee, but the chair of the committee at that time decided that there would only be one additional chair in the hearing room. So the gentlewoman from Colorado and the gentleman from California had to sit in the same chair. So we sat cheek-to-cheek, hip-to-hip, and it took great dignity on the part of both of us to do this. We leaned into each other, recognizing what was being said to us by the humiliating effort to not allow the gentlewoman from Colorado and the gentleman from California to sit in two separate seats. But we turned to each other and we said let us do it with great dignity. Let us not give these people the luxury of thinking that they got to us. It was a difficult day, but when you are sitting cheek-to-cheek with someone, you learn a great deal about them.

Over the 20-something years that we have served together, we have learned a lot about each other. I personally will miss the services of the gentlewoman from Colorado. She has singularly fought major battles in this body to bring sanity to our military budget, to help move the world toward peace, to move us toward nuclear disarmament and toward arms control.

She has made an effort to stand on the floor of this body to challenge this Nation to a rational, coherent, and compassionate set of human priorities. I will miss the gentlewoman because sitting there with her year in and year out, fighting the same battles has given me heart, has given me courage to know that I was never standing alone, even sometimes when we were outnumbered in the Armed Services Committee.

With respect to my distinguished colleague from Mississippi, Mr. MONTGOMERY, he and I were guys who walked in, he was here before myself. We have very different politics. But it is the interesting thing about this institution that people looking from the outside rarely, even the media, rarely get a feel for that even where you can have differences of opinion, friendships develop and friendships emerge.

I knew that I had made it in this institution when I became friends with SONNY MONTGOMERY. I knew that my personal credibility was no longer being challenged in this institution.

My little story about SONNY MONTGOMERY is I remember several years ago when the Republican Party was controlling the other body, we had worked for several weeks to get through the Defense authorization bill. Every single item in the bill had been reconciled with the exception of one. The Montgomery GI bill. Every single issue, billions of dollars had been reconciled, late into the night, wee hours in the morning.

I am about to wrap it up. I am just filibustering so we can get other people back. Be lenient, I will finish this quickly, Mr. Chairman.

Everyone was leaning on the gentleman from Mississippi. SONNY, let it

go, let it go, we will hold some hearings next year. And I remember they were beating hard on the gentleman from Mississippi and, I thought, in a relatively unfair way. So this junior Member from California, with left-wing politics, stepped up and stood next to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and said: Stay strong, SONNY, you can win this thing. And to the shock and amazement of the colleagues in the conference, the gentleman from Mississippi, conservative Democrat, the gentleman from California, progressive Democrat, arm in arm walked out of the conference and, walking out of that conference, allowed thousands of young people to go to college who would never have had the opportunity.

In Mr. MONTGOMERY walking out of that conference, he set a tone that said, if you are going to reconcile this bill, you are going to bring the Montgomery GI bill to fruition. He walked back in and they conceded. And that is why you now have the Montgomery GI bill that serves well thousands of young American people who can matriculate in this country.

So with those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say farewell to five very important, very significant Members who played a vital role in this Congress. I have enjoyed serving with them.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries pursuant to the administration's request of January 29, 1996.

Legislation authorizing the proposed transfer of these ships is required by section 7307(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, which provides in relevant part that "a naval vessel in excess of 3,000 tons or less than 20 years of age may not be sold, leased, granted * * * or otherwise disposed of to another nation unless the disposition of that vessel is approved by law * * *". Each naval vessel proposed for transfer under this legislation displaces in excess of 3,000 tons and/or is less than 20 years of age and therefore the Congress must act.

Therefore the first part of this amendment would insert a new section in title X of the bill to authorize the transfer of 10 naval vessels—(8 sales, 1 lease, 1 grant—to the following countries:

To the Government of Egypt, one *Oliver Hazard Perry* class frigate *Gallery* (FFG 26); sale: \$47.2 million.

To the Government of Mexico, two *Knox* class frigates: *Stein* (FF 1065) and *Marvin Shields* (FF 1066); sale: \$5.9 million.

To the Government of New Zealand, one *Stalwart* class ocean surveillance ship: *Tenacious* (T-AGOS 17); sale: \$7.7 million.

To the Government of Portugal, one *Stalwart* class ocean surveillance ship: *Audacious* (T-AGOS 11); grant: \$13.7 million.

To Taiwan (the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States), three *Knox* class frigates: *Aylwin* (FF 1081) *Pharris* (FF 1094), and *Valdez* (FF 1096) Sale: \$8.2 million; one *Newport* class tank landing ship: *Newport* (LST 1179) lease: No rent lease.

To the Government of Thailand, one *Knox* class frigate: *Ouellet* (FF 1077); sale: \$2.7 million.

According to the Department of Defense, the Chief of Naval Operations certified that these naval vessels are not essential to the defense of the United States. The United States will incur no costs for the transfer of the naval vessels under this legislation. The foreign recipients will be responsible for all costs associated with the transfer of the vessels, including maintenance, repairs, training, and fleet turnover costs. Any expenses incurred in connection with the transfers will be charged to the foreign recipients.

