afraid of coming down with cancer? Are they more afraid of heart disease? Are they more afraid of many of the other illnesses that we still have not conquered yet? Or are they sleeping with a night light thinking that some enemy is going to overrun America and that if we do not insist the Pentagon get even more money than they have asked for, it is all over for us?

The average American I know is much more frightened about the progress we have not made on many diseases, and I think they might want this $9.5 billion to go to deficit reduction. But if it did not go to deficit reduction, I would certainly think if we insisted it had to be spent some way, many people I know would much prefer it be spent trying to find some answers to diseases that their families have suffered from that have been suffering from cutbacks in funding rather than insisting that we give a bunch of weapons systems that people do not want and do not even know where we would use them.

This money could be used to clean up 380 Superfund sites. We have been cutting the funding for cleaning up environmental Superfund sites. Again, I think many Americans would much prefer to see Superfund sites cleaned up because they are much more frightened of what we have done to the environment and the fact that we are playing so fast and loose and pretending like this planet is really just in a chapter 11 closeout sale. A lot of people would prefer we spent it that way if you are going to insist we spend it. There are need-based causes over there.

When we look at what you could do for breast cancer. Ninety-five million mammograms could be bought for that. You want to know how many mammograms that is? More than we could ever want. But that is a way we could go if you wanted to do that.

It would cover child care costs totally for every young children at the highest quality, for 2.5 million children in America. We all know that we are way short on child care slots.

Mr. Speaker, many things are there and I must say, we ought to do what is need based and not protect it the way this rule is going to protect this added fat to the budget.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 12 noon.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 14 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until 12 noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WICKER) at 12 noon.

PRAYER

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

We recall the words of the Psalmist of old who wrote: ''How wonderful it is, how pleasant, for God's people to live together in harmony!'' O gracious God, from whom all good gifts do come, we pray that we will represent in our daily lives the unity that You gave to us at creation and the solidarity we share as Your people. Though we differ in our manifestations of our knowledge, yet may we testify also to the shared values that are the legacy of our land and the faithful heritage of faith and hope and love that is Your gift to every person. Bless us this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. NORWOOD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Agriculture; Committee on Banking and Financial Services; Committee on Commerce; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on International Relations; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on Resources; and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I rise not to object but only to convey that what the gentleman from Georgia said is correct, that the minority has been consulted and there are no objections to these requests.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1530, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 164 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 164

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. 1530) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, 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, as modified by striking section 807, and by an amendment printed in part 3 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, 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, as modified, shall be in order except the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, and the amendments described in section 4 of this resolution.

(c) Except as specified in section 5 of this resolution, each amendment printed in the report 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 or 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, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, and amendments described in section 4 of this resolution, are waived.

(e)(1) Consideration of amendments printed in subpart A of part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the subject of cooperative threat reduction with the states of the former Soviet Union and shall not exceed thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security.

(2) Consideration of amendments printed in subpart D of part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the subject of ballistic missile defense and shall not exceed sixty minutes 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 accompanying this resolution 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 amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be in order for Representative Clinger of Pennsylvania, with the concurrence of Representatives Collins of Illinois, to offer the amendment numbered 1 in subpart C of part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules in a modified form that is germane to the form printed in the report.

(b) After disposition of all other amendments, it shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on National Security or his designee to offer an amendment not printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution to reconcile spending levels reflected in the bill with the corresponding level reflected in a conference report to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996. The amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for ten 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.

SEC. 5. (a) The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by this resolution.

(b) The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes.

(c) The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration of any amendment made in order by this resolution 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, as modified. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments there to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 164 is a complicated structured rule that will permit the House to consider H.R. 1530, the national defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1996. The rule waives all points of order against the bill and against its consideration, and provides for 2 hours of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on National Security.

The rule makes in order the Committee on National Security amendment in the nature of a substitute as original text for amendment purposes. That text is modified by striking section 807, which deals with recoupment of research and development costs, and by an amendment printed in part 3 of the report on the rule which deals with the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve in California, about which I will have a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] in a few minutes.

All points of order against the substitute are waived.

Unless otherwise specified in the rule, the rule makes in order only those amendments that are printed in the report of the Committee on Rules, certain amendments en bloc, and pro forma amendments offered by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on National Security.

Except as otherwise specified in the rule, the amendments shall be considered in the order and the manner specified in the report.

The rule provides that amendments printed in part 2 of the report shall be debatable for 10 minutes each, equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent.

The amendments shall be considered as read and are not subject to amendment unless otherwise specified in the report, and they are not subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points or order against the amendments printed in the report.

□ 1215

The rule also provides for an extra 30 minutes of general debate on cooperative threat reduction with the former Soviet Union in part 1 of the report, and an extra 60 minutes of general debate on ballistic missile defense, also in part 1.

The rule provides that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] may offer a germane modification to his amendment on acquisition reform, with the concurrence of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS]. And I repeat, with the concurrence of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

The chairman of the Committee on National Security or his designee is authorized to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments in part 2 of the report or germane modifications thereto. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read except that modifications shall be reported. Amendments en bloc shall not be subject to amendments en bloc shall be subject to amendment or a division of the question in the House or the Committee of the Whole, and they shall be debatable for 20 minutes.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendment en bloc.

The rule authorizes the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone consideration of a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and to reduce to 5 minutes the time for voting after the first of a series of votes.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole is also authorized to recognize for consideration of any amendment printed in the report out of the order in which it is printed, but not sooner than, and this is important for Members listening, not sooner than 1 hour after the chairman of the Committee on National Security or his designee announces from the floor a request to that effect. That is so Members will be properly alerted.

The rule authorizes the chairman of the Committee on National Security to offer an amendment not printed in the report to reconcile spending levels in the bill with the final defense spending level contained in the conference report on the budget resolution.

This amendment, if offered, shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to amendment or to demand for a division of the question. This amendment, if offered, shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee of jurisdiction.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

This, then, is the rule which will permit the House to work its will on H.R. 1530.

Mr. Speaker, the national defense authorization bill is the most important piece of legislation that comes before this body in any given year, and especially this year. I say that because of my conviction that protecting the territory and the vital security interests of the United States of America, what the Constitution calls providing for the ''common defense,'' is the preeminent constitutional obligation of the Federal Government. It is, in fact, the one true entitlement program.

This bill represents the one thing that every American in this country, regardless of race, creed, age, sex or any other distinction, can expect to receive from the Federal Government. That is why we formed this Republic of States.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference an election makes. Anyone who believes that elections do not make a difference should just study this bill.

When we compare this bill with the administration's request, we find procurement is up 11 percent. Research and development are up 5 percent. Operations and maintenance are up 3 percent. Military construction and family housing are up 5 percent. And how terribly important that is when we have an all-volunteer military, with families living in deplorable conditions in our military today. And instead of a ceiling limiting the number of military personnel, ladies and gentlemen, we find a floor below which the number of uniformed personnel on active duty will not go.

We are going to maintain a strong military preparedness in this country. To provide for all of these vital increases, yet only increasing this overall defense bill by a mere 3.8 percent, we make substantial cutbacks in nondefense expenditures.

These have been clogging the defense authorization bill in recent years, creating the appearance that defense spending is much higher than it really is. We find such things as non-defense Department of Energy activities charged to the defense budget. They are substantially reduced and will be reduced further in years to come. Nondefense funding for environmental restoration is down 12 percent. So-called peacekeeping is zeroed out altogether, at least as far as this defense budget is concerned.

And, Mr. Speaker, we will not permit our active-duty personnel to be hollowed out, and their readiness impaired, all in the pursuit of so-called peacekeeping. That does not belong in this budget. If there are funds needed, fund it out of the foreign affairs bill or some place else, not out of the military budget.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this bill stops and even reverses the 10-year decline in the national defense budget of this country.

