Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

☐ 1223

Messrs. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado, WYNN, and WELDON of Florida, Ms. DANNER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. KAPTUR, and Messrs. LARGENT, LEVIN, and THOMAS, and Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. OWENS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO RULE ON DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], what proposed changes he may have to offer with respect to the rule.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the minority whip that out of consideration for the ranking member of the Committee on National Security, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], who we have the greatest respect for, I have said that many times and will say it over and over again. He and I come from different philosophical persuasions, but he is one of the true gentlemen and sincere Members of this body.

Because of that, we are going to change this rule and we are going to remove an amendment that would be a striking amendment on the B–2 bomber, remove that from the rule, having made it in order. And we will make in order the original Dellums amendment No. 104, which is a striking amendment and the transfer of those funds. That will be one change in the rule that I will propose in a few minutes.

Second, we will make in order an Everett amendment No. 77 dealing with the depots around this country with a 1-hour debate.

We will substitute a Frank amendment; we will make in order a Frank amendment No. 85 instead of the Frank amendment No. 83. In addition to that, we will make a Traficant amendment No. 3 authorizing the use of the defense personnel to assist border patrols to stop illegal immigration coming into this country. And we will make in order a Weldon amendment No. 110 which is a sense of Congress on the need for Russian transparency on the Yamantau Mountain project. That is somewhat classified information, but most of the Members understand what that is all about.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman anticipating any additional time on any of these amendments?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we will include on the B–2 issue, we will extend that to 1½ hours by agreement. And, of course, the Everett amendment has an hour of debate based on the agreement we just discussed.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I thank him and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and others for signing off on this agreement.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I will call up the rule in just a moment. I will make this unanimous-consent request. If it is objected to, I will wait until the end of the rule and then make the unanimous-consent request again. If it is objected to, I will move that unanimous-consent request before the vote on the rule.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 169 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 169

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution, the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1119) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on National Security now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Except as specified in section 5 of this resolution, each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Unless otherwise specified in the report, each amendment printed in the report shall be debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment (except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment).

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

(e) Consideration of the first two amendments in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the subject of United States forces in Bosnia and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on National Security or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier disposed of or germane modifications of any such amendment. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read (except that modifications shall be reported), shall be debatable for twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. For the purpose of inclusion in such amendments en bloc, an amendment printed in the form of a motion to strike may be modified to the form of a germane perfecting amendment to the text originally proposed to be stricken. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional record immediately before the disposition of the amendment en bloc.

SEC. 4. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be fifteen minutes.

SEC. 5. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration of any amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules out of the order printed, but not sooner than one hour after the chairman of the Committee on National Security or a designee announces from the floor a request to that effect.

SEC. 6. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 7. House Resolutions 161, 162, and 165 are laid on the table.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 169

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of H.R. 1119, pursuant to House Resolution 169, it may be in order:

To offer the amendment numbered 7 in part 1 of House Report 105–137 in the modified form that I have placed at the desk, to debate it for 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] or his designee and an opponent, and otherwise to consider it as though printed in House Report 105–137;

To offer the amendment numbered 15 in part 2 of House Report 105–137 in the modified form that I have placed at the desk, and to debate it for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] or his designee and an opponent, and otherwise to consider it as though printed in House Report 105–137;

To offer an amendment by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EVERETT] or his designee in the form that I have placed at the desk, and to debate it for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EVERETT] or his designee and an opponent, and otherwise to consider it as though printed in House Report 105–137;

To offer an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] or his designee in the form that I have placed at the desk, which shall be in order as though printed as amendment numbered 42 in part 2 of House Report 105–137;

And to offer an amendment by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] or his designee in the form that I have placed at the desk, which shall be in order as though printed as amendment numbered 43 in part 2 of House Report 105–137;

And, finally, the additional period of general debate on the subject of United States forces in Bosnia, described in section 2(e) of House Resolution 169, shall precede the offering of amendments numbered 8 and 9 in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules rather than the amendments numbered 1 and 2 in that part.

And, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendments.

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

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain again what will happen here. The unanimous-consent request making these changes to the rule has been objected to, so at the end of this debate I would propound the unanimous-consent request again. If that is objected to, I would then move it and there would be a recorded vote taken at that time.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, this is the traditional structured rule that the Committee on Rules has provided in past years for defense authorization bills.

First, this rule provides 2 hours of general debate. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is made in order as the original text.

Next, the rule provides that no amendment will be in order except those in the report accompanying this rule. Each amendment will be debatable for the amount of time provided in the Committee on Rules report.

The amendment will not be subject to amendment except as specified in the Committee on Rules report. However, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security may each offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment.

The rule provides that before the House considers the two amendments dealing with the subject of United States forces in Bosnia, there will be an extra hour and a half of general debate, if the unanimous-consent request goes through, controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security.

Next, the rule provides at any time the chairman of the Committee on National Security or his designee may offer en bloc amendments consisting of amendments printed in part 2 of the Committee on Rules report or germane modifications of those amendments.

These en bloc packages of amendments will be debatable for 20 minutes and will not be subject to amendment. This rule provides authority for the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to roll votes in order to make more efficient use of Members' time. That means we can cluster votes to try to save the Members' time running back and forth.

Amendments may be considered in an order different from that in the Committee on Rules report if the chairman of the Committee on National Security or his designee gives at least 1 hour's notice on the floor of the House.

The rule also provides for a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The very last section of this rule, Mr. Speaker, provides for laying on the table three rules which were originally reported in order to provide for the consideration of supplemental appropriation bills. Then the rules became unnecessary when the supplemental appropriation bill was taken up by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, of the approximately 130-odd amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules, there have been 56 made in order by the rule. Nineteen of these, and now 20, are offered by Democrats and 29 are offered by Republicans and 5 have bipartisan sponsorship. This means that 40 percent of the

amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules are made in order by this rule. Given the time constraints for consideration of this bill on the floor, this rule represents a very fair balance between the majority and the minority.

Mr. Speaker, on the bill itself, let me just again congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], chairman of the Committee on National Security, for once again putting together an excellent piece of legislation under very difficult circumstances. And again let me commend the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], for his outstanding work. Again, this is a very controversial issue. We all come from different philosophical persuasions, but the gentleman from California has certainly done all he could do to cooperate in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely imperative this bill contain adequate funding for our military personnel who are right now out in the field standing vigilant on behalf of all Americans, particularly in a place called Bosnia right now, and up in the border between North and South Korea.

It is imperative that this bill contain enough quality of life incentives to retain and recruit the best people we can from all walks of life across this country.

It is imperative that this bill contain enough funding for operations and maintenance so that our troops can be as highly trained as possible in case they are called into battle.

It is imperative that this bill contain adequate funding for weapons procurement and research and development so that our troops can fight and defend themselves with only the very best equipment and technology available.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this bill set out policies which are consistent with and seek to maintain the unique warrior culture of the military, for without that, we cannot win wars, and that is what our military is there for, God forbid they ever be needed.