Through the sale of these naval vessels, this legislation generates \$71.7 million in revenue for the U.S. Treasury. In addition, through repair and reactivation work, service contracts, ammunition sales, and savings generated from avoidance of storage/deactivation costs, the Navy estimates this legislation generates an additional \$525 million in revenue for the U.S. Treasury and private U.S. firms.

The second purpose this amendment is to amend authorities under the Foreign Assistance Act [FAA] of 1961, as amended, and the Arms Export Control Act [AECA] to revise and consolidate defense and security assistance authorities, in particular by updating policy and statutory authorities.

This amendment is identical to H.R. 3121, which the House passed on April 16, 1996, by voice vote, continues the effort by the Committee on International Relations to amend the FAA and AECA to make improvements to defense and security assistance provisions under those Acts. The provisions included in this amendment are the product of bipartisan effort and cooperation and enjoy the strong support of the Departments of State and Defense.

This amendment would insert a new title XV in the bill and is organized by subtitle as follows:

Subtitle A modifies applicable provisions on terms and criteria of financing assistance, including drawdown authorities and a rewrite of the excess defense article authority.

Subtitle B modifies terms of assistance for the International Military Education and Training [IMET] Program.

Subtitle C clarifies current law authorities under which antiterrorism assistance is provided.

Subtitle D modifies authorities under which assistance for international narcotics is provided.

Subtitle E deals with general provisions regarding military assistance including approval of third-country transfers, standardization of congressional review procedures for arms sales, definitions, arms sales certification thresholds, designation of major non-NATO allies, end-use monitoring, and other miscellaneous issues.

I appreciate the opportunity to explain my amendment and would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the provision in this amendment that authorizes international military education and training assistance for Indonesia.

In 1992, we voted to end all IMET assistance for Indonesia because of that country's abysmal human rights record and their continued oppression of the people of East Timor. Despite the lack of improvement in Indonesia's

human rights record, and the opposition of myself and many of my colleagues, a modified IMET program was approved for Indonesia in the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996.

When this provision was added to the foreign aid bill last year, we said we would monitor the human rights situation in Indonesia very carefully and act accordingly this year. Well, the State Department's Country Report on Indonesia was released in March, and according to the report, "The Government continued to commit serious human rights abuses."

That doesn't sound to me as though the situation has improved.

The State Department report also said that in Indonesia "reports of extrajudicial killings, disappearances, and torture of those in custody by security forces increased." Not decreased. Not stayed the same. Increased. Should we really be authorizing IMET assistance for this government now when they have not addressed these critical human rights issues? I don't think so.

Indonesia's policy in East Timor is about the oppression of people who oppose Indonesia's right to torture, kill, and repress the people of East Timor. It is about the 200,000 Timorese who have been slaughtered since the Indonesian occupation in 1975—200,000 killed out of a population of 700,000. It is about genocide.

Mr. Chairman, this provision should be debated fully by this House, not slipped into an en bloc amendment.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose passage of the fiscal year 1997 DOD Authorization Act because I believe it funds expensive and unneeded cold-war programs that will compete with fundamental defense spending priorities.

I am concerned that this bill, as did the fiscal year 1996 Authorization Act, puts us on a course to buy cold-war weapons systems such as the F-22, the new attack submarine and national missile defense—star wars. Funding these types of programs puts immediate spending priorities at risk. The number of big ticket and unnecessary procurement items authorized will make it difficult to fund basic defense needs in the outyears. The bow wave of increasing procurement costs that the bill establishes will make it much harder to ensure basic defense capabilities and needs.

While I agree with some of the priorities funded in this bill that help us meet new and changing threats, such as avionics upgrades and the V-22 program, I believe that the extra \$7.5 billion authorized in this bill for procurement will threaten more important defense priorities. This increase will have direct consequences on specific readiness needs, such as: adequate funding to operate and maintain our forces, stable pay and benefits for our military service members, the ability to retain a steady and capable civilian work force, and the modernization of less glamorous hardware programs such as artillery systems.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I must reluctantly vote against the fiscal year 1997 Department of Defense Authorization Act because I am troubled by a number of aspects of the bill. First and foremost, the overall spending level is too high. While I appreciate that the bill seeks to address a number of shortcomings in the President's defense budget, too much additional spending has been added to the bill.

Our Nation's legitimate defense needs must be met, but if we are to succeed in the critical and ongoing effort to balance the budget, the defense budget cannot be exempt from spending reductions.

This year's authorization level is \$2 billion over last year's level, probably significantly higher than required to meet the essential military aspects of our national security. Furthermore, I disagree with the decision to prevent amendments to the bill that might allow for a rational debate on program funding levels and some reasonable reductions.

Most of the additional funds authorized in this year's plan were for procurement—about \$8 billion. This is too generous an increase over the budget request. While I believe procurement and modernization funding does need to increase in certain longlead components of major programs, this year's increase seems to avoid making the necessary choices to establish our most important priorities. This unsolicited increase is not the most rationale way to procure additional weapons, does not go far enough to reflect those items most needed by the services, and may have an adverse impact on our ability to meet real requirements in the future.