For the first time since fiscal year 1985, this House will pass a national defense authorization bill that increases our commitment to providing for the common defense over the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude this portion of the debate by citing a most significant remark made shortly after the Persian Gulf war by the Saudi Arabian general who served as his country's chief liaison officer at General Schwarzkopf's headquarters. The Saudi Arabian general said, ''If the world is to have only one superpower, thank God it is the United States of America.'' Believe you me, Mr. Speaker, he was speaking for more than his own people in Saudi Arabia. He was speaking for the entire free world.

Mr. Speaker, our country is by destiny rather than choice the one remaining superpower in this world. This year we will pass a defense budget that is equal to that obligation.

''If the world is to have only one superpower, thank God it is the United States of America.''

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

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

Mr. Speaker, no matter what my Republican colleagues may say—this rule is not fair.

The bill gives the Pentagon $9.5 billion more than they asked for and the rule will keep anyone from changing that.

As far as I am concerned, $9.5 billion is a lot of money; $9.5 billion could send 1.6 million children to Head Start. It could put 268,818 new police officers on the street. It could even go so far as to clean up the Boston Harbor.

I wonder why Republicans are insisting on giving the Pentagon more money than it needs when we are having trouble paying for the things we do need?

If my colleagues are truly interested in cutting spending, especially unnecessary spending, why do they refuse to allow people to cut some of the wasteful spending out of this bill?

A number of Members have some very good ideas on how to save a lot of money and cut out a lot of unnecessary military spending. But under this rule, their amendments are not going to be allowed to see the light of day.

I suspect these amendments are being kept from the floor because, despite the Republican majority, despite the cohesion of their party, these amendments just might pass.

Meanwhile, to add insult to injury, just when you thought we had gotten over the most ridiculous fantasy of all, star wars, here it is again, and this rule will protect it to the bitter end.

What Republicans are saying is that it is OK to cut spending, as long as it is not spending for something they like, no matter what the Pentagon says, no matter what our defense needs, even the Pentagon says they do not need this much money to defend the country.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question to allow a vote on amendments to redirect military spending toward readiness and away from star wars and to cut unnecessary waste. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of my son's graduation from college, I was necessarily absent for votes on Thursday, June 8.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall 362, directing the President to lift the arms embargo against Bosnia, and I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall 366, final passage of the American Overseas Interests Act.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, what the gentlewoman neglected to say was that her son graduated magna cum laude from Harvard, so I mean, nobody from Massachusetts could deny a request like that.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], a classmate of mine. We came here together 17 years ago, and he is a very valuable member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a member of the California delegation; I yield this time to him for a colloquy.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for entering into a colloquy over section 2 of the rule affecting the sale of the naval petroleum reserve at Elk Hills.

Is it the chairman's understanding the new language in the amendment incorporated in the bill through this rule regarding settlement regarding the so-called school lands issue and California's interest in the naval petroleum reserve permits California to be fully compensated for its interest in Elk Hills?

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I will say to the gentleman based on my interpretation of that language, it certainly does.

Mr. THOMAS. Is the chairman aware of the State's concern about the amendment's possible effect on getting fair market value for its interest by giving Federal agencies power to force the State to take less than, in their opinion, fair value for those claims?

Mr. SOLOMON. I would say to that, yes. Again, there is no question for the amendment to preclude or limit the State of California from pursuing judicial remedies should an agreement or settlement with the Federal Government not be arrived at in this matter. And as the gentleman knows, Mr. Dan Lundgren is another former classmate of ours who came here with us, and in his position in the California government, I think you can be assured there will be a reasonable settlement out of this. Do you not think so?

Mr. THOMAS. I believe the attorney general of California feels comforted by the chairman's statement that there is no intention to preclude a judicial remedy if we cannot reach agreement. I am perfectly satisfied we will reach agreement.

But it is a comfort for the chairman to indicate that is his interpretation of the rule.

I thank the chairman for the colloquy.

Mr. SOLOMON. Again, the people of the State of California ought to be proud of the gentleman for standing up for their interests.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished friend from Glens Falls, NY, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, like the chairman I believe it is imperative, absolutely imperative, that we maintain the strongest, best equipped, most professional military in the world.

The world is counting on us to do it.

I am pleased this rule makes in order a defense authorization bill that will help to strengthen our national security by restoring funding in several vital areas and focusing on our true priorities in others.

This rule makes in order some 56 amendments from both sides of the aisle, 56 amendments. I am confident that there will be full and open debate on such important issues as to whether or not to fund more B–2 bombers, the status of aid to Russia, missile defense strategy, procurement reform, things we are talking about in America.

While the minority may find fault with a specific amendment made in order or lack thereof, perhaps, Members should be aware this Committee on Rules has continued the tradition of reviewing and allowing numerous amendments to the DOD bill on a bipartisan basis. National security is not partisan matter.

One tradition we have not followed, however, in the Committee on Rules is the practice of granting multiple rules for the consideration of this bill. Last year we needed two rules. The year before, it took four rules to complete the DOD bill.

So this single rule is welcome progress toward efficiency as well as fairness.

Mr. Speaker, the cold war is over. As we have witnessed in the Middle East, Bosnia, and Korea, there are still many actual and potential regional conflicts that could easily threaten the United States and individual members of our military forces. Our readiness must not be allowed to deteriorate to the minimum acceptable level.

In this uncertain world, we still need deterrence and we still need to be able to handle any threat to our security. Our military, for now, I think, has distinguished itself once again in a great way. We certainly have proven that we give the best training and the best equipment to our troops, and that it is justified. It is also true, I might add, we have an obligation not to misuse our military for nonmilitary purposes. Haiti comes to mind in that vein.

Having said that, it is evident the administration, sadly, has been cutting back our Armed Forces too quickly and not enough thought given to the impact that specific cuts would have on our security. Once again, I commend the Committee on National Security for bringing forward this bill, and I urge passage of this rule for its fair consideration of the bill.

□ 1230

Thinking of the remarkable exploits and successful saga of Scott O'Grady and his rescuers, can any Member do less than support this bill?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I must say I stand in absolute opposition to this rule. I find this rule very, very offensive. Three quarters of the cutting amendments that we wanted to offer have not been allowed.

Now, for someone to say, ''Oh, yeah, but we're giving you one rule rather than multiple rules,'' hey, I will take multiple any day if it allows a real debate on these issues, and the reason that this is so distracting is what we are doing in this rule, if this rule passes, is we are hermetically sealing in $9.5 billion that the Pentagon does not want, that the President does not want and that the Senate does not think is needed. But somehow, because the House committee thinks it is needed, we are going to seal it in so the people like myself, senior members of the committee, cannot even offer an amendment to take it back down to the level every other reasonable group seems to think is adequate.

Now this is not what the Pentagon wants. What we are doing is force feeding the Pentagon money they have not asked for. It seems to me that at a time when we are trying to balance the budget we ought to be looking at need-based concerns. The Pentagon came up with a need-based budget based on two major wars. It was 92 cents for every dollar that was spent by the Pentagon during the cold war. I would have guessed that was too high. But we cannot even get to that because of this add-on of $9.5 billion.

I have got to say what are we doing here as we are standing here cutting school lunches, student loans, all these other things and saying for every other Department of Government we are looking at the fat, we are trimming what is in there, but for the Defense Department it is going to be different. Not only are we not going to look at what they requested, we are going to give them even more than they requested. It used to be we gave them everything they wanted. Now we are giving them all sorts of things they do not even want.

Now figure that out at a time when we are spending more money for defense than the rest of the world. This makes no sense. Defeat this rule.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the House National Security Committee, in his statement in the May 18 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said that while other departments are expected to put their fiscal houses in order, the Department of Defense does not because ''Defense is different.''

