Airport'' each place it appears and inserting ''Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport'':

(A) Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 686, chapter 444).

(B) Sections 106 and 107 of the Act of October 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 553, chapter 443).

(C) Section 41714 of title 49, United States Code.

(D) Chapter 491 of title 49, United States Code.

(2) Section 41714(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended in the subsection heading by striking ''WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT'' and inserting ''RONALD REAGAN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT''.

(b) OTHER REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Washington National Airport shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 349, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

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

All we are doing here today is adding the word ''Washington'' to the legislation that we passed yesterday. Yesterday we passed legislation renaming the airport the Ronald Reagan National Airport. We are taking the Senate version, which inserts the name ''Washington'' and makes it the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. By agreement with our friends on the other side, we do not expect a rollcall vote on this matter and expect it to move expeditiously.

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

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

I rise in opposition to the conference report for all the reasons I articulated yesterday, and without recapitulating them, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for yielding me this time.

I think that a recommittal would have been in order today personally, but we had a full debate yesterday. We understand that the majority of this Congress has chosen to rename this airport, and we respect the majority, obviously.

I do want to take a couple minutes here, because I do think that it should be said for the record that renaming this airport does constitute an unfunded Federal mandate on local governments. The cost involves more than just changing a few signs and reprinting stationery. Millions have been invested by the local governments, the private sector, the airlines, the travel hospitality industries to promote this region and identify Washington National as the gateway to the Nation's capital.

□ 1300

So the Board of Trade's assessment is probably an understatement, that it would be confusing and expensive. The total amount might be in millions of dollars for new ad campaigns to associate the airport's new name with the location it serves.

We felt it was ironic that part of President Reagan's legacy was the successful transfer to local control of Washington National Airport. All of the locality organizations and the local governments oppose this.

But I think at this stage in the process, Mr. Speaker, that we want to also be clear that it is entirely appropriate to give some positive recognition to Ronald Reagan on his birthday. We felt it was not the appropriate recognition; but, given the fact that the majority of the Congress has spoken, I do not think that it would be appropriate to force people to go through what has got to be an embarrassing situation for the Reagan family and for everyone who wants to find an appropriate way to memorialize President Reagan.

He will be memorialized soon with the new Federal trade building, the aircraft carrier and so on. But if this is the wishes of the majority, then we will not ask for a recommittal. We will not ask for a rollcall vote. We will just ask that in the future, that the interests of the minority, and particularly of local governments, gain greater respect from the majority so that in the future we can be more consistent with what we thought was President Reagan's underlying philosophy that local governments ought to have greater say in the things that affect their daily lives.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I will sit down. I will not fight this battle again, at least this year. Maybe people will recognize that what goes around can come around. But at this point, I think the majority of this body would like to put this issue to rest and go home and try to deal with more constructive issues in the future.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I read in the morning papers that the President has said he will sign this bill. And, with that comment, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). All time for debate has expired.

The bill is considered read for amendment and, pursuant to House Resolution 349, the previous question is ordered.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 2625) was laid on the table

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. 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 S. 1575, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 182

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 182.

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

There was no objection.

DISAPPROVING THE CANCELLATIONS TRANSMITTED BY PRESIDENT ON OCTOBER 6, 1997, REGARDING PUBLIC LAW 105–45—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of the veto message and the bill (H.R. 2631) disapproving the cancellations transmitted by the President on October 6, 1997, regarding Public Law 105–45, from the President of the United States.

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

There was no objection.

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of November 13, 1997, Part II, at page H10942.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H.R. 2631) disapproving the cancellations transmitted by the President on October 6, 1997, regarding Public Law 105–45.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HEFNER) for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the veto message and the bill, H.R. 2631, from the President of the United States, and that they may include tabular and extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge all Members to vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 2631, a bill disapproving the President's line item vetoes of the Military Construction Appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, I do this for three simple reasons. First, in his first-ever use of the line-item veto on an appropriations bill, the President used this new power in this instance carelessly and casually without doing his home work. The administration did not even consult with the Pentagon.

The administration admitted making several mistakes. The President said he would correct these mistakes by putting these projects in the fiscal year 1999 budget. Well, we have just received the fiscal year 1999 budget, and only one of the 38 projects that he line-item vetoed was put in his budget proposal, so he has not corrected his mistake. We simply want to make those corrections today.