I am particularly concerned by the committee's plan to pursue what may be a premature deployment of a national ballistic missile defense system. I am not convinced that a true ballistic missile threat to our Nation from rogue nations will materialize as quickly as some have asserted. Our Nation's current missile defense plan can provide for an affordable defense against limited missile threats before those threats will emerge. I am concerned over the committee's plan to deploy a space-based "star wars" defense, and costs that would add nearly a billion dollars over the President's request to accelerate the development of both national and theater missile defense systems. This course of action commits us to a very expensive and probably unaffordable path. This attempt to accelerate missile defense deployment without a consensus on the actual threat is not sound policy.

The bill does meet important needs for operations and maintenance programs, as well as improvements in our military housing and other facilities. It is difficult for me to oppose this bill because it funds some important military construction programs in my own State of Delaware. But these worthwhile provisions are overshadowed by other problems in the bill.

The authorization bill attempts to legislate divisive social policies which will not improve our military readiness. These policies include a ban on privately funded abortions for U.S. military personnel in overseas hospitals, and mandatory separation of HIV-positive personnel without evaluation of whether they can perform their duties.

In conclusion, I think the fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization bill provides worthwhile support for our military personnel. Nevertheless, the overall funding level in the bill goes beyond what is necessary at this time, and the provisions regarding social policies are unnecessarily divisive. For these reasons, I reluctantly oppose the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend Chairman SPENCE and ranking member DELLUMS for their work on this legislation and to thank them and Subcommittee Chairmen DORNAN, HEFLEY, and WELDON for their attention to Guam's priorities.

The most significant provision in H.R. 3230 for Guam is the repeal of restrictions imposed on land transferred by the Federal Government to the Government of Guam over 15 years ago. The land covers 927 acres, located in the port area and adjacent to facilities closed by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission [BRAC] last year.

The repeal of restrictions will enable the Government of Guam to develop a comprehensive redevelopment plan and to attract private investors to the port area. Reuse of the port land will stimulate long-term economic growth and private sector employment. Private sector job growth is especially important in light of the loss of jobs by workers at BRAC-closed facilities near the port last year.

I am pleased that H.R. 3230 includes report language on the upgrade of the Piti Power Plant on Guam. The report language notes the continued commitment of the Navy under the Guam power agreement to transfer the Piti Power Plant to the Government of Guam in good working order, and urges the Navy to accelerate funding for the upgrade of two generators already programmed for fiscal year 1999.

The upgrade of two generators at the Piti Power Plant will fulfill a long-standing Navy commitment and greatly improve on the ability of the Guam Power Authority to provide adequate power to the island. The acceleration of the programmed funds to next year is critical, and I want to thank Chairman HEFLEY for his attention to this matter.

H.R. 3230 also includes report language on the extension of theater missile defenses [TMD] to U.S. territories. The report states that "the committee strongly supports fielding highly effective TMD systems that are capable of protecting U.S. territories from ballistic missile attack and directs the SecDef to review the TMD requirements for U.S. terrorists." It requires the Secretary of Defense [SecDef] to submit a report on the results of this review to the congressional defense committees not later than November 15, 1996.

As the majority pursues the development of a national ballistic missile defense system, I believe it should be an equal priority of the SecDef to develop a theater missile defense system which will protect U.S. territories from missile threats.

On Guam, the debate over missile attack is not academic. A few years ago, North Korea threatened Guam, which is closer to North Korea than Hawaii and Alaska, with a missile attack. This is a very real threat, and Guam deserves to receive equal consideration in the development of national missile defense systems. The report language included in H.R. 3230 will focus the Pentagon on the missile defense needs of the territories, especially the Pacific territories, which are outside the coverage of the national missile defense systems.

I am disappointed that no funds are authorized in the bill for construction of an armory for the Guam Army National Guard. As my colleagues know, the Guam Army National Guard is the only national guard unit without an armory. At the same time the Guam Army National Guard is being nationally recognized for its excellence in recruiting and retention. A readiness center to be used for training is essential to the continued excellence demonstrated by the Guam Army National Guard.

It is my hope that next year, the National Security Committee will not be forced into the

same position again, and the Department of Army will request funds for armory construction in its annual budget request to Congress. Without informing Congress that armory construction is a priority to the Army, the Guam Army National Guard and other guard units will be left without the needed facilities. I urge the Secretary of the Army to recognize the service of the National Guard and to request funds to construct new armories in next year's budget request.

In spite of this reservation, I want to reiterate my appreciation for the attention of Chairman SPENCE and Ranking Member DELLUMS to issues of importance to Guam.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this defense authorization bill. A nation's greatness ought to be measured only in terms of the greatness of its people; not by the greatness of its ability to dominate and intimidate with military might. Excessive funding in the defense authorization budget at the expense of critical social needs gives rise to a perilous sense of artificial security and leads to a dereliction of duty to all our citizens' needs.