Defense has been deemed so different by the House National Security Committee that not only does it not have to face painful cuts, they get an unrequested increase of $9.5 billion, an increase that largely pays for unrequested weapons systems. It takes us off the so-called procurement holiday and puts on a procurement splurge. This bill adds $553 million for two unrequested B–2 bombers, $550 million in unrequested funds for the *Seawolf* submarine, $160 million for eight unrequested AV–8B Harriers, an unrequested sum of $974 million for an amphibious transport dock ship. This is just the beginning. I could keep going, but I would run out of time before I ran out of adds.

I had hoped to offer an amendment eliminating the $9.5 billion increase to return the spending level to the level requested by the Pentagon. I assume the generals over at the Pentagon know what they need. However, my amendment was denied.

This unrequested increase is a lot of money, $9.5 billion can buy a lot in the civilian world. It can buy things that make a real difference in peoples lives. It could clean up 380 Superfund sites, pay for Pell grants for 4 million needy students, cover prenatal and postpartum care for 2.4 million uninsured pregnant women. It could pay for 95 million mammograms and double biomedical research at NIH. It could cover child care costs for 2.5 million children under 5 for a year, and feed 11.6 million hungry people in the United States one nutritious meal a day for 1 year. If you don't think those are wise investments, then it could be block granted to the States at a level of $190 million for each of the 50 States, or returned to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

In light of the budget cuts domestic programs will be taking to balance the budget, it is impossible to justify this $9.5 billion increase. We are still spending 92 cents for every dollar we spent during the cold war, and the threats we face loom nowhere as large. In

fact, we are spending more on our defense than our NATO allies, Russia, and Japan combined. I find it blatantly inconsistent that the majority, who is so strongly dedicated to balancing the budget, has carved out the defense budget as their sacred cow, and has refused to allow it to be questioned. The Democratic process is based on questions and challenges. In this case the process has been subverted. The $9.5 billion increase in this bill is unjustifiable. This is not the Pentagon's increase; it is the committee's. Cuts to the funding level of H.R. 1530 are substantive amendments and should have been allowed. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule, and I oppose it because it makes it impossible for the House even to consider reversing a serious mistake made by the Committee on Natural Security. That mistake was to reduce the authorization for the Energy Department's environmental management programs by almost three quarters of a billion dollars and to add that money into missile defenses, the Star Wars Programs. Those priorities are exactly wrong.

Mr. Speaker, as we might say to our kids, ''We need to clean up our room before we use our allowance to buy new toys.''

Through its environmental management programs, the Department of Energy carries out the work of cleaning up places like Rocky Flats site, in my district, and other sites around the country, facilities where America developed and built the nuclear weapons that helped us win the cold war. Those cleanup costs are part of the cost of that victory. They have to be paid. And while the possible benefits of increased spending beyond what the Defense Department has asked for on star wars are highly speculative, there is absolutely nothing speculative about the benefits in health and safety that we will gain by expending these necessary funds for cleaning up Rocky Flats and the other weapon sites.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] and myself each offered an amendment that we asked to be made in order under this rule; neither was. Mine would have restored all the money; his would have restored a major part of it. But neither was made in order. So, this House will have no opportunity to decide whether or not cleaning up this mess created over 3½ decades ought not to come first.

As a result, with this restrictive rule we will be denied the opportunity to debate and have the will of the House done on this issue. I have no choice under these circumstances but to oppose this unfair, unwise, and restrictive rule, and I urge my colleagues, as well, to vote ''no.''

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, in bringing forward the largest budget of the Federal Government, the largest general fund discretionary expenditure of the Federal Government, under a restrictive rule we have got to ask what is the majority afraid of, why is it that they do not want to have the free interplay of the legislative process here on the floor of the House of Representatives? What is it they are trying to protect?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, you heard earlier from Mrs. SCHROEDER from Colorado, and you'll hear later from others, there are a number of things they want to protect. They want to protect the procurement process at the Pentagon. You know, it came out that they lost $15 billion in the procurement process over the last 10 years which they can't account for—simple bookkeeping errors. Do you think there is any other segment of the Federal Government where, if there was a $15 billion scandal, that we wouldn't be in full cry on the floor of the House, amendment after amendment, hearings, special investigations, special committees? But hey, the Pentagon just lost $15 billion. So they can't account for it—minor clerical error—and there will be no substantive amendments to overhaul the procurement process at the Pentagon in this bill. They will not be allowed for under this rule.

Then there is the little item of the Office of Support Aircraft. In a GAO report that Senator GRASSLEY and I obtained it says that we are probably 50 to 75 percent overbuilt for administrative support aircraft; that is, we are at such a point where every one-star general at the Pentagon, every deputy junior assistant secretary, is taking a helicopter to go to Andrews Air Force base to get on their private jet planes and fly off to routine meetings at extraordinary costs to the Federal taxpayers. The estimates of GAO say we could save $200 million a year from this account and meet the legitimate defense and military requirements of this country. We spent $275,000 to send the Air Force Cadets to Hawaii. That is a scandal.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the last two speakers talk about toys that we are going to give to our military, and there is nothing, I guess, that aggravates me more.

As my colleagues know, back in 1979, when we had allowed our military to go to hell, soldiers were on food stamps with their families. It was a disgrace in this Nation what we had done to them. This Congress had allowed the military preparedness of this country to disintegrate. And we had hostages being held in a place called Iran, and we tried to rescue those hostages. At that time our equipment was in such bad condition we had to cannibalize 14 helicopter gunships just to get 5 that would, perhaps, work. Three of the five failed, and so did the mission, and we never did bring those hostages out with a rescue attempt.

My colleagues know to look now at what has happened. We look at Desert Storm, where we had the fewest casualties possible. Why? It is because we had the highest technology, the state-of-the-art equipment, equipment that allowed us to see the enemy—they could not see us.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to put other men and women into combat and into harm's way, we better give them the very best. We have an all-volunteer military. One of the proudest, proudest jobs one could have in America today is serving in our military, and then we hear these things called toys? Stinger aircraft missiles, multiples launch rocket systems, Hellfire antitank missiles, AV–8 Harriers—excuse me for getting so excited, but, as my colleagues know, when I hear advanced technology called toys I just get burned up.

We are going to provide an adequate military for our military personnel, and that is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ], a very valuable member of the Committee on Rules.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule. This is a critical issue for us to consider. As defense spending has steadily declined over the last decade, we were able to maintain the world's premiere fighting force by spending our defense dollars more wisely. However, in the last couple of years we have seen numerous indicators that our military readiness is dangerously on the decline and our military personnel are suffering in pay, in housing, in training. This bill is a step toward reversing that troubling trend.

This rule provides for fair consideration of a critical issue. Because of the scope and importance of this issue, we could debate the defense bill until the end of the year, and there are undoubtedly some who would like to. Our rule allows amendments on a wide variety of important issues that are of interest to members.

This rule is a fair attempt to allow members to air their differences and at the same time allow us to move forward in determining the future of our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop behaving like a herd of ostriches. Let us get our heads out of the sand.

I had a simple amendment. It would mean that we would stop buying C–17's until the Pentagon had come forth with its report in November and until that report has been analyzed. That is a very commonsense amendment, but my amendment was denied. Congress cannot even get to discuss this issue.

Now I believe that the C–17 is a goldplated turkey whose wings are broken. I believe that it is a lemon, and I believe that we could look at its history and learn something.

In 1985 we were told that this plane would carry 86 tons 2,400 miles with no refueling. Well, that payload has been reduced four times. We were told it would be ready by September 1992. But in fact there will not be flight testing completed until 1995, this year. We were promised no significant recalls, yet in 1991, Mr. Speaker, it went back to the shop to fix fuel leaks. In 1992, went back because the wings had problems. The slats melted, the wings buckled. In 1993, went back because the main landing gear collapsed.