Second, according to the Pentagon, all of these projects are executable and address valid and military requirements. By executable, I mean they are executable in this fiscal year. In fact, we ran all of these projects through the Defense Department and not one raised any objections.

Nearly all of these projects are in the Pentagon's 5-year plan. Each of these 38 project were scrubbed very carefully by our subcommittee.

□ 1315

Finally, all of these projects were approved by the authorizing committee and fall well within the budget limits set by Congress. There is absolutely no wasteful spending. In fact, Members should all know that spending on military construction has been reduced significantly every year for the past 3 years, an 18 percent cut in the past 2 years from $11 billion to $9 billion.

We gave the President the line item veto power and authority to use judiciously. I still support the President having that power, and whether my colleagues support the President having the authority or not, they should not support the misuse of that authority. A vote today to override is not only a vote for our men and women in uniform, it is a vote to ensure that the line item veto is used fairly, carefully and responsibly in the future.

Last September, 413 of us here in this body voted for these projects when the conference report came to the floor; 352 of us voted to disapprove the President's line item veto of the 38 projects. That vote was last November 7. Nothing has changed. There is no reason for anyone to change their vote from aye. I urge every Member to restore these quality of life projects to our men and women and families in the military service by voting aye on this override resolution.

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

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

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

This is a first for this committee. We have worked very diligently in the past years when I was the chairman of the committee and we worked with staff. The staff did a tremendous job. We had hearings. We had people come in from all of the services, and we worked together as a bipartisan group to put together what we thought were bills over the past years that were in the best interest of our men and women in service.

We have had to fight some difficult battles because our budget has been shrunk, and we have actually been in free fall for a few years, and we are not even up to what we were several years ago. It is a little bit disappointing that the President and the folks down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue would be looking for some things to scratch in this bill. I think they are absolutely misguided in their direction on our bill.

Some of the folks said that these were not already designed, but most of these projects could be completed, they are in the 5-year plan. Not everything has to be a certain percentage designed because some of them are off of the shelf, and they can be implemented right away. They are all good projects. They have been considered by four committees, and they all have a contribution to our national defense.

I spoke against and was totally opposed to the line item veto because I do not think it serves democracy very well. And so the Members that would say, I voted for the line item veto and I cannot very well go back on my vote, if they read this bill and if they look at the things that it does, when they voted for the line item veto, they did not take a blood oath that anything that was vetoed that they would go along with. That is not the way our democracy works.

This is a good bill. It has been well thought out. The staff did a tremendous job along with the other body. It is a bipartisan bill and has absolutely, to our knowledge, it has absolutely no errors in it. Of course that would be speaking a little bit presumptuously to say that there are no errors, but this is a good bill. Everybody in this House should vote to override this veto. I would ask that Members give us their vote on overriding the President's line item veto.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues, I rise in the strongest support for this vote to override the President's veto. This is both a pro-defense and a pro-line item veto vote that we are going to be casting.

As the chief proponent and the author of the line item veto, and I believe very strongly in it, the line item veto was written to give any President, regardless of party, the authority to highlight questionable spending provisions in omnibus bills in his judgment. Likewise the law was written specifically to protect Congress's ability to defend its spending decisions and priorities by providing for expedited consideration of bills to disapprove of the President's actions and, if subsequently vetoed, to use the constitutional process to override that veto.

This is stage four in the line item veto process. First Congress passed the military construction appropriations bill. Second, the President exercised his line item veto authority to cancel 38 provisions from that bill. Third, the House and Senate voted 352 to 64 and 69 to 30 respectively for a bill disapproving the cancellations. Today we reach stage four in the process.

Let me just say this to my colleagues. The reason they need to come over here and vote to override this veto is this: We wrote the line item veto so that any items that are vetoed and those vetoes stand, it takes away from the overall appropriation. In other words, we reduce the amount of money we are going to spend on our defense budget. That has already reached the low figure of 15 cents on every dollar.

The reason that we are here today in this Congress is to provide for the common defense for our 50 States. That is the main reason we are here, and we are close to going back to 1979 when we had to cannibalize 15 helicopter gunships just to get five that would work. And then three of those failed, and so did the rescue of our hostages. Let us not go back there. Let us come over here and vote to override this veto.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this vote to override the President's veto of the Military Construction Appropriations disapproval bill, pursuant to the Line Item Veto Act.