Therefore, I oppose this bill because it reduces and/or eliminates funding for many critical Federal programs of importance to my constituents. We do not need a defense budget that authorizes \$12.4 billion over what the administration has already requested. Why must we tailor our military force for threats that simply no longer exist. Wake up people. The cold war is over.

More than half of the increase over the President's request is for additional weapons procurement. How can we justify a \$6 billion increase when funds are being reduced for safe and drug-free schools, for programs for kids with disabilities; for nearly 50,000 American children from the Head Start Program are eliminated, and so forth. We can't. The justification is not there. We can't because this bill, is simply not people-friendly.

Further, this bill is flawed by self-serving adventure-fantasies catering to but a few. It ignores with extreme insensitivity the sordid impact it has upon social concerns.

One of these social concerns affecting my constituents, is this bill's requirement of the immediate discharge of service personnel infected with HIV, the virus that causes AIDS. While I respect the fact that others have a strong opinion on the topic of homosexuals in the military, I do not share views that rescinding the ban on homosexuals in the Armed Services would cause dangerous problems.

I am also concerned that this bill has an overseas ban on abortions. Ideally, men and women would have all the information they need about birth control and socially accepted methods to ensure it would be readily accessible. Unfortunately, this is not the reality for many Americans. Therefore, I continue to strongly believe that a woman, whether in or outside the military, in consultation with her doctor, family, and/or clergy has the right to choose.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this Shays-Frank-Gephardt amendment.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think the defense hawks need some history lessons. Lesson No. 1: the Second World War ended 50 years ago. Lesson No. 2: the cold war ended 5 years ago.

Now, a pop quiz: who won! In case some of you cold warriors forgot—we did. We defeated fascism and we defeated communism.

But this defense bill completely ignores this reality.

Right now, many of our European and Asian allies enjoy higher standards of living than our constituents, the American people. Somehow, these nations can support education, health care, child care, and so forth. Because we keep paying their military bills.

I don't know about you, but I am sick of Uncle Sam acting like Uncle Sucker.

The time has come for our allies to share the burden of their own defense. The time has come for shared responsibility. The time has come for us to reap the benefits of our hard work, and invest in our children, our seniors, and our environment.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this legislation. It represents not only a continuation of the misplaced priorities but a compounding of missteps in last year's defense bill, of a much more extreme level. Last year, the Republican majority added \$7 billion to the Pentagon's request. This year they added almost double this amount, over \$12 billion in unnecessary spending. Even within the Republican party there are those who believe this is going too far, both in terms of spending and policy.

While the bill itself is bad policy, the process by which it is being considered is worse. In the past, open debate and opportunities to modify defense legislation have guided this process. Now we are restricted by the Republican rule in the amendments we can consider and issues that can be voted upon. Important amendments were offered but were not permitted in this debate, including a Republican amendment to reorganize the spending priorities of this out of balance defense budget.

The bill itself adds over \$12 billion to the request of the Pentagon. Most of this new spending in the \$267 billion bill goes to unrequested weapons systems, which one analysis points out will require an additional \$50 billion in outlays in the next 6 or 7 years. How can the Republican majority maintain their balanced budget rhetoric with increased spending such as this? Unfortunately, the Republican agenda to accomplish this is through deep cuts to programs assisting American working families, seniors, students, and children. The spending on the procurement accounts of this bill alone, at about \$83 billion, is more than any nation in the world will spend on their entire global defense program.

The budget offered by the majority which we will be considering this week highlights the priority problems of this Congress and this DOD authorization bill. Defense spending under the Republican's proposed overall budget plan will increase over the next 6 years, while severe funding cuts are proposed to be made to community development, infrastructure, the environment, and yes even education, I guess smart weapons but not smart soldiers is this formula, the United States will enter the next century with more weapons systems, but with seniors at-risk due to Medicare cuts, and a work force not keeping pace with technological and skills changes. If responsible cuts are to be made in the Federal budget, there should be no special dispensation for defense spending, above all spending Congress must ask the tough questions of DOD spending in 1996.

Instead of reasonable defense spending though, this authorization bill adds billions of dollars to the Pentagon's wish list. A host of new planes and helicopters, as well as submarines and ships are added, above what is justified or necessary for our military role. The additions and modifications to missile defenses waste millions of taxpayer dollars, again shifting the focus toward the discredited star wars missile defense. In addition, this legislation unilaterally alters the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty [ABM] by imposing a definition of theater and strategic defenses. These changes to the ABM treaty circumvent the Clinton administration and past administration negotiations and commitments with Russia over this important issue.

The majority also states that the additional billions of dollars are for items the service chiefs have requested. The service chiefs were literally asked what they might do with additional funding if they had it. In response they provided a list of new and continued programs. Certainly anyone could provide a list of items they would purchase if extra funds were available. But to say that the service chiefs requested these additions to this year's bill is outrageous, this was a wish list, as if the dollars and taxes didn't matter.