If this was an automobile, the C–17 would be a lemon no one would waste their money on, and yet the taxpayers are being asked to pony up another $2.6 billion this year.

And although the C–17 has had all these problems, what happened to the price sticker? Well, in 1989 we were told it would cost $199 million each, but in 1995 the price is $563 million each. If this were an automobile, consumers would be filing complaints with the Federal Trade Commission.

□ 1245

Yet, we are not even allowed to discuss this issue on the floor of the House of Representatives, the people's House.

I wanted to remind Members, it is not they who are paying for the C–17, it is the U.S. taxpayer, and they deserve to know what it is they are buying.

Why is there this congressional wall of silence? Four independent reports have shown we get a better airlift if we mix C–17's and 747's or C–5's. That mix, we are told by four independent reports, would save $15 billion of the taxpayers' money.

No one would buy a car without reading the Consumer Reports. No one would buy a car where the features get axed and the price goes up. Members of Congress should be as thrifty as their constituents are. Why aren't they? What is the deal here?

It is time to stop wasting defense dollars. It is time the taxpayer gets an accounting. No more expensive lemons. Let us get the airlift we need at the price we can afford. Let us defeat this rule. Let us give the American taxpayer their money's worth.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the ranking member of the Committee on National Security.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I have said on more than one occasion here, I both understand and respect the fact that all of us come here with different perspectives, different points of view, different philosophies, different values, and different politics at the end of the day, and that we engage in a relevant and significant debate on the critical issues of our time.

But it seems to me this is the one place where we all should always come together, without difference, and that is that the process by which we engage in these substantive discussions and substantive debates be characterized as a process that embraces the principles of fairness, openness, dignity, and integrity.

I am chagrined at the fact that I must rise this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, suggesting to you that the rule that governs the DOD authorization bill for fiscal year 1996 does not meet that test. For those reasons, I must rise in opposition to the rule proposed to govern debate on H.R. 1530. It is not fair. It does not serve well the legislative process. That is why we are here, to engage in a deliberative process to arrive at substantive policy conclusions that affect the lives of millions of Americans and people throughout the world.

It excludes important issues from the debate, and it makes in order an amendment that addresses major issues which need to be worked on by several committees, but instead they were not worked on by several committees. It ignores a lengthy history of allowing for significant debate on this important annual legislation, and it does not return the fair play that I believe this gentleman brought when I sat as chair in the last Congress to the debate of national security policy.

Previous rules have successfully permitted expedited and fair consideration of the defense authorization bill, one of the most important and expensive elements of our national undertakings, Mr. Speaker. Few enough amendments were filed this year in this gentleman's opinion to allow the Committee on Rules to make additional relevant, important amendments in order. This would provide for a better debate, one well within the time-frame envisioned by the majority leadership.

We should not, Mr. Speaker, become captives of time. We have time to debate these matters. What more important issue could we ever discuss than the national security of this Nation? We should provide adequate, ample time to engage in that process substantively.

Mr. Speaker, whether in personal matters, weapons procurement, research and development, foreign policy initiatives, or acquisition reform, the failure to initiate full-fledged even-handed inquires and the public solicitation of the views of outside experts constitutes, in this gentleman's humble opinion, a real legislative shortcoming.

Acquisition reform is just one major area in which such procedural shortcoming initiate substantive programs, in the bill or by amendment, with significant potential unintended consequences, and all without meaningful legislative deliberations. I testified at some length on this matter before the Committee on Rules. I was prepared to answer every question dealing with this extraordinary shortcoming to the members of the Committee on Rules. Yet, in spite of that testimony, we find this matter coming before the Congress in this bill without hearings, without markup, and without the involvement of other committees of relevant jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are being paid. That is why we were elected. That is why this process was set up. To short circuit it in the interests of time or for some reason to exploit an opportunity, denying the Members their responsibility to carry out their fiduciary responsibilities with respect to their duties as Members of Congress, it seems to me is incredibly shortsighted.

Many Members who felt compelled to remedy the deficiencies that are in the acquisition reform bill by virtue of the fact that the process was short-circuited have been denied that opportunity to attempt to refine and address the misgivings and shortcomings that they perceived because the Committee on Rules chose not to provide them that opportunity. So they lost on both counts. The process did not allow them to be involved and the rule that we are debating and discussing at this moment does not give them the opportunity to engage the process a second time.

Efforts to restore environmental management funds to the Department of Energy, to provide impact aid, to provide educational funds to local communities, were not made in order, because the Committee on Rules considered them as amendments to cut funds from the ballistic missile defense program.

Mr. Speaker, this Catch-22 requires Members to provide offsets for amendments that have dollar costs associated with them. That is the rule. That is the name of the game. Yet when they provided such offsets, their amendments were, in this gentleman's opinion, unfairly considered to be interchangeable with amendments that sought as a matter of policy to reduce ballistic missile defense funding.

I also testified specifically on this matter. I urged the members of the Committee on Rules to place those two amendments in the policy context that they were attempting to raise, that these were not ballistic missile defense amendments that should indeed be played off against each other. Yet my admonishment, my cautiousness and my thought processes were laid on the table as these amendments were denied the opportunity to be debated in the full light of day. Other important policy amendments were also not made in order.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, amendments were offered that sought to reduce the authorization level proposed in the Committee on National Security report, H.R. 1530. As you know, the committee placed roughly $10 billion in

budget authority above what the President requested. The budget resolution allowed that ceiling. But I would argue that the House should have the right in the context of this debate to reduce total authorizations in the light of the types of programs the Committee on National Security bought with the budget resolution's increased funding. That is all right. We are the authorization committee. It is one thing in the context of the budget resolution. But it seems to me it is only proper, only fair, only intellectually honest and politically appropriate to allow a Member of Congress to come to this floor and say now that you have engaged in consideration and deliberation on this bill, I have the right or someone would have the right to offer an amendment to reduce that level, now that they know the purposes to which you put the funds. But the Committee on Rules chose not to provide that. I do not understand the principle upon which that decision rests, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, an informed and thorough debate should assure the American people that all of the issues that affect our national security might fully be considered and decided in the full light of day. I do not believe that the proposed rule, as I said earlier, achieves that goal. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, if I can have the attention of the ranking member just briefly, I was so surprised to hear my friend, and he is my friend, rise in opposition to the rule. At the gentleman's request, I specifically declined to write into this rule a time limit on the bill which might preclude Members from having time to offer their amendments. Every single amendment made in order is going to be debated on this floor. There is no king-of-the-hill provision giving the majority an edge, which other parties have had in years past as the gentleman knows. This Committee on Rules under Republican leadership will not have a king-of-the-hill provision. That is a provision whereby an amendment can pass with 240 votes, yet be knocked out by one that has only 218 votes. No more of that. Everything is a fair fight.

Last, amendments are made in order on every single major issue, whether it is the Nunn-Lugar cooperative threat reduction, whether it is the ballistic missile defense, whether it is burden sharing, whether it is the tritium issue, whether it is abortion, all of these issues are singled out. The B–2 bomber, that is in there.

So I just call that to the Member's attention. This is truly a fair rule. I just wanted to let the gentleman know we are still trying to be fair.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER], the vice chairman of the Committee on Rules, and a very valuable Member of this body.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. Fairness, openness, dignity, and integrity are exactly what this rule offers, as was raised by my friend from Oakland, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security. It seems to me as the gentleman from New York, [Mr. SOLOMON] just enumerated, virtually every single proposal is being considered in this legislation. With nearly 200 amendments submit to the Committee on Rules, some decisions had to be made. I believe that using those guides of fairness and openness, we have successfully done that with this rule. I would like to say I believe we are clearly on track here.