This is both a pro-defense and a pro-line item veto vote.

As a chief proponent of the line item veto in the House and as Chairman of one of the Committees charged with oversight over that law, I believe such an action would be fully consistent with the intent of the line item veto.

The line item veto was written to give any President, regardless of party, the authority to highlight questionable spending provisions in omnibus bills.

Likewise, the law protects Congress' ability to defend its spending decisions and priorities by providing for expedited consideration of bills to disapprove of the President's actions and if subsequently vetoed to use the Constitutional process to override that veto.

This is stage four in the Line Item Veto Process. First, Congress passed the Military Construction Appropriations Bill for FY 1998. Second, the President exercised his line item veto authority to cancel 38 provisions from that bill.

Third, the House and Senate voted 352–64 and 69–30 respectively for a bill disapproving

those cancellations last November. Today we reach stage four in the process. As provided in the Constitution, Congress can override the veto of such canceled provisions with a two-thirds vote of both Houses.

Indeed the fact that this measure is on the floor of the House today demonstrates that the line item veto process works and that Congress' Constitutional prerogatives are protected.

Under the line item veto, any canceled dollars are dedicated to deficit reduction, as the spending cap for the affected bill is lowered by the value of the cancellations. In this particular instance the spending ceilings for defense programs would be reduced by $287 million.

However, if these provisions are overridden total defense spending would not be reduced. This is the 13th straight year of inflation-adjusted cuts in the defense budget. No other major account in the entire federal budget has been reduced by this much.

Consequently, it is imperative that we maintain the current level of defense spending to ensure that we equip our uniformed men and women with the best that money can buy and that research and development can obtain.

Congress can agree with granting the President line item veto authority while disagreeing with how that authority is exercised.

This is clearly the case here today. Each member is able to look at each cancellation individually and decide for themselves whether or not to vote to override the President's action.

The line item veto law provides Members that opportunity and I am proud to stand here today with my colleagues in casting a strong vote in favor of overriding the President's veto. This is a yes vote for our national defense and a yes vote for the line item veto.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I support the override of the President's veto.

I rise in support of the override of the President's veto of H.R. 2631, the military construction line-item disapproval bill.

Passage of this legislation is necessary to correct the mistakes that were made during the President's vetoes of 38 projects included in the bill which passed the House by a wide margin last year.

I thank the leadership for allowing this bill to come to the floor, and I am especially grateful to Chairman PACKARD and Mr. HEFNER for their work in sheperding this legislation.

This bill has been called by several of my colleagues as the ''military construction line item integrity bill,'' since this legislation restores integrity to the line-item veto process by ensuring that decisions are made on the basis of facts, not mistakes.

The Office of Management and Budget has acknowledged that mistakes were made which led to the President's line-item vetoes, and passage of this legislation would allow those mistakes to be corrected.

This bill has broad bipartisan support, and has received the endorsement of the National Guard Association of the United States.

I ask all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support this legislation to ensure that our laws are based on factual information, not mistakes and erroneous information.

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

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

I would like to take just a moment to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HEFNER), this being his last year, although we will get to work together on the next bill, but I want to tell him personally how much I appreciate the work he has done on this bill.

He certainly has been a joy to work with and has made a great contribution to our country and to our men and women in the services. This bill reflects his priorities as it does mine. It has been a real pleasure to work together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

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

I want to rise in strong support of H.R. 2631. I want to give my colleagues one good example why it is appropriate to do that. On the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, I became familiar with a proposal of a particular construction project in Fort Derussey, Hawaii. It is to relocate the Asian Pacific Center for Security Studies to a building that is existent. It is used as a reserve center. This center today is renting very high-cost space. That building is waiting to be renovated. All parties concur that this was an appropriate and agreed decision and appropriation item. Its inclusion on the veto list was an inexplicable error that ought to be corrected by our override on the veto.

Undoubtedly there are other such cases in the hastily prepared and inadequately vetted veto list, but this is one that saves the taxpayer money. Everybody agrees it should have been done. It was inexplicable error. It is another reason why we should vote to override the veto.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in strong support of H.R. 2631, legislation to override the President's veto of military construction programs. Certainly, the President has the authority to exercise the line-item veto on occasion when fiscal responsibility demands. No one disputes that prerogative; however, this authority must be exercised very judiciously.