In terms of requested weapons systems, the Department of Defense's own inspectors have determined that recently the Navy overstated its needs by at least \$10 billion. This includes redundancy of systems and overestimation of the numbers of weapons needed. Another Defense Department report in May 1995 also indicated the Navy was seeking \$14 billion in submarine technology that it did not need. More recently, the GAO released a study questioning the need for billions of dollars spent on ground attack weapons. The report found existing systems can accomplish the tasks of many of the sought after new weapons on which billions will be spent.

The problems of budgetary and defense policy in this bill are equalled by the social policy it contains. Instead of being concerned with the future direction of military policy and the role of the United States in the post-cold-war world, this bill focuses on social issues such as the discharge of HIV-positive personnel.

The Congress has already taken action on the issue of discharging HIV-positive personnel. This policy, which is not sought by the military and was formulated and carried out under Republican administrations, removes perfectly capable personnel from the military. The training and investment in these soldiers would be lost to an ill-conceived policy.

Certainly a much better bill can be crafted, one that does not include huge increases in spending beyond what the Pentagon has requested and one with an opportunity to debate the important defense issues. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Department of Defense [DOD] a authorization bill for 1997.

I oppose the bill because the legislation authorizes \$12.4 billion more in defense spending than requested by the Pentagon. Later, this week we will vote on a budget resolution which proposes to spend \$19 billion less than the President's request for priority domestic programs. The priorities being proposed are not consistent with the realities of challenges facing the United States.

One of the worst provisions in this bill would lead to the immediate discharge of 1,049 serv-

ices members infected with HIV, the virus that causes AIDS. The Department of Defense opposes this provision and does not believe that these service members present a deployment problem. Clearly, members with HIV should be treated as any other service member with chronic, possibly fatal, medical conditions and remain on active duty until such time as they cannot perform their duties.

This provision is discriminatory because it treats people with HIV differently from any other people with other chronic diseases are treated. Thankfully, a bipartisan coalition was successful in removing this provision from last year's bill and hopefully, this same coalition will prevail before this legislation is completed.

In addition, this bill would undo the current compromise and put in statute a complete ban on lesbians and gay men from serving in the military. Clearly, lesbians and gay men have served their country with distinction as members of the armed service from the very beginning of our country. This provision is unnecessary and is part of a disturbing pattern of promoting hostility toward lesbian and gay Americans.

Mr. Chairman, for budget reasons in general, and this provision in particular, I urge a "no" vote on this legislation.

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.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Florida) 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, pursuant to House Resolution 430, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DELLUMS. I am in its present form, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DELLUMS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3230 to the Committee on National Security with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title X (page 359, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1041. REALLOCATION OF NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE FUNDING INCREASE.

(a) INCREASE IN AMOUNT FOR IMPACT AID.—The amount provided in section 301(5) for operation and maintenance for defense-wide activities, and the amount specified in section 367(a)(1) as the portion of such amount that is available for impact aid assistance, are each hereby increased by \$53,000,000.

(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR CORPS SAM SYSTEM.—Of the amount provided in section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for defense-wide activities that is available for programs managed by the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, not less than \$56,000,000 shall be made available for the Corps Surface-to-Air Missile (SAM) system.

(c) OFFSETTING REDUCTIONS FROM AMOUNTS FOR NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE.—The amount provided in section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for defense-wide activities, and the amount specified in section 231 as the portion of such amount that is available for programs managed by the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, are each hereby reduced by \$53,000,000. Of the amount specified in section 231, not more than \$749,437,000 may be made available for the National Missile Defense program element.

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit 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 was no objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to recommit because I believe it is designed to help the people we should care about most, and that is the families serving in our military and their children. Specifically, this motion to recommit puts \$53 million more into the Impact Aid Program, which should be called the military children education program.

Mr. Speaker, last December at Fort Hood in my district, I met with 50 soldiers being deployed to Bosnia. The second soldier I met had missed the birth of his first child because he was in Desert Storm. He was about to miss the birth of his second child because of his service to his country in Bosnia. It was a very personal experience to me in realizing the tremendous sacrifices our military families make for our country.

If we cannot guarantee that soldier he should be paid as much as we would like him to be paid, if we cannot guar-

antee his family will not wait in line for hospital care, if we cannot guarantee 1996 housing, one thing we should all agree is that we ought to ensure that that soldier and others like him can know when he serves his country that his child will get a first-class education. This \$53 million for impact aid will help do that.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman SPENCE, and the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BATEMAN, to put \$50 million in impact aid in this bill, and I support that effort. But this motion to recommit takes their good idea and takes it a step farther in making an unquestioned commitment to ensuring that the children of our military families receive a quality education. Our families deserve no less.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, with the remaining amount of time, let me add some additional remarks with respect to the motion to recommit.

It would provide two opportunities to achieve what this gentleman believes to be a better balance of national security priorities. The motion would increase funding for two very important programs, would pay for these increases by reducing funding for star wars-type national missile defense programs contained in this bill.