Mr. Speaker, to the best extent possible, this bill, I think, does all of that. At $268 billion, the bill adds nearly $3 billion to President Clinton's wholly inadequate request. The bill adds $3.7 billion to the President's request for procurement and $1.5 billion for research and development over and above the original request.

These accounts contain adequate funding for the weapon systems of tomorrow, such as the F–22 stealth fighter, the B–2 bomber, the Marine Corps V–22 troop carrier, and the next generation of aircraft carriers and submarines which are so vital to the strategic interests of our country around the world.

These accounts also contain funding to bring us one step closer to developing and deploying defenses against ballistic missiles, something for which, and I can guarantee my colleagues, we will all be grateful for some day.

H.R. 1119 contains, Mr. Speaker, a 2.8-percent pay raise for every soldier and sailor and marine and air force man serving in our military today, and adds significant funding increases for barracks, family housing, and child care centers.

I say to my colleagues, if Members have not visited these military installations around our own country and overseas, they really should do it, because much of the housing, both in America and overseas, is inadequate. It is an embarrassment to put our families of military personnel today in them.

When I served in the Marine Corps, more than 45 years ago, 90 percent of us were single. We did not have to worry so much about housing. Today, 70 percent of our military people are married, both men and women that serve in our military, and they deserve decent quarters to live in.

The bill also sets up a commission to resolve the complex and very troubling problems of gender integrated training, while requiring psychological screening for all drill instructors.

This bill does not have, Mr. Speaker, a provision which would separate the basic training of men and women in our military, and I worry about that. In the Marine Corps, we do not do that. We separate them, and we do not have some of these problems that have cropped up. I really do hope we will study this issue and try to resolve it. We want to be as fair as we can to everyone, but we want to try and solve the problems that have cropped up in recent months and years.

Despite all these excellent provisions in this bill, Mr. Speaker, let me go on the record right here and now. We continue to provide inadequate, yes, inadequate funds for this Nation's defenses. This bill will represent the 13th straight year of inflation-adjusted cuts to this budget. No other account in the Federal budget has been cut so much.

Weapons procurements, which have been cut by nearly 70 percent since 1985, remain at least $14 billion below what the Joint Chiefs of Staff say we need to be in order to retain our technological advantage over potential adversaries.

Let us turn that around and compare it to the People's Republic of Communist China, where in the last 4 years their budget has almost doubled. In the 1990's alone they have increased more than 50 percent, and in the last year alone 15 percent. We have to think about that.

Our military is vastly smaller and older than just 6 years ago during Desert Storm. Most experts agree that such a mission would simply be impossible today. One great example of that are the bombers that we fly today. Some of them, many of them, are more than 40 years old, even much older than the pilots flying them.

In 1991 we had 18 army divisions and used 7 of them in Desert Storm. Today we have only 10 divisions, not 18, and are heading toward 9. What are we going to do if we have to put another seven divisions back in a place called Desert Storm or in the gulf, when China is selling and giving Iran missiles that are going to create an incident over there that is sure as heck going to draw us back into it? Where will we get those seven divisions if we only have nine altogether? That means we will have to pull troops from all over the world, put them in one place, and then what would we do if there was an outbreak in North Korea? We would be in serious trouble.

Mr. Speaker, as former Secretary of Defense William Perry said, a Clinton appointee, we are already at the minimum force structure level we need in order to retain our role as a global power. We should think about that. Of course, this is not the fault of the Committee on National Security, as I said before. They have operated under very severe constraints, and those constraints are the repeated unwillingness of our President to pay adequate attention to this Nation's defense.

□ 1245

Despite his State of the Union pledge years ago, President Clinton continues to cut national defense funding in his budget he presents to this body and has fought our defense levels tooth and nail.

Mr. Speaker, that to me is a scandal, but it is one we can overcome by voting for this rule and voting for this bill today and then working together to find additional moneys for the No. 1 constitutional duty of this House. We, as representatives of our people, are primarily here to provide for national defense for all Americans adequate to protect our strategic interest in and around the globe and, in doing so, give our young men and women in uniform the best state-of-the-art equipment that we can give them to carry out their mission should, God forbid, they ever be called into harm's way.

So I would ask my colleagues at the appropriate time to come over here and vote for this rule and then let us debate the bill and let us pass it.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I have an opening statement. However, at this time, prior to my opening statement, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] because of a scheduling conflict; and then, with the concurrence of the majority, I would like to proceed to my opening statement as soon as the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is through.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for yielding me this time at this point and for many other courtesies that he has rendered, particularly in reference to this particular piece of legislation.

I rise in opposition to this restrictive rule as it currently stands. This is a rule, as reported last night, that is outrageous, restrictive, undemocratic, and

unprincipled. And if it cannot be repaired before we vote on it, and I certainly hope it will be, it ought to be defeated.

Regrettably, the Everett-Sabo-Klug-Fazio amendment was not made in order last night despite overwhelming evidence that Members of this House wanted an opportunity to voice their position on the issue of using competition as a means to make DOD dollars more efficient and save hundreds of millions of dollars for the taxpayer. It is incredible that the Speaker would not let the House vote on this highly important public policy, one that could lead, I might add, directly to a veto of this entire defense authorization bill.

In my view, lately we have had all too many votes here on the floor to support restrictive and undemocratic rules that muscle Members of this House. Without our amendment, this bill undermines the military's effort to modernize and prepare for the 21st century by effectively eliminating competition for depot maintenance workload. And without competition, we lose crucial cost savings and value for the American taxpayer.

This, I might add, was a bipartisan amendment. It crossed the political spectrum in this House. And still, the Speaker, as of last night, has intervened to make sure that it would not go forward. For a while, it looked as though the parochial interests of a few had won out on this amendment. But now the unanimous-consent request, if agreed to, would restore this and other important amendments.

If that were to succeed, I would support the rule and hope others would, as well. Because then we would have ample time and a breadth of issues that we could consider, in the full belief that we have given the defense authorization bill due consideration.

I have always supported defense bills on this floor. However, I cannot, in good conscience, support this rule if the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], his unanimous-consent request, is not agreed to, either through lack of objection or, more likely, as a result of a vote that he will ask for.

For those who have not quite figured it out yet, we are in serious jeopardy of not having a defense bill this year. The President will veto this bill in its current form. I oppose this bill in its current form, and I urge the House to defeat this undemocratic and unprincipled rule unless we first vote to amend by supporting the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

It needs to be repaired or it needs to be defeated. And there is far more on the table here than the simple parochial issues that some think we are fighting about. This is about preservation of the American defense industrial base. I hope Members will support the motion to be made and then the rule and, more importantly, listen carefully to the Everett-Sabo amendment when it is offered later to strike language in this bill which never was heard in the full committee, but which does terrible detriment to our defense establishment.

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

Let me at the outset kind of review where we are. I think it is very important. This may be a little confusing for Members. It may be a little confusing for the public watching this proceeding.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is going to renew his unanimous-consent request at the end of this hour. If there is objection, then he will move this matter, move to amend the rule. And, of course, the components that will be in both his unanimous-consent request and his motion are the Dellums-Kasich-Foley amendment, the Everett amendment, the Frank Amendment No. 85, Traficant No. 3, and Weldon No. 110.