This Member would tell his colleagues that there are many meritorious programs that the President targeted for elimination without careful consideration of the consequences. In particular this Member would point to one particular construction project, that of Fort Derussey, Hawaii. This is to become the future home of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies which was established in September 1995.

Relocating the Asia-Pacific Center from its current location to Fort Derussey will eliminate a very major rental cost now being borne by the Center and the American taxpayer. It makes sense to use the existing U.S. government facility after renovations rather than continue to pay the high rental costs. All parties concur that this is the proper and agreed decision and appropriations item. Its inclusion on the veto list was an inexplicable error that ought to be corrected by our override vote of the veto. Undoubtedly, there are other such cases in the hastily prepared and inadequately vetted veto list.

The Asia-Pacific Center's mission is to serve as a focal point where national officials, decision makers, and military officers of the United States and other Asia-Pacific nations gather to explore pressing issues and achieve a greater understanding of the challenges that face the Asia-Pacific region. This center can help foster early rapport among the leaders of tomorrow and promote U.S. interests throughout the region.

Mr. Speaker, this Member urges support for H.R. 2631.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the President's veto of H.R. 2631, legislation to restore funding for the 38 military construction projects which were proposed for cancellation late last year.

The projects proposed for cancellation by the Administration are among the most heavily reviewed military construction projects in history. This vote will mark the sixth time the House has rendered judgment upon them. In every case, support for these projects has been overwhelming and I hope the same will be the case today.

The facts are clear. First, each of these projects meets a validated military requirement. Second, each of the 38 projects is executable in this fiscal year. Third, nearly all of these projects—85 percent—are in the Administration's own defense program. And fourth, the $287 million to complete these projects are within the limits established by the budget agreement.

The Administration admits mistakes were made in the extensive exercise of the line-item veto on the Military Construction Appropriations Act and, it is my understanding, that the Administration no longer opposes this legislation.

The evidence on the public record provides ample justification to restore these projects. I urge my colleagues to support the restoration of funds to meet critical facilities shortfalls affecting the armed forces. I urged the House to support H.R. 2631.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 2631, the Military Construction Veto Disapproval. I have the privilege of representing Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas. One of the thirty-eight projects stricken from the military construction bill was in my district so I have a very personal interest in this legislation, but I believe that the President made the decision to strike many projects in the bill based on poor advice and inaccurate information.

One of the reasons the President gave for vetoing these projects was that they did not meet a so-called ''quality of life'' requirement. I don't know what the President's definition of quality of life is, but I do know this: these thirty-eight projects which were eliminated included facilities to provide a safe working

place for the men and women we entrust with the defense of our nation.

In the case of the squadron operations facility to be built at Dyess Air Force Base, there are currently no existing facilities to house the 13th Bomb Squadron. Without this facility, the men and women of the 13th Bomb Squadron will be denied the tools they need to do their jobs.

How does this add to their quality of life or their ability to discharge their duties? ''Quality of life'' involves a great deal more than housing and child care facilities and gymnasiums, although those are very important. I cannot imagine how the quality of work life could be much worse than importing 500 to 1,000 men and women to do a job without any facilities in which to house that work.

The projects line item vetoed by the President were included in the military construction bill because they are essential to the mission of our military. Most of these projects were included in the five-year plans of the military services so that the money for these projects will be spent eventually. These projects were considered by four different Congressional committees with expertise in the area of national security and were reviewed by the Pentagon. The House and the Senate voted by overwhelming majorities to approve the military construction appropriation act.

Yet the President and his staff acting in haste crafted a new criteria for military construction projects—quality of life. While I do not oppose the use of quality of life as a consideration for determining the merit of a project, it should not be the only criteria, and it should be clearly defined and fairly applied. In the case of the 13th Bomb Squadron Operations Facility and many of the other projects cancelled by the President, it was not. The President incorrectly substituted his judgment for that of the Congress and the Pentagon. I urge my colleagues to support our men and women in uniform by voting again to override the President's line item veto to restore these projects.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support once again for H.R. 2631, legislation to override the President's line item vetoes of projects in the fiscal year 1997 Military Construction Appropriations Bill.