I think as we look at our challenge of trying to deal with the national security of this country, as we have faced as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has raised on several occasions the fact that Captain Scott O'Grady was shot down and the challenges that we look at there, and, of course, nuclear expansion throughout the world, this bill is a measure which is very positive in addressing it.

It seems to me that as we look at one of the very important items that directly impacts my State, the Federal Government is making a right decision in selling off the naval petroleum reserve at Elk Hills, and also recognizing that for nearly a century and a half, the State of California has had a very modest claim on part of that, and I hope that we will be able to work out a satisfactory compromise on that with the amendment that has been brought forward.

I thank my friend for yielding and strongly support this rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I had a relatively minor amendment which attempted to delete $17 million for the Army to build a 49th museum in the monument corridor here in Washington, DC, and direct that to family housing. The gentleman talked about the family housing, and it has been testified before our committee, on which I sit, that this is a crisis. I wanted to redirect this $17 million to family housing. I thought that was a pretty good idea. I spoke in subcommittee and full committee asking for the right that I place my amendment on the floor, and both subcommittee and committee chairman expressed an understanding to that.

□ 1300

I think that is normal procedure for reserving your right to bring an amendment to the floor.

What I would like to ask you is, could you explain to me why, and I think other Members of Congress may have this same question, for a member who follows normal procedure in reserving the right to bring it to the floor, why this amendment was not considered in the rule?

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my good friend, I would like to make every amendment in order that is not duplicative so that every Member can work their will.

As the gentleman knows, we are limited with a window of opportunity. We could only make so many amendments in order. I will say this for the gentleman: His Democrat leadership did include his amendment on a second tier of amendments they would like to have had made in order. We made almost all of the first tier amendments in order. There is no more time to add more amendments to it.

It is not just the gentleman. I have a Member, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. KLUG, who will not even speak to me now from our side of the aisle because his amendment was not made in order. We tried to be as fair as we could.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his efforts but this is, I think, an important amendment. We have people in military housing, family housing that is falling apart. I think we should have done it. The Army, I think, has gagged this amendment from coming forward. I think this is an insult to the American taxpayer, and it is an insult to the American military families who are in this housing.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, just to answer the gentleman, we are providing for an additional 5 percent, that is a huge increase, in construction and housing for our military. It is something that is so badly needed. We are taking care of it in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, [Mr. LINDER], another valuable member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, it was not very long ago, 1981, when Ronald Reagan became President of the United States and inherited a military where one-third of our planes could not fly for lack of spare parts, one-third of our ships were in dry dock.

Our soldiers were practicing with pretend bullets, as the chairman of the Committee on rules stated. Troops were on food stamps. Over the next 8 years of buildup and fleshing out, we won the cold war. But the fact of the matter is, our military has been declining in real terms since 1985. Though adjusted for inflation, we are not much further ahead in spending than we were

in 1941, and it is time to build back up again. It is time to get our troops off food stamps, to get them into good housing.

This bill is an effort to do that. The rule under which it will be debated is a fair rule. We will have opportunities to debate most of the substantive issues that come before us. There will be plenty of time to have the discussions heard.

Sure, some amendments did not make it. That happens in virtually every bill that comes to the floor. Even under some open rules, if there is a time frame, they do not make it.

This is a fair rule, it deserves to be supported by the entire body, and I strongly support the rule and urge my colleagues to do also.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. FRANK], a very vocal member of the Massachusetts delegation.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the former chairman of the Committee on Rules for whose regime I have become increasingly nostalgic. It is hard to be vocal when one is gagged.

This rule will provide for the least adequate discussion of a defense authorization bill in the 15 years I have been in Congress. There has not, in my time here, been a rule which so severely limited Members' ability to discuss things.

Efforts by Members on our side to reduce the overall authorization to the President's number were simply arbitrarily canceled. They were ruled out of order. The chairman said, We tried hard. They tried hard, having first made it clear that they could not succeed.

We are in session 3 days this week. Apparently, under the Republican calendar, we only have this week for the defense bill. We did nothing on Monday. We will do nothing on Friday.

To cram the entire defense authorization bill, $270 billion, the biggest single discretionary item, into 3 days, with general debate, with the rule, when you then have 2 days in which we do nothing, why were we not meeting on Monday or Friday? Why under this new, hard-working Republican regime would we not be dealing with this bill? We have a Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday setting.

The *Seawolf* issue will not be coming up. Burden sharing is up. But burden sharing in the past has had three or four different versions that Members could choose among. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. BRYANT, had a much more forceful one that I was prepared to support in addition to my own. It is not allowed. The Committee on rules simply has restricted discussion of these issues more than they have ever been.

We will not be talking about the single biggest item in the discretionary budget. We will not be talking about *Seawolf*. We will have one version to choose from. In some cases, important issues will be debated for 20 minutes; in some cases, 40 minutes. But we will be indeed extremely restricted.

The Republican party has decided to begin increasing military spending at the expense of health research and Medicare and Head Start and other programs, and we will not allow a serious discussion. This is not a rule brought forward by Members who want a lot of attention to what they are doing. This is a rule that says, We are going to increase military spending significantly, far more than it seems to me needed, and we will have very restricted debate.

The notion that efforts to bring the authorization level down to what the President proposed will not be allowed is outrageous. The chairman of the Committee on rules said, Well, we did not do this and we did not do that. I suppose if you were on trial and you were going to be sentenced for some crime, you could plead all the crimes you did not commit. I do not think that would be very persuasive.

Frankly, I would rather have some of these issues up, whether it was king of the hill or king of the mountain or queen of the May. We could vote on them. The gentleman said, We will not vote on them at all. We have got nothing. The gentleman has made a mountain into a molehill. A hill would look pretty good to us right now. The single most important issue we have got, and it is the most restricted rule I can imagine.

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

Let me just say to the gentleman who just spoke, who said that we will not be doing anything on Friday. On Friday we will be taking up the military construction appropriations bill. That is a very, very important piece of legislation. In trying to be family friendly with so many requests from your side of the aisle, we are going to try to get out of here by 2 p.m. on Friday.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in this case I would put being taxpayer friendly ahead of being family friendly. I think our families would not mind if we debated some serious issues about defense and you let us talk about cutting $9 billion back to the President's level.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I was just going to look up the gentleman's rating by the National Taxpayers Union as being one of the big spenders.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is because they never counted military spending.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will submit that for the RECORD in due time.

Let me comment briefly on the statement about the overall funding for this bill. Yes, it is funded at $267 billion. And no, the Schroeder amendment was not allowed because we all know that we are in very, very delicate negotiations with the Senate right now over the total budget for this Government.

We have already voted on the level of spending in the budget that passed this House and consequently, we do not want to do anything that is going to interrupt those negotiations with the Senate.

I think it is extremely important that we keep this bill at that level of spending.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Evans, GA [Mr. NORWOOD]. He is a new Member of this body, and we sure are glad to have him here.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I particularly thank the chairman because he knows, as I know, I am not on the Committee on Rules nor am I on the Committee on National Security, but I am also interested in defense. I do not think you have to be a rocket scientist to know that over the last few years this country has weakened our defenses considerably, and I would like to see us strengthen them.

In addition to strengthening them, I wanted to make sure that we do so and keep ourselves out of war. I have participated in one war, and a strong national defense is the certain way to make certain that my children and grandchildren do not have to participate in that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this rule is more than fair to all sides. With the scope and breadth of this bill, I think it would be impossible for us to move forward in shoring up our weakened defenses and the low level of readiness without such a structured rule and debate.

In reviewing the rule, it is obvious that all points of view from hawk to dove will be represented and will be given ample time and opportunity to be heard.

And once they are heard we will vote, and then we are going to move forward.