I will support the effort of the gentleman from New York to amend this rule. And assuming that is successful, I will support the rule. And I think I speak for a number of Members on my side of the aisle. If his effort is not successful to amend this rule, there are a very large number of Members on this side of the aisle who will vote against the rule.

Let me be clear. Some of my colleagues, on the merits, when we get to it will not support the Dellums amendment when it is offered tomorrow or tonight, but we support right of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] to offer his amendment, and that is a very, very important distinction and a very, very important point.

So I would urge this House, on both sides of the aisle, to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] so that we will then be able to pass this rule. Should the amendment not pass, there is a real chance this rule will not pass and we will not be able to proceed to the consideration of this bill today and the remainder of this week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and then I want to continue my statement.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I appreciate the fact that we have resolved what clearly was about to be a major injustice, and I am appreciative that I have been given the opportunity to offer the amendment on the B–2 that I drafted. There have been other concessions that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has offered as an amendment to the rule.

I simply rise to say, first of all, I am appreciative of the fact that we have sat down to negotiate these matters out in good faith. They have been negotiated to this gentleman's satisfaction. I thank my colleague for his kind and generous remarks.

I would simply underscore for emphasis the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Texas, Mr. FROST, that those who stood in the well of this House, in this Chamber this morning who were supportive of my right to see to it that the process had integrity and had dignity, that they would support this amendment.

I know that there are other controversies here because other matters were brought into it. I would simply say that at the end of the day, we all ought to be about transparency and accountability and, in the marketplace of ideas, let us have a free and open debate.

I have never been a person that said that I had to guarantee that I win. I probably lost since 1971 more times than any one Member in this Chamber, and I try to learn how to lose with pride and dignity. But what I always demand is the right to have a free and honest debate in the marketplace, and let us have an honest and open exchange.

The amendment of the gentleman from New York provides us with this opportunity, and I appreciate that. I urge my colleagues who are supportive of those principles to support that amendment and let us move on.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, if I may continue my remarks at this point, it is my intention to support H.R. 1119, the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1998.

This legislation is one of the most important bills this House will consider this year. It authorizes a total of $268 billion in spending for our national defense, an amount which will ensure the military superiority of the United States in the next year and in the years to come.

This funding level will ensure that production of important weapon systems continues, will ensure that the Congress' efforts to improve quality of life for our men and women in uniform and their families continues, and will ensure that our commitments around the world are met.

H.R. 1119, the National Security Committee has provided $2.1 billion for research and development for the F–22, the next-generation air superiority fighter which is designed to replace the F–16. The Committee has also provided for a total of $1.3 billion for production and continued research and development for the V–22 Osprey. The addition of this aircraft to the Marine Corps and Special Forces arsenal will ensure that our soldiers and marines can be quickly and safely delivered into combat.

The Committee has provided funding to restart those parts of the B–2 Stealth production line which have been shut down. The B–2 is a vital component in our national security system and will continue to serve the Air Force well into the next century. H.R. 1119 not only restarts production lines, it provides adequate funding for advance procurement to ensure that production of this effective weapons system continues in future years.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on National Security has provided the President's request for a 2.8-percent pay increase for military personnel, has provided a new special duty pay for service at hardship posts, and has increased the family separation allowance. The men and women who make up our armed forces today are being asked to make enormous sacrifices while increasing their workload because of increased operations worldwide and personnel drawdown.

I think the Committee has rightly focused much of its attention on quality-of-life issues for our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines and their families, for they are the foundation that ensures that our national security is indeed secure.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask if I may direct one question to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. It was not clear to me during his explanation, on the question of the Everett amendment, as to where that would appear, assuming his amendment is adopted and the Everett amendment is made in order.

I would ask the gentleman from New York, do I understand that would appear in part A of the attachment to the rule? And if so, where in part A will it appear? Would it be at the end of part A?

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman, it would appear at the end of part A, which means it could be brought up at any time. As my colleague knows, that is flexible.

Mr. FROST. I just want to be clear that it was in part A and not part B.

Mr. SOLOMON. At the end of part A.

Mr. FROST. That is my assumption. I appreciate the gentleman for clarifying that.

I just want to repeat before I yield time to other speakers what I said at the outset. The adoption of the Solomon amendment to the rule later in this hour is critical. I intend to support that. If the Solomon amendment fails, this rule is in jeopardy and the rule may not pass. So I will support the Solomon amendment and, assuming the Solomon amendment is in order, I will support the rule.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and a member of the Committee on Rules as well.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Glen Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding the time, and I rise in support of this fair structured rule as outlined by the chairman. I think that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] have clearly laid out what is before us in terms of how this is going to unfold.

While we could not possibly make each of the 120, actually I think it was more than 130-plus, amendments in order, I believe that this rule allows for debate on amendments in all of the major policy areas. Providing for the national defense is arguably one of the only 100-percent legitimate, constitutionally mandated functions of the Federal Government. And that is the business today.

Unlike some of my colleagues and some of the folks in the administration, I have never been able to share the unrelenting optimism of those who greeted the end of the cold war as the time to set aside all of our national defense systems.

□ 1300

I happen to believe that the world is still a very dangerous place.

What this means is that we must place a premium on good intelligence and highly trained and responsive armed services. While we have been very successful at cutting spending in some areas since the 1980's, I cannot support further massive defense cuts, cuts which would undermine our long-term security for the sake of some short-term gain.

H.R. 1119 ups the funding in key readiness accounts and halts reductions in active duty military personnel. It gives our soldiers and their families long overdue assistance and improved quality of life by closing pay gaps, improving military housing and bolstering the defense health care system, all matters that we have heard spoken to so far today.

H.R. 1119 will also put modernization programs back on track by giving priority to unfunded requirements, encouraging technological innovation, and there are many that are very promising, and ensuring that the Reserve Forces that are more and more often being called to duty have the training and the equipment they need when they are in harm's way.

This is all designed to ensure one thing, that we are up to the national security challenge, whatever that challenge is, when it comes: The next Pearl Harbor, the next Desert Storm, whatever the form, wherever the place, whenever the time.

Of course, in today's budgetary climate we also recognize that no department can or should escape scrutiny or reform. This legislation does include measures to downsize unnecessary and low priority bureaucracies in the Defense Department and to improve business practices in the Defense Department.

And the rule before us makes a bipartisan manager's amendment in order that is going to take further strides in this area. Those who serve their country deserve our honor and respect. The best way to serve them is to maintain our strong commitment to them and to their families and to ensure that they have the resources and the training they need when they move on to the battlefield. This legislation gets us on the right path. I support it. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule, because the Committee on Rules had an opportunity to rectify an injustice. By choosing not to rectify it, it perpetuated it.