Last October 6, the President line item vetoed 38 military construction projects worth $287 million. The other body overruled him on October 30, by a 69–30 vote. The House followed suit on November 8, voting 352–64 to restore funding. Despite two-thirds margins in both Houses, however, the President vetoed the bill disapproving his line item vetoes.

There are many reasons why Members should support this bill. Every one of the 38 vetoed projects was properly authorized by Congress. Every one of them met strict criteria established by the committees with oversight for military construction. The vast majority—33 of the 38—were in the Pentagon's 5-year plan, and those that were not were only absent because they were emergent requirements. And the inclusion of all of these projects was completely consistent with both the Congress' constitutional responsibility to provide for and maintain our Armed Forces, and the fiscal year 1998 budget resolution.

When President Clinton originally signed the bill giving him line item veto authority, he argued that it would help him cancel projects that are ''special interest boondoggles, tax loopholes or pure pork.''

However, according to OMB Director Franklin Raines, ''the great majority, if not the overwhelming majority of these [vetoed] projects can make a contribution to our national defense.'' Moreover, in vetoing these items, the President himself said that these projects ''have merit but should be considered in the future.''

Then, after the vetoes, the administration itself admitted that it acted on erroneous data. Initially, the White House said two projects should not have been vetoed. Later, the number grew to 11. Still later, the White House admitted to as many as 18 mistakes.

Finally, I should note that anyone inclined to support the President's position should understand that they are not saving money by endorsing his vetoes. Rather, they will be costing the American taxpayer more money. These projects will all get built, because they are all validated military requirements and are in the services' extended budgets. Postponing them will only drive up costs due to inflation.

Given all of these considerations, I believe every Member ought to support the override bill. These projects were not pork, but had merit. The process that the administration used to select them was deeply flawed. Postponing construction of these projects will only cost more money.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a strong supporter of this bipartisan bill which would disapprove the President's line-item vetoes of 38 critically-important projects included in the fiscal 1998 Military Construction Appropriations Act. Each of these projects is needed by the military. Each complies with the spending limits established by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. And each, if funded, can be started during this current fiscal year.

I can speak about one of these projects from first-hand knowledge.

Included in the vetoes was $6.8 million to construct an operations and training facility for combat-ready rescue personnel in the 41st Rescue Squadron based at Moody Air Force Base in Valdosta, Georgia, located in the District I represent. The job they do is dangerous and absolutely essential to the safety and well-being of our airmen and civilian populations on the ground. These highly-trained rescue specialists not only serve areas of Georgia and Florida in the general vicinity of the base, it is believed they perform more deployments throughout the world than any other Air Force units. Rescue personnel from Moody are assigned right now to the Persian Gulf.

They were transferred to Moody Air Force Base from Patrick Air Force Base during the first six months of last year. Although there was no available building for these units at Moody, the Air Force planned to build one as quickly as possible. Meanwhile, they had to be housed in temporary, rented trailers at a cost of $108,000 a year.

These trailers are cramped and totally inadequate for the work these units do, including operations planning and on-going training exercises.

If anyone can overcome difficulties such as this, it is the men and women who serve in our armed forces. But it will be a disgrace if we, in Washington, D.C., keep these rescue units stuck in crowded temporary facilities any longer than necessary. We will fail in our responsibility if we send these troops into harm's way without providing them the basic support they need.

It will also be more costly. Not only will construction costs go up, we will continue paying the rent—and that is pure waste.

I believe the Administration acted in good faith. These are projects they truly believed could wait. But, I also believe the White House was acting on misinformation.

Based on the veto message, the White House apparently thought the rescue personnel had not yet been relocated to Moody, that the planning was not far enough along for construction to begin this fiscal year, and that this was not a quality-of-life project.

This was incorrect on all counts.

The rescue personnel had been transferred months before. Work can begin this year. Without question, providing adequate working conditions for military personnel, and particularly for those involved in life-and death operations, is a quality-of-life issue.

In fact, a number of these vetoes were evidently based on mistakes.

Moreover, there is no question that each and every one of the vetoed projects is needed for military readiness.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yea'' on this bill and live up to our responsibility to provide our military forces the basic tools they need to carry out the missions that keep our country secure and help protect freedom throughout the world.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of MILCON veto override.