This bill is too important to bog down in petty disagreements. We need this bill to better protect our soldiers in the field and to keep our technological edge in a very dangerous world.

Yes, we have won the cold war. Now, because we have won that war, we are given a much more unstable world, which requires us to be just as vigilant, just as prepared, and just as willing to be the world's leader.

Later in debate on this bill, I will outline the importance of resuming tritium production to our Nation's defense and the upkeep of our nuclear arsenal that has helped keep the world in peace over the last 50 years.

This defense authorization is a step in the right direction that takes into account our more than $5 trillion worth of debt. Do I wish we could go further? Yes, I do. Do I wish we could go further? Indeed, I certainly do. Do I think this rule is fair? Yes, I do. Am I

going to vote for this rule? Yes, I am. And I do encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this very dastardly gag rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, this rule is unfair to the children of military families. Let me repeat that: This rule is unfair to the children of military families. For some reason, the Republican leadership decided to prohibit an amendment that I had authored that would fully fund the impact aid program. The impact aid program is that program that provides education funds for the children of our military families living off bases all throughout the United States.

The action of the Republican leadership in this case is to ensure at least a 50 percent cut in impact aid programs for military families all over this country. I think that is cruel. I think it is unfair. And it will hurt our military morale and readiness.

Lest anyone think impact aid is not important, let me quote from the gentleman from Georgia, Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, in a letter of May 18 where he said, ''We must preserve, protect, and improve the impact aid program so that it adequately serves those it was intended to serve.''

The impact aid program should have been preserved. It has been cut by this rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this very restrictive rule. Yesterday in Elyria, OH, I stood in front of 20 mostly elderly Lorain Countians to talk about Medicare cuts. They do not understand how we can spend $9½ billion more on military spending while we cut Medicare, and while we cut student loans, while we cut school lunches. They can also not understand how amendment after amendment can be denied, amendments that would cut further; 37 percent of the amendments that cut spending were denied, were not allowed under this rule.

One particular amendment that was not allowed and that was especially important was to be offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE], to just further study the C–17, so we did not spend the kind of money that this Congress seems to want to spend. The majority wants to spend another $15 to $19 billion on the C–17 when we have alternatives. The C–17 flies half as far, carries half as much and costs twice as much as a 747 and the alternative that we could put together. Yet Republicans on the House floor will not allow us to debate this.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this restrictive rule.

□ 1315

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, there is a memorial service for our departed colleague, Les Aspin. We are trying to hold down our time here. I will be summing up for the majority, and we will not have any further speakers, but in order for the buses to leave on time, and we have 2 votes coming, we are going to try to expedite it. I just wanted that side to know that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would ask the gentleman, are we going to have the votes before we leave?

Mr. SOLOMON. That is up to you, sir.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I am glad I have some decision around here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WICKER). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS].

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

Mr. Speaker, this week I plan to offer an amendment to restore $282 million of the $744 million deleted from the Chairman's mark from DOE's environmental restoration and waste management budget request. Unfortunately, my amendment was not made in order by the Committee on Rules.

As a member of the committee, I had offered a germane amendment that I had offered in the full committee, and for good reason. The committee canceled a hearing dedicated to the DOE's nuclear weapons cleanup program. In effect, Congress will be making an uninformed decision about the funding priorities in the program that will run into the hundreds of billions of dollars, and which will affect the health and safety of Americans around the DOE weapons complex.

Why did this process fail? Many of the same Members who decided to rob DOE's environmental funding to build B–2 bombers and other cold war weapons systems also have DOE facilities in their districts. They do not want to have to go on the record as voting against this funding, and the majority's rules ensures that they will not have to. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] who is also part-time Ambassador to Korea.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, in the past the Pentagon asked for money and the Congress always delivered. Now the Pentagon does not ask for money, and the Congress gives them more.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the overall spending in this bill is much higher than needed for an adequate national defense posture. Unfortunately, the rule we are considering does not allow many of us to express this concern.

To raise defense spending for questionable reasons, when no such spending increases are necessary, is not the right thing to do. It is simply inconsistent to ask Americans to set priorities, then increase military spending, despite lower requests from the administration and the Pentagon. The Clinton administration is not cutting defense. Instead, it is meeting requests of the Pentagon.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense has done some good things, very good things, in the last year: our peacekeeping operations in Rwanda and Haiti; its excellent work at Guantanamo Bay with the refugee situation; training programs, as evidenced by Captain O'Grady and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from William J. Perry to the Honorable Alan J. Dixon.

The letter referred to is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, June 9, 1995.

Hon. ALAN J. DIXON,
Chairman, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, Arlington, VA.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Since I forwarded my recommendations to you on February 28, 1995, I have appreciated the excellent manner in which the Commission has conducted its demanding work under your leadership. I write today to maintain the open exchange of information that has been a hallmark of this Commission's relationship with the Department of Defense.

As a normal part of its process, the Air Force has been conducting site surveys to refine the financial analysis of recommendations affecting Air Force bases. During this process, the financial picture on Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, has changed considerably. As you know, the recommendation concerning Kirtland AFB was designed to retain the Phillips Laboratory and other largely civilian operations, while relocating most of the active duty military operations, and closing related support functions.

In its site survey process, the Air Force discovered that many of the original cost estimates significantly understated the costs of relocating the active duty units. The final estimate of the one-time cost to implement the recommended realignment is $538 million. I understand this figure and the supporting COBRA analysis have been provided previously to your staff. Although some options to reduce these costs were examined, I understand that none of the options provided the same benefits as estimated for the recommended realignment. Significantly, the Department of Energy also asserted that they received support far in excess of that currently reimbursed to the Department of the Air Force for DOE activities on Kirtland AFB. As a result, the total costs to the United States Government were not captured in the original estimates.

After reviewing the results of the site survey, it is my judgment that the recommendation for the realignment of Kirtland AFB no longer represents a financially or operationally sound scenario. I ask

that you take these matters into consideration as the Commission conducts its review of my recommendations.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. PERRY.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to defeat the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the amendments I would offer if the previous question is defeated.

The amendments referred to are as follows:

Amendment to House Resolution 164: On page 6, after line 6 add the following:

''(c) Before consideration of any other amendment, it shall be in order to consider the following amendment as if printed in the report to be offered by Representative Schroeder of Colorado or her designee, debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent:

An amendment to be offered by Representative Schroeder of Colorado or a designee, debatable for 40 minutes: Page 16, after line 8, insert the following new section:

SEC. 4. LIMIT ON TOTAL AUTHORIZATION.

In order to provide a total authorization of appropriations in this Act of $257,602,636,000 (as proposed in the budget of the President for fiscal year 1996), each amount in this Act providing an authorization of appropriations is hereby reduced by 4.0 percent.

(d) After disposition of the amendment numbered 2 printed in subpart D of part 1 of the report, it shall be in order to consider the following amendment as if it were numbered 3 in that subpart to be offered by Representative Edwards of Texas or his designee, debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent:

An amendment to be offered by Representative Edwards of Texas or a designee, debatable for 20 minutes: At the end of title III (page 153, after line 25), insert the following new section:

SEC. 396. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENT EDUCATION ASSISTANCE (IMPACT AID) FOR SCHOOL-AGED DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN MILITARY PERSONNEL.

(a) PROVISION OF DEPENDENT EDUCATION ASSISTANCE (IMPACT AID)—(1) In the case of students described in section 8003(a)(1)(D) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(a)(1)(D)), the Secretary of Defense shall provide funds to local educational agencies that received payments for these students from the Department of Education in fiscal year 1994 or 1995 under the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, 81st Congress) or title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.).