The gentleman who just spoke said that those who defend our country are entitled to the respect that they deserve. But what about after they have served our country? Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon, the Department of Defense is the only large organization in America that once its employees reach the age of 65, they become ineligible for that employer's health care. They become ineligible for CHAMPUS, they become ineligible for TRICARE, and they are told that the only thing they can do is go to a military treatment facility and wait at the end of the line until everyone else has been served, and only if there is no one else waiting for health care can they then be served. It is wrong. It is unfair. We have a solution to it.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules is a sponsor of my legislation that allows Medicare military retirees to join the FEHBP. I thought he understood the situation. Apparently he does not understand the situation because if he did, he would want to rectify it, I am sure. But the Committee on Rules, in reporting out this rule, chose not to address it in the way that makes the most sense, which is to make military retirees eligible for the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan. There is no other way that military retirees can get decent, affordable, accessible health care. All we wanted to do was to demonstrate how it can be done in the most efficient manner. It would not have cost any money. It was the right thing to do. It should have been done. I urge a vote against the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, we have one Border Patrol agent for every 2.5 miles of border as I speak. In the last 6 weeks Border Patrol agents have been shot, one almost killed. Eighty percent of certain narcotics are coming across the border. Illegal immigration is running rampant and the American people have been asking, look, if Congress has declared war on illegal immigration, if Congress has declared war on drugs, then when is Congress going to engage in the battle? When is Congress going to fight?

I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] and everyone who has helped to make my amendment in order.

The Traficant amendment says that our military, that right now many of them are falling out of chairs without arm rests overseas, can be transferred to our border in the Southwest, not to make arrests but to detain and hold illegal immigrants and people running across the border with backpacks full of narcotics and cocaine for the Border Patrol.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this. The taxpayers of this country are financing chaos literally on our border. It is time to fight. Our troops are cashing their checks overseas, going to the theater in Rome, for dinner in Frankfurt, and we have narcotics corrupting our cities, our government, and destroying the lives of our children. I say it is time, Congress, to wage war.

I want to thank those who are trying and attempting to make this amendment in order. I will debate this amendment when it comes. The debate on this amendment is necessary. That is where the debate should take place, not on the streets but in the halls of Congress.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], one of the most respected Members of this body.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I support this rule. No, it does not have everything in it that I would like. I think the gentleman from Virginia mentioned an area that we all ought to be concerned about when we talk about military retirees, but I think basically it is a good rule. But there is one item that I wish we had made in order that I had requested, and that is we are required in the area of defense to do more with less now. And so we want every single dollar to be spent in the most effective way possible. I wish the gentleman had made my Davis-Bacon amendment in order so that we could discuss the amount of savings that could come if we exempted from the Davis-Bacon Act military construction.

We are over 70 years behind in our infrastructure capitalization in our armed services. In housing alone, depending on the service, we are 10 to 40 years behind. There simply is not enough money in MILCON to get from here to there under the present circumstances.

And so we went to Secretary Perry and sat down with him when he was Secretary of Defense and we said, how can we do better? One of the things we did was to set up some privatization of housing on military bases. I think that helped some. But we also said, what are the impediments to getting the most bang for the buck? And they gave us a list of those impediments and we have been trying to deal with those. But one of them was the Davis-Bacon Act that is costing enormous sums more than we ought to be paying. In fact, the estimates are in the billions of dollars of savings if we could simply remove the Davis-Bacon, the Depression era Davis-Bacon, archaic law from the books where military construction is concerned.

If we want the most for the money, Mr. Speaker, this is something that needs to be done and we need to consider it in the future even though it is not considered in this particular bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I am going to oppose this rule for a number of reasons. But first and foremost, this is supposed to be a democracy. This is supposed to be the place where the Members who were sent here by about 550,000 people, citizens of this country, have the opportunity to make things better. Unfortunately the Committee on Rules in many instances decided that those people do not count, that we cannot make things better, that we do not even have the chance to make things better.

One of the things that I would have very much liked to addressed and asked the Committee on Rules yesterday to address involves the war on drugs. Our Nation spends about $12 billion on the war on drugs. As I speak we have AWAC's flying over Central and South America. We have what is called E–3's and P–3's flying over Central and South America. We have troops on the ground in Colombia in at least 3 different locations. At one of those locations about 80 miles away, the Colombia guerrillas overran a Colombian army base and either killed or captured everyone there in the month of February. It is a real war, with real deaths. Just a few years ago in Peru, one of our C–130's on a reconnaissance patrol was shot up by Peruvian aircraft. We do not know whether he did it by mistake or on purpose. We do know that an American airman fell 11,000 feet to his death. It is a real war, with real money, and real American lives being lost.

One amendment that I wanted to offer that the Committee on Rules cowardly did not even vote on would have said we need to test those civilians who work for the Department of Defense to see whether or not they are on drugs, particularly those involved in the counternarcotics effort. What good does it do to spend all of this money and put people's lives on the line if the people who are manning the aircraft, who are making them work, people who know where the missions are going to go, are on drugs? What if they are in cahoots with the drug dealers?

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] did not even think it was worth voting on. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] did not think it was worth voting on. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] did not think it was worth voting on. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER], the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HASTINGS] and the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK] did not even think it was worth voting on. Are they going to tell me in those States there is not a drug problem, that we do not need to know whether or not the guys who are supposed to be on our side being paid by our country are on drugs?

Ronald Reagan back in 1986 when he was the President of the United States called for a drug testing policy, but it was not mandatory. I think we need to know if the people who work for you and me are on drugs. It is a shame that the Committee on Rules does not feel the same way. I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, while the recent changes in the rule announced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] certainly improve the bill, and I will strongly be supporting the Dellums amendment, among others, it is my view that when we are dealing with a $268 billion authorization, an authorization which ultimately determines the priorities of this country, that every Member of this body who has thought about this issue has a right to have their amendment offered on the floor of the House and debated on the floor of the House.

In a fundamental way, today we are discussing the priorities of this Nation. We are talking about spending tens and tens of billions of dollars on weapons systems that many experts think we do not need while at the same time Members of Congress want to cut back on Medicare, want to cut back on Medicaid, while we continue to have the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world, while people are sleeping on the street, while millions of families cannot afford to send their kids to college.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about today are national priorities. Do we put more money into B–2 bombers and less money into health care for our senior citizens? More money into submarines and not adequately fund education or health care for the people? Those are issues of enormous consequence. Every Member of this body should have a right to participate in that debate.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is looking at the biggest peacetime military scandal in recent history. Too often women

enter the military to serve their country, yet end up having to defend themselves. We have seen cases of rape, sexual assault and harassment at every level. Military standards of courage, honor, and valor have given way to sexism, favoritism and power.

□ 1315

And this Congress is willing to only make minimal efforts toward reform.

More than 2 months ago, I introduced a bill asking for a commission to review the entire military justice system. My efforts toward adding the commission to the DOD bill were rejected. I congratulate the Committee on National Security for at least including part of my proposal in their bill, but it falls far too short of what is needed.

We have seen enough scandals, the military does not need another soap opera, and crisis management is not going to solve the problem. I urge a no vote on the rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY].

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Speaker, would the chairman of the Committee on Rules enter into a colloquy with me for a couple of minutes?