Specifically, the bill removes \$109 million from star wars funding increases. It would increase funding, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, impact aid assistance by \$53 million. It would also plus-up the Corps SAM missile program by \$56 million, taking it from the national missile defense program.

The gentleman from Texas articulately discussed the matter of impact aid. I will not attempt to compete with those remarks.

On the second matter, let me note that much has been made, and appropriately so, of the urgency of being able to deploy a theater missile defense. Corps SAM is a system that we need to deploy with our troops. It will travel with our forces and provide protection to them from tactical threats in the theater, the No. 1 priority threat that we have at this particular moment.

Again, we should direct our scarce resources away from fanciful and extraordinary ideas, like star wars-type programs, and into programs of demonstrated requirements. A \$56-million increase in Corps SAM is precisely an appropriate type of reordering missile defense priority.

So in summary, it does two things: \$56 million for theater missile defense, which ought to be the appropriate priority in missile defense, not national. We take the money from the increases in national missile defense. Mr. Speaker, \$53 million of those dollars go into impact aid. As the gentleman pointed out, this is educational assistance for the children of our service personnel who ought to have the same fine education that any of our other children outside the military have access to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. As has been said on many occasions today, we have amply provided, I think, for the national security needs of this country. We reported the bill out of the committee by a vote of 49 to 2, a very bipartisan, as you can see, vote.

□ 1530

This authorization amounts to \$600 million less than that budget figure allocation in our budget for 1997. This translates into 1.5 percent less, adjusted for inflation, than current spending.

From the standpoint of what we did for the military, we had a 3-percent raise for our troops, a 50 percent increase over the President's budget for housing allowance; things that are needed very much: family housing, barracks, child care facilities for our people.

We enhanced our military readiness by increasing the underfunded request. We added ammunition to the Marine Corps. They did not have enough to fight two major contingencies. We continued to add to the underfunded modernization programs. The Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs have asked for \$60 billion in modernization beginning now. This administration only asked for about 39. We have added to it.

In short, we have done those things that the administration did not do.

From the standpoint of impact aid referred to in this motion to recommit, none was requested by the administration. This committee added \$58 billion to impact aid. There were no amendments in the committee to do otherwise.

On theater missile defense, we added to the request that was submitted by the administration. I might add parenthetically on the matter of theater missile defense, it is a very important priority of this committee. As a matter of fact, last year we added to theater missile defense over the request of the administration, and the administration proceeded to spread out that which was authorized and somebody had appropriated. This year again we have added a third of what the administration request was for theatre missile defense, and so we do not really need to have anything more added to it even for impact aid or missile defense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Procurement.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, let me just reiterate the theme that the chairman just elaborated on is, I think, a very important one for all of the Members to understand, and that is that this should not be, this bill should not be, a competition between whether or not we are going to give a pay raise to

the troops or we are going to have the right equipment for them to use in a military conflict. It should not be a conflict. It should not be either-or.

What we have done in this bill is come up with an additional funding that allows us to have a 3 percent pay raise, it allows us to give the \$300 million that the Marines need in ammunition to be able to fight the two war scenario, it enables us to get the 96 million M-16 bullets that they were short under the administration's budget, it enables us to have the theater defense and to start on the national defense just like the one that we are giving the State of Israel.

It enables us to do all those things that are important in terms of being able to project American military power and carry out foreign policy.

This is a complete package, and the gentleman has done a superlative job in bringing this thing together on the committee level and bringing it to the floor.

Let us pass this bill. Vote "no" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Research and Development.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is an amazing motion. We heard one of our colleagues from Texas get up and say we need money for impact aid. I have his letter from April 10 asking us to put \$58 million in the bill. That is what is in the bill.

What are we talking about?

Mr. Speaker, I have heard from the colleagues on the other side saying we are spending too much money on missile defense, we have too many programs, and we need more burden sharing. What do they want to do with the motion to recommit? They want to reestablish another missile defense program that we have eliminated, and they want to do it for Europe, not for the United States, even though France has opted out of the program.

Mr. Speaker, this is amazing, it is absolutely amazing. We have heard that we want to cut programs, we have done that. We heard we want to not fund our European allies, and we have done that. So here we are being asked to support a motion to recommit to reestablish another missile defense program to protect not the United States, but the Europeans, even though one of the four partners, France, decided to opt out.