(2) Subject to the availability of appropriations for this purpose, funds shall be paid under this section in fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999. However, the Secretary of Defense may use the authority provided by this section only in the event that payments under section 8003 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703) for a fiscal year on behalf of students described in subsection (a)(1)(D) of such section are not made in a total amount equal to at least the level of funding for fiscal year 1995 under such section for such students.

(b) COMPUTATION OF BASIC PAYMENT.—Each local educational agency described in subsection (a) shall be eligible for basic payments, which shall be computed for each year by multiplying—

(1) the amount determined by dividing—

(A) the amount of funds received by the local educational agency in the second preceding fiscal year under this subsection, section 3(b)(3) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, 81st Congress), or section 8003(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(b)); by

(B) the number of students described in section 8003(a)(1)(D) of such Act in average daily attendance in the second preceding fiscal year; and

(2) the number of such students in average daily attendance of the local educational agency in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the payment is being made.

(c) COMPUTATION OF DISABILITY PAYMENT.—Each local educational agency described in subsection (a) shall also be eligible for disability payments for students described in section 8003(d)(1)(B) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(d)(1)(B)). The payment required by this subsection shall be computed for each year by multiplying—

(1) the amount determined by dividing—

(A) the amount of funds received by the local educational agency during the second preceding fiscal year under this subsection, section 3(d)(2)(C) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, 81st Congress), or section 8003(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(d)); by

(B) the number of students described in section 8003(d)(1)(B) of such Act in average daily attendance in the second preceding fiscal year; and

(2) the number of such students in average daily attendance of each local educational agency in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the payment is being made.

(d) HEAVILY IMPACTED ASSISTANCE.—(1) Each local educational agency described in subsection (a) shall also be eligible for heavily impacted assistance if—

(A) the local educational agency—

(i) had an enrollment of students described in subparagraphs (B) and (D) of section 8003(a)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7003(a)(1)) during the previous fiscal year, the number of which constituted at least 40 percent of the total student enrollment of such agency; and

(ii) has a tax rate for general fund purposes which is at least 95 percent of the average tax rate for general fund purposes of comparable education agencies in the State; or

(B) the local educational agency—

(i) had an enrollment of students described in subparagraphs (B) and (D) of section 8003(a)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(a)(1)) during the previous fiscal year, the number of which constituted at least 35 percent of the total student enrollment of such agency; and

(ii) has a tax rate for general fund purposes which is at least 125 percent of the average tax rate for general fund purposes of comparable educational agencies in the State.

(2)(A) For each local educational agency described in paragraph (1), payments for each year shall be computed by first determining the greater of—

(i) the average per-pupil expenditure of the State in which the agency is located; or

(ii) the average per-pupil expenditure of all the States.

(B) The Secretary shall next subtract from the amount determined under subparagraph (A) the average amount of State aid per pupil received for that year by each local educational agency described in paragraph (1).

(C) For each local educational agency described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall multiply the amount determined under subparagraph (B) by the total number of students described in subparagraphs (B) and (D) of section 8003(a)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(a)(1)) in average daily attendance for that year.

(D) Finally, the Secretary shall reduce the amount determined under subparagraph (C) for a local educational agency for a fiscal year by the total amount of—

(i) all payments the local educational agency receives under subsections (b) and (c) for that year; and

(ii) any payments actually received under section 8003 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703) for that year.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a local educational agency that actually receives funds under section 8003(f) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(f)) for a fiscal year shall be eligible to receive funds under this subsection only after the full amount computed under paragraph (2) has been paid to all local educational agencies described in paragraph (1) that do not receive funds under such section for that fiscal year.

(4) For purposes of providing assistance under this subsection, the Secretary shall use student and revenue data from the local educational agency for the fiscal year for which the agency is applying for assistance.

(5) For purposes of this subsection, the Secretary shall determine the current year State average per-pupil expenditure data for the second preceding fiscal year by the same percentage increase or decrease reflected between the per-pupil expenditure data for the fourth preceding fiscal year and the per-pupil expenditure data for the second preceding fiscal year.

(6) For purposes of this subsection, the term ''average per-pupil expenditure'' means the aggregate current expenditures of all local educational agencies in the State, divided by the total number of children in average daily attendance for whom such agencies provided free public education.

(e) PROHIBITION ON MULTIPLE PAYMENTS.—(1) Amounts received by a local educational agency under subsection (d) in a fiscal year, when added to amounts actually received under section 8003(f) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(f)) for that year, may not exceed the amount the agency would have received under such section had assistance under such section been fully funded.

(2) Amounts received by a local educational agency under subsection (c) in a fiscal year, when added to amounts actually received under section 8003(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(d)) for that year, may not exceed the amount the agency would have received under such section had assistance under such section been fully funded.

(3) Amounts received by a local educational agency under subsection (b) in a fiscal year, when added to amounts actually received under section 8003(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(b)) for that year, may not exceed the amount the agency would have received under such section had assistance under such section been fully funded.

(f) PRORATION OF AMOUNTS.—If necessary due to insufficient funds to carry out this section, the Secretary shall ratably reduce payments under subsections (b, (c), and (d).

(g) COOPERATION.—The Secretary of Education shall assist the Secretary of Defense in gathering such information from the local educational agencies and State educational agencies as may be needed in order to carry out this section.

(h) FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.—The amount provided in section 301(5) for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities is hereby increased by $100,000,000. Of the funds corresponding to such increase—

(1) $50,000,000 shall be available for payments under subsection (b) in fiscal year 1996;

(2) $10,000,000 shall be available for payments under subsection (c) in fiscal year 1996; and

(3) $40,000,000 shall be available for payments under subsection (d) in fiscal year 1996.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for payments under this section such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1997, 1998, and 1999.

(j) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION.—The amount provided in section 201(5) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities, and the amount provided in section 241 for the National Missile Defense, are both reduced by $100,000,000.

(e) It shall be in order to consider the following three amendments as if the amendments were numbered 47, 48 and 49 and printed in part 2 of the report:

47. An amendment to be offered by Representative Browder of Alabama or a designee, debatable for 10 minutes: In the table relating to authorized Army construction projects inside the United States in section 2101(a), strike out the item relating to Fort Myer, Virginia.

In section 2104(a), reduce the amount specified in paragraph (1) by $17,000,000 and increase the amount specified in paragraphs (5)(A) by $17,000,000.

48. An amendment to be offered by Representative Evans of Illinois or a designee, debatable for 10 minutes: At the end of title XXXI (page 532, after line 5), insert the following new section:

SEC. 3145. ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR CERTAIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—(1) Amounts authorized by section 3102(c) for waste management are hereby increased by $150,000,000.

(2) Amounts authorized by section 3102(f) for nuclear materials and facilities stabilization are hereby increased by $81,000,000.

(3) Amounts authorized by section 3102(g) for compliance and program coordination are hereby increased by $51,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Amounts authorized by section 241 are hereby reduced by $282,000,000. Affairs shall return such portion to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army.

(d) LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be transferred under this section shall be determined by surveys that are satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army. The cost of such surveys shall be borne by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Army may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the transfer under this section as the Secretary of the Army considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

49. An amendment to be offered by Representative Coleman of Texas or a designee, debatable for 10 minutes: At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII (page 490, after line 2), insert the following new section:

SEC. 2834. TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION, FORT BLISS, TEXAS.

(a) TRANSFER OF LAND AND NATIONAL CEMETERY.—The Secretary of the Army may transfer, without reimbursement, to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs a parcel of real property (including any improvements thereon) consisting of approximately 22 acres and comprising a portion of Fort Bliss, Texas.

(b) USE OF LAND.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall use the real property transferred under subsection (a) as an addition to the Fort Bliss National Cemetery and administer such real property pursuant to chapter 24 of title 38, United States Code.