Mr. SOLOMON. I would be glad to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for making the amendment regarding pulling troops out of Bosnia in order. As my colleague knows, it calls for bringing our troops home from Bosnia at the end of this year. It also allows the President to make a written request to extend that date for 6 months. We want to show our colleagues that the President will, in fact, get that vote should he request in written form to extend for 6 months the time for pulling them out. We provided in the amendment for the Senate expediated procedures that guaranteed such a vote, and the House, taking the gentleman's advice, we did not provide that, but I know that in consultation with the gentleman he wants to assure our colleagues that they would get that vote.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I most certainly do, and I want to, above all else I want to bring those troops home. Those troops never should have been there in the first place.

As my colleagues know, American foreign policy has always been under both Democrat and Republican leaderships up until this President has been to help to defend our treaty allies against outside military aggression. There is no outside military aggression in this place called Bosnia, the troops never should have been there, and we need to get them home as soon as we can. Not only is it a terrible expense to have them there, but it is draining the rest of our military budget as far as operation and maintenance is concerned.

So I commend the gentleman, and we will do everything we can to make sure there is going to be a vote.

This cuts off the troops as of December 31. If the President wants to ask for another 6 months, then we need to debate it on this floor. It is a good amendment, and I support the gentleman.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it, and I think it is a good rule, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 12 minutes.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in opposition to the rule.

I had an amendment, as I know many others did, which was germane and, I think, important which was denied by the committee for consideration, and I do believe very strongly that there should have been more amendments allowed including the one that I proposed.

My amendment would strike section 1021 of the bill. That section exempts the Navy and MARAD from the provisions of section 6 of the Toxic Substances Control Act which governed disposal of PCB's and other hazardous materials on vessels which are being exported for scrap or sunk in ocean waters during tests of operational readiness. This section also exempts the Navy and MARAD from related provisions in the Resource Recovery and Conservation Act and the Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act.

Under these regulations export of PCB's for disposal is banned. While the Navy and MARAD may wish to export ships for scrap, they have been barred from doing so because the vessels contain PCB's which are highly toxic, persistant and mobile, and I think that is a pretty good reason to put the brakes on these sales, at least in the short run.

Overseas scrapping of PCB containing vessels poses real threat to foreign workers in the environment. Section 1021 allows the Navy and MARAD to be treated in a more privileged manner than private ship owners, and let me add there is no national security reason to treat them differently.

Section 1021 is opposed by the EPA for these reasons, it is opposed by the administration, and finally I do not think this Congress wants to go on the record in support of allowing ocean dumping of toxic materials. Yet that is just what section 1021 would allow. By exempting the Navy and MARAD from the Marine Protection Act, which by the way is also under the jurisdiction of other committees, it would allow them to sink ships laden with PCB's and other toxins in our oceans.

What we are doing here is reopening the ocean dumping ban, and that is something which I know that I cannot stomach, and I really think that the majority of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle share my view.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and many others that I have not stated I would urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

Unfortunately the chairman of the Committee on Rules was not present when I testified before the Committee on Rules, but immediately preceding me was a gentleman from Alabama talking about the McVeigh trial and that 168 Americans, innocent children, women, Government workers, law enforcement officials, people seeking services were murdered by a violent criminal heinous act. All of us believe that justice is being done in that case.

Mr. Speaker, 1,000 times that number, yes, 10,000 times that number, have been murdered, raped, driven from their homes, subjected to genocide.

There is no one on this floor for genocide. Everyone on this floor would say that in a civil world international genocide, as we said in Nuremberg, needs to be acted against collectively by the international community and hold accountable international criminals.

I sought to offer an amendment to carry forward the Dayton Peace accords which said that all of the signatories to that accord and all the nations of the United Nations would hold accountable the criminals in Bosnia.

Now I understand that there are debates about what does that expose us to, how far should we go with our troops? I understand those are legitimate questions. What I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, is why we could not debate that on the floor of this, the people's House.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES], a very distinguished member of the New York delegation.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I appreciate the opportunity.

I am extremely concerned because small businesses across this country will be ill-served because we have been denied the opportunity to extend the very important program that this Congress enacted back in 1994 to help all those small businesses who during the cold war kept their lines open, purchased their specialized equipment to

provide for the national security and the defense of this Nation.

Back in 1994 this program allowed businesses that were suffering because of the 13 years, as the good chairman mentioned, 13 years of downsizing of defense; these small businesses have suffered, and to allow them to convert from defense businesses to commercial applications, this delta program is critical and something very unique in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, we were not asking for any more money. The money is already there. All we were asking was for the simple opportunity to extend a program that helps small businesses in defense-dependent areas like New York and California and Massachusetts and many of the States across the country.

This program is expiring, and I am deeply disappointed that the Committee on Rules denied America's small businesses the opportunity to continue to partake in this program as we leave the cold war and look for new opportunities to help this Nation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas very much for yielding.

The men and women of the military are some of our most precious resources. Each and every day when they volunteer for us, they protect this flag and the United States of America. How unfortunate, however, that the Committee on Rules decided that a commission to study military justice was not appropriate. Not since 1983 have we decided to review the idea of how military justice is rendered. I think it was very important.

The amendment offered by my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], along with myself was to establish a Commission on Military Justice so that we could understand in this climate of sexual harassment and misconduct accusations against the men and women in the service, for once and for all we could understand what the processes are, what the court martialing process is, whether or not we have an antiquated system that does not respond to the good of the military system that we need to have.

I am very disappointed that we did not understand that there is an inequity in treatment between men and women in the military. There is a question about past adulterous acts as they may relate to one's promotion. There is a question about one particular ethnic or racial group is targeted over another. We do not need to speculate. We do not need to make accusations. We needed a commission in order to understand, and the American people could understand, where almost 70 percent of them said they thought it was an unequal justice system between enlisted men and women and those who are officers.

We should not deny the rights of those who have given or offered their life in the U.S. military. Let us have a fair system to review this military code of justice so that we can treat men and women in the military fairly and we can promote the men and women who deserve to be promoted, and that they do not need to be denied those opportunities because of infractions that neither one of us would consider detrimental.

It is important to have had that commission. I am sorry that we would not have to debate it today. Vote ''no'' on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in vehement opposition to this rule for H.R. 1119, the National Defense Authorization. The rule is far too restrictive.

Yesterday, Representative CAROLYN MALONEY and I came before the Rules Committee to offer an amendment that would have created a bipartisan independent Commission to examine systemic problems in the military justice system. The Commission would be required to submit their recommendations regarding any changes the Commission finds necessary in the judicial, law enforcement, punishment, and data collection areas, to the President and to the Congress.

Not since 1983, in the Military Justice Act Advisory Commission Report, has a comprehensive review of the military justice system been undertaken. A new review of the now antiquated military justice system is critical in light of recent media reports of sexual misconduct in the military and scandals such as those at Aberdeen and the cases of Sergeant Major McKinney, Lieutenant Flinn, and General Ralston. These cases highlight the fact that there is a clear lack of uniformity in sentencing in the military, particularly when it comes to sexual misconduct and assault crimes.