It is amazing, and I urge our colleagues do the right thing. Vote "no" on the motion to recommit and support the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Florida). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 240, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—185

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Orton
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Owens
Baessler	Gordon	Pallone
Baldacci	Green (TX)	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Becerra	Hall (OH)	Payne (VA)
Beilenson	Hamilton	Pelosi
Bentsen	Harman	Peterson (FL)
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	Hefner	Pickett
Bonior	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Borski	Hinchev	Poshard
Boucher	Hoyer	Rahall
Brewster	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Browder	Jackson-Lee	Reed
Brown (CA)	(TX)	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Jacobs	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Rose
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Chapman	Johnston	Rush
Christensen	Kanjorski	Sabo
Clay	Kaptur	Sanders
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Sawyer
Clement	Kennedy (RI)	Schroeder
Clyburn	Kennelly	Schumer
Coleman	Kildee	Scott
Collins (IL)	Kleczka	Serrano
Collins (MI)	Klink	Sisisky
Condit	LaFalce	Skaggs
Conyers	Lantos	Skelton
Costello	Levin	Slaughter
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
Cummings	Lofgren	Stark
Danner	Lowe	Stenholm
de la Garza	Luther	Stokes
DeFazio	Maloney	Studds
DeLauro	Manton	Stupak
Dellums	Markey	Tanner
Deutsch	Mascara	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	Matsui	Tejeda
Dingell	McCarthy	Thompson
Dixon	McDermott	Thornton
Doggett	McHale	Thurman
Dooley	McKinney	Torres
Doyle	McNulty	Torricelli
Durbin	Meehan	Towns
Edwards	Meek	Traficant
Engel	Menendez	Velazquez
Eshoo	Millender-	Vento
Evans	McDonald	Visclosky
Farr	Miller (CA)	Volkmer
Fattah	Minge	Waters
Fazio	Mink	Watt (NC)
Fields (LA)	Moakley	Watts (OK)
Filner	Montgomery	Waxman
Foglietta	Moran	Williams
Ford	Nadler	Wise
Frank (MA)	Neal	Woolsey
Frost	Oberstar	Wynn
Furse	Obey	Yates
Gejdenson	Olver	
Gephardt	Ortiz	

NAYS—240

Allard	Frelinghuysen	Mica
Andrews	Frisa	Miller (FL)
Archer	Funderburk	Mollohan
Army	Gallegly	Moorhead
Bachus	Ganske	Morella
Baker (CA)	Gekas	Murtha
Baker (LA)	Geren	Myers
Ballenger	Gilchrest	Myrick
Barcia	Gillmor	Nethercatt
Barr	Gilman	Neumann
Barrett (NE)	Goodlatte	Ney
Bartlett	Goodling	Norwood
Barton	Goss	Nussle
Bass	Graham	Oxley
Bateman	Greene (UT)	Packard
Bereuter	Greenwood	Parker
Bevill	Gunderson	Petri
Bilbray	Gutknecht	Pombo
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Porter
Bliley	Hancock	Portman
Blute	Hansen	Pryce
Boehlert	Hastert	Quillen
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Quinn
Bonilla	Hayes	Radanovich
Bono	Hayworth	Ramstad
Brownback	Hefley	Regula
Bryant (TN)	Heineman	Riggs
Bunn	Herger	Roberts
Bunning	Hilleary	Rogers
Burr	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Burton	Hoekstra	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Hoke	Roth
Callahan	Horn	Roukema
Calvert	Hostettler	Royce
Camp	Houghton	Salmon
Campbell	Hunter	Sanford
Canady	Hutchinson	Saxton
Castle	Hyde	Scarborough
Chabot	Inglis	Schaefer
Chambliss	Istook	Schiff
Chenoweth	Johnson (CT)	Seastrand
Chrysler	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Clinger	Jones	Shadegg
Coble	Kasich	Shaw
Coburn	Kelly	Shays
Collins (GA)	Kim	Shuster
Combest	King	Skeen
Cooley	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Cox	Klug	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Knollenberg	Smith (WA)
Crane	Kolbe	Solomon
Crapo	LaHood	Souder
Creameans	Largent	Spence
Cubin	Latham	Stearns
Cunningham	LaTourette	Stockman
Davis	Laughlin	Stump
Deal	Lazio	Tate
DeLay	Leach	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (NC)
Dickey	Lewis (KY)	Thomas
Doolittle	Lightfoot	Thornberry
Dornan	Lincoln	Tiahrt
Dreier	Linder	Torkildsen
Duncan	Lipinski	Upton
Dunn	Livingston	Vucanovich
Ehlers	LoBiondo	Walker
Ehrlich	Longley	Walsh
Emerson	Lucas	Wamp
English	Manzullo	Weldon (FL)
Ensign	Martinez	Weldon (PA)
Everett	Martini	Weller
Ewing	McCollum	White
Fawell	McCrary	Whitfield
Flanagan	McDade	Wicker
Foley	McHugh	Wilson
Forbes	McInnis	Wolf
Fowler	McIntosh	Young (AK)
Fox	McKeon	Young (FL)
Franks (CT)	Metcalf	Zeliff
Franks (NJ)	Meyers	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Fields (TX)	Molinari	Talent
Flake	Paxon	Ward
Holden	Smith (NJ)	

□ 1555

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On the vote:

Mr. Ward for, with Mr. Paxon against.