(c) RETURN OF UNUSED LAND.—If the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines that any portion of the real property transferred under subsection (a) is not needed for use as a national cemetery, the Secretary of Veterans * * *.

Strike subsection (a) of section 4 and redesignate accordingly.

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

''Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, it shall not be in order to consider the amendments numbered 1 and 2 in subpart C of the report.''

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

Mr. Speaker, I would try to expedite this matter, again for the services for Les Aspin.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the last couple of speakers speak. One in particular said he was talking to a group of senior citizens, and they vehemently objected to the amount of money being spent on this defense budget. I do not know about where he comes from in Ohio, but I come from Glens Falls, Queensbury, NY, up in the Adirondack Mountains. It is a funny thing, I go home every weekend, and I have for 17 years. It is a really beautiful place in this world. I never moved my family here to Washington and have commuted back and forth.

Every weekend I see senior citizens. I saw a group this past weekend. I have an opportunity to tell them what was in this defense budget we are going to pass here this week. We talked about the need for it. So often Captain O'Grady's name came up. Captain O'Grady's name came up, and we have to ask ourselves, how was he rescued? How were we able to do that, when we have failed so miserably before, in years past, when we did not have a strong military preparedness? How was it that he was able to avoid his captors? How was it that he was able to have the equipment with him that was going to be able to communicate back to our troops?

Then, how was it that we were able to jam their radars? How was it that we were able to go in there with our helicopter gunships and bring him out without even a casualty? It is because of what we are reinstating in this budget today. It is so terribly, terribly important.

We must never, never, in the future of this country, ask men and women in All-Volunteer military to volunteer, and then to put them in harm's way without giving them the very best that we can do. I do not know of any senior citizen in my whole congressional district who resents the fact that we are going to spend a mere $8 billion more. I do not know of any that would.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would just say to Members today, this is a fair rule. I would ask them to vote for the rule, and I would ask them to give their wholehearted support to this very, very vital piece of legislation which is going to protect the strategic interests of this country around the world, but more than that, it is going to protect the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Page 3, line 23, strike ''A'' and insert in lieu thereof ''B''.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the minority is aware of this amendment. It simply corrects a clerical error by changing the letter A to the letter B. This clarifies what the rule already specifies, and that the extra 30 minutes of debate applies to the Nunn-Lugar topic, and not to the subject of the B–2 bomber.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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.

Pursuant to clause 5(b) 1 of rule XV, the Chair may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the amendment.

This will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 191, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 367]

YEAS—225

Allard	Castle	Ewing
Archer	Chabot	Fawell
Armey	Chambliss	Flanagan
Bachus	Chenoweth	Foley
Baker (CA)	Christensen	Forbes
Baker (LA)	Chrysler	Fowler
Ballenger	Clinger	Fox
Barr	Coble	Franks (CT)
Barrett (NE)	Coburn	Franks (NJ)
Bartlett	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Barton	Combest	Frisa
Bass	Cooley	Funderburk
Bateman	Cox	Gallegly
Bereuter	Crane	Ganske
Bilbray	Crapo	Gejdenson
Bilirakis	Cremeans	Gekas
Bliley	Cubin	Gilchrest
Blute	Cunningham	Gillmor
Boehlert	Davis	Gilman
Boehner	Deal	Goodlatte
Bonilla	DeLay	Goodling
Bono	Diaz-Balart	Goss
Brownback	Dickey	Greenwood
Bryant (TN)	Doolittle	Gunderson
Bunn	Dornan	Gutknecht
Bunning	Dreier	Hancock
Burr	Duncan	Hansen
Burton	Dunn	Hastert
Buyer	Ehlers	Hastings (WA)
Callahan	Ehrlich	Hayworth
Calvert	Emerson	Hefley
Camp	English	Heineman
Canady	Ensign	Herger

Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kim
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—18

Brown (CA)
Collins (MI)
DeLauro
Everett
Fields (TX)
Gephardt
Graham
Johnston
Kleczka
Lantos
Largent
Mica
Myrick
Peterson (MN)
Ros-Lehtinen
Towns
Wilson
Yates

□ 1342

Messrs. PICKETT, SPRATT, SKELTON, and GORDON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. GANSKE, LINDER, PORTER, KIM, GUNDERSON, COX of California, and FOLEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 367, I was with a constituent and inadvertently missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 183, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 368]

AYES—233

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Flanagan
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kim
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—183

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Ganske
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano

Shays	Taylor (MS)	Volkmer
Skaggs	Tejeda	Ward
Slaughter	Thompson	Waters
Spratt	Thornton	Watt (NC)
Stark	Thurman	Waxman
Stenholm	Torres	Williams
Stokes	Torricelli	Wise
Studds	Tucker	Woolsey
Stupak	Velazquez	Wyden
Tanner	Vento	Wynn
Tauzin	Visclosky	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—18

Brown (CA)	Gephardt	Myrick
Collins (MI)	Johnston	Peterson (MN)
DeLauro	Kleczka	Ros-Lehtinen
Doyle	Lantos	Towns
Fields (TX)	Largent	Wilson
Foley	Mascara	Yates

□ 1352

Mr. FARR and Mr. TORRES 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, at the time of rollcall vote No. 368, passage of the rule on consideration of H.R. 1530, the 1996 national defense authorization bill, I was unavoidably detained while testifying before the Base Realignment and Closure Commission in the Senate Hart Building. I was testifying in strong support of the 911th Air Reserve Station at Pittsburgh International Airport and the Charles E. Kelley Support Facility in Oakdale, both facilities which are in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall No. 368.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 368 I was unavoidably detained—testifying before the Base Realignment and Closure Commission and could not return in time to record my vote. Had I been here for the vote, I would have voted ''no'' on the rule.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making announcements and also to tell Members there will not be another vote around here until about 6:30 this evening in case they want to leave the floor now.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform Members that when the Rules Committee is requested to grant open rules on any of the 13 regular appropriations bills for fiscal year 1996, the rules may include a provision giving the Chair authority to grant priority in recognition to those Members who have caused their amendments to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted. Amendments should be titled, ''Submitted for printing under clause 6 of rule 23,'' signed by the Member, and submitted at the Speaker's table.

Mr. Speaker, it has been our experience so far this year that the preprinting option has worked to the benefit of the sponsoring Members, the committees of jurisdiction, and the general membership alike. It has helped to ensure a more informed and deliberative amendment process on the House floor.

The new House rule requiring the Clerk to assign a numerical designation to each amendment filed in the RECORD has also made it easier for all concerned to identify amendments for reference purposes. We encourage Members to continue to take advantage of this preprinting option.

We also ask Members to score any offset amendments with the CBO in advance since offsetting budget authority numbers will not necessarily achieve an offset in outlays.

PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT TO HOUSE REPORT 104–127 ON H.R. 1062, ENHANCING COMPETITION IN FINANCIAL SERVICES INDUSTRY

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report to House Report 104–127 which accompanied H.R. 1062 and that such report be printed. The supplemental report incorporates, as required by rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office of H.R. 1062, as reported and amended by the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 13, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation from the Committee on Small Business effective June 13, 1995.

Warm regards,

KAREN MCCARTHY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 166) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 166

Resolved, That the following named Members be and they are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Mr. Brewster of Oklahoma.

Committee on Resources: Mr. Pickett of Virginia and Mr. Pallone of New Jersey, both of whom will rank in order after Mr. Ortiz of Texas.

Committee on Small Business: Mr. Skelton of Missouri, who will rank after Mr. LaFalce of New York, and Mr. Baldacci of Maine.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Ms. McCarthy of Missouri.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 94

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 94.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

1993 ANNUAL REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the requirements of 42 U.S.C. 3536, I transmit herewith the 29th Annual Report of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which covers calendar year 1993.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 13, 1995.*

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain twenty 1-minute speeches on each side.