This Commission is also necessary to address the disparity between the treatment of men and women in the military, as well as the targeting of African-Americans and minorities in the military justice system.

This rule is outrageously restrictive, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and in so doing signal their support of a Commission to assist us in creating a just and equitable military justice system.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], subcommittee chairman of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to begin by responding to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE]. As certainly chairman having direct oversight of the military judicial system, the subcommittee is moving systematically and methodically in its reviews of many of the issues regarding sexual misconduct, fraternization, and sexual harassment, and I believe that she is jumping to incredible conclusions by saying inequities with regard to race or gender which called a racial target group, group targets. We are moving methodically. This commission was not at all timely. We have some reviews already as an amendment in the bill itself, and I commend the chairman for not including this commission.

On the issue with regard to Bosnia, I want to commend the chairman for permitting my base amendment with regard to Bosnia. As I understand, that in the rule we have my colleague has permitted a perfecting amendment to my base bill. My base amendment is that I want the President's date of June 30, 1998 to be the cut-off date, no more funding for the troops, we bring the troops back, we have a reporting mechanism. We want the President to report to the Congress his plans for withdrawal, and we also want him to report to us on his plans post-June 30 date on how we cooperate with our allies because we also, as Republicans, and every Member of this House wants to insure that it is, in fact, a durable peace in the Balkans.

By the Committee on Rules having permitted a perfecting amendment, does that mean that the Republican leadership supports the Van Hilleary position over my position?

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. There is no Republican leadership position on this issue. The gentleman's amendment was made in order first as base text for the amendment because of his seniority and his chairmanship of the subcommittee. The gentleman has a excellent amendment. We both and, I think, the sponsors of the other amendment as well, want those troops out of there.

□ 1330

We want to do it in the most expeditious way that we can.

The gentleman's approach is good in that it agrees with the President, and yet 6 months before that cutoff date of June 30, the gentleman requires the President to give us a policy of how we will get out of there, so that our allies in Europe, because it is a European problem, it is a regional problem in that part of the world, can plan on America's intent.

So the gentleman's amendment is excellent. To tell the gentleman the truth, I do not know how I am going to vote, because both gentlemen have good amendments.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentleman for allowing so many different opinions to shine on the issue in Bosnia. This is very important to our Nation and that of our allies.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this restrictive rule. The bill authorizes $3.7 billion more on procurement alone than the administration requests. We should not spend billions of

dollars that the American people do not have to buy weapons we do not have to fight enemies that do not exist.

Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment that would have reduced the spending for the F–22 fighter plane to the level approved by the Senate Committee on Armed Services. We should not be funding the development of three competing fighter planes for the same mission, but the rule does not permit my amendment even to be discussed on the floor of the House. Is it perhaps because the contractor, the prime contractor is based in Marietta, GA?

It is a disservice to the American people that this amendment and scores of others that would have allowed for the discussion of the size and scope of this budget, were barred from the floor of the House. If we had a proper rule, we could discuss cost overruns, its program delays, its fuel leaks, its prototypes that crash and burn, brought to you by the hard-earned dollars of the American taxpayer, and we could vote on that funding.

But the rule will not permit that. A rule that prevents such debate and prevents the House from voting on whether to waste billions of dollars on three separate duplicative programs should not be approved. I urge my colleagues to defeat it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], another very outstanding Member of this body from Florida and a member of the committee.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman and I appreciate all of his support. However, I do have to stand and oppose this rule if the amendment to the rule is adopted.

The House committee on National Security carefully crafted the language in this bill in order to overturn an effort by this President to politicize the BRAC process. The Everett amendment, which is an attempt to amend the rule with the Everett amendment, would overturn the carefully crafted language in the House committee bill and put privatization in place back in the bill. Now they call it public-private competition, but make no mistake about it. The way they have structured this public-private competition, it is privatization in place.

The BRAC process will remain politicized if the Everett amendment is passed today. It should not be a part of this rule. We need to ensure that the integrity of the BRAC process is maintained. Many of us, I have a business in my district that is being closed, 8,000 jobs lost. But we did not go and say let us politicize the process, let us keep it open. The BRAC process was set up to keep politics out of it. Defeat the Everett amendment, and if it is in the rule, defeat the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to oppose the rule. I have a great deal of respect for the chairman of the Committee on Rules, but I want those of my colleagues who can hear me, who can hear the sound of my voice to listen to the amendment that was turned down by the Committee on Rules yesterday. Here we are talking about the military, we are talking about equipment, we are talking about facilities.

I had an amendment that said we have to honor, we have to honor our commitment to the men and women who serve in the military. If we tell them we are going to provide certain benefits to them when they retire, they are entitled to them and we ought to keep the promise. That is the simple amendment.

I tell my colleagues, it does not make any difference how many pieces of equipment we build, what kind of facilities we build. If we do not have good men and women serving in the military, it makes no difference. All I was asking is that we honor our commitment.

The U.S. military, when it makes a commitment to a young person who comes in and signs up and says they are going to get health benefits, they are going to get certain benefits when they retire, all of us know, we have casework. We know. they have a problem getting those benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we are asking the United States to honor their commitment, to honor it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the outset, it is my intention to support the amendment about to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to the rule. It is a balanced amendment which provides balance to this rule. I hope it is successful. If it is successful, I will support the rule. If it is not successful, a number of Members on my side of the aisle will vote no on the rule. I urge adoption of the Solomon amendment, and if the Solomon amendment is adopted, I urge adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to apologize to Members when we have a bill like this that deals with $260 billion, $270 billion of the Federal budget. I would like to bring this bill on the floor as an open rule and let all 435 Members work their will, but, Mr. Speaker, we just cannot do that. We have never done it, even when the Democrats had control of the House.

We have to have a structured rule in order to finish this bill in 4 or 5 or 6 days. We struggled with all of these amendments. We tried to be fair. We tried to give those amendments that are agreed to by both sides, to put them on the floor for reasonable debate, but it just is not possible to do that.

Mr. Speaker, what we do have is a fair rule that has certainly taken into consideration as many Democrat Members as we could, as many Republican Members as we could. It is a fair balance, which I think the manager of the bill on that side of the aisle has spoken to.

But I think the important thing is that, Mr. Speaker, we do not ever want to look at the defense authorization as a jobs program. But I am going to tell my colleagues something, it is one of the best jobs programs we have in America. Because when you look at the young men and women that are serving in our military today, we can be so proud of those people. They come from all walks of life, they are a real cross-section of this country. Whether they serve 20 years in the military or just 4 years like I think the acting speaker did, or 2 years, they learn something as citizens. They may have come out of an inner city perhaps, and maybe they did not have a father.

Mr. Speaker, when I grew up, my dad walked out on me and my mom at the very height of the Depression. We never saw him again. We had tough times. But, Mr. Speaker, these young men growing up, when they go in the military, they learn words like pride and patriotism and voluntarism. They learn what good citizenship is. When they get out, whether it is 20 years later or 2 years later, they go back to where they came from and they become good, upstanding citizens in that community.