Messrs. FAWELL, INGLIS of South Carolina, and TAUZIN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Florida). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 272, noes 153, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

AYES—272

Abercrombie	Dooley	Kasich
Allard	Doolittle	Kelly
Archer	Dornan	Kennedy (RI)
Army	Dreier	Kennelly
Bachus	Dunn	Kildee
Baesler	Edwards	Kim
Baker (CA)	Ehrlich	King
Baker (LA)	Emerson	Kingston
Baldacci	Ensign	Knollenberg
Ballenger	Everett	Largent
Barcia	Ewing	Latham
Barr	Fawell	LaTourette
Barrett (NE)	Fazio	Laughlin
Bartlett	Fields (LA)	Lazio
Barton	Flanagan	Lewis (CA)
Bass	Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Bateman	Fowler	Lightfoot
Bentsen	Fox	Linder
Bereuter	Franks (CT)	Livingston
Bevill	Frelinguysen	Longley
Bilbray	Frisa	Lucas
Bilirakis	Frost	Manzullo
Bishop	Funderburk	Martinez
Bliley	Gallegly	McCollum
Boehlert	Gejdenson	McCreery
Boehner	Gekas	McDade
Bonilla	Gephardt	McHale
Bono	Geren	McHugh
Brewster	Gibbons	McInnis
Browder	Gilchrest	McIntosh
Brown (FL)	Gillmor	McKeon
Brownback	Gilman	McNulty
Bryant (TN)	Gonzalez	Metcalf
Bunning	Goodlatte	Meyers
Burr	Goodling	Mica
Burton	Gordon	Miller (FL)
Buyer	Goss	Mink
Callahan	Graham	Mollohan
Calvert	Green (TX)	Montgomery
Canady	Greene (UT)	Moorhead
Chambliss	Greenwood	Moran
Chapman	Gutknecht	Murtha
Chenoweth	Hall (OH)	Myers
Christensen	Hall (TX)	Myrick
Chryslers	Hamilton	Nethercutt
Clayton	Hansen	Norwood
Clement	Harman	Nussle
Clinger	Hastert	Ortiz
Clyburn	Hastings (WA)	Orton
Coble	Hayes	Oxley
Coburn	Hayworth	Packard
Coleman	Hefley	Parker
Collins (GA)	Hefner	Pastor
Combest	Heineman	Payne (VA)
Condit	Herger	Peterson (FL)
Cooley	Hilleary	Pickett
Cox	Hobson	Pombo
Cramer	Hoke	Pomeroy
Crane	Hostettler	Porter
Crapo	Houghton	Portman
Cremeans	Hoyer	Pryce
Cubin	Hunter	Quillen
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Quinn
Davis	Hyde	Radanovich
de la Garza	Inglis	Regula
Deal	Istook	Richardson
DeLauro	Jefferson	Roberts
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Rogers
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, E. B.	Rohrabacher
Dickey	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Dicks	Jones	Rose

Roth	Souder
Salmon	Spence
Sanford	Spratt
Saxton	Stearns
Scarborough	Stenholm
Schaefer	Stockman
Schiff	Stump
Scott	Tanner
Seastrand	Tate
Shadegg	Tauzin
Shaw	Taylor (MS)
Shuster	Taylor (NC)
Sisisky	Tejeda
Skeen	Thomas
Skelton	Thompson
Smith (MI)	Thornberry
Smith (NJ)	Thurman
Smith (TX)	Tiahrt
Smith (WA)	Torkildsen
Solomon	Torres

Traficant
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—153

Ackerman	Gutierrez
Andrews	Hancock
Barrett (WI)	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Hilliard
Beilenson	Hinche
Berman	Hoekstra
Blute	Horn
Bonior	Jackson (IL)
Borski	Jackson-Lee
Boucher	(TX)
Brown (CA)	Jacobs
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)
Bryant (TX)	Johnston
Bunn	Kanjorski
Camp	Kaptur
Campbell	Kennedy (MA)
Cardin	Klecza
Castle	Klink
Chabot	Klug
Clay	Kolbe
Collins (IL)	LaFalce
Collins (MI)	LaHood
Conyers	Lantos
Costello	Leach
Coyne	Levin
Cummings	Lewis (GA)
Danner	Lincoln
DeFazio	Lipinski
Dellums	LoBiondo
Deutsch	Lofgren
Dingell	Lowe
Dixon	Luther
Doggett	Manton
Doyle	Markey
Duncan	Martini
Durbin	Mascara
Ehlers	Matsui
Engel	McCarthy
English	McDermott
Eshoo	McKinney
Evans	Meehan
Farr	Meeke
Fattah	Menendez
Filner	Millender
Foglietta	McDonald
Foley	Miller (CA)
Ford	Minge
Frank (MA)	Moakley
Franks (NJ)	Morella
Furse	Nadler
Ganske	Neal
Gunderson	Neumann

Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Poshard
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Thornton
Torrice
Towns
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Volkmer
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Fields (TX)	Maloney	Talent
Flake	Molinari	Ward
Holden	Paxon	

□ 1606

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FAZIO of California, and Mrs. THURMAN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel

strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3230, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 3230, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, cross references, and to make such other technical, clerical, and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 178, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-577) on the resolution (H. Res. 435) providing for further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 178) 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD ENTITLED “SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING INDICATORS—1996”—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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