Most of the projects on the President's cancellation list were in the Pentagon's future years defense plan.

All of them are executable this fiscal year.

Three of the projects were Air Force Reserve projects, and together they represent 50 percent of the Air Force Reserve's construction budget for fiscal year 1998.

While the active Air Force and the Air National Guard have suffered some cuts over the last few years, the Air Force Reserve's MILCON Program is literally being driven out of existence.

The President's fiscal year 1999 budget submission includes only one new Air Force Reserve project. One project. That's it.

Enough is enough.

The MILCON bill was the only appropriations bill where fiscal year 1998 spending was below fiscal year 1997.

I urge all of my colleagues to support motion to override.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker I thank my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee, for yielding.

I rise in support of this override effort because I am a strong supporter of the line-item veto and the process it provides for ensuring careful scrutiny of Federal spending. In this case, Mr. Speaker, Congress is asserting its power of the purse, insisting to the President that we have carefully considered the items in the military construction spending bill that the President—I believe in haste and in error—chose to line-item veto. Contrary to the claims of some naysayers, we did not write Congress out of the spending process when we crafted the line-item veto. Quite the contrary, in fact, we provided very explicit procedures by which Congress could assert its authority—as we witness by today's proceedings.

Some pundits and even some Members have pointed to the President's application of the line-item veto on the military construction

spending bill as an example of why the line-item veto isn't a good idea. I firmly disagree. The line item veto has accomplished exactly what those of us who spent years bringing it about intended—it has brought greater accountability and sunshine to the process of spending the taxpayers' money. And it has provided a real opportunity for saving more than one point $2 billion. Sure, in the cynical world of budgeteers and inside-the-beltway types, that may seem like a rounding error—but to the American people, $1.2 billion is serious money. And there's more to come, I am sure. I share with many of my colleagues some disappointment that this President did not spend more time and take more care in developing sound criteria and preparing to use the powerful new tool we delegated to him in the form of the line-item veto. But I remain firmly committed to the idea that we did the right thing by implementing the line-item veto—and I hope this exercise of override will chasten the administration to think first and line item second during the upcoming budget cycle. I urge support for this override effort.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there are others that have come on the floor that want to speak, but in deference to my colleague from North Carolina, who has yielded back the balance of his time, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 347, nays 69, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—347

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—69

Ackerman
Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Boswell
Brown (OH)
Carson
Chabot
Conyers
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutsch
Dickey
Doggett
Dooley
Duncan
Engel
Ensign
Ewing
Filner
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Harman
Johnson (WI)
Kanjorski
Kind (WI)
Klug
Leach
Lofgren
Luther
Markey
Martinez
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McKinney
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Minge
Neumann
Nussle
Owens
Payne
Petri
Ramstad
Rangel
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Royce
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanford
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Sherman
Skaggs
Smith (MI)
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Towns
Upton
Vento
Waxman
Wexler
Yates

NOT VOTING—14

Armey
Becerra
Burton
Dellums
Eshoo
Furse
Gonzalez
Hall (OH)
Herger
Klink
McKeon
Porter
Schiff
Wynn

☐ 1345

Ms. LOFGREN and Messrs. SHAYS, SALMON, MARKEY and GREENWOOD changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. MALONEY of Connecticut and Messrs. NADLER, RUSH and PALLONE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, because of official business I was not present for Roll Call votes 7, 8, 9, and 10. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on each of these votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 10, I was unavoidably detained making remarks to a business association headquartered in downtown Washington and was, for that reason, not present for the vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on roll calls #8, #9, and #10, I was unavoidably absent because of activities connected with this morning's National Prayer Breakfast. Had I been present, I would have voted nay on roll call #8—ordering the previous question on H. Res. 348; nay on roll call #9—final passage of H.R. 2846; and yea on roll call #10—final passage of H.R. 2631. I ask unanimous consent that this explanation be placed at the appropriate part of the RECORD.

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 5 minutes.)

FAREWELL SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE RONALD V. DELLUMS.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, it is with an incredibly heavy heart that I take the well of the House of Representatives today because this will be the last time that I will do this.

I have served in these chambers for 27 years, and it has been an extraordinary honor and high privilege to serve with all of my colleagues here.