That is why this bill is so important; that is why this level of funding is so important.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's recent remarks about the young men and women in uniform. I am convinced, after being on the committee on which I serve, formerly known as the Armed Services Committee and now the Committee on National Security, and meeting with them in all parts of this country and other countries where they are literally on the edge in representing the American interests, that they are the finest military we have ever had. They are truly a national treasure, and it is up to us in this Congress under the Constitution to take care of them, to make sure that we have them properly equipped, properly trained, and that we keep the good people in, encourage them so that the days and years ahead, when those troubles come, and sure as the Lord made little green apples, those troubles will come, whether they can either deter or stop aggression.

I appreciate the gentleman's kind remarks about the people in the military, and that is why I think this bill is worthwhile.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman has some good amendments made in order and I will be supporting every one of them.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say that not only do they learn these words and actions of good citizenship, they even get a little religion. They learn how not to use drugs. When they go back into their communities, they become forces in that community, and that is why we absolutely must give them the best that money can buy as far as state of the art technology for weapons, if, God forbid, they ever should be called into harm's way.

That is why I would now, Mr. Speaker, offer an amendment to the rule, which is at the desk.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON:

Strike section 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 7. House Resolutions 161, 162, and 165 are laid on the table.

SEC. 8. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment numbered 7 in part 1 of House Report 105–137 may be offered in the following modified form, shall be debatable for 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by Representative DELLUMS of California or his designee and an opponent, and shall otherwise be considered as though printed in House Report 105–137:

At the end of title I (page 23, before line 7), insert the following new sections:

SEC. 123. B–2 AIRCRAFT PROGRAM.

(a) PROHIBITION OF ADDITIONAL AIRCRAFT.—None of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 103(1) may be obligated for advanced procurement of B–2 aircraft beyond the 21 deployable aircraft authorized by law before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) PRODUCTION LINE CURTAILMENT.—None of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 103(1) may be obligated for reestablishment of the production line for B–2 aircraft. The Secretary of the Air Force may use up to $21,800,000 of funds available for the B–2 aircraft program for curtailment of the B–2 production line.

(c) FUNDING REDUCTION.—The amount provided in section 103(1) for procurement of aircraft for the Air Force is hereby reduced by $331,200,000.

SEC. 124. INCREASE IN AMOUNT FOR GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT.

The amount provided in section 105 for procurement of equipment for the reserve components is hereby increased by $331,200,000.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment numbered 15 in part 2 of House Report 105–137 may be offered in the following modified form, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by Representative FRANK of Massachusetts or his designee and an opponent, and shall otherwise be considered as though printed in House Report 105–137:

At the end of title XII (page 379, after line 19), insert the following new section:

SEC.1205. LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS FOR COST OF NATO EXPANSION.

(a) The amount spent by the United States as its share of the total cost to North Atlantic Treaty Organization member nations of the admission of new member nations to the North American Treaty Organization may not exceed 10 percent of the cost of expansion or a total of $2,000,000,000, whichever is less, for fiscal years 1998 through 2010.

(b) If at any time during the period specified in subsection (a), the United States' share of the total cost of expanding the North Atlantic Treaty Organization exceeds 10 percent, no further United States funds may be expended for the cost of such expansion until that percentage is reduced to below 10 percent.

(c) The following amendment may be offered by Representative EVERETT of Alabama or his designee, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative EVERETT or his designee and an opponent, and shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in part 1 of House Report 105–137:

Strike out sections 332 through 335 (page 68, line 10 through page 77, line 21).

(d) The following amendment may be offered by Representative WELDON of Pennsylvania or his designee and shall be in order as though printed as the penultimate amendment in part 2 of House Report 105–137:

At the end of title XII (page 379, after line 19), insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON NEED FOR RUSSIAN OPENNESS ON THE YAMANTAU MOUNTAIN PROJECT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(1) The United States and Russia have been working in the post-Cold War era to establish a new strategic relationship based on cooperation and openness between the two nations.

(2) This effort to establish a new strategic relationship has resulted in the conclusion or agreement in principle on a number of far-reaching agreements, including START I, II, and III, a revision in the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty, and a series of other agreements (such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention), designed to further reduce bilateral threats and limit the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

(3) These far-reaching agreement were based on the understanding between the United States and Russia that there would be a good faith effort on both sides to comply with the letter and spirit of the agreements, that both sides would end their Cold War competition, and that neither side would seek to gain unilateral strategic advantage over the other.

(4) Reports indicate that Russia has been pursuing construction of a massive underground facility of unknown purpose at Yamantau Mountain and the city of Mezhgorye (formerly the settlements of Beloretsk–15 and Beloretsk–16) that is designed to survive a nuclear war and appears to exceed reasonable defense requirements.

(5) The Yamantau Mountain project does not appear to be consistent with the lowering of strategic threats, openness, and cooperation that is the basis of the post-Cold War strategic partnership between the United States and Russia.

(6) Russia appears to have engaged in a campaign to deliberately conceal and mislead the United States about the purpose of the Yamantau Mountain project, as shown by the following:

(A) General and Bashkortostan, People's Deputy Leonid Akimovich Tsirkunov, commandant of Beloretsk–15 and Beloretsk–16, stated in 1991 and 1992 that the purpose of the construction there was to build a mining and ore-processing complex, but later claimed that it was an underground warehouse for food and clothing.

(B) M.Z. Shakiorov, a former communist official in the region, alleged in 1992 that the Yamantau Mountain facility was to become a shelter for the Russian national leadership in case of nulcear war.

(C) Sources of the Segodnya newspaper in 1996 claimed that the Yamantau Mountain project was associated with the so-called ''Dead Hand'' nuclear retaliatory command and control system for strategic missiles.

(D) Then Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Rocket Forces General Igor Sergeyev denied that the facility was associated with nuclear forces.

(E) R. Zhukov, a Deputy in the State Assembly, in 1996 claimed that the Yamantau Mountain facility belonged to ''atomic scientists'' and posed a serious environmental hazard.

(F) Russia's 1997 federal budget lists the project as a closed territory containing installations of the Ministry of Defense, while First Deputy Defense Minister Audrey Kokoshin recently stated that the Ministry of Defense has nothing to do with the project.

(7) Continued cooperation and progress on forging a new strategic relationship between the United States and Russia requires that both nations make transparent to one another major projects underway or plans under consideration that could alter the strategic balance sought in arms control agreements or otherwise be construed by the other side as an important new potential threat.

(8) The United States has allowed senior Russian military and government officials to have access to key strategic facilities of the United States by providing tours of the North American Air Defense (NORAD) command at Cheyenne Mountain and the United States Strategic Command (STRACOM) headquarters in Omaha, Nebraska, among other sites, and by providing extensive briefings on the operations of those facilities.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In light of the findings in subsection (a), it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Russian government should provide to the United States a written explanation on the principal and secondary purposes of the Yamantau Mountain project, specifically identifying the intended end user and explaining the heavy investment in that project;

(2) the Russian government should allow a United States delegation, including officials of the executive branch, Members of Congress, and United States experts on underground facilities, to have full access to the Yamantau Mountain project to inspect the facility and all rail-served buildings in the southern and northern settlements located near Yamantau; and

(3) the Russian government should direct senior officials responsible for the Yamantau Mountain project to explain to such a United States delegation the purpose and operational concept of all completed and planned underground facilities at Yamantau Mountain in sufficient detail (including through the use of drawings and diagrams) to support a high-confidence judgment by the United States delegation that the design is consistent with the official explanations.

(e) The following amendment may be offered by Representative TRAFICANT of Ohio or his designee and shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in part 2 of House Report 105–137:

At the end of subtitle C of title X (page 326, after line 6), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1032. ASSIGNMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONNEL TO ASSIST IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE AND CUSTOMS SERVICE.

(a) ASSIGNMENT AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Chapter 18 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 374 the following new section:

''§ 374a. Assignment of personnel to assist border patrol and control

''(a) ASSIGNMENT AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may assign up to 10,000 Department of Defense personnel at any one time to assist—

''(1) the Immigration and Naturalization Service is preventing the entry of terrorists, drug traffickers, and illegal aliens into the United States; and

''(2) the United States Customs Service in the inspection of cargo, vehicles, and aircraft at points of entry into the United States.

''(b) REQUEST FOR ASSIGNMENT.—The assignment of Department of Defense personnel under subsection (a) may only occur—

''(1) at the request of the Attorney General, in the case of an assignment to the Immigration and Naturalization Service; and

''(2) at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, in the case of an assignment to the United States Customs Service.''.

''(c) REIMBURSEMENT REQUIREMENT.—Section 377 of this title shall apply in the case of Department of Defense personnel assigned under subsection (a).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 374 the following new item:

''374a. Assignment of personnel to assist border patrol and control''.

SEC. 9. Notwithstanding section 2(e) of this resolution, the additional period of general debate on the subject of United States forces in Bosnia shall precede the offering of amendments numbered 8 and 9 in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules rather than the amendments numbered 1 and 2 in part 1 of the report.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is the exact unanimous consent request that I propounded early on in the beginning of this debate. This amendment, which has been approved by the other side of the aisle, I would say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], is acceptable to both sides.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee yesterday and like many of my colleagues did not have my amendment made in order. The chairman of the committee was present when I testified and said that he both read and understood the nature of my amendment. If he understood the nature of my amendment then it only stands to reason that it would have been made in order.

My amendment was simple. It would have simply clarified the vague and blanket terms currently found in section 6822 of the existing bill. It would have stricken the term ''prohibited state-owned shipping companies and inserted ''prohibited state-owned companies.'' The amendment further defined and clarified the term ''prohibited state-owned companies'' as a corporation, partnership, or other entity that is owned or controlled by a foreign government or foreign state as defined in section 1603 of title 28, United States Code—The Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act.

The amendment would have further removed the blanket prohibition against conveyance of Department of Defense owned properties to all foreign or state owned companies by requiring the President to certify that the prohibited foreign or state-owned company or its government is a threat to the national security of the United States.

The amendment maintained the integrity of the base realignment and closure process by allowing the decisions for reuse to remain in the control of the local government. It was not made in order and I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule—and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Solomon amendment to this rule, House Resolution 169.

I am outraged and astonished that the rule passed by the committee would deny the House an opportunity to speak about the critical issue of depot maintenance and repair.

In its current form, H.R. 1119 contains provisions that would severely impact the ability of the Department of Defense to conduct competitions for its depot maintenance and repair work. The Air Force has designed a model competitive process for repair and maintenance activities now performed at McClellan and Kelly Air Force bases. Through these competitions, the Air Force will be able to accurately determine whether public depots or private contractors can provide the best value to the taxpayer in the performance of this work.

Yet a component of this bill would prevent these competitions from moving forward. That proposal has implications far beyond the issue of whether Air Force maintenance work is performed in Sacramento, Texas, Utah, or elsewhere in the Nation.

Through these anticompetition provisions, this bill would insert the Congress for the first time into the Pentagon's implementation of a base realignment and closure commission decision. Further, it would put the Congress in the position of dictating to the Pentagon how to manage its maintenance and repair activities, regardless of what is sound security or fiscal policy.

That is why my colleagues, Representatives EVERETT, SABO, KLUG and FAZIO have sought an amendment to strike the anticompetition provisions from the bill. Yet House Resolution 169 would not allow the House to consider that important amendment.

The depot maintenance and repair proposal in this bill represents a significant, and absolutely unwise, new direction in defense policy. The House ought to have an opportunity to debate this matter. We must ensure that the Solomon amendment to the rule is approved so that this important debate can occur. I urge my colleagues to support the Solomon amendment and to oppose the rule if the amendment does not pass.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RILEY. 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 329, nays 94, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

YEAS—329

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickett
Pitts
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Riggs
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders

Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shays
Sherman
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
White
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)

NAYS—94

Aderholt
Bachus
Bartlett
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blunt
Brown (FL)
Bunning
Burr
Canady
Cannon
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coburn
Collins
Condit
Cook
Cox
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Deal
Deutsch
Evans
Ewing
Filner
Forbes
Fowler
Gekas
Gibbons
Goodling
Green
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hostettler
Hunter
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Jones
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Largent
Lewis (CA)
Lucas
McCarthy (NY)
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Ney
Norwood
Pappas
Pease
Pickering
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Roemer
Rogers
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Scarborough
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Snowbarger
Souder
Stearns
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thurman
Tiahrt
Walsh
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

DeGette
English
Istook
Lipinski
Miller (CA)
Pombo
Pomeroy
Reyes
Schiff
Stokes
Whitfield

□ 1402

Mr. GREEN, Mr. LARGENT, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. SHADEGG changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. LINDER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Messrs. KOLBE, FOLEY, THOMPSON, and BAESLER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 322, noes 101, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No.213]

AYES—322

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Clement
Coble
Combest
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Flake
Foley
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Morella
Murtha
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tierney
Torres
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (FL)

NOES—101

Aderholt
Bachus
Baesler
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Brown (FL)
Cannon
Cardin
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coburn
Collins
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crapo
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
Deutsch
Dingell
Etheridge
Evans
Filner
Forbes
Fowler
Furse
Gibbons
Goodling
Green
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hostettler
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (CT)
Jones
Klug
Largent
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lucas
Maloney (NY)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
Millender-McDonald
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Nadler
Norwood
Ortiz
Pallone
Payne
Pickett
Rangel
Riley
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sandlin
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shimkus
Sisisky
Snowbarger
Stearns
Sununu
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tiahrt
Towns
Vento
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weller
White
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

DeGette
English
Foglietta
Istook
Lipinski
Miller (CA)
Pombo
Pomeroy
Schiff
Stokes
Whitfield

□ 1421

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. SISISKY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). Pursuant to House Resolution 169, House Resolutions 161, 162 and 165 are laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 169, the resolution just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 169 